



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Tuesday, October 21, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of all the earth, we thank Thee for the beauty of life about us, for the symphony of sound and color in the world of nature. And we thank Thee for the world within, deep and mysterious, which Thou hast made for Thy spirit. Keep our inner being so in harmony with the outward beauty, that the invisible and the visible world may be one in the kingdom of the spirit. With the passing of each day may we grow both in personal piety and in social righteousness. Give us wisdom to remove every discord between man and man, and all that blemishes the landscape of human existence. Make us strong to help others, banish poverty, eliminate injustice, and set up Thy kingdom of peace and good will among men. Be with those who serve in this place that America may lead in all that is beautiful and good and true.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 20, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 17, 1969, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Richard Vigil;

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos;

S. 1836. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended;

S. 2564. An act to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; and

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 12, 1969, and ending October 18, 1969, as "National Industrial Hygiene Week."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 74. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota;

S. 775. An act to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota; and

S. 921. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, South Dakota; and

S. 210. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the Pueblo of Laguna.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4293. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports;

H.R. 9163. An act to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Ga., under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949;

H.R. 13767. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14030. An act to amend section 358a (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 4293. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9163. An act to authorize the disposal of certain real property in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Ga., under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

H.R. 13767. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Fort Donelson National Battlefield in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14030. An act to amend section 358a (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The bill clerk read the nomination of William O. Baker, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Regents, Na-

30643

tional Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years from August 3, 1969;

And of Jack Malcolm Layton, of Arizona, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1973.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, commencing with Calendar No. 478 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE URGES THE PASSAGE OF SIX BILLS TO IMPROVE HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS—S. 1279, H.R. 693, H.R. 2768, H.R. 3130, H.R. 9334, AND H.R. 9634

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I am proud to recommend to the Senate six important veterans' bills which will greatly expand and improve the hospital, nursing home and outpatient care available to the men who have served our Nation in the military services. This is probably the largest package of veterans' medical care bills to be reported at any one time by the committee. I wish to commend all of my colleagues on the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, for their non-partisan efforts with regard to these bills.

The committee urges the Senate to approve S. 1279, which would greatly ease the burden of those veterans who are former prisoners of war in establishing that the disabilities they suffer are service connected. More specifically, this bill would create a rebuttable presumption that any disability suffered by a former prisoner of war is service connected for purposes of that veteran's right to hospital and outpatient care. The committee recognizes that many veterans who are former prisoners of war have great difficulty in proving the origin of their disabilities because of incomplete or destroyed medical records. Unless there is a presumption in the veteran's favor, such as S. 1279 creates, a former prisoner of war in many cases would have an almost impossible task of qualifying for hospital and medical care.

At present there are approximately 115,000 former prisoners of war in the United States, not including those who are now imprisoned by North Vietnam. As a result of the harsh and often inhumane treatment these men have received, many of them suffer with physical and psychiatric disturbances which will be with them for the rest of their lives. The committee believes that because of the sacrifices these veterans have made for our country, they should not have the burden of proving the service connection for their disabilities.

The second bill which the committee urges the Senate to adopt is H.R. 693. This bill, as amended by the committee, would eliminate the requirement that a veteran who is in receipt of a Veterans' Administration pension sign a pauper's oath as a prerequisite to receiving hospital care for non-service-connected disabilities. This requirement that a veteran sign this onerous and degrading oath of poverty is a disgrace which has been allowed to exist for much too long a time. H.R. 693 is a positive step toward removing this stain from our veterans' laws. With the adoption of H.R. 693, approximately 194,869 veterans would be exempted from having to swear to this oath in order to obtain hospital and outpatient care.

A third bill which the committee recommends to the Senate is H.R. 2768. This bill would authorize community nursing home care for an unlimited period of time for those veterans hospitalized with service-connected disabilities. At present such veterans may stay in a community nursing home for only 6 months. Permission for a veteran to remain in a nursing home for longer than 6 months rests in the sole discretion of the Veterans' Administration. H.R. 2768 greatly expands the veterans community nursing home program which has proved to be so successful in the past.

The fourth bill favorably reported by the committee is H.R. 3130, which permits the Veterans' Administration to furnish medical service to a veteran having a service-connected disability whether or not the care is needed for that particular disability. This relieves the veteran of the burden of showing that he is seeking care for the disability known to be service connected, a medical question that is often disputable, and time consuming in determination. This present limitation on medical care to the precise disability that was incurred in service is unwarranted, and should be dropped, as this bill provides.

Fifth, the committee considered and favorably recommends H.R. 9334, to improve the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans homes. It raises the Federal payment per diem for each veteran from \$3.50 to \$7.50, and authorizes \$5 million matching funds each year for 10 years, for remodeling or altering State home facilities. This bill will permit the renovation of many State veterans homes which desperately need it.

The final bill the committee recommends, H.R. 9634, authorizes the Veterans' Administration to enter into sharing arrangements with other hospitals so vital medical resources can be used where needed. More flexibility in the

administration of personnel will permit the best use of interns, residents, and nurses within an area, rather than just for the particular Veterans' Administration hospital.

These bills are a great tribute to hard work and leadership the new chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, Senator CRANSTON. It is an honor for a new Senator to be chairman of any subcommittee in the Senate, and in the case of the Senator from California, we can thank him for the speed with which he mastered the subject matter of these bills and the complicated business of medical care and treatment for veterans.

The subcommittee and the full committee worked diligently and thoroughly. The reports attest to the detailed consideration given all six of these bills.

I urge their prompt enactment by the Senate. They will mean better, and more efficient health care for the Nation's veterans. I submit that these bills are a proper tribute to our veterans from a grateful nation.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1279, H.R. 693, H.R. 2768, H.R. 3130, H.R. 9334, and H.R. 9634. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I reported these bills from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on October 17, 1969, under authority of the order of the Senate of October 16, 1969, with committee amendments in four of them. I commend all of these bills to the Senate.

One of these bills, H.R. 9634, contains minor administrative amendments to authorities governing the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care program. This bill is explained in the committee report as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 9634

Sections 1, 2, and 3 incorporate the provisions of S. 2623 to amend 38 U.S.C. § 4114, to provide greater flexibility in the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care program. The modifications these sections make would generally provide the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs with greater administrative discretion in the appointment of nurses, particularly in recruiting career nurses; in the Veterans' Administration internship and residency program by authorizing agreements for the central administration of the administrative and personnel aspects of the programs of those interns and residents serving part time in Veterans' Administration hospitals and part time in other non-Federal hospitals; and in the appointment of dentists of high academic and research standing on a temporary full-time or part-time basis.

More specific explanations of these three sections follow:

Section 1 of the bill provides for the amendment of section 4114(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the temporary full-time appointment, for a period not to exceed 1 year, of persons who have completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing and are awaiting registration.

Nursing school graduates who are awaiting registration in a State are recruited for the purpose of ultimate career appointment as nurses in the Veterans' Administration following such registration. The ability of the Veterans' Administration to offer employment to them immediately upon graduation provides an invaluable source for recruiting career nurses. While most of these employees are registered and converted to career nurse appointments within 90 days of their employ-

ment, circumstances are such that this is not always possible. This can result from such reasons as State delay in processing registration applications, examination scheduling practices, and the inability of a candidate (e.g., illness) to be available on the scheduled date of an examination. In these situations, it is necessary that these employees be kept in an employment status if they are to be retained until they can become career nurses.

This legislative change would be of further assistance in meeting nursing needs of the medical program.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 4114(b) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to enter into agreements for the central administration of interns and residency training and would allow him to expend appropriated funds for the purpose of paying to the central administrative body the costs involved for the periods during which the trainee serves with the Veterans' Administration.

Under present Veterans' Administration programs, there are three types of residents and interns: (1) those whose residency program is established and directed by a Veterans' Administration hospital and who although they may serve a portion of their residency in other hospitals, receive the entire amount of their stipends, fringe benefits, and leave privileges under Veterans' Administration regulations; (2) those whose residency program is established and directed by other than a Veterans' Administration hospital but who serve a portion of their residency in a Veterans' Administration hospital, receiving their stipends, fringe benefits, and leave privileges under Veterans' Administration regulations only for the periods they are serving in a Veterans' Administration hospital; and (3) those whose residency program is established and directed jointly by a Veterans' Administration hospital and one or more participating institutions and who serve on a rotating basis in the participating institutions, receiving their stipends, fringe benefits, and leave privileges under Veterans' Administration regulations only for the periods they are serving in a Veterans' Administration hospital. It is in the latter two types that administrative problems arise.

The movement of Veterans' Administration residency and internship programs toward professional unification with the programs of medical school hospitals continues to increase. The Advisory Subcommittee on Programs for Exchange of Medical Information, a subcommittee of the Special Medical Advisory Group, authorized by section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, recently passed the following resolution:

"The subcommittee is conscious of the fact that the geometric advances of medical science are moving beyond the capacity of the single hospital to provide all that is required to produce the best educated resident. Thus, with increasing frequency, the residency is becoming an educational endeavor shared by a group of hospitals. Each participating hospital must be convinced that the individual resident "belongs" to all and not just to the hospital in which he is physically present at the moment. For this reason, the Veterans' Administration is urged to do all in its power to create mechanisms which will provide the utmost flexibility in the scheduling and movement of residents between VA hospital and non-VA hospital. There should be no limitations of movement based upon distinctions of being on duty at the VA hospital or away from the VA hospital. Similarly every effort should be made to minimize differences in pay scales and in fringe benefits among hospitals grouped for residency training, to assure a total income to the resident commensurate with his education and provision of valuable service as a byproduct of his training as a resident. It is recom-

mended, therefore, that in each VA-hospital-non-VA hospital(s) combination, local VA hospital management be permitted the utmost discretion and capability to establish pay rates and make scheduling arrangements appropriate for the local situation. This local adaptability will produce many individual variations in patterns of operation throughout the Nation, but this diversity will undoubtedly serve to "graduate" the type of residents which the Veterans' Administration and the Nation need critically."

To accomplish intern and residency training within the concept now growing more prevalent, the Veterans' Administration feels that it must more and more resort to the integrated type of training wherein the trainee will serve a portion of his time in a Veterans' Administration facility and may receive training in several other nongovernmental hospitals. This creates tremendous problems in that the pay, fringe benefits, and leave policies differ in the various institutions involved. Thus, when a trainee moves from one institution to another, it results in a great deal of confusion as to his entitlement to fringe benefits and leave. Moreover, it involves different rates of pay and there are routine delays, particularly while serving with the Veterans' Administration, as would be the case in any Federal agency, in receiving pay as a result of pay administration procedures. This situation can be remedied insofar as the nongovernmental hospitals are concerned and, in the past few years, the Veterans' Administration has been presented with more than 20 proposals for some type of accommodation which would permit it to participate in an intern or residency operation administered from a central point.

The Veterans' Administration feels, and the committee agrees, that participation in a centrally administered program would greatly enhance its ability to train medical personnel. Moreover, it would be less costly in that Veterans' Administration payments would be limited to those periods when the trainee is serving in the Veterans' Administration facility and the Veterans' Administration is receiving his service.

The five other bills are designed to expand and improve medical and hospital care benefits and facilities for the treatment of seriously disabled veterans.

Two of the House-passed bills, H.R. 2768 and H.R. 3130, were reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee without amendment. These bills are explained in the committee reports as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 2768

Section 620 of title 38, United States Code, authorizes the placement in a community nursing home at the Veterans' Administration's expense (generally for a period of 6 months), hospitalized veterans who are no longer in need of hospital care and whose primary requirements are for nursing care. This bill would authorize such community nursing home care of unlimited duration for veterans hospitalized for a service-connected disability. Service-connected veterans are admitted as a matter of right for their service-connected disabilities to all Veterans' Administration hospitals. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are admitted on a bed-available basis if unable to defray the necessary expenses.

Placement in community nursing homes under 38 U.S.C. § 620 has been a factor in bringing about the desired reduction of the workload of the Veterans' Administration hospital system. In the committee's view, the bill's provisions would further reduce that workload and also the cost for medical care for service-connected veterans in Veterans' Administration facilities. Cost of care for beneficiaries of this bill now ranges as high as \$50 a day for hospital care in contrast to

approximately \$19.50 a day for community nursing care.

The committee is also of the view that the original intention of section 620, to aid the veteran and his family in making the transition from a hospital to his place in the community, should be expanded for veterans hospitalized with service-connected disabilities. Such a veteran should be entitled to all necessary nursing home care at Veterans' Administration expense as close as possible to his home community. Indeed, the longer the duration of his stay in a nursing home, the greater may be the veteran's need for location in his home community in order to permit visits by friends and relatives residing there. Unfortunately the location of Veterans' Administration operated nursing home beds does not in many cases permit a veteran to be near his home community.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that approval of this proposed legislation would increase the daily nursing care load in community nursing homes by approximately 350 at a cost of \$1,500,000 annually.

As part of its consideration of H.R. 2768, the committee also considered H.R. 692, which the subcommittee had ordered reported to the full committee without recommendation. That bill, also amending section 620, would permit community nursing home confinements of 9, rather than the present 6, months. With the adoption of H.R. 2768 for service-connected veterans, the impact of H.R. 692 would be limited to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. The full committee did not feel that favorable action on H.R. 692 was warranted in light of testimony from the Chief Medical Director, and the Director, Extended Care Service, of the Veterans' Administration that since establishment of the community nursing home program in 1965 only 302 requests for extensions beyond 6 months confinement were made from a patient population of over 25,000 and that 92 percent of them had been granted.

These officials also testified that the Veterans' Administration was "not reluctant" to grant these exceptions and did so "when there is medical and economic necessity" or "factors of humanity" (hearings, p. 64). However, VA regulation section 6051.1, which limits extensions to "circumstances of a most unusual nature such as when additional time is needed to complete imminent arrangements for other care," seems narrower than the testimony quoted above. In the committee's view, these regulations should be revised in accordance with the testimony. When that is done, the committee believes that extensions will be granted to those non-service-connected veterans for whom there is no other reasonable alternative to continuation of community nursing home care at Veterans' Administration expense beyond 6 months.

Finally, the committee was concerned that a blanket extension from 6 to 9 months of community nursing home care for non-service-connected veterans might, by virtue of budget limitations, significantly reduce the number of needy veterans who could receive any care in such facilities at Veterans' Administration expense.

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 3130

This measure would make available to any war veteran who has a permanent total disability resulting from a service-connected condition, complete medical services, which in effect means outpatient care for a non-service-connected disability.

Although outpatient treatment for veterans is generally restricted to service-connected disabilities under 38 U.S.C. § 612, the prehospital and posthospital care program now operative in the Veterans' Administration medical system applies in thousands of instances to non-service-connected cases. The "pre" system permits a workup prior to admission to a hospital; the "post" system

authorizes a followup of the care and treatment prescribed in the hospital.

The committee supports this bill for several reasons. First, it recognizes the need to provide the fullest possible medical care to veterans with service-connected disabilities. A veteran totally disabled by a service-connected condition should not be troubled with the necessity of trying to prove in particular cases that certain other conditions may be considered related to the service-connected disability. It is felt that their service-connected total disability status should entitle them to full medical care from the Veterans' Administration without need for investigation as to the exact relationship between their service-connected disability and other conditions. Second, the elimination of the need for such investigation will save the Veterans' Administration the often complicated and time-consuming task of making medical judgments as to whether certain conditions are related to or separate from a totally disabling service-connected condition. Third, substantial evidence exists to indicate that the extension of outpatient services to veterans such as this group would cause a further decline in the inpatient care program of the Veterans' Administration hospital system and would have an overall effect in reducing cost.

The Veterans' Administration estimates, however, that the enactment of this legislation would cost approximately \$8 million the first year.

One of the House-passed bills, H.R. 9334, was reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with a very minor amendment which is explained in the committee report. This bill is explained in the committee report as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 9334

Following the Civil War, a tier of Northern States built and operated State soldiers' homes which were for the care and treatment of Federal veterans of the War Between the States. Each home, naturally, set up its own criteria for admission and some homes permitted the veteran to bring his wife with him at the time he was admitted. Originally they were conceived as old soldiers' homes and provided largely domiciliary care. Lately they have developed into more sophisticated facilities, providing the full spectrum of care—domiciliary, hospital, and nursing. The program has expanded, in recent years, to cover homes constructed in Georgia, West Virginia, and Oklahoma.

Historically, the Federal Government has made a contribution for the care of each such State home veteran who is eligible under the provisions of title 38 for care in a Veterans' Administration hospital. That level of payment today stands at \$3.50 per day for medical care and the same amount for hospital care; but a \$5 rate is provided for nursing home care, the higher rate being justified because nursing home care has only recently been added to the State home system.

One of the provisions of Public Law 88-450 was to create this special rate for nursing home care for State homes, and in addition it authorized a \$5 million yearly appropriation for 10 fiscal years through fiscal year 1974 to be used on a matching fund basis for the construction of new nursing home facilities. ***

Section 1 of the bill would amend pertinent provisions of title 38 to increase the Federal payment for hospital care in a State home from \$3.50 to \$7.50. As a companion to the present continuing authorization of appropriations for the construction of State veterans nursing home facilities, section 2 of the bill would authorize a \$5 million appropriation on a matching fund basis for 10 years to assist the States in remodeling and modifying or altering existing hospital and domiciliary facilities at State homes.

It should be borne in mind that domiciliary costs in the Veterans' Administration facilities now average \$6.63 per day in contrast to \$3.50 which the Government pays to a State home for similar care; that nursing care in a State home averages \$5 per day, while the Veterans' Administration figure on an average is \$15.60 per day in its own facilities and for a community nursing home, \$13.24. If the proposed hospital rate of \$7.50 is enacted into law, this will contrast with a VA cost of \$21.63 a day for psychiatric hospitals and \$40.90 for care in a general hospital.

The committee received testimony indicating that many existing State home facilities had been constructed around the turn of the century and were in desperate need of renovation. Testimony also was provided that at least 16 States presently have plans for alterations, expansion, or modernization of present facilities. The matching Federal funds that could be made available under this bill should prove an accelerating factor in these plans. Thus, there would seem to be a clear need for matching Federal participation in raising the capital for making the necessary renovations.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the first-year cost of the bill would be \$2,803,000. This would be increased by \$2,500,000 in 1971 because of the funds for remodeling and alteration and another \$2,500,000 in 1972 for the same reason.

Two of the bills, S. 1279 and H.R. 693, were reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with amendments of some significance. These amendments are fully explained in the reports on those bills. I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) for his introduction of S. 1279 to assist former prisoners of war in claims for hospital and medical care from the Veterans' Administration. The committee amendment carries out the essential purpose of the bill as introduced by Senator MONTOYA.

S. 1279 and H.R. 693 are explained in the committee reports as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 1279

The bill, as amended by the committee, would establish, for the purposes of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, relating to hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for veterans, a rebuttable presumption that any disability from which a veteran of any war, or of service after January 31, 1955, is suffering is service connected where any one of the following three conditions is met:

(1) When the Veterans' Administration is not, within a reasonable period of time, able to locate and examine any medical records covering such a veteran's active duty service during any particular tour of duty—that is, where there has been an enlistment and a discharge, or a discharge and a new enlistment or tour of duty. It is important to note in connection with this category that the absence of records must be total and that it is not intended by the committee that the creation of this category should open the door to claims that records for particular alleged medical conditions are absent and that the presumption should thus obtain. Rather, there should be relatively little, if any, dispute as to which cases fit this category—namely, those in which the Veterans' Administration calls for the file of a veteran for a particular tour of duty and no medical records for that tour of active duty are forthcoming. Although the committee considered the possibility of extending the presumption to cover cases in which no medical records were available for any substantial portion of service, this was rejected as impracticable in light of military record-keeping practices. Since no regular (for example, monthly) positive entries are required on a

soldier's medical record, such a provision would inevitably lead to numerous claims of missing records for particular illnesses or injuries, and the Veterans' Administration would be required to spend significant time just determining whether the burden of proof should be shifted.

(2) When the Veterans' Administration is not able, within a reasonable period of time, to locate and examine the medical record of any separation physical examination which was required to be conducted by law or regulation in effect at the time of or shortly before separation of the veteran. Again, the absence of this key record should be readily ascertainable and should not serve to proliferate claims that the presumption be raised. It is the committee's understanding that separation physical examinations are generally required for servicemen who have served at least 30 days of active duty or active duty for training unless they are being separated for immediate enlistment.

(3) When the veteran in question was a prisoner of war or was forcibly detained or interned in line of duty by a foreign government or power. With respect to claims by former prisoners of war, it is the committee's understanding that the Veterans' Administration already awards to them the most expeditious treatment and medical examinations as well as the benefit of the doubt on medical interpretations. This provision of the bill would codify the benefit of the doubt as a rebuttable presumption. At the same time, this provision is not intended in any way to alter or replace the expeditious handling of such cases currently required in Veterans' Administration regulations.

In the case of those veterans who were not held during a "period of war" as defined in 38 U.S.C. 101(11) (such as during the post-Korean conflict (after January 31, 1955) and before the Vietnam era began (on August 5, 1964), the "line of duty" concept is intended to exclude the same category of cases which would generally be excluded for workmen's compensation purposes when an employee is clearly on "a frolic of his own." This would include misconduct or disobedience of orders such as being absent without leave (AWOL). Generally, servicemen on authorized leave would be entitled to the benefit of the presumption if captured during that period by a foreign government or power or a force purporting to act in the name of such government or power.

The committee is aware of the provision of 38 U.S.C. 354(b) that veterans of combat with the enemy shall have resolved in their favor all reasonable doubts with regard to claims of service connection of any disease or injury. However, the committee believes that in cases in which the unavailability of records, through no fault of his own, virtually precludes a veteran from successfully carrying the burden of proving service connection, the law should affirmatively relieve him of that burden. Thus, in the three enumerated circumstances, the burden would be shifted to the Veterans' Administration, and it would have to disprove service connection.

In introducing this bill, Senator Montoya, its principal sponsor, estimated that somewhat less than 115,000 former prisoners of war (not including those presently held by the North Vietnamese) are now living and that many already have disabilities which are rated as service connected. He also stressed at that time and later in testimony before the committee, the very serious nutritional deficiencies and psychiatric disturbances resulting from such imprisonment which may plague a former prisoner of war for the rest of his life and which may many years after discharge be manifested by new symptoms difficult to prove as having arisen out of service. The committee agrees that, in light of the extensive sacrifices many of these men have been called upon to make for their country, they should be relieved of the bur-

den of proving service-connection for their disabilities.

This statutory recognition of the special medical problems of prisoners of war is recognized in present law in 38, U.S.C. 612(b)(3) which provides for furnishing of outpatient dental services and treatment and related dental appliances to former prisoners of war.

The presumption provided by the committee amendment has been made rebuttable rather than conclusive so as to preclude successful claims of service connection for disabilities resulting from conditions clearly arising before or after and independent of service. There are a number of precedents for raising such presumptions. For example, for purposes of disability compensation under 38 U.S.C. 311, there is a rebuttable presumption of sound medical condition upon enrollment in military service; and for the same purposes under sections 312 and 313 certain diseases—Chronic, tropical, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, and Hansen's disease—manifesting themselves after service under certain conditions are rebuttably presumed to have been service connected in their origins. By contrast, the section amended by the bill, section 602, presently raises a *conclusive* presumption of service connection for any active psychosis developed within 2 years of discharge.

The Veterans' Administration estimates the total first-year cost of this bill for the former prisoners of war (not including those presently held as prisoners of the North Vietnamese or listed as missing in action) as approximately \$1,017,000 including approximately \$215,000 in administrative costs. Because of the uncertainty of the number of veterans who would apply for the benefit of the presumption under the first two categories, it is impracticable to make a precise estimate of the annual cost for those categories. However, there is no reason to believe that these categories would entail substantial expenditures.

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 693

Section 1 of the bill would provide that a veteran who is in receipt of a Veterans' Administration pension would no longer be required to sign, under oath, a statement of inability to defray the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care in order to gain admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital for a non-service-connected disability. Presently, veterans with service-connected disabilities are admitted to Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries as a matter of right; but non-service-connected veterans must complete an oath of inability to defray necessary expenses, which under 38 U.S.C. § 622 is required to be accepted by the Veterans' Administration as sufficient evidence of such inability. The oath form which non-service-connected veterans must complete also includes a number of questions regarding financial data.

Although under present Veterans' Administration practice veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions need not complete the financial data items, they are still required to swear or affirm to the oath. The committee believes that such an oath is entirely superfluous for such pensioners whose financial need has already been verified for pension purposes.

The House-passed bill premised the exemption on an age test (72 years or older), thereby eliminating a needs test for care for non-service-connected conditions of such veterans. The committee's amendment to substitute a pension test would apply to considerably more veterans than the age test. Based on the number of VA patients discharged from VA and non-VA hospitals in 1968, the age test would exempt from taking the oath 110,056 non-service-connected veterans who were 72 years or older. Based on these same figures, the amended section 1 using a pension test would cover 194,869 such non-service-connected veterans and would fail to cover only 17,232 non-service-con-

nected veterans 72 years of age and over who were not in receipt of pensions.

Thus, the pension yardstick would apply to 84,813 individual veterans whose neediness had clearly been established and who would not be covered by the age test, and would extend coverage to approximately 67,581 more veterans than the House-passed provision. Whereas the House-passed measure would have an estimated first-year cost of \$1,825,000—since it is expected that some veterans 72 years or older presently unwilling or unable to subscribe to the oath would receive Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary care—the pension test adopted by the committee would entail no additional expenditures.

The committee also gave considerable attention to the form of the oath and income questions . . . [on the] . . . present oath form (VA form 10-P-10 (November 1966)).

As a result of its review, the committee believes that items 36A through 40 on page 2 of the form (regarding valuation of residential property, mortgages or other indebtedness, all real and personal property, and estimates of average monthly net income and personal expenditure) needlessly invade the privacy of the non-service-connected veteran, especially at a time when the reason for his completing the form is that he is in need of medical assistance.

In addition, the committee believes that inquiry regarding these items is not fully consistent with the intent of the section 622 requirement that the oath of inability to defray necessary expenses be conclusive on that question for admission to VA facilities. These items would seem justifiable for one of three reasons or for a combination thereof: (1) to discourage the veteran from taking the oath; (2) to render him liable to Federal prosecution for false statement of a material fact (18 U.S.C. § 1001); or (3) to assist the veteran in determining ability or inability to pay. The committee finds only the third purpose to be appropriate in light of section 622. Moreover, recent studies of persons taking similar oaths (for welfare purposes) indicate that people are just as apt to be truthful when taking the oath without a requirement for full income disclosure as when taking the oath followed by full financial investigation.

Consequently, the committee is of the view that items 36A through 40 on the form should be deleted or prefaced by a statement in large print to the following effect:

"You need not complete any or all of the following items in order to receive Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary care. These items are set forth for whatever assistance they provide you in determining whether or not you wish to subscribe to the oath of inability to defray the necessary expenses of such care."

Finally, the committee is also of the view that the notarization requirement be eliminated under item 45. Section 622 does not require such a degree of formality, and the committee is not aware that any similar notarization is required on other Veterans' Administration forms, such as the income questionnaire for pension or dependency and indemnity compensation purposes. And no such notarization is required for subsequent criminal prosecution under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 or civil liability under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. § 231, *et seq.*). A standard certification of "true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief" would be more in keeping with standard Government forms.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Administrator to furnish outpatient care and such other medical services as he finds to be reasonably necessary to any veteran who is in receipt of pension or compensation based on need of regular aid and attendance or who is permanently housebound. Inasmuch as care for service-connected veterans in this category is already administered on the most liberal basis, the only substantial change

would occur in the pension field and is restricted to those individuals who are the most severely disabled and in demonstrated financial need. The aid and attendance group is so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person. The housebound are so disabled as to require them to remain in their homes constantly.

Section 3 would authorize the furnishing of drugs and medicine at Veterans' Administration expense to those veterans who are receiving additional compensation or pension by reason of being permanently housebound. As with the amendment made by section 2, the basic change effected by section 3 would be in the pension field since, under present law, drugs and medicine prescribed by a physician are furnished to veterans for their service-connected disabilities. They are also furnished to the veteran during periods of hospitalization and during periods of prehospital and posthospital care regardless of whether his disability or disease is service-connected or nonservice-connected in character. In addition, under existing law, pensioners who are in need of regular aid and attendance are furnished drugs and medicine prescribed by a physician. By providing for the furnishing of drugs and medicine at Veterans' Administration expense to veterans receiving additional pension by reason of being permanently housebound, section 3 seems to the committee a logical extension of the above provisions to a demonstrably needy group of seriously disabled veterans.

Section 1 of the bill, providing for admission of veterans in receipt of pension to a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary without subscribing to the oath of inability to pay is estimated not to entail any additional expenditures. Section 2, providing outpatient care for aid and attendance pensioners and the housebound group of pensioners would cost approximately \$9,503,000 the first year; and section 3, authorizing the furnishing of drugs and medicine for the housebound pensioners would cost \$3,400,000 the first year.

Testimony on these bills was heard by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on July 17, and the subcommittee considered the bills and reported them to the full committee on October 2 in the form in which the full committee, on October 9, ordered them reported to the Senate. I urge all of my colleagues to join in the bipartisan spirit which pervaded the subcommittee's and full committee's consideration and unanimous action on these bills.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending bills H.R. 693, H.R. 2768, H.R. 3130, H.R. 9334, H.R. 9634, and S. 1279. These bills represent an important contribution to the welfare of veterans who need medical care and domiciliary care. All of these bills were approved by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs and by the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare without a dissenting vote.

As ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I had the privilege to work in a most cordial and bipartisan manner on this legislation with the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished junior Senator from California.

H.R. 693 would eliminate the so-called pauper's oath for about 195,000 non-service-connected veterans on pensions who might seek hospital or domiciliary care at the expense of the Veterans' Administration. The bill as passed by the House would have exempted all non-

service-connected veterans over 72 from the means test or pauper's oath. However, our subcommittee agreed that all non-service-connected veterans receiving pensions, regardless of their age, should be spared from the means test, since they have already had to meet this test to draw a pension. So we have amended the bill to accomplish that.

Other provisions of H.R. 693 would assist some 144,000 veterans who are on pensions or other compensation due to their regular need for regular aid and attendance, or who are permanently housebound. H.R. 693 would see that these veterans received outpatient care, drugs and medicines at VA expense.

H.R. 2768 eliminates the 6-month limitation on length of community nursing home care extended to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 3130 would assist veterans with a total disability resulting from duty in the Armed Forces, by providing these veterans with outpatient medical care for their non-service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 9334 will increase the Federal payment for hospital care in a State veterans home from \$3.50 a day per patient to \$7.50 per day. It will also authorize an annual \$5 million appropriation on a matching fund basis to help States improve the physical facilities at State veterans homes over the next 10 years.

In this regard, I am pleased that the State veterans home in my home State of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Soldiers' and Sailors' Home located in Erie, would be one potential recipient of this construction aid, since it is considering adding 175 beds to its present capacity of 285 beds.

H.R. 9634 would provide for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs greater flexibility in operating the hospital and medical care programs of the Veterans' Administration. It authorizes the use of shared specialized medical resources of other hospitals, and it allows more flexible personnel policies in the recruiting of nurses, interns, and dentists. This bill has been requested by the Veterans' Administration itself in the interest of furthering its medical programs.

Finally, S. 1279 will add to the law a presumption that a former prisoner of war's disability is service connected. This will put the disability of a former prisoner of war, or any other veteran whose medical records are not available, in the status of a service-connected disability unless the VA can rebut the presumption by its own evidence.

Mr. President, I am pleased to give my full support to this measure to give former prisoners of war an additional degree of access to the medical care programs of the VA. Unfortunately, America today still finds herself at war, and there are American prisoners of war being held by the enemy in Vietnam. The legislation today that I urge the Senate to pass, S. 1279, is one small measure of the obligation which our Nation owes to its returning prisoners of war, both those who have already returned and those who, we hope and pray, will return in the future.

Mr. President, all of these six pending bills merit the favorable attention of the

Senate. They will strengthen the medical and hospital programs being carried on by the Veterans' Administration, so that veterans in need of help will have easier access to it. I urge that the Senate act promptly to pass H.R. 693, H.R. 2768, H.R. 3130, H.R. 9334, and S. 1279.

MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR OLDER VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 693) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans who are 72 years of age or older shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", strike out "Administrator may not require any statement under oath from an applicant referred to therein who is seventy-two years of age or older for the purpose of determining inability to defray necessary expenses, and such applicant shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care", and insert "receipt of pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall constitute sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses, and any veteran in receipt of such pension shall be exempt from making any statement under oath regarding his inability to defray necessary expenses"; and, on page 2, after line 23, strike out:

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2); (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ";" and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) any veteran for a non-service-connected disability if such veteran served in the active military or naval service in Mexico, on the borders thereof, or in the waters adjacent thereto during the period beginning on May 9, 1916, and ending on April 6, 1917."

SEC. 5. (a) The provisions of section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 shall not apply with respect to employees of the Veterans' Administration and such employees shall not be taken into account in applying the provisions of such section to the other departments and agencies of the executive branch.

(b) Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide nursing home care and contract hospitalization for certain veterans living in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes", approved October 21, 1968 (Public Law 90-612, 82 Stat. 1202), is hereby repealed.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who are in receipt of pension shall be deemed unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care, and for other purposes".

NURSING HOME CARE FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

The bill (H.R. 2768) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OUTPATIENT CARE FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

The bill (H.R. 3130) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for non-service-connected disability to any war veteran who has total disability from a service-connected disability was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARE OF VETERANS IN STATE HOMES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9334) to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 15, strike out:

Sec. 3. Section 5034(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "one and one-half" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SHARING PROGRAM OF AND EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9634) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments. On page 1, after the enacting clause, insert:

That section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting in subsection (a) (3) (A) immediately after the first sentence thereof the following: "Temporary full-time appointments of persons who have successfully completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing, approved by the Administrator, and are pending registration as a graduate nurse in a State, shall not exceed one year."

On page 2, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 2. Section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "(b)" at the beginning of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) (1)" and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to more efficiently carry out the provisions of paragraph (1) of this sub-

section, the Administrator may contract with one or more hospitals, medical schools, or medical installations having hospital facilities and participating with the Veterans' Administration in the training of interns or residents to provide for the central administration of stipend payments, provision of fringe benefits, and maintenance of records for such interns and residents by the designation of one such institution to serve as an agency for this purpose. The Administrator may pay to such designated central administrative agency, without regard to any other law or regulation governing the expenditure of Government moneys either in advance or in arrears, an amount to cover the cost for the period such intern or resident serves in a Veterans' Administration hospital of (A) such stipends as fixed by the Administrator pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, (B) hospitalization, medical care, and life insurance, and any other employee benefits as are agreed upon by the participating institutions for the period that such intern or resident serves in a Veterans' Administration hospital, (C) tax on employers pursuant to chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, where applicable, and in addition, (D) an amount to cover a pro rata share of the cost of expense of such central administrative agency. Any amounts paid by the Administrator to such fund to cover the cost of hospitalization, medical care, or life insurance or other employee benefits shall be in lieu of any benefits of like nature to which such intern or resident may be entitled under the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code, and the acceptance of stipends and employee benefits from the designated central administrative agency shall constitute a waiver by the recipient of any claim he might have to any payment of stipends or employee benefits to which he may be entitled under this title or title 5 of the United States Code. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any period of service of any such intern or resident in a Veterans' Administration hospital shall be deemed creditable service for the purposes of section 8332 of title 5 of the United States Code. The agreement may further provide that the designated central administrative agency shall make all appropriate deductions from the stipend of each intern and resident for local, State, and Federal taxes, maintain all records pertinent thereto and make proper deposits thereof, and shall maintain all records pertinent to the leave accrued by each intern and resident for the period during which he serves in a participating hospital, including a Veterans' Administration hospital. Such leave may be pooled, and the intern or resident may be afforded leave by the hospital in which he is serving at the time the leave is to be used to the extent of his total accumulated leave, whether or not earned at the hospital in which he is serving at the time the leave is to be afforded."

On page 4, line 7, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting in subsection (d)(1) immediately after the word "physician" the following: "or dentist".

And, at the beginning of line 11, strike out "That section" and insert "SEC. 4. Section".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of

Veterans' Affairs to appoint certain persons in the nursing service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and to enter into agreements with hospitals, medical schools, or medical installations for the central administration of a program of training for interns or residents, to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources, and for other purposes."

REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR DISABILITIES OF CERTAIN VETERANS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1279) to provide that any disability of a veteran who is a former prisoner of war is presumed to be service-connected for purposes of hospitalization and outpatient care which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "For"; and by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(b) For the purposes of this chapter, the disability of any veteran of a war or of service after January 31, 1955, shall be deemed to be service-connected if—

"(1) there are no medical records available to the Veterans' Administration for the period of such veteran's active military, naval, or air service;

"(2) there is no medical record available to the Veterans' Administration for such veteran showing the results of any physical examination which was required by law or regulation, in effect at the time of such veteran's discharge or release from active duty, to be given members of the Armed Forces immediately prior to discharge or release from active duty; or

"(3) for any period of time during his active military, naval, or air service such veteran (A) was held as a prisoner of war, or (B) while in line of duty was forcibly detained or interned by a foreign government or power;

unless the Administrator can show by clear and convincing evidence that such disability was not incurred in or aggravated in line of duty by such veteran while serving in the active military, naval, or air service."

(b) The catch line of section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 602. Presumption relating to certain disabilities".

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"602. Presumption relating to psychosis."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"602. Presumption relating to certain disabilities".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to create a rebuttable presumption that a disability of a veteran of any war or certain other military service is service connected under certain circumstances".

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT THREE HOUSE BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills H.R. 693, H.R. 9334, and H.R. 9634 be printed in full as passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION ON PASSAGE OF VETERANS BILLS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, it is a particular pleasure and privilege for a freshman Senator to see the Senate pass legislation originating in a subcommittee which he chairs. This was made possible only because of the outstanding cooperation and assistance of many Senators to whom I would now like to express my personal thanks.

First, I wish to think the distinguished majority and minority leaders for their cooperation in securing such speedy passage of the six bills—S. 1279, H.R. 693, H.R. 2768, H.R. 3130, H.R. 9334, and H.R. 9634—which were just passed by the Senate.

I wish also to express my appreciation to all of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for their bipartisan support of these measures.

Next, I wish especially to express my gratitude to the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, who is also the ranking majority member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. Senator YARBOROUGH has labored vigorously to see this legislation through the subcommittee and the full committee and has in every respect been true to his reputation as the Senate's foremost champion of legislation to aid the veterans of this Nation.

Finally, and certainly not least in my gratitude, I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. Senator SCHWEIKER has exhibited a great bipartisan spirit in the consideration of these bills by the subcommittee and the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, after the so-called moratorium of October 15, I received approximately 300 letters from Vermont, largely from young people attending college. Ninety-nine out of 100 of these young people were very conscientious and well meaning, and of course they urged an immediate termination of the war in Southeast Asia.

I felt that they were entitled to know the facts as I saw them, and I prepared a letter to send to each of them. Then it occurred to me, instead of sending 300 letters to these young people, I might as well make a statement for the RECORD so that others, besides the students, could also know the facts of the situation as I see them to be today.

Just 3 years ago on October 19, 1966, I urged President Johnson to withdraw

our military personnel from South Vietnam.

At that time our troops there numbered 313,000.

The military situation was relatively well in hand and it was virtually certain that no outside nation could take over the country.

The President did not see things as I did and continued to send additional troops to South Vietnam until by the time President Nixon assumed office on January 20, 1969, they numbered approximately 550,000.

Soon after taking office, the President decided to withdraw a substantial part of our troops from Vietnam.

As of October 16, there were 501,000 remaining there, with the speed of withdrawal accelerating.

Unless the unexpected happens, I expect that practically all of our ground troops will be withdrawn by a year from now.

Some of the unexpected things that might happen would be a step-up of military aid, intervention in the war by another country, or violent upsurge of war on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

While we all wish withdrawal could be done immediately, the movement of all our personnel and equipment poses a tremendous transportation problem.

Further than that, however, is the fact that the safety of minority groups must be assured, unless we are now willing to assume responsibility for wholesale massacre.

I have been kept well informed from my own sources as to the progress of the President's withdrawal policy and feel that it is progressing on schedule, except for the loss of possibly a month in late summer.

North Vietnam, the Vietcong, South Vietnam, and the United States now appear to realize the futility of continuing an American war which never should have been started.

The only people—in this country—who now oppose our withdrawal appear to be our own minority group who look upon war as the solution to all our problems and visualize the United States as the dominant nation.

As for the moratorium of October 15, I doubt that it will change the President's policy because of the physical and political difficulties involved.

However, the moratorium has not done any harm, and it might even strengthen the President's hand in dealing with the pressure groups who hold that the war should go on until complete military victory is achieved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1970, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 91-37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal

year 1970, in the amount of \$4,316,319, for the legislative branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CANCELLATION OF REIMBURSABLE IRRIGATION CHARGES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cancellation of reimbursable charges against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, dated October 23, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, its annual audit report, dated September 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FORMULA GRANTS TO SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Natchitoches Parish Chamber of Commerce, Natchitoches, La., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Livonia, Mich., praying for the rejection of any and all proposals relating to the taxing of sovereign states and their municipalities; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial adopted by the King County Council, State of Washington, praying for the defeat of any attempt to increase costs of local governments such as imposing a tax on the interest paid to individual investors in local securities; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CRANSTON, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 11959. An act to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowance paid to eligible veterans and persons under such chapters (Rept. No. 91-487).

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs (Rept. No. 91-488); and

S. 11. A bill to reinforce the federal system by strengthening the personnel resources of State and local governments, to improve intergovernment cooperation in the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal Government, and State and local governments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-489).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without reservation: Executive D, 91st Congress, first session, a Convention on the Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic (Executive Rept. No. 91-8); and

Executive E, 91st Congress, first session, Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and Optional Protocol relating to the settlement of disputes (Executive Rept. No. 91-9).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 3046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3047. A bill to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels and to require the inspection of certain vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3048. A bill for the relief of Hamilton Joseph; and

S. 3049. A bill for the relief of Marianna Pegal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3050. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the import duty on certain raw silk and certain yarns of silk wholly of noncontinuous silk fibers; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced S. 3050 appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FANNIN (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 3051. A bill to extend Letters Patent No. 2,322,210, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3052. A bill for the relief of Corazon H. Roche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Constance M. Lozano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 3054. A bill to extend the protection of the mechanic's lien law of the District of Columbia to subcontractors beyond the first tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. FONG, Mr. INOUE, and Mr. MUSKIE):

S.J. Res. 162. A joint resolution in recognition of the Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution Research; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The remarks of Mr. MURPHY when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 3047—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO LICENSING OF PERSONNEL ON CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation designed to bring greater safety to inland water commerce.

Each year, towing vessels become more powerful and push larger numbers of barges carrying greater amounts of hazardous materials. In its 1968 report, "The Nation's Water Resources," the Water Resources Council forecasts a 350-percent increase in inland waterborne commerce in the next 50 years, a doubling of the horsepower of towing vessels, and a 25-percent increase in speed.

Each day, tons of oil and chemicals are barged up inland waters by unlicensed operators in uninspected vessels. Many run aground severely damaging inland beaches, marshes, and wildlife with their foul smelling, life killing contents. Others come loose, drift downstream to damage highway bridges and set afire moored vessels and port facilities.

The National Transportation Safety Board has in its "Study of Towing Vessel Safety and Accident Preventive Recommendations" set out a series of typical towing vessel accidents that clearly show the hazards of inland waters commerce. These documented accidents clearly evidence the need for Coast Guard inspection of the towing vessel and Coast Guard licensing of the towing vessel operator.

Following are some of the accidents set out in the Safety Board's study:

First. An uninspected tug pushing a barge collided with a major highway bridge knocking out one section of the bridge. No lives were lost, but the bridge was closed to traffic for some time, and damages estimated at \$200,000. This collision occurred on a clear night with light winds, no current, and the bridge well lighted. The operator of the tug was unlicensed, and had only 4 months experience operating tugs of the type involved.

The report of the investigation stated that the proximate cause of the casualty was that the operator fell asleep while operating the tug. It further concluded that the operator on watch was probably quite fatigued, having worked for 7 days, on a 6-hour watch, 6-hour off-duty basis. There were three crewmembers on board the tug, two of whom alternated as operator, and a deckhand, none licensed by the Coast Guard.

Second. A towing vessel pushing a large tow of barges was bound downriver on a clear night in the Mississippi River above Baton Rouge, La. It was displaying proper navigation lights on the vessel and the barges in its tow. Another towing vessel, without tow, attempted to cross the river to the east bank. It was displaying masthead lights only. This latter vessel attempted to cross ahead of the downbound tow, and

sounded no whistle signal. The downbound operator saw the other get underway and head towards his tow. He illuminated the tow with his searchlight and attempted unsuccessfully to raise the other vessel by voice radio. He sounded the danger signal, reversed engines in an attempt to clear the crossing vessel. The lead barge failed to clear the other vessel and capsized it. One of two in her crew drowned.

The unlicensed operator of the crossing vessel was at fault for reckless or negligent operation. In the absence of a crossing agreement and without sounding appropriate whistle signals, he attempted to cross the lead barge of the other vessel's tow when risk of collision was imminent and apparent to an experienced operator. He also was at fault in failing to keep clear of a privileged vessel or to sound the danger signal. Another violation was operating without lighting the red and green side lights. Radio communication could probably have avoided this collision.

Third. A towing vessel backed a double-up tow of barges into the river after they had been loaded with highly volatile "Southern" crude oil, and was in the process of securing them in tandem for pushing. During this process, the lead barge collided with an anchored tanker as the swift current set the barge down on the anchor chain and tanker's bow. Fire engulfed the tanker and two barges, injuring nine crewmembers of the tanker, and resulted in damages totaling \$700,000.

The cause of this casualty was inadequate power on the towing vessel to control its tow under existing current conditions, resulting in her inability to back clear of the tanker. There was also negligence or reckless operation evident on the part of the unlicensed operator of the tug for failure to recognize the existing conditions and for attempting such a maneuver.

Fourth. A low-powered towing vessel attempted to tow a sulfuric acid barge alongside, on inland waters, despite small craft warnings in effect. The weather deteriorated, and high winds and seas forced the tug to abandon trying to push the barge alongside. The tug tried to rig a bridle for astern towing. Only one lead of the bridle was secured, and the tug lost control of the barge, which drifted down on a trestle of a bridge. Damages to the bridge and barge totaled over \$300,000.

The tug was not adequately powered to control her tow in existing weather and sea conditions. The crew of the tug were inexperienced and seasick. Only two of the crew had Coast Guard documents, but no licenses. The operator failed to take prudent action when the weather forecast was heard, but continued on his voyage, losing control of his tow when the weather deteriorated.

The legislation I am introducing will require that towboats of more than 15 tons weight or 26 feet in length be inspected every 2 years and be operated by licensed pilots. This legislation will also require towing vessels of 750 horsepower and over to have on board an engineer licensed by the Coast

Guard while under way, and limit the time a towboat operator can work to 12 hours a day.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3047) to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels and to require the inspection of certain vessels, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4427 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 405) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first word thereof, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) As used in this subsection—
(A) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating;

"(B) the term 'towing' means pulling, pushing, or hauling alongside or any combination thereof;

"(C) the term 'towing vessel' means a vessel engaged in or intended to engage in the service of towing which is above fifteen gross tons or twenty-six feet or more in length;

"(D) the term 'uninspected' means not required by law to have a valid certificate of inspection issued by the Secretary.

"(2) A towing vessel in order to assure safe navigation shall while underway, be under the actual direction and control of a person licensed by the Secretary under regulations prescribed by him. A person so licensed may not work a vessel while underway or perform other duties in excess of a total of twelve hours in any consecutive twenty-four-hour period except in case of emergency.

"(3) A towing vessel of seven hundred and fifty horsepower and over shall, while underway, have on board as engineer, a person licensed by the Secretary under regulations prescribed by him."

Sec. 2. All towing vessels regardless of manner of propulsion, and whether documented or not, shall be inspected under the provisions of this Act.

"(a) The Secretary shall, before a towing vessel is put into service, and at least once every two years thereafter, cause it to be inspected, and shall satisfy himself that it (1) is of a structure suitable for the service in which it is to be employed; (2) is equipped with the proper appliances for lifesaving and fire protection; (3) has suitable accommodations for the crew; and (4) is in a condition to warrant the belief that it may be used, operated, and navigated with safety to life and property in the proposed service.

"(b) The Secretary may, in order to secure effective provision against hazard to life and property created by vessels subject to this section, prescribe such regulations as may be necessary with respect to the following matters:

"(1) The design, construction, alteration, or repair of towing vessels.

"(2) Operation of towing vessels, including the waters in which they may be navigated.

"(3) Manning of towing vessels and the duties of the licensed officers and members of the crews of such vessels.

"(4) Licensing and certification of crews of towing vessels.

"(c) In prescribing regulations for towing vessels the Secretary shall give consideration

October 21, 1969

to the age, size, service, route, and other factors affecting the operation of the vessel. If the Secretary determines that the application to any towing vessel of the regulations prescribed for towing vessels is not necessary in the public interest, he may exempt that vessel from the application of the regulations, or any part thereof, upon such terms and conditions and for such periods as he may specify.

(d) The Secretary may prescribe reasonable fees or charges for (1) any inspection made and (2) any certificate, license, or permit issued under this section or the regulations prescribed hereunder.

(e) A certificate of inspection issued to a towing vessel may at any time be voluntarily surrendered."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1970, or on the first day of the sixth month which begins after the month in which regulations are first issued under the amendments of section 4427 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 405) made by this Act whichever date is later.

S. 3050—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL SUSPENDING FOR A 3-YEAR PERIOD THE IMPORT DUTY ON CERTAIN RAW SILK AND CERTAIN YARNS OF SILK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would remove a serious impediment from an old and respected American industry.

For many years, the American silk industry has been burdened with increased operation costs because it must wind the duty-free silk it imports. A slow and tedious task, winding has attracted few new workers, and the expensive process has backed the silk industry into a corner.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill to suspend for 3 years the import duty on raw silk which is prewound on spools and cones.

By freeing its labor force from winding tasks and reducing the period of time needed to produce silk fabric, the silk industry will hopefully be able to regain its former competitive position with foreign silk fabric imports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3050) to suspend for a 3-year period the import duty on certain raw silk and certain yarns of silk wholly of noncontinuous silk fibers, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 162—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER POLLUTION RESEARCH

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have frequently labeled pollution, both air and water, as one of the most serious problems confronting our country. We know, however, that pollution is not only a problem of this Nation but also a worldwide one.

The pollution of our environment seems to increase along with industrialization, urbanization, and population growth. We know that we cannot con-

tinue past practices of polluting our environment. The growing concern in the Congress and in the country over water pollution can be seen with the passage by the Senate of S. 7, the Water Quality Improvement Act, and by the House action of almost tripling the budget for sewage treatment construction.

Mr. President, with world demands on our water resources likely to increase as populations grow and industrialization continues, we simply must stop or greatly reduce industrial waste and domestic sewage if we are going to have supplies sufficient to meet these growing demands.

The United States has been giving increasing attention to the water pollution problem. I have been pleased to have supported the various measures enacted to accelerate our country's battle against this water pollution. The search for a solution to the water pollution problem continues here and also in the other countries of the world.

Earlier this year, Mr. President, the Fourth International Conference of the International Association on Water Pollution—IAWPR—was held in Czechoslovakia. One thousand one hundred research workers and engineers in pollution prevention studies attended the conference to exchange and explain recent advances in the important water pollution field. This conference was similar to the first IAWPR conference held in London in 1962, the second held in Tokyo in 1964, and the third conference held in Munich in 1966.

Today I introduce Mr. President, a joint resolution recognizing the Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution Research, which is scheduled to be held in one of the favorite cities of the world, San Francisco, Calif., from July 26 through August 1 of next year, and a reconvened conference which will be held in another great city, Honolulu, Hawaii, from August 2–5, 1970. The joint resolution is cosponsored by Senators BOGGS, CRANSTON, FONG, INOUYE, and MUSKIE.

The growing worldwide concern over the pollution problem as well as the magnetic lure of San Francisco promise that a minimum of 3,500 individuals from at least 50 countries will be in attendance at the San Francisco meeting. The proceedings of this international conference will be presented in five languages. In addition, there have been submitted twice as many papers as have been submitted in any previous international conference.

President Nixon in his September 19 address to the United Nations stated that the task of "protecting man's environment is a matter of international concern," and further pledged the support of the United States for "international initiatives toward restoring the balance of nature, and maintaining our world as a healthy and hospitable place for man."

Mr. President, I certainly want to commend this Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution Research. Surely the pollution problem transcends both national and international boundaries, as well as ideologies, and is an area where nations can and must work together for the good and safety of all mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the joint res-

olution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 162) in recognition of the Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution Research, introduced by Mr. MURPHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 162

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress declares that—

(1) the International Association on Water Pollution Research was formed throughout the world together in the fight against water pollution;

(2) the objectives of the association are to contribute to a better understanding of water pollution problems, to encourage the exchange of scientific knowledge, to better enable the nations of the world to combat water pollution problems, to narrow the gap between actual and optimum use of water resources, and thus to contribute to continuing social and economic progress;

(3) a lack of maximum communication and coordination between research programs has retarded efforts to effectively utilize all funds available for water pollution research performed in various countries;

(4) efforts by the International Association on Water Pollution Research have materially assisted in alleviating duplication in pollution research, have fostered the exchange of scientific research data, and have significantly benefited all nations in their programs to control water pollution;

(5) the international association has sponsored biannual conferences on water pollution research which have provided scientists, engineers, and administrators a forum for formulating an international activities program to permit concerted and cooperative water pollution research;

(6) President Richard Nixon, in his address of September 19, 1969, to the United Nations, stated that "the task of protecting man's environment is a matter of international concern";

(7) in that address the President pledged the strong support of the United States for "international initiatives" toward restoring the balance of nature, and maintaining our world as a healthy and hospitable place for man"; and

(8) the Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution will be held in San Francisco, California, July 26, 1970, through August 1, 1970, and will be reconvened in Honolulu, Hawaii, from August 2, 1970, through August 5, 1970, to deal with water pollution, one of the most important problems of the United States and the world.

(b) Therefore, all Federal departments and agencies, the States, and all interested persons and organizations, both public and private, are urged to cooperate with, and assist fully, the Fifth International Conference on Water Pollution, the United States National Committee, and the California and Hawaii Host Committees in making the 1970 conference the most outstanding, productive, and successful yet held.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 232

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at

the next printing, the names of the Senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the junior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) be added as cosponsors of S. 232, to promote the economic development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1362

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, to provide Federal financial assistance to Opportunities Industrialization Centers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3035

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3035, to amend title II of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 144

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Junior Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the junior Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the junior Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 144, to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 153

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 153, to establish a commission to report upon the condition and future of American policy respecting all aspects of international trade and tariffs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO TERMINATE THE JOINT RESOLUTION COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) to

terminate the joint resolution commonly known as the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The remarks of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio when he submitted the concurrent resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

NIXON PLANNING TO REORGANIZE THE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been recent press reports that the administration is planning to reorganize the Federal banking agencies. The central feature of the administration's proposal seems to be an effort to strip the Federal Reserve Board of its bank regulatory duties and divide them between the FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency.

Additional details on the reorganization are cloaked in secrecy. A call to the Federal Reserve Board indicated that none of the governors of the Board have even seen the plan other than newspaper stories about it. Other officials were also in the dark. According to press reports, the most knowledgeable sources about the plan seem to be Under Secretary Charles E. Walker, former executive director of the American Bankers Association and a committee of the American Bankers Association which has been reviewing the plan. It seems a little strange that the American Bankers Association, a private trade association, seems to be better informed about the plan than the Federal Reserve itself.

Press reports do indicate that President Nixon might implement the reorganization by Executive order. Under this procedure, the reorganization plan goes into effect automatically in 60 days unless specifically disapproved by either House of Congress.

Mr. President, under the present regulatory framework, bank supervision is divided between three agencies. There are about 4,700 national banks with 60 percent of banking assets supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency. There are about 1,300 State member banks with 23 percent of banking assets which are supervised by the Federal Reserve. And there are about 7,500 State non-member banks with 17 percent of banking assets supervised by the FDIC. The average sized bank supervised by the Comptroller is \$63 million, for the Federal Reserve it is \$93 million, and for the FDIC it is \$11 million.

The issue of reorganizing the banking agencies has been around for many years. A number of proposals have been advanced, including the establishment of a single Banking Commission to assume all regulatory duties. Many of these proposals have been debated in congressional hearings and in other discussions. From these discussions, one thing seems clear: the reorganization of the banking agencies involves more than administrative efficiency. The structure of our bank regulatory agencies can have a profound impact upon the banking industry and the economy. The present threefold division of responsibility was deliberately created by Congress to maintain our dual banking system and to avoid excessive concentration of power in the hands of a single agency. A thorough review of

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO SCHUYLKILL RIVER STUDY

Mr. SCHWEIKER (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

S. RES. 276

Resolved, by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved June 13, 1902, is requested to review the reports on the Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania, contained in House Document Numbered 529, Seventy-ninth Congress, and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable, with particular reference to the needs for flood control, navigation, water supply, recreation, environmental and other allied water purposes in the Schuylkill River Basin.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 30

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 271, for peace in Vietnam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 252

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13270) to reform the income tax laws, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. MILLER when he submitted the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if no other Senator is seeking the floor at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may

this structure is long overdue, but I firmly believe that Congress should actively participate in any change.

I am, therefore, concerned over reports that the President might seek to implement a far reaching reorganization of the banking agencies through the Reorganization Act procedures. If this were done, Congress would be treated as voters in a Russian election. We could only disapprove the plan worked out by the administration. We could not participate in shaping the plan or in amending its details. We would not have adequate time to study the ramifications of the plan. We would not have time to hear the views of interested organizations and outside experts on banking. The House and Senate Banking Committees would not have an opportunity to consider the plan since reorganization plans are generally considered by the Government Operations Committees.

The purpose of the Reorganization Act is to promote economy and efficiency in Government. By making reorganization plans automatic unless specifically disapproved by Congress, the President is given a powerful tool for streamlining procedures and eliminating bureaucratic deadweight. I thoroughly support these objectives and the use of the Reorganization Act to achieve them.

However, I do not believe the Congress intended the Reorganization Act to be used when major policy matters are involved. In that connection, Congress amended the act to prohibit its procedures to be used to create or abolish any executive department. This prohibition properly reflects the view that a major organizational change should be through the positive affirmation of Congress rather than the negative veto procedures of the Reorganization Act. A major overhaul of the banking agencies should also require positive legislation since such a reorganization could have a significant impact on our economy. Any far-reaching reorganization of the Federal banking agencies should be thoroughly discussed in hearings before the House and Senate Banking Committees.

A dangerous precedent would be created should the administration transfer responsibilities from the Federal Reserve through the Reorganization Act. The primary job of the Federal Reserve is to execute monetary policy and in carrying out this assignment, Congress has intended that the Federal Reserve be independent of the President and the Treasury. If the President can relieve the Federal Reserve of its bank supervisory duties through the Reorganization Act, there is nothing to prevent him from using the same approach to transfer the Fed's monetary policy responsibilities to the Council of Economic Advisers. The power to reorganize is the power to control. How long could the Fed maintain its traditional independence if the President threatened to reorganize it out of its job?

I certainly think a good case can be made for closer coordination of economic policy between the Fed and the administration. Perhaps the President ought to have more control over the Fed. But only

Congress can decide this question. We should not legislate the independence of the Fed and then turn around and give the President the power to undermine that independence through the Reorganization Act. Nor should we set a precedent for such action by approving a transfer of bank supervisory responsibilities under the Reorganization Act.

According to press reports, the underlying reasons for getting the Fed out of bank regulation are twofold: First there is a feeling by some Fed officials and others that its bank supervisory responsibilities detract from its main job of making monetary policy; second, there is a feeling by some bankers that the Fed is "too strict" in its regulatory approach and that regulations would be softer under another agency. The decision by the House Banking Committee to put one-bank holding companies under the Fed's supervision may have increased the sentiment to get the Fed out of bank regulation.

Without attempting to prejudge the answers, I would like to raise a number of questions concerning the proposed reorganization of the banking agencies. These questions should be thoroughly debated and aired in hearings before the Banking Committees of Congress.

First, what impact would the reorganization have upon the execution of monetary policy? If the Fed were stripped of its regulatory powers, would it be in a weaker position to induce commercial banks to restrain their lending activities during periods of tight money? We have seen commercial banks develop a variety of devices to avoid tight money including borrowing eurodollars and issuing commercial paper through holding company affiliates. Efforts to avoid monetary restriction could intensify if banks were no longer supervised by the Fed.

Second, who should exercise control over the rates of interest which banks can pay on time deposits? Such limitations were originally imposed as a regulatory tool to promote safety, but in recent years they have grown into a powerful supplement to general monetary policy.

Third, what will be the impact on bank mergers? Reorganizing the banking agencies can have a substantial effect on bank mergers. There are major differences in the importance which each agency attaches to the competitive and antitrust aspects of bank mergers. For example, the Bank Merger Act requires each banking agency and the Justice Department to prepare an advisory opinion on all merger applications. The advisory opinion must indicate if the proposed merger would have a substantially adverse effect upon competition. Whenever a merger case is before one of the three banking agencies the other two agencies and the Justice Department must issue an advisory opinion.

By comparing each agency's findings with those of Justice, we can see how each agency views threats to competition. From 1960 to 1969, the FDIC said there was some adverse competitive effect on 60 percent of the mergers on which they issued an advisory opinion.

The comparable figure for Justice on the identical cases was 54 percent. Likewise, the Federal Reserve found some adverse competitive effect on 61 percent of its advisory opinions compared to 50 percent for Justice on the same cases. These two agencies were actually tougher than Justice.

However, when we look at the Comptroller of the Currency, the situation is dramatically reversed. The Comptroller could only see some adverse competitive effect on 22 percent of its advisory opinions compared to 45 percent for Justice on the same cases.

If we look at these same merger statistics in terms of the dollar value of the assets involved, the comparisons are even more striking. From 1960 to 1969, the FDIC issued advisory opinions on bank mergers involving assets of \$316 billion. They found some adverse effect upon competition in mergers involving \$168 billion in assets or 53 percent of the total. The Justice Department, looking at the same cases, found an adverse competitive effect on 67 percent of the total assets involved.

Likewise, the Fed found anticompetitive effects on 67 percent of the dollar volume of merger cases it considered compared to 59 percent by Justice on the same cases. The Comptroller could only see an adverse competitive effect on 35 percent of the dollar volume of merger cases it considered compared to 75 percent by Justice on the same cases. Once again, the Comptroller appears to have myopia when competition is an issue.

It is interesting to compare each of the three agencies to Justice in terms of their propensity to see anticompetitive effects. The Fed is 8 percentage points ahead of Justice, while the FDIC is 14 percentage points behind and the Comptroller is a whopping 40 percentage points behind. These differences have occurred despite the fact that each of the three agencies is interpreting the identical law.

The Comptroller seems to have a constitutional inability to perceive threats to competition. It has clearly demonstrated that it is substantially more lax in its regulatory philosophy than the other two banking agencies.

Since the proposed reorganization apparently assigns greater responsibility to the Comptroller, the effect on bank competition could be disastrous. We could have a wave of bank mergers under the benign sponsorship of the Comptroller resulting in the concentration of banking assets in the hands of a few large banks. This would be especially true if the Comptroller rather than the Fed, passed upon mergers and acquisitions involving bank holding companies.

A fourth question about the reorganization plan is what impact would it have upon the dual banking system? The proposed reorganization could undermine the dual banking system. If the State banks supervised by the Federal Reserve were shifted to the FDIC, many of them might convert to national charters since the FDIC has traditionally been oriented to the problems of smaller banks. Such a move could spell the end of State banking. As I pointed out earlier,

the average size of a federally supervised bank is \$93 million compared to \$11 million for an FDIC supervised bank. In addition, many State banks might elect to convert to national charters if the Comptroller took over the responsibilities for approving mergers and acquisitions by bank holding companies.

On the other hand, if the larger State banks elected to stay under FDIC supervision, they could dominate the agency and small banks would lose their independent voice at the Washington level.

In summary, the proposed reorganization of the banking agencies could undermine our dual banking system and lead to a monopoly by a handful of the Nation's largest banks. We need to move with extreme care and caution. I have raised a number of questions about the proposal. These are difficult and complex questions which need to be carefully explored by the two banking committees, which have the expertise on banking matters. I would hope the administration

would not try to ram such a proposal through Congress under the Reorganization Act in which Congress has only 60 days to say yes or no. We need to consider the reorganization of our banking agencies, and I am glad that the administration is developing a proposal. But I hope that the administration would recommend positive legislation to accomplish the reorganization instead of relying upon the Reorganization Act procedures which were never intended for such a far-reaching action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a table showing the bank merger statistics I referred to in my speech, an article from the New York Times about the reorganization, and a paper presented by Gov. Andrew Brimmer of the Federal Reserve Board on bank mergers.

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

AGENCY ADVISORY OPINIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT, 1960 TO MAR. 31, 1969

	Number of cases	Percent of Total considered	Dollar volume of assets involved (in billions of dollars)	Percent of total considered	Difference in percentage points between banking agency and Justice
Cases considered jointly by Justice and FDIC.	930	100	316.4	100	—
Some adverse effect on competition found by:					
Justice	506	54	210.8	67	—
FDIC	563	60	167.8	53	-14
Cases considered jointly by Justice and Federal Reserve.	1,047	100	225.5	100	—
Some adverse effect on competition found by:					
Justice	524	50	132.3	59	—
Federal Reserve	641	61	151.8	67	8
Cases considered jointly by Justice and Comptroller of the Currency.	525	100	147.7	100	—
Some adverse effect on competition found by:					
Justice	237	45	111.3	75	—
Comptroller	114	22	51.9	35	-40

BANKING REFORM PLAN STIRS INDUSTRY CONCERN

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

On Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, a select group of bankers are due to gather in Washington to consider the possibility of a fundamental overhaul in the Governmental machinery that regulates their industry.

The Nixon Administration, largely in the person of Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles E. Walker, has made little effort to conceal its desire to reshuffle the powers of the three Federal banking agencies, so that the Federal Reserve Board would be left free to concentrate on the management of the nation's money supply, while the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the office of the Comptroller of the Currency would have responsibility for such things as examinations, merger and branching applications and holding company expansion.

Rumors that such a reorganization was brewing have been circulating in Washington for many weeks, but the banking industry did not become fully aware that it was imminent until The New York Times reported the broad outline of the Administration's plan on Sept. 15.

NOVEMBER DATE REPORTED

Now, according to the authoritative newsletter, Washington Financial Reports, there is a "very high probability" that the reorganization will be announced by Nov. 15.

Nat S. Rogers, president of the First City National Bank of Houston, and the newly elected president of the American Bankers Association, appointed a special committee on the Federal bank regulatory structure as his first significant action in office. It is this group that will meet in Washington this

week, to try to get a line on the details of what the Administration has in mind.

The chairman of the group is Rex J. Morthland, president of the Peoples Bank and Trust Company, Selma, Ala., and its members include John J. Cummings, president of the Industrial National Bank, Providence, R.I., Paul Hanna, senior vice president of the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York and Leslie C. Peacock, executive vice president, the Crocker-Citizens National Bank, San Francisco.

According to one insider, there is likely to be a sense of urgency in the proceedings, because of clear indications that the Administration plans to push ahead quickly with its idea.

WALKER SEES AGREEMENT

At a news conference at the American Bankers Association convention in Honolulu two weeks ago, Mr. Walker left no doubt where he stood on the issue. Mr. Walker, who was formerly executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, said that there was "growing agreement" that the Federal Reserve should get out of bank regulation, although the details of the reorganization were still to be worked out.

In any event, Washington sources emphasize that the reform is likely to be carried out in an Executive Order by President Nixon, which the Congress would then have the authority to veto within 60 days. There is a suspicion among some bankers that the Administration may be attempting to press its plan quickly before opposition to it has a chance to organize.

According to Washington Financial Reports, plans call for the details to be settled in consultation between Federal Reserve

Chairman William McChesney Martin Jr., Kenneth A. ("Kay") Randall, chairman of the F.D.I.C., and William B. Camp, the Comptroller of the Currency. Once an agreement had been reached, a formal recommendation would be made to the White House, which would then accept it in whole or in part, or reject it.

An added complication may well come, bankers say, from the fact that all three men could be leaving their present jobs soon. Mr. Martin and Mr. Randall are near the end of their terms and will retire, and there are persistent reports that the Republican Administration would like to replace Mr. Camp, a Democrat.

Whatever the outcome, it is likely to generate a lively political controversy. Many bankers, although certainly not all of them, have been chafing for years under what they regard as unnecessarily tight and rigid regulation by the Federal Reserve authorities. These men would like to see the Federal Reserve get out of the bank regulation business.

At the same time, many Congressmen—some of whom are normally hostile to the Federal Reserve authorities—like the strict job of regulation that the seven-man board is doing, and indeed have been insisting that regulation of one-bank holding companies, an issue which is now pending before the House of Representatives, be given to the Reserve, just for this reason.

REACTION AWAITED

How these men—who include Representative Wright Patman, the Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee—will react to a reorganization plan that takes the Federal Reserve out of bank regulation, remains to be seen.

Then, too, while the principle of the reorganization sounds simple enough, it turns out in practice to be a highly complex affair. Assuming the Federal Reserve is to be stripped of its regulatory powers, just how are these powers defined, and to which other agency are they to be assigned?

For example, is the Federal Reserve's authority to set interest rates on time and savings deposits a regulatory or monetary function? It was originally conceived as a regulatory power, but lately the Reserve has used it to restrict the ability of the banks to bid for lendable funds, and thus force them to hold back on loans that are considered to be inflationary.

Sources close to the A.B.A. committee say there are no easy answers to this and many other questions.

Furthermore, there are other, more fundamental issues. A number of influential officials—including New York Superintendent of Banks Frank Wille, Irvine H. Sprague, a director of the F.D.I.C., Representative Henry S. Reuss and Senator William Proxmire (the latter two both Wisconsin Democrats)—have called for a basic study of the nation's financial structure by a Presidential Commission, to sort out the conflicting and overlapping areas of regulation, as well as the competition between different types of financial institutions for broader areas of service.

Some bankers are concerned that the Administration's contemplated reorganization, should it be carried out, could foreclose the possibility of an analysis that would try to answer the basic question of what kind of financial structure the nation needs to meet the money needs of the next decade.

MARKET STRUCTURE, PUBLIC CONVENIENCE, AND THE REGULATION OF BANK MERGERS

(By Andrew F. Brimmer)

The debate over the changes required in our banking structure to meet the expanding credit needs of the American public is always a lively one, and the role of bank mergers is usually close to the center of the discus-

sion. Today, despite the focus on the question as to whether banks should be allowed to conduct their businesses through operational subsidiaries, loan production offices or under the direction of a holding company, the policies followed by Federal bank supervisory agencies in the regulation of mergers and acquisitions continue to be of vital interest to the banking community. Thus, an annual convention of the American Bankers Association is an ideal setting for an examination and assessment of the way in which the bank supervisory agencies have carried out their statutory responsibilities in recent years.

The Bank Merger Act, originally enacted in 1960, and the Bank Holding Company Act, enacted in May 1966, were both amended in 1966. Principal among the amendments to each of the statutes was a change in the statement of circumstantial factors the Board is required to consider under the Bank Holding Company Act, and which the appropriate Federal supervisory authority (Board, Comptroller of the Currency, or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—depending on the charter status of the continuing institution), must consider under the Bank Merger Act. The amended "statutory factor" provisions were made virtually identical in the Bank Merger and Bank Holding Company Acts and, with respect to the competitive aspects of a merger or holding company proposal, the more precise guidelines found in the Sherman and Clayton Acts were made applicable.

Thus, with respect to either a proposed bank merger where the resulting bank is to be a State member bank, or a bank holding company acquisition, the Board may not approve any proposal that would result in a monopoly or that would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize or to attempt to monopolize the business of banking in any part of the United States. Nor may the Board approve any proposed merger or holding company acquisition the effect of which, in any section of the country, may be substantially to lessen competition unless the Board finds that the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are *clearly outweighed* in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

Pursuant to the amended provisions of both the Merger Act and the Bank Holding Company Act, a court before which an action is commenced under the antitrust laws, following agency approval of a Merger Act or Bank Holding Company Act proposal, is required to review *de novo* the issues presented, and the standards to be applied by the court are those required to be considered by the agencies under paragraph 5 of the Merger Act, and by the Board under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act.

It is in this legal framework that the assessment of bank mergers and bank holding company proposals must be made. In approaching this task, I have attempted to answer the following questions:

To what extent, if any, can one observe significant differences in the pattern of merger decisions by the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

In deciding proposed bank mergers or bank holding company acquisitions, what weight, if any, should be given to possibilities of future, or potential, competition?

Should the rate of economic growth in an area influence the policies of the regulatory agencies?

In answering these questions, I have reached the following conclusions:

The Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC apparently approve a much higher proportion of merger applications than does the Federal Reserve Board. These diver-

gencies in denial rates seem to reflect differences in policies among the agencies rather than differences in the seriousness of anticompetitive effects involved in the kinds of cases handled.

Potential competition should be assigned considerable weight in merger cases. However, the Federal Reserve Board seems to follow this practice to a far greater extent than does either of the other two agencies.

A more permissive approach toward mergers in growth areas is not warranted as a general proposition. However, there may be some cases in which the effect of mergers on competition in such areas is offset by the advantage to the community in convenience and needs.

Before proceeding further, let me stress that the present assessment of bank mergers is entirely my own. To anyone familiar with the record of Federal Reserve Board merger and holding company decisions, it should be obvious that in this area—as in others—each Board member speaks for himself.

THE PATTERN OF DECISIONS IN BANK MERGERS AND ACQUISITION, 1966-1968

From the beginning of 1966, through July of 1968, there were over 460 merger and holding company applications received by the three Federal banking agencies. (See Table I, attached.) The vast majority of these applications (391) have proposed mergers, while only 71 have been for holding company acquisitions and formations.¹ Applications to the Comptroller of the Currency account for a little less than half of those received, those to the FDIC about 30 per cent and those to the Board close to 25 per cent.²

As one would expect, in view of wide differences in State laws governing multiple-office banking, merger and holding company activity is not evenly distributed throughout the United States. (Table II). Over the period, more than 80 per cent of the applications received came from seven Federal Reserve Districts: New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Richmond, Chicago, and Minneapolis. The Richmond district alone accounted for close to 20 per cent of the applications. By and large, each of these Districts includes one or more states in which multiple-office banking is prevalent. On the other hand, there has been less activity in the St. Louis, Kansas City and Dallas Districts, principally because of State restrictions on multiple-office banking.

Over this period, there were 427 decisions by the three banking agencies. There were 409 approvals and 18 denials. (Table III.) While the Board accounted for about one-quarter of the decisions, it also accounted for two-thirds of the denials. The FDIC and the Comptroller each had three denials; the Board had 12. The denial rate at the Board has been close to 11 per cent (with about the same rate for mergers, holding company formations and acquisitions). The denial rate at the FDIC has been less than 3 per cent and at the Comptroller of the Currency, less than 2 per cent. These data strongly suggest that there are significant differences among the agencies with respect to the way each handles its cases, and these differences in approach may have a strong bearing on whether the cases are likely to be approved or denied.³

Either the policies of the Board differ from those of the other banking agencies, or the kinds of cases handled by the Board involve more serious anticompetitive effects. While the latter possibility may account in part for the difference between the denial rate at the Board and the FDIC, it hardly seems likely to account for the difference between the Board and the Comptroller.

If, in fact, the denial rates at the Board and at other agencies reflect a difference in policy, this might be reflected in the way the

Board's advisory opinions on competitive effects or merger cases are received. Over the period covered, the Board issued 121 advisory opinions to the FDIC and 204 to the Comptroller of the Currency—325 in all. (Table IV.) In 94, or close to 30 per cent of these reports, the Board indicated that the competitive effects of the proposed merger would be serious. (As might be expected, given the small size of the typical insured nonmember bank, the proportion submitted to the FDIC deemed serious was lower—about 22 per cent—than the proportion submitted to the Comptroller—about 33 per cent.)

An indication to another agency that the anticompetitive effect of a merger is serious does not necessarily mean that the Board itself would have denied the application. Serious anticompetitive effects could be offset, or "clearly outweighed" by the convenience and needs of the community. This would, however, have had to be the situation in a little less than two-thirds of the 94 cases in which a serious effect was indicated in order to bring the denial rate down to the Board's own 11 per cent.

In fact, however, the other two banking agencies issued denials in only three of the 94 cases in which the Board found a serious anticompetitive effect. The three other denials issued by the FDIC and the Comptroller were in cases in which the Board did not find a serious anticompetitive effect. There does not appear to be a significant relationship between the finding of a serious anticompetitive effect by the Board and the decisions by the other banking agencies.⁴

In my opinion, the pattern of merger decisions examined here is strong documentation of differences in the approach taken by the three supervisory agencies in carrying out their responsibilities under the bank merger statute. Since each agency must determine for itself how well it is meeting the requirements of the Bank Merger Act, I clearly cannot—and would not want to—judge the performance of the other agencies. With respect to the Federal Reserve Board, I obviously believe that we are performing reasonably well.

THE ROLE OF POTENTIAL COMPETITION

While one can describe statistically the differences in the pattern of merger decisions by the Federal bank supervisory agencies, it is far more difficult to explain those differences. Whatever the basis for the differences among the supervisory agencies, it appears to be reflected in their attitudes toward potential competition—that is, the extent to which weight is given to possibilities of future competition in a proposed bank merger or holding company acquisition.

Although it is not clear just how much importance the Comptroller and the FDIC assign to potential competition in deciding cases before them, one does get the impression that the weight they accord this factor is quite small. In contrast, the Federal Reserve Board places considerable emphasis on potential competition in the determination of both bank merger and bank holding company applications.

I believe it to be clearly established that the effect of the 1966 amendments to the Bank Merger and Bank Holding Company Acts was to impose on the responsible supervisory agencies a scheme for appraising and determining competitive consequences that, in major respects, is utilized generally in the Government's enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended in 1950. Most relevant to this discussion is the question: Does a determination of whether the effect of a proposed merger or holding company acquisition "may be substantially to lessen competition" encompass situations involving "potential competition"?

The concept of "potential competition", treated herein, does not automatically en-

Footnotes at end of article.

compass—nor absolutely exclude—the related concepts of "potential injury to competitors" and "ease of market entry." Both of these concepts are properly the subject of inquiry in competitive analysis, but are not necessarily related to a determination of the likelihood that parties to a merger or holding company proposal will become active competitors.

Effective, workable competition in a given market exists when buyers of products or services are offered purchasing alternatives sufficiently real to provide these buyers with the opportunity to change from one seller to another, with the possibility of such change influencing sellers to seek improvements in the quality and price of the products and services which they offer. However, particularly in a market in which actual competition is in some manner deficient, sellers may be influenced as much by the realization that a low level of quality or a high price level may attract more competent or efficient entrants from the periphery of the market as they are by the threat posed by existing competitors. Effective competition in such markets, therefore, requires the preservation of the threat of potential competition.⁵ Admittedly, to deal with "the preservation of the threat of potential competition" is, on its face, conjectural. But Congressional concern over probabilities, not certainties, was the precise reason for the Celler-Kefauver Amendment (1950) to section 7 of the Clayton Act.⁶

It seems fair to say that "potential competition" as a determinative factor in merger and acquisition cases, bank and nonbank alike, while recognized for many years past, has become a crucial and, in some cases, a decisive factor only within the last five years or so. In 1964, the United States Supreme Court decided three cases under section 7 of the Clayton Act in which substantial weight was accorded potential competition.⁷ Of these decisions, *Penn-Olin* provides the most direct statement of law and of criteria for applying the law—both of which the Board finds applicable, and has applied, to bank merger and bank holding company proposals. *Penn-Olin* involved a joint venture agreement to produce and sell sodium chlorate in the southeastern United States between Pennsalt Chemicals Corporation, a producer and nationwide distributor of chemicals and chemical products, and Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation, a producer of chemicals and chemical products with division plants in 15 States. However, at the time of the joint agreement the two corporations did not compete. The relevant market was then dominated by two other corporations, together controlling over 90 per cent of the sodium chlorate market. Pennsalt, pursuant to a sales agreement with Olin, was a minor third competitor in the relevant market. The joint venture agreement was a successor to the above-mentioned sales agreement.

The Supreme Court rejected the finding of the District Court that potential competition between the two joint venturers could be found to have been foreclosed only if, as a matter of reasonable probability, it could be shown that both Pennsalt and Olin would separately have entered the southeast market by means of plant establishments. Sufficient for a finding of substantial lessening of competition through foreclosure of potential competition, the Supreme Court said, was a finding of a "reasonable probability that either one of the corporations would have entered the market by building a plant, while the other would have remained a significant potential competitor".

Quoting in part from the aforementioned TNEC Monograph No. 21, the Court concluded:

"Potential competition, insofar as the

threat survives . . . may compensate in part for the imperfections characteristic of actual competition in the great majority of competitive markets. . . . The existence of an aggressive, well equipped and well financed corporation engaged in the same or related lines of commerce waiting anxiously to enter an oligopolistic market would be a substantial incentive to competition which cannot be underestimated." 378 U.S. 174.

Nor is the absence of a proven intent or attempt to enter a market a bar to a finding that a given concern is a potential competitor. It is sufficient to establish that such concern is the most likely entrant.⁸

The doctrine of potential competition, while not relied upon by the courts as a decisive consideration in a court contest involving alleged anticompetitive consequences of a proposed bank merger or holding company acquisition, has been considered and rejected, not as being *per se* inapplicable, but as being inapplicable in view of the facts of record.⁹ Preclusion of entry into a defined banking market by a substantial potential competitor through consummation of a merger involving the potential entrant, and the question of whether such result violates section 7 of the Clayton Act, and should have been denied under the Bank Merger Act, are issues recently (9/10/68) placed before a Federal District Court by the U.S. Department of Justice, following the Board's approval of merger proposals involving Girard Trust Bank and Doylestown National Bank (Doylestown, Pa.) and the Fidelity Bank & Doylestown Trust Co. (Doylestown, Pa.). The Board, in its 6-1 decision in those cases which were considered together, took into account the possible impact of potential competition. While five members of the majority ruled that the net effect of the proposed mergers on competition would not be adverse, I felt that the over-all competitive effect would be no more than slightly adverse. Nevertheless, I, too, felt the applications should be approved.

The complaints filed by the Department of Justice in each case assert numerous violations of section 7 of the Clayton Act, the majority of which relate to asserted elimination of potential competition in commercial banking between and among the banks involved in the two mergers, and a general allegation of violation premised on the contributory effect of the two mergers on the continuing trend toward reduction in potential bank competitors in the Philadelphia area. We can safely assume, I believe, that the Department of Justice currently takes the position that potential competition is a major factor for consideration in determining the legality of a proposed bank merger; and that proven miscalculation or disregard of a merger's effect on potential competition can require remand to an agency or reversal of agency action.

No less import is attributed by the Board to the factor of potential competition in its consideration of Bank Holding Company Act applications. In the Board's denial action (April 1967, Fed. Res. Bull. 763) on the application of Allied Bankshares Corp., Norfolk, Virginia, to form a bank holding company through ownership of the Virginia National Bank, Norfolk, and The Central National Bank of Richmond, existing competition between the banks was found to be insignificant, and the effect of its elimination of minimal consequence. However, the likelihood that substantial potential competition between the banks would be precluded by their affiliation was stated to weigh heavily in the Board's decision. In May 1967, one month following the Allied denial, the Board, by unanimous vote, denied a proposal by *BT New York Corporation* to acquire *Liberty National Bank and Trust Company, Buffalo* (50 Fed. Res. Bull. 769). As in the *Allied* case, the Board concluded that existing competi-

tion between and among the banks involved in the proposal was sufficiently negligible that it posed no bar to approval. However, the proposal's probable effect on potential competition was found to present a severely adverse consideration. Rejecting Applicant's assertion that consummation of the proposal would promote deconcentration in the heavily concentrated Buffalo area—through *Liberty National's* anticipated greater ability to compete with its two larger rivals—the Board concluded that *Liberty Bank* was presently capable of offering to customers in its market area, both large and small, an alternative source of essential banking services.

Noting that legal and economic barriers to new entry into the Buffalo market area were already high, the Board expressed its concern that there be preserved whatever incentive might exist for entry by potential competitors having the resources and capacity to surmount existing barriers. Based on the financial and management resources of *BT New York Corporation*, the Board found that the Applicant was a potential competitor in the Buffalo market, whose greater participation in that market was not dependent on consummation of the proposed acquisition, and that the entry of such a sizable organization by that means would simply raise the entry barriers for others without increasing the banking alternatives already available to the public. Further, it was concluded that *Liberty Bank*, through a less anticompetitive affiliation, could offer meaningful competition to Applicant and other banking organizations in the upstate banking markets.

Lest the impression be given that there is no limit to the Board's application of the potential competition concept, I can and do speak with knowledge of the Board's efforts to delineate those cases where, because of the facts presented, potential competition has no reasonable role in the Board's determination. Assessing the competitive potential of a given institution is oftentimes difficult. Such assessment requires a definition of the relevant product and geographic markets, and a finding of the ability of a party to a proposal to compete in the market in which the other party or parties are engaged. A determination as to the ability of a bank to compete in given product and geographic markets involves analysis of the cost factor related to such entry. An accurate measure of probable profit, or lack thereof, can often mandate a conclusion as to whether a given bank can reasonably be designated a potential competitor. Similarly, the size of the bank, history of innovation, management ability, and related operational motives all must be taken into consideration in a determination of the presence or not of a potential competitor.

Whatever may be the desirability of taking account of potential competition, the United States Supreme Court has now ruled that it must be done.¹⁰ As reflected in a Statement in which I joined, dissenting from the 4-3 action of the Board approving the merger of two banks in North Carolina (*The State Bank, Laurinburg-Wachovia Bank and Trust Company*, 7/11/68), I believe that Federal bank supervisory authorities are required by law in acting upon merger and bank holding company applications to guard against the continuing trend toward concentration of banking resources, a trend that the Bank Merger Act, the Bank Holding Company Act, and the antitrust laws were designed to prevent. The job cannot be done by ignoring the potential competitor, and will be done only if barriers to market entry are removed or substantially reduced.

MERGER POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Should the rate of economic growth in an area influence the policies of the regulatory agencies toward proposed acquisitions? It

Footnotes at end of article.

apparently has been argued that competition tends to be more intense in a rapidly growing area than in a non-growing area; therefore, the regulatory agencies can afford to pursue a more permissive approach toward acquisitions.

There is nothing in current law or in recent court decisions that would suggest that rapid economic growth is taken by the Supreme Court as a relevant competitive consideration offsetting, let us say, the effect of a merger on concentration in an area. Nor has the Court suggested that the growth of an area, past or prospective, constitutes a justification for a merger that would otherwise be illegal—as might be the case if it were found that mergers in growing areas contributed substantially to the convenience and needs of the community. However, the bank regulatory agencies deal with large numbers of proposals that merit a full scale economic review, many of which are, in all likelihood, not violations of the antitrust laws as currently interpreted. In such cases, there is no necessary reason to adopt exactly the same presumptions as have been applied in antitrust cases by the courts. Moreover, the substantive question would, in any event, remain and it does warrant consideration.

The view that the regulatory agencies need not be as restrictive in preventing mergers in a rapidly growing area as in a slow-growing or stagnant area is presumably based on the belief that economic growth would, in and of itself, intensify competition and would tend to offset high levels of concentration. There are several intuitively appealing reasons why this might be the case. If the economy of an area is growing, there may be a stimulus toward more intensive competition as the aggressive competitors in the area attempt to obtain new customers and also to secure the old ones whose accounts become more valuable. Moreover, marginal banks that might otherwise offer little in the way of effective competition, either because of their small size or limited management, would have an opportunity to grow with their area and to become more vigorous competitors. Finally, in a growing area, there is likely to be room for new entry, either by branching or new charter. Banks in other areas and other entrepreneurs will see an opportunity for profit. Bank supervisors should see a "need" for new facilities.

The above arguments may seem persuasive to many in the banking community. However, the regulatory agencies should not accept them easily. It is by no means obvious that the prospects of obtaining new business will stimulate banks to more effective competition. This would seem to depend on the extent to which banks find it profitable to compete. In a highly concentrated market, it may still be more profitable to follow customary rather than competitive patterns of behavior. Indeed, evidence from the experience of other industries suggest that competition frequently becomes intense, not when conditions are prosperous, but when they are depressed and there is pressure on earnings. I would suggest that we simply do not have enough evidence to state with assurance the effect of the rate of economic growth and changes in the rate of growth on the competitive behavior of banks.

On the other hand, there probably is enough evidence to state that economic growth can, at times, convert a marginal competitor to a larger and more effective competitor. Much would depend on the attitude of management. But, at the same time, such banks may also be very attractive merger partners for larger banks. If a permissive policy is adopted, it is difficult to see how this source of increased competition would be realized.

There should, nevertheless, be room for

new banking facilities in a rapidly growing area whereas there might not be room in a slowly growing area. But whether or not the new growth is accommodated by "inside" banks on the one hand, or "outside" banks and new charters on the other, depends in part on the attitude of bank supervisors who regulate branching and new charters, and also in part on the aggressiveness of the larger banks already in the area. If the large and aggressive "inside" banks are permitted to acquire the most favorable office sites through *de novo* branching or merger, particularly with financial marginal institutions—and they have some real advantages in finding them—the entry of new organizations may be quite limited. The establishment of new branches, and mergers with marginal institutions may make it more difficult for new entrants to become established in the fringe areas. In the long-run, the effect would be to maintain the same or even higher levels of concentration.

There appears to be, however, an inverse relationship between concentration and growth. Slow growing areas often have higher concentration ratios than rapidly growing areas. This is understandable. Regulatory policy, which in part is aimed at protecting existing banks from excessive competition, tends to be restrictive toward new entry in stagnant areas and perhaps somewhat more permissive towards mergers. The observed inverse relationship between economic growth and banking concentration has, it should be noted, taken place within a framework of bank supervision that has not been permissive toward mergers in rapidly growing areas.

There is no way of knowing with certainty what kind of relationship between concentration and economic growth would be observed over the next decade if merger policy were to become less restrictive in growth areas. However, as indicated, it seems the competitive benefits deriving from the growth of marginal banks would disappear through acquisition. While there would still remain the possibility for new entry by branching and new charter, the extent to which competition would be benefited from these sources would depend on the extent to which existing banks would strengthen their positions in marginal areas and also on regulatory policies which differ from state to state and, sometimes, from one Comptroller of the Currency to his successor. In any event, it seems doubtful that the regulation of mergers, in the present institutional environment, should be based on assumptions about regulatory policies toward branching and new charters. Finally, as noted, the apparent stimulation of competition among existing competitors when new business is at stake seems dubious, depending, as it does, on hypotheses that have not, to my knowledge, been adequately tested.

If it is not reasonable, in evaluating the competitive effects of mergers, to rely on economic growth in banking as an offset to higher concentration, it does seem reasonable to conclude that merger policy should be viewed as a complement to economic growth in highly concentrated markets. In an unregulated industry, economic growth and the prospect of high return would tend to attract new capital; and if entry barriers are not too high, this should result in an intensification of competition. In a regulated industry like banking, where barriers to entry and concentration are high in part because of regulation, economic growth should be given the opportunity to produce the degree of competition more prosperous conditions make possible. This means, by and large, permitting new entry to meet rising demands for banking services and also permitting marginal banks to emerge as effec-

tive competitors. It is in the slow growth areas that marginal banks are not likely to emerge as effective competitors, and new entry may also be unlikely whatever regulatory policy.

While a more lenient policy toward mergers in growth areas on competitive grounds seems unwarranted as a general proposition, there may, nevertheless, be some justification for such a policy on grounds of convenience and needs. A growing area develops large demands for bank credit. Small local banks may not be able to meet such demands, because of the volume of their resources, their loan limit or simply their customary ways of doing business. It is quite conceivable that, in some cases, mergers in growing areas would involve benefits to the community that offset any anticompetitive impact. This would be particularly true in the absence of banks suitable in size and approach to meet the demands for banking services generated by growth. But just as in the analysis of competition, generalization is difficult, and a careful study of the likely benefits in each case would be required.

It may be concluded that an easier policy toward mergers in growth areas is not warranted as a general proposition. There may, however, be some cases in which the effect of mergers on competition in such areas is offset by the advantage to the community in convenience and needs.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the above discussion of several key issues relating to bank merger and bank holding company acquisitions, I am personally convinced that important differences exist among the supervisory agencies in the way they carry out their statutory responsibilities. However, I see no ready means of resolving these differences in the near future, although interagency consultations may be helpful. Beyond that, from the pattern of court decisions in the several cases challenged by the U.S. Department of Justice there may come a set of guidelines further sharpening the antitrust standards of the Bank Merger Act.

In the meantime, to meet the growing demand for banking services, the nation's banking structure must also grow and adapt. Innovations in banking services in particular markets must be allowed to come forth. However, although acquisitions under some circumstances may have a beneficial effect on competition—and often on the convenience and needs of the public—we must carefully guard against the anticompetitive possibilities implicit in widespread acquisitions among banks.

TABLE I.—MERGER AND HOLDING COMPANY APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY BANKING AGENCIES, 1966-68¹

AGENCY	1968 (Jan. 1— July 31)			Total for period
	1966	1967	1968	
Federal Reserve:				
Mergers.....	22	15	5	42
Holding company formations.....	9	11	6	26
Holding company acquisitions.....	18	17	10	45
Total.....	49	43	21	113
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	42	47	45	134
Comptroller of the Currency.....	99	76	40	215
Total.....	141	123	85	349
Total.....	190	166	106	462

¹ Jan. 1, 1966, to July 31, 1968.

TABLE II.—DISTRICT DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY BANKING AGENCIES, 1966-68¹

AGENCY	Boston	New York	Philadelphia	Cleveland	Richmond	Atlanta	Chicago	St. Louis	Minneapolis	Kansas City	Dallas	San Francisco	Total
Federal Reserve Board:													
Mergers	6	7	2	5	6	10	2	2	4	5	6	4	42
Holding company formations	1	5	2	2	2	6	4	1	4	3	4	1	26
Holding company acquisitions	2	3	2	14	10	9	11	3	1	1	4	1	45
Subtotal	9	15	2	9	22	16	23	6	5	1	6	113	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	11	19	17	16	21	1	10	8	4	3	4	20	134
Comptroller of the Currency	12	29	35	20	47	8	11	3	6	4	4	40	215
Total	32	63	54	45	90	25	44	11	16	8	8	66	462
Proportion of total	6.9	13.6	11.7	9.7	19.5	5.4	9.5	2.4	4.5	1.7	1.7	14.3	100.0

¹ Jan. 1, 1966 to July 31, 1968.TABLE III.—MERGER AND HOLDING COMPANY APPROVALS AND DENIALS, 1966-68¹

	1966	1967	1968 (Jan. 1-July 3)
AGENCY			
Federal Reserve mergers:			
Approvals	21	13	4
Denials	2	2	1
Holding company formations:			
Approval	6	10	5
Denial	2	1	0
Holding company acquisitions:			
Approval	15	16	10
Denial	2	2	0
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:			
Approval	36	38	31
Denial	0	2	1
Comptroller of Currency:			
Approval	85	76	43
Denial	2	1	0
Total:			
Approval	163	153	93
Denial	8	8	2

¹ Jan. 1, 1966 to July 31, 1968.TABLE IV.—ADVISORY OPINIONS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE, TO OTHER BANKING AGENCIES, 1966-68¹

	To Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	Comptroller of the Currency	Total
Anticompetitive effects:			
Serious	27	67	94
Not serious	94	137	231
Total	121	204	325

¹ January 1, 1966 to July 31, 1968.

Note.—Between May 29, 1967 and July 31, 1968, the Board's opinions have indicated one of 5 terms describing anticompetitive effects. These, in order of the seriousness of the effect are: (1) monopoly; (2) substantially adverse; (3) adverse; (4) slightly adverse and (5) no adverse. The first 3 categories are considered to involve serious anticompetitive effects. Prior to this period, the Board's opinions did not use standardized terminology; however, the reports themselves were reviewed and classified on the 2-way basis indicated in this table.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Nevertheless, since 1964, there appears to have been an upward trend in holding company activity. The following data are for Board decisions in holding company cases, rather than applications: 1964, 11; 1965, 17; 1966, 26; 1967, 31. There may be at least 33 decisions in 1968.

² A little more than 1/2 (37 per cent) of the Board applications have been for mergers; the remaining applications have involved holding companies.

³ For the technicians who may be interested, the relationships appearing in the pattern of merger decisions were tested statistically. Cross classifying Board and "other agency" decisions by "approvals" and "denials" permitted a nonparametric contingency test which yielded a chi square value of 13.7. This value is significant at better than the 1 per cent level and supports the hypothesis indicated above.

⁴ Cross classifying Board findings of serious and nonserious anticompetitive effects, in advisory opinions by "approvals" and "denials" by other agencies permitted a nonparametric contingency test which yielded a chi square value of .48, which cannot be taken as significant.

⁵ Wilcox, *Competition and Monopoly in American Industry*, Temporary National Economic Committee Monograph No. 21 (1940), p. 7.

⁶ *United States v. Philadelphia National Bank*, 374 U.S. 321 (1963); *Brown Shoe Co. v. United States*, 370 U.S. 294 (1962).

⁷ *United States v. Continental Can Co.*, 378 U.S. 441; *United States v. Penn-Olin Chemical Co.*, 378 U.S. 158; *United States v. El Paso Natural Gas Co.*, 376 U.S. 651.

⁸ *Federal Trade Commission v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 386 U.S. 568, 580 (1967).

⁹ *United States v. Crocker-Anglo National Bank*, 223 F. Supp. 849, 856-7 (N.D. Cal. 1963).

¹⁰ *The Supreme Court Review*, 1964, The Law School, The University of Chicago, p. 188.

(5) Exercises a power confided to another branch of government, (6) Exercises a power prohibited to the Federal Government or reserved to the States.

None of the human rights treaties fall within these six cases where the provisions of the treaty would transcend certain provisions of the Constitution. Ratification of the treaties would not limit individual rights—on the contrary, it would expand them. Thus the argument that ratification of the treaties could violate constitutional provisions simply is not valid. We can no longer accept this argument as a basis for continued failure to ratify these important conventions. The Senate has the responsibility to act on these treaties now; there is no justification for further delay.

SUPPORT FOR AN END TO THE WAR IS BROADER AND DEEPER THAN EVER BEFORE—COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, support for an early and complete disengagement from Vietnam keeps growing.

A popular government cannot remain indifferent to the rising opposition of the people toward prolonging our participation in this war. In the past two national elections, the people voted for peace. Yet, all they got was more war. The reluctance of the Government to heed public opinion is the underlying cause for the massive outpouring of pentup feeling that occurred on October 15, moratorium day.

Now that the President has commenced to withdraw from Vietnam, the people would like to see the process speeded up. At the present rate of withdrawal, American troops will be engaged in Vietnam for the next 8 to 10 years. The present policy, dependent as it is on Saigon and Hanoi, waits upon the pleasure of foreign governments whose interests differ diametrically from ours. We should take back the timetable into our own hands, where it belongs.

Last week, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and I introduced a bipartisan resolution, Senate Resolution 270, expressing the sense of the Senate that the time has come for the South Vietnamese people to take charge of their own destinies, and calling for "a more rapid withdrawal of American troops, and a commitment by the United States to fully disengage from South Vietnam pending such reasonable interval as may be necessary to effect an orderly transition on the battlefield, and

RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES FULLY CONSISTENT WITH U.S. CONSTITUTION

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most persistent fears which has stood in the way of ratification of the three human rights conventions concerning genocide, the political rights of women, and forced labor has been that these treaties could negate certain provisions of the Constitution. Although this concern has been widespread and has frequently been used as an excuse for failure to ratify the treaties, it has no basis in fact.

Justice Story made it very clear that the treatymaking power must be subject to those provisions of the Constitution establishing the Government and imposing express limitations on its powers:

A power given by the Constitution cannot be construed to authorize a destruction of other powers given in the same instrument. It must be construed, therefore, in subordination to it; and cannot supersede or interfere with any other of its fundamental provisions. Each is equally obligatory and of paramount authority within its scope; and no one embraces a right to annihilate any other.

Mikell in his article, "The Treaty Making Power," published in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review outlines those cases where a treaty would transcend the Constitution:

A treaty or treaty provision would transcend the Constitution if the treaty: (1) Alters the form of government, (2) Alters the departmental structure of the Federal Government, (3) Alters the constitution of any of the branches of government, (4) Deprives the Federal Government of a delegated power,

provide for the safety of American troops and those who may wish to leave with them."

Mr. President, the welcome response to our invitation to cosponsor this resolution is another indication of the growing sentiment for peace in the Senate. To this date, a total of 18 Senators have endorsed the resolution. This represents the high water mark of Senate support for any resolution calling for an end to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be listed as cosponsors on the next printing of Senate Resolution 270:

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Burdick), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case), the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Gravel), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCarthy), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ribicoff), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator indicates that the cosponsors of his resolution (S. Res. 270) represent the high water mark of Senate support for any resolution calling for an end to the war in Vietnam.

May I remind the Senator that Senate Resolution 271 is sponsored by 36 Members of this body, and calls upon the North Vietnamese—the enemy in this conflict—to do certain things.

For the RECORD, I wish to emphasize that there are 36 sponsors of that resolution.

Mr. CHURCH. I am familiar with the Senator's resolution. I think that if he reads carefully the text of my remarks, he will find that they do not need revision.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allen in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. PRESIDENT—NOT ENOUGH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Nixon last spring announced he favored increasing social security benefits by 7 percent. With a surplus in the social security and social security disability fund of nearly \$30 billion—which is a

tremendous surplus—certainly payments to men, women, and children should be increased to 15 percent. If they were increased to 15 percent, the social security fund would still continue to be an actuarially sound insurance system.

Social security is the greatest legislative achievement of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. Conservatives of that period denounced it as state socialism and sneered that Americans would be wearing "dogtags." The Republican platform of 1936 pledged repeal. Its candidate, Gov. Alf Landon of Kansas, a good man, carried but two States. It has since been unthinkable for any political party to oppose the social security program.

A young worker today is building insurance for his family that could pay thousands of dollars in benefits should he become disabled or die before his children are grown. Today, 1,300,000 disabled workers under 65, and 1 million dependent children each month receive social security checks averaging \$235. Many Americans are unaware that changes in the law now provide payments in early and middle years. For example, a young worker disabled before the age of 24 with 1½ years of covered employment during the preceding 3 years qualifies for social security payments as long as he lives. Also, children of a working mother covered by social security who dies or becomes disabled are immediately eligible for payments regardless of the father's income.

President Nixon proposed a 7-percent increase in social security benefits; recently he increased that proposal to 10 percent, effective not earlier than next April. Unfortunately, there is no delay in the ever-increasing cost of living and a long, cold winter is approaching, particularly for lower income families.

Social security is, and it will continue to be, and it must continue to be, an actuarially sound insurance system. Payments to the 25 million men, women, and children now receiving social security benefits could be and should be increased 15 percent, and without delay.

REPEAL THAT GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the final session of the 89th Congress on March 1, 1966, I report with pride that my vote was recorded in support of a resolution to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which was passed in the Senate following misrepresentation of facts from the White House and aided and abetted by officials of the National Security Council and Central Intelligence Agency falsely claiming small North Vietnamese gunships had fired upon our destroyers, including the destroyer *Maddox*.

Mr. President, hindsight is much better than foresight. Looking back on it, that assertion seems preposterous. The *Maddox* was accompanied by other destroyers of the U.S. Navy, but the *Maddox* alone could have destroyed every one of those small gunships that were falsely alleged to have attacked the *Maddox*.

President Johnson used this alleged incident to obtain authority to send hun-

dreds of thousands of men of our Armed Forces overseas into Vietnam to wage an undeclared, immoral major war in that faraway country.

There were only five U.S. Senators at that time who voted to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I am glad to report I was one of those five. The others were Senators FULBRIGHT, McCARTHY, Morse, and Gruening.

Mr. President, I have prepared and am submitting a resolution to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, under the authority of section 3 of the joint resolution, commonly known as the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and entitled "Joint Resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia", approved August 10, 1964 (78 Stat. 384), such joint resolution is terminated upon passage of this concurrent resolution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE NOMINATION OF HON. CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR., TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, at a special news conference convened in his office yesterday, President Nixon reaffirmed his support for Judge Clement Haynsworth and stated he had examined in detail the record made by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and that he had absolutely no doubt that Judge Haynsworth is a man of integrity and honesty.

I have read the transcript of the news conference, Mr. President, and also examined the charges that have been raised against Judge Haynsworth and their denial by Senator Cook and others before the Senate.

I share the judgment of the President as to the honesty and integrity of this distinguished nominee.

I believe that if any Senator examines in detail and depth the so-called appearances of impropriety that have been raised, rather than taking a rigid position based on superficial reasoning determined by philosophy or ideological persuasion, he will reach a similar judgment.

If that approach is used, then I am convinced that the nominee will be confirmed by this body by an overwhelming vote.

Some are now saying the President should withdraw this nomination because there are appearances of impropriety that have been created; but I ask, in all due deference, "Who created those ap-

pearances?" Clearly, in my view, not the distinguished nominee, for, as I have said, any objective analysis of the record will clearly indicate to the contrary. The so-called appearances of impropriety so often alluded to in debate on this floor have been created, in my judgment, not by the nominee but by the debate, the newspaper accounts, the reports, the innuendo, the rumor, the incomplete analysis of the 700-page record compiled by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

But even if this be the fact, it is being contended that while the ethical questions that have been raised were not warranted, or were without foundation, since doubt has been raised the President should withdraw the nomination. However, as the President has said, and said only yesterday, to pursue that course of action would mean that anyone who wants to make a charge can thereby create the appearance of impropriety, raise a doubt, and then demand that the nomination be withdrawn. The President rejected that course of action, and I commend him for it.

To allow a man to be victimized in this manner would be contrary to our system, and would obviously mean that a nomination could be defeated for a good reason, for a bad reason, or, as in this case, for no reason at all.

Mr. President, I have great respect for this body, as I have deep and genuine respect for the underlying genius that created our tripartite system of central government, consisting of the executive department, the two branches of the legislative department, and the judiciary, each having a rather exquisite set of checks and balances, prerogatives, and overlapping jurisdiction with the others. This insures that there is a consensus expressed by the machinery of government that fairly and clearly represents the will of the people themselves.

The Senate is now engaged in one of its unique jurisdictional undertakings—the responsibility, under the Constitution, that it advise and consent with the President of the United States on the confirmation or the withholding of confirmation of a nominee for the highest tribunal the only constitutional tribunal, in this Republic.

I think it might be appropriate, for the moment, to examine in detail the responsibility of this body in that respect. Clearly, I believe, the President and the Senate have concurrent responsibility and concurrent jurisdiction in the matter of selecting the members of that constitutional tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States, in this case specifically an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

I have no quarrel with those who say that the Senate must not act as a mere rubber stamp, giving automatic or pro forma approval to any nomination sent by any President to the Senate at any time. I do believe that our jurisdiction is as great as that of the executive department; otherwise, the phrase "advise and consent" would have no meaning. But there is one principal constitutional distinction between the responsibility of the President and the responsibility of the Senate. As it clearly appears

from the Constitution, only the President can initiate a nomination. The Senate may consider only those nominations so initiated; and, in considering nominees for the highest tribunal, it is the responsibility of the Senate to examine every fact and every facet involved in such nominations.

It is my purpose now to urge my colleagues to do precisely that; and, with all due respect, even with my great reverence for this body, to suggest that they have not yet done it. The debate thus far has been altogether too detached from the record compiled by the Committee on the Judiciary. The debate thus far has dealt too much and too often with "the appearance of impropriety," and too little with the fact and substance of the nominee's record as adduced by the committee.

I believe it would be a tragic chapter in the relationship between the Senate and the judiciary if this nomination were not determined on the basis of the merits and facts of the controversy, rather than on the basis of innuendo. I believe, as I have stated before on this floor, that it is time we examined the facts and circumstances attendant upon this nomination, and stopped "shoveling smoke"—a phrase that was impressed upon me some years ago when I was in law school. It was then pointed out that too often law students and lawyers and, I am inclined to believe, legislators, even those in this august body, tend to become caught up in the emotions of the moment and to be attracted by the glitter of vocabulary instead of careful scrutiny of the record itself and the facts and circumstances on which a judgment should be based.

In response to that implication, either Justice Holmes or Judge Learned Hand—I have forgotten now which—made the charge that lawyers are prone to spend much of their adult lives "shoveling smoke"—that is, dealing in things other than the facts of the case at issue.

I admonish my fellow Senators, and I am confident that the Senate will not do so, not to engage in a smoke shoveling contest in connection with the confirmation of Clement Haynsworth to serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe my colleagues, and the Senate as a body, will not engage in the luxury of innuendo as the basis for judgment, but rather will make their judgment on the basis of the facts. The facts have been clearly delineated in the hearing record, and on occasion in debate on this floor. I commend now, as I have previously, the magnificent statement made by the junior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), wherein he took, one by one, the charges, the inferences, the allegations, and the implications—not just those involved in the debate, but in the stories circulated in the press, from every source—and made a point by point, meticulous answer to all such charges. I said then and I say once again that it is the constitutional duty of every Member of this body to do what MARLOW COOK, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky, did, and that is to examine these matters and look the facts in the face.

The confirmation of the nomination of a man to serve on the highest court in

this land must be so judged. It must not be judged on some inference of liberal philosophy or conservative philosophy, or some alleged bias of a pro-labor or anti-labor stand, because, Mr. President, if we do judge on that basis, we are setting up a constitutional principle that I believe none of us would consciously adhere to or approve of. If some say, as some have said, "I oppose Clement Haynsworth because his philosophy is too pro-labor or too anti-labor, or too liberal or too conservative," we are in fact saying by that allegation or that statement that we are going to choose the members of the Supreme Court of the United States based upon some artificial balance between liberal and conservative, pro-labor and anti-labor. Mr. President, for my part, I do not want a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, whether it be the Chief Justice or an Associate Justice, who is either pro or anti anyone in these United States. To say that Clement Haynsworth is anti-labor implies that the maker of the statement would rather have someone who is pro-labor; or to say that he is anti-civil rights, that he would rather have someone who is pro-civil rights.

Judge Haynsworth is neither, and no conscientious member of this Government, whether he be a Senator, a Justice of the Supreme Court, or the President of the United States himself can afford the luxury of being anything other than dispassionate, calm, and impartial in his judgment of what is best for this country and best for humanity.

So I reject out of hand the contention that we should judge on the basis of a philosophical bias of any sort, and say rather that we should examine this nominee as we should examine all nominees, on the basis of their competence, their qualification to serve and to serve well, to serve impartially and to serve judiciously the best interests of the people of this country, all of them, without breaking the population down into pro or anti anything.

Clement Haynsworth is uniquely suited for this difficult task. The President of the United States has chosen well. The Senate of the United States must examine the facts and not revel in innuendos or aspersions. We must come to terms with the judgment we must make, disregarding as we must so often disregard what its political impact will be at home with one group or another, and we must decide what is best for this country.

In my humble view, what is best for this country is a man who has the judicial impartiality to look facts in the face and call the judgments as he sees them, which is precisely what we must do also in judging this confirmation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the fine presentation he has just made. It is my firm belief that when Senators read the record in the Haynsworth case, they will find that Judge Haynsworth is as well qualified as any man who has ever been nominated to be a Supreme Court Justice.

I am very proud that the Senator from Tennessee has seen fit to make the remarks he has made today.

Having known Judge Haynsworth, his father, his grandfather, and the distinguished family from which he comes, I am sure that the Members of the Senate and the people of this country will be very proud to have him serve as a Supreme Court Justice.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, looking back to the debate on the 1970 military authorization bill, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two points which have caused me deep concern in the past 6 or 7 weeks.

The first point is the fact that this debate has revealed to our enemies vast amounts of classified information they could not have obtained otherwise. Second, it appears to me we are witnessing a direct challenge to the committee system as we have known it here in the Senate.

On point No. 1 regarding classified information, it is not my desire to bring into question the right of any Senator to challenge any item in any bill on the floor of the Senate. To do so would challenge the democratic process which has made our Government a powerful and influential one.

However, it must be recognized that in the 6 weeks the military procurement bill has been debated item by item, information on weapons systems vital to our defense has been spread across the public record for all to see.

During this debate the thought often occurred to me that our enemies would have been required to pay millions to espionage agents for the information revealed in a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which sells for a few cents. It is not hard to imagine the excitement of Communist military leaders around the world as their interpreters pour over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and extract information vital to their development of an effective strategy against us. Can you imagine the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which have been shipped to Russia, China, Cuba, and other unfriendly countries in the last month?

Mr. President, the opponents of these various weapons systems are not the only ones who have spilled our "military beans" so to speak, but those of us trying to defend these systems have also been forced to reveal classified data, knowingly and unknowingly, in an effort to preserve the strength of our Military Establishment.

Our entire military strategy and concepts have been enumerated in full. We have had to talk about the "2 and 1/2" concept and justify it. We have had to talk about our balance of deterrence, our commitments abroad, our strategy of attack, the strength of our Navy, the shortage of submarines, the approaching weakness of our manned bombers, the successes and failures of our antiballistic missiles, the characteristics of our new tank, the naval strategy involving our aircraft carrier forces, the approaching obsolescence of our Air Forces, the strategic concepts upon which the C-5A is based, and so on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on two systems our debate has been particularly revealing, the ABM and the MBT-70.

In the lengthy debate on the ABM we precisely pinpointed the location of our planned defensive missiles, we discussed their capabilities and their weaknesses, we talked about the multiple independent reentry vehicle techniques, the size and power of our warheads, the number and range of our ABM's, the dispersion of our Sprints and Spartans, the expected points of interception, the problems with chaff and other countermeasures, and the strength and failures of the radars which control and guide these defensive missiles. This debate also laid bare the strength of our ICBM's, our Polaris and Poseidon forces, and the present makeup of our strategic bomber squadrons.

Furthermore, we revealed to a large degree exactly what we know and what we do not know about the military strength and plans of the Russians and the Chinese. Any schoolboy could plan the defense of his fort better if he knows how many slingshots, rubber guns, and dirt balls his opponents have prepared to use against him.

Regarding our revolutionary new tank, the MBT-70, we were forced to reveal its particular characteristics in an effort to justify its continued development. This being a joint project with West Germany, our allies must be in a state of shock over the fact we have unveiled to a potential enemy all the strengths and weaknesses of a vehicle in which they might some day have to place their young men and commit to a battlefield. It is likely the MBT-70 will be the last joint development project any nation will ever undertake with America, the land of open discussion.

Mr. President, I do not know what the answer is, but I hope it is something other than what we have just been through. All of these weapons systems have been reviewed and discussed at length in executive sessions of the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate. In the past, certain classified hearings and reports of the committee have been available for Members of the Senate to examine if they wished.

It is not my suggestion that the Members of the Senate give unqualified support to the recommendations of the Senate Armed Services Committee. This committee has 18 members but we are not infallible, nor is the Defense Department, the President, the Bureau of the Budget, or any group involved in the defense of this Nation. Still, there must be a better way to get at these issues and deal with them in an effective way which will serve the best interest of all concerned. This must be accomplished with the recognition that more secret data vital to the survival of this country is heard by the Armed Services Committee than goes before all other congressional committees combined.

This problem is complicated by the fact that our enemies in this world operate in closed societies where the repre-

sentatives of their people are more the servants of a powerful elite than the masters as in our country. Discussions of their military problems never reach the public ear or printed word and, therefore, they have an advantage because of the oppressive nature of the political systems under which they operate. While we cannot do anything about their system it does seem that some thought should be given to finding adequate methods to provide the necessary reviews and debates of our own military problems without the exposure which has just resulted in the Senate.

On the second point, we have witnessed in recent months a challenge to the committee system. We have seen members of other committees use their committees to go into strictly military problems in an obvious challenge to the Senate Armed Services Committee. In addition, we have seen organized a bipartisan group of Senators and Congressmen working as members of an unofficial body called the Military Spending Committee of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law.

What would the members of this august body think if a similar nonofficial committee was organized to challenge the findings and reports of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Judiciary Committee, or the Finance Committee? If such a practice should become a custom we would have chaos, and each of us clearly recognizes the inherent dangers.

Now, Mr. President, I know some of the members of this military spending committee and they are good men who share a deep concern for the well-being of our people. But I wonder if they realize they are opening the door to the destruction of the committee system of Congress and embarking on broad vistas from which there may be no honorable retreat. They have assigned themselves to such groups and in so doing have demonstrated a lack of faith in the committee system as such.

Also, there are some other questions which should be raised. For example, what sort of impression would be created if 30 or 40 amendments were offered to the foreign aid authorization bill calling for reviews and studies of our foreign aid to each recipient in South America, in the Far East, in the Near East, and so on. Has the expenditures of these funds been analyzed in detail? Have cost effectiveness studies been made on each program in these various countries? Is it cheaper to feed an Indian or an Indonesian? Should not the General Accounting Office look into these programs? Have justification hearings been held on these expenditures? Where do these expenditures fit into our priorities?

In overcoming malnutrition, has the responsible committee determined what constitutes malnutrition and how many calories are needed to overcome it? What independent studies are available to support these requests? Is it cost effective to ship rice from Arkansas or Louisiana to Vietnam when Formosa could provide it cheaper? Should we not have studies on top of the hearings conducted by the responsible committees here in Congress on these subjects?

These unorthodox procedures of short-cutting committee work and organizing a parallel nonofficial committee has resulted in floor challenges poorly based in fact. But the result has been not victories for the opponents, but victories for our enemies who have learned classified information about our Military Establishment. Yes, we could go into daily executive sessions in these Senate debates, but would that serve the high purposes of democracy or enhance the image of the Senate in the eyes of the people? I think not.

Mr. President, these two subjects have been on my mind a great deal since the recent debate of the 1970 procurement bill began. There is no doubt that this bill has received the closest examination by the Senate in the history of this Nation. This examination has also served some useful purposes as well as bringing about the problem I have just discussed. For one thing, it is my opinion the Senate Armed Services Committee gave the 1970 military procurement the most careful study and review it has given a piece of legislation since I have been on that committee. This does not mean to imply that committee action in previous years has not been thorough, but today, more than ever, our military establishment is gigantic and its needs are consuming a large part of the budget dollar.

The debate on this year's military authorization bill amounts to a new phenomenon never before witnessed in the Senate. The requests of the military were about the same last year, during the Johnson administration, when no item was seriously questioned on the floor, even the expansive Sentinel ABM which involved a commitment much greater than the Safeguard ABM recently passed by a narrow vote. We have just witnessed here in the Senate during recent weeks an item by item challenge of many of the new hardware weapon systems vital to our national defense. It is an unprecedented situation, and I sometimes wonder if the "whiz kids of systems analysis" in the Department of Defense have not moved to the Hill.

Mr. President, secrecy is not bad when it involves the defense of our loved ones, our homes, our businesses, and our cities. There is a difficult area here, and we must find the right place to draw the line between the people's right to know and the point at which our security is being compromised. I believe that a fuller use of the committee system, working through the proper committees, is a part of the answer. Surely, we cannot continue to lay bare our military secrets as has been done during the debate on the 1970 military procurement bill.

NEED MORE HELP FOR RURAL WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many nonmetropolitan Americans have every right to question our national priorities when we can put men on the moon, but are falling farther behind in the effort to provide modern conveniences for many of our smalltown and farm homes.

Out in the rural United States more than 30,000 smaller towns are still with-

out water systems, and more than 40,000 without sewer systems. Despite scientific and engineering developments of recent years, Americans residing in these areas still must struggle against the hazards of bad water and scarce water; and communities without these advantages most of us take for granted are certain to lose out in their efforts to hold their people, attract newcomers and develop new industry. The lack of central water and sewer systems is much of the reason for rural decline and mounting numbers of distressed people moving in on our cities.

In recent years we launched an attack on this problem through the rural community water facilities program. The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture has helped rural communities plan and finance 3,600 water and sewer systems in the first 8 years of the effort.

My State of Missouri is one of the three leading States in accomplishment under this program. However, we still need many more systems in rural Missouri than the 165 produced to date. Unfortunately, in the past 2 years, the program in our State has gone down from a pace of \$14 million to \$3 million a year. This results from lack of support in a war-heavy Federal budget for this kind of action in the interest of a stronger and better America.

Missourians and their statewide Farmers Home organization, so well administered in the past administration by State Director J. Everett Jose, put forth an outstanding effort to begin the task of overcoming the rural disadvantage in water and sewer services. We have been assured that Mendel Cline, succeeding Everett Jose as State director, also will make the most of every resource and opportunity to carry on the rural water facilities program; but more help is needed from the administration and the Congress.

The challenge of water and sewer development in rural areas is often compared to the challenge of rural electrification, which has been met so successfully that lights and power now flow to almost every farm home in the United States.

Rural electric cooperatives also have demonstrated in Missouri that they can render outstanding public service in helping the people of their communities provide long-awaited water and sewer systems, through the Farmers Home Administration program.

This civic effort by rural electrics is described in an editorial published in Rural Electric Missourian for September 1969. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WATER SYSTEMS ARE ESSENTIAL FOR RURAL PROGRESS

Rural leaders have long been aware of the important role that a good, quality water supply plays in the total rural development program. Industrial growth, recreation development and just plain wholesome rural living all are enhanced by the availability of a safe and sanitary water supply.

Good and adequate water is a serious problem in many areas of rural Missouri because ground water is very high in salt con-

tent. Drilling in these areas for individual water wells becomes a definite financial burden.

For all these reasons Missouri is one of the leading states in developing modern, central water systems covering small towns and countryside. Project financing through the Farmers Home Administration to date totals some \$35-million in loans for Missouri rural water systems.

Our state ranks third, exceeded only by Texas and Mississippi, in the volume of its rural water program. Some 165 projects have been developed to date with 25 additional projects in advance stages of planning. Most of these systems are thriving. Some are having the expected difficulties that come with having a service to sparsely settled rural areas.

In addition, approximately 140 applications have been rejected because funds will not be available to finance them until after fiscal 1970.

Missouri's electric cooperatives have been instrumental in developing many of these projects. They have provided technical assistance and leadership in the development of these projects throughout the state.

With the knowledge gained from 35 years experience providing electric service in rural America, electric cooperatives in Missouri and other states can and should offer valuable leadership and advice during the difficult formative years of the rural water districts.

Water and electricity are two essential resources for the growth of any area. Electric cooperatives have provided the electricity—they can lend valuable assistance to the water districts.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE RURAL AGED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for the past 2 months it has been my privilege to conduct a series of field hearings into the problems of the rural aged on behalf of the Special Committee on Aging. During that time hearings were held in Iowa, Kentucky, Indiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi. In each of these States the problems of the rural aged were all too obvious: extreme isolation, inadequate diets, ramshackle housing, and infrequent medical treatment are but a few of the severe problems with which they must contend. In addition, they share with their urban contemporaries a common economic problem. Almost without exception their income is grossly inadequate to meet their needs. The minimum social security benefit of \$55 which many of them receive is barely enough to maintain life from month to month. As well, many of the people whom I talked with have no income at all and must rely entirely on friends and relatives for the necessities of life.

If there is one conclusion that I came away with after the hearings, it is that this country has a positive obligation to make as comfortable as possible the twilight years of those who have served it so well. Let us not forget that these are the farmers and the miners and the laborers and the mothers who have time and time again shown their devotion to this country. Certainly, the true test of a nation's greatness is its treatment of those "who are about to leave the fair."

One man who feels very strongly that our country is wanting in this regard is the Reverend Nathaniel Machesky, O.F.M. Father Machesky has done much in the Greenwood, Miss., area to insure

that the last years of the aged will be dignified and happy. The statement which he delivered before the Special Committee on Aging at the Mississippi hearing, I found to be most powerful and moving. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON AGING

A case for action, immediate and meaningful, for the aging was established here this afternoon just as in every hearing conducted by the distinguished Senator from Indiana and by other members of his Committee on Aging.

There is, however, one dimension of the overall consideration which must be mentioned. This is the profoundly human dimension. Something mysterious, almost magical, happens to a person in need when he or she knows that somebody cares. For far too long aged people in our community have known—not felt—that few if any cared about them. Can any of you here this afternoon know what it means to have lived a life of backbreaking toil in cotton fields or cotton warehouses only to be told in the twilight of one's years that "If you were not so lazy you would have saved for your old age"? Or to be told, "If you had been a better parent you would have trained your children to look after you"?

I have looked into tear-filled eyes of old people who heard such things from social and welfare workers who used such a cruel way of reminding old people that they were a burden to society and if they happened to be black, they were somehow less than a person. I have heard old people say that they lived in the hope of one more Christmas because the little party for old folks here at the Center was the biggest day of their lives because it proved that somebody cares.

Gentlemen of this special committee, please carry to every member of your committee the voice of all the aging members of our community. They can point to a life of loyalty to the American system, they can show you a record of many years of hard work, they can tell you in a voice mellow with age, enriched with sincerity, that they have survived by their faith in America and their confidence in the American dream. Before their life's candle flickers out, they hope—oh, how they hope!—that America will show it truly cares. America should show it cares quickly and meaningfully by using the resources these aged persons have helped develop, by using it now to make every minute of their waning lives rich in contentment so that their loyalty, their faith and their hope will not have been in vain.

KANSAS HONORED BY SECRETARY HICKEL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the State of Kansas was honored this month with a 3-day visit by Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel and his charming wife.

For the Secretary, his visit was in most respects a homecoming, for it was near the town of Clafin that he was born and reared. It was my privilege and pleasure to accompany the Hickel party on a tour of our State which took him into each of the five congressional districts. It was obvious that the Secretary enjoyed every minute of his stay, and there was little question about the warmth of his reception.

The full account of this visit is related in a most concise and picturesque manner by Mr. McDill Boyd, noted Kansas publisher and outstanding citizen, who

also accompanied the Hickel party on much of its swing around the State. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boyd's article, entitled "A Most Remarkable Man," and published in the Phillips County Review of October 16, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A MOST REMARKABLE MAN

An engaging and dynamic man, the human side of Walter Hickel emerged at Clafin last Friday evening when his heart was on his sleeve as he visited with family and friends.

The Secretary of Interior, accompanied by his gracious wife, took time out from an extensive tour of Kansas last week to "go back home", and see his folks again. It was his first visit to Kansas since he was named to the Cabinet post by President Nixon, and after watching him relax at a family dinner, it was easy to see why he had said that if he came to Kansas, he was certainly going to visit Clafin.

Hickel reached down to tousle the hair of a nephew; and inquire of a little niece what had happened to one of her front teeth. Surrounded by 46 close relatives (he came from a large family) the group first went to dinner at the church basement; then to the high school football game; and wound up the evening with a reception when more than 100 relatives, down to second and third cousins, continued with the visit.

He and Mrs. Hickel have six sons of their own, and with two of them still at home, she cannot travel with him all the time, but was at his side constantly on the trip to Kansas. Commenting simply, he said: "When a man gets too big for his home town, he's too big to be useful to anyone else."

During half-time at the football game, he was at the microphone in the press box telling family and friends how good it was to be home again; and calling for teammates on the Clafin football team. The other three members of the backfield (Hickel was the quarterback at 135 pounds) all showed up as Hickel called for "42-right", a favorite play at that time.

Hickel is at his no inconsiderable best with questions and answers before audiences of any size. He fields questions promptly, directly, and intelligently. Audiences at Wichita, Salina and McPherson; the press corps at those cities as well as at Hays and Dodge City were captivated by his forthright approach. During his brief stay in Kansas, he had a capacity crowd at a Wichita luncheon; at a reception and dinner in Salina; at an airport reception in Hays enroute to Dodge City where he was the principal speaker at the Arkansas Basin Development Association before going on to tour Old Fort Larned, one of the Kansas installations under his supervision. He also visited the "Waiting Wives" at the Schilling Air Force base in Salina where families of veterans who are overseas await their return.

After a busy day and a half, he made the trip to Clafin to spend the night with relatives, and then took off for McPherson at 7 a.m. Saturday where another overflow crowd—this time a breakfast—greeted him and his wife.

The party then left for Lindsborg to participate in the Hyllingsfest parade before going on to Salina to fly to Lawrence where he visited the Haskell Institute, another Department of Interior installation, and attended the K-State-K.U. football game.

He didn't want to "just be a spectator"—and donned a Wildcat purple cap and rooted for the K-State team as vigorously as any other fan.

Following the game, there was a reception at the Ramada Inn, sponsored by Cong. Larry Winn of the Third district; and the Secretary and Mrs. Hickel then returned to

Topeka for another reception, with Cong. Chester Mize of the Second district joining the party.

Cong. Keith Sebelius had been with the group on all stops in the First district; and Cong. Garner Shriver joined the group at Wichita and McPherson. Sen. Bob Dole, who was primarily responsible for scheduling the trip to Kansas, was at Hickel's side most of the way—but had a prior engagement at El Dorado Friday night, and missed the Secretary's visit with home folks.

Hickel has a remarkable record. He went to Alaska in 1940 (there were more children than needed at the old home place) arriving with 37¢ in his pocket. He went to work; later established his own business, and when Alaskan statehood was at issue, he became a driving force. He served on the Republican National Committee for 10 years, and in 1966 was elected governor. When President Nixon invited him to become a member of his cabinet, he says quite simply:

"It was an honor, a challenge," he says, "but I didn't need a job. I accepted because there was a job to do, and I feel that most of the men around the President have the same feeling."

He points out in his public appearances that the Republican party is now "proposing, not opposing," and that many proposals now before Congress are held up because Congress is controlled by the opposition party.

"This is the first time a president has been elected in 100 years without control of the U.S. Senate," he says, "and every time I want to make an appointment to a high level post, I must get the approval of the Senate, controlled entirely by the Democrats. The same thing happens to legislation."

He feels that the best way to activate necessary reforms is to elect a Republican Senate in 1970 "that will work with the President."

But politics aside, his knowledge of his department; his dedication to the conservation of our natural resources, is astounding. He is a fighter, too—he won the Golden Gloves championship as a welterweight before going to Alaska—and it is not surprising that the large newspapers in the East who so vigorously opposed his nomination, have now made a complete turn-around, and hold Hickel in high esteem.

One example warmed my heart.

While governor of Alaska, (Russian fishing boats by the hundreds work off its coast) local fishermen were being consistently robbed of their traps, their gear, their fish by night-time marauders who would "sweep" inlets with large nets, stealing everything that could be netted.

Protests to Washington were of no avail, for the boats would be out beyond the three-mile limit before they were detected, and there was no way to tell one fishing boat from another.

So Hickel ordered a plane to fly over the area, and any time a Russian fishing boat was found in an inlet, to drop a can of paint on it. The coast guard cutters could then spot the offenders and get back the stolen goods.

A Russian emissary called to protest this summary action as a violation of the three-mile limit arrangement, and Hickel informed him in no uncertain words that he was not going to permit the Russian fishing thefts to continue. The matter was dropped; and the marauding fishermen stayed out of local waters.

It is Hickel's feeling that the Russians respect strength; and will take advantage of weakness. He has been invited to visit that country and will go if he can enter at Vladivostok, and spend two weeks "going anywhere I want to go".

He says that this is the right way to enter that country (not through Moscow). "We can get along with the Siberian area," he

says, "for it is only 20 miles from Alaska and we have many things in common."

A man of common sense, of ideals and ideas—a man who will never get too big for his home town, or lay aside his love for family—Walter Hickel and his wife are the kind of people you would like to have as next door neighbors.

STUDENT PROTEST

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, uppermost in the minds of many Americans these days is the subject of student protest and one of its corollaries, the generation gap.

One of the most eloquent and carefully reasoned statements I have heard on this subject appears in the October issue of the UNH magazine, a publication about the University of New Hampshire for parents of students and alumni of the institution.

In the cover article, Judge Bernard I. Snierson writes about "Student Protest and Revolt." Judge Snierson is a judge of the Laconia, N.H., district court, where he has gained widespread recognition for his counseling of young offenders. He is serving his second term as a trustee of the University of New Hampshire; and when the board of trustees last year established its student affairs committee, Judge Snierson was appointed chairman.

Because I think that what Judge Snierson has to say about student protest warrants widespread dissemination, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

STUDENT PROTEST AND REVOLT

(By Bernard I. Snierson)

Let me be totally frank and honest. I confess to no superior knowledge to any of you in the area of student protest and revolt. These matters are being discussed on every forum and in every household. Very strong views are held by almost everyone and I expect no converts from among those who may disagree with me. If my thoughts have any value, however, they do have the benefit of some experience on the field of combat and a personal involvement on the scene. I recall (U.S. Senator) Norris Cotton once telling me that those who now consider him to be a real conservative should have known him when he was just a resident of Lebanon. He found a great deal more of the nation's and the world's problems to be considered from the Washington scene than could ever be apparent from any narrow, provincial approach without the benefit of actual dealing on a national scale with the great matters of worldwide significance.

Let's start with the high school graduate, particularly from a normal family background in a small or medium-sized community. At most liberal colleges and universities, he is suddenly confronted with an entirely new spectrum of ideas and concepts up to then unknown and unfamiliar to him by simple lack of exposure. He is for the first time called upon to meet new challenges and to venture into strange caverns of ideas and concepts heretofore unexplored by him. His first reaction may well be one of shock and considerable resistance, to hold onto his little world of comfort and security and freedom from unpleasantness. Very few of us who have graduated from small high schools have not found our secure little world of ideas shaken by the onslaught of the larger concepts we once thought outside the scope of our existence. If there is one characteristic common to most high school graduates, es-

pecially the bright ones, it is the sublime knowledge that they know everything, that any further education will merely solidify and extend presently held beliefs which they consider inviolable. The first shock comes when they meet and live with people of different backgrounds and with different ideas. Then suddenly comes the realization that the world is not static, that issues must be considered and met which they and their parents may even have failed to recognize as problems.

We have to accept the fact that today's youth is a different breed than he was 25 years ago. By reason of insight, knowledge and exposure, he is more psychologically and physically mature than we were a generation ago. Courses formerly reserved for colleges are now studied in high school. Instant television has, for example, brought into every home a graphic demonstration of tragic events heretofore read about only in cold print. One shot of police dogs snarling at defenseless blacks in Selma, Alabama, crystallized sympathy in one of our nation's most urgent problems of the day as nothing else could. So did the frightening sight of students in Willard Straight Hall on the Cornell campus armed to the teeth with rifles shock a public concerned with violence on our campuses. And I am convinced that at least some of our expression of opposition to the war in Viet Nam results from the fact that mothers and parents now can see the horrors of killing and maiming in the field in a far-off war which they find difficult to understand or identify with.

Further, we must recognize that today's youngsters are vitally concerned with the world around them and its massive problems, the vast inequalities of black and white, the inconsistency of poverty and starvation in the midst of unheard of affluence and ease of living, the problems of our urban ghettos and the cities, even the failure of our universities to assume an effective working membership in contemporary society, and particularly the spectacle of an unpopular far-off war from which we do not seem able to extricate ourselves, although I now have great hope that we are at last on our way to accomplishing this. This youth is concerned because it is his world and he wants to have a voice in determining its shape and content. He knows that the determination of these problems and their outcome vitally affects his life and he wants a part of the action. This is the world he is going to have to live in, and he knows that there is more to education than can be found in books and in the classroom. He wants to be given responsibility, and he insists on his right to express his viewpoint whether or not his elders agree with him.

And I see no objection to this. I do not expect the bright, concerned student of today to agree in all respects with me. But just as I am willing to listen to him, I think I have the right to ask him to consider what I have to say even though it might disagree with his concepts. I am willing to allow him to take part in those matters which will affect his life, but I must also insist that he act responsibly, reasonably, and in accordance with the fundamental rules of law which guarantee his right to be heard as well as mine. If he is going to be given responsibility in the making of decisions, then he must realize that he too must be accountable for the outcome of those decisions. He cannot claim the rights to freedom of expression, the right to dissent and to disagree, and at the same time deny me those same rights. If he objects to me acting in *loco parentis* toward him, then he cannot tell me that those words mean only "crazy like a parent".

He wants to talk to me about the generation gap, and I tell him there is no such gap except as he may create it by insistence that there is no other answer to his problems than his own solution. When I refused to accede to some request my children made to me when they were little, which I felt to

be unwise, they always said, "But Dad, you don't understand!" And my answer was, "You really don't mean that I don't understand. You're simply saying, 'I don't agree'. Believe me, I do understand, and that's why I don't agree."

There really is not a vast generation gap between parents and the youth of today. We have taught them in the home those ideals and concepts common to us in our Judeo-Christian heritage: concern for others, for the downtrodden, the unfortunate, and the disadvantaged. When they act to rectify the inequities and injustices they find too prevalent in the world today, we should applaud them. We ask only that they express themselves within the framework of our democratic processes, to recognize that there are constitutional and legal processes available to right wrongs and to cure injustices. They cannot be allowed to take the law into their own hands, substituting their own consciences and personal concepts of what is right for the established procedures which alone protect both them and us. There is no place in our democratic society for the criminal, even the intellectual law violator who insists that he is acting from some higher law of personal conscience. We believe in the right, and are committed to the protection of all peaceful non-obstructive forms of protest. But protest that deprives others of the opportunity to speak or be heard, or that requires physical take-over of buildings to disrupt the educational process, or the eviction of administrators, the burning or confiscation of files and other property, is incompatible with the democratic process all of us depend upon for protection. It is also inconsistent with the nature and high purposes of an educational institution. The distinction is the difference between dissent and uncompromising resistance.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how unfair and dangerous it is to condemn the liberal student movement as a whole because of the violence and criminality of the few. Unlike the vast majority of the concerned liberal students, the militant has no interest in discussion or compromise. He really is an ideological criminal, breaking the laws we live by in favor of his concept of what he calls a higher law. He feels that his destructive action will force the establishment to listen and will somehow bring about a better world. He really has two targets: the establishment and the uncommitted onlookers who make up the vast majority of the students. And herein lies his power and the great danger which requires the most careful and delicate handling. He hopes to trigger a physical confrontation that will draw sympathy to his side by those who have no identity with his aims. In most cases of campus violence, to grant his initial demands does not bring peace. He simply escalates them beyond in order to make a political, as opposed to an academic, point. He hopes to draw bystanders into the melee, cause them to become physically injured or shaken up and so forced to take sides against the establishment which now has harmed them. This is exactly what happened recently on the Berkeley campus. Governor Reagan, in opposition to students' take-over of People's Park, saw fit to line the campus with helmeted, armed police standing with fixed bayonets while helicopters crisscrossed the campus spreading tear gas indiscriminately, a tactic heretofore by Americans reserved for the Viet Cong. As a result, thousands of students, up to that time completely unsympathetic with the student extremists, went to join them in People's Park for the first time as an expression of their disgust and resistance to this form of counter-violence.

We must separate the violent extremists from those who intelligently and lawfully express their dissent. We cannot meet arrogance, hatred, and violence with like emotions, or we drive to the militant those stu-

dents of good will and reasonableness who make up the majority. Those who urge revolution and sanction violence remain a minority, but they become influential beyond their numbers on the campus if we do not recognize that they are a special breed to be handled and treated not in a vacuum but with a view to the entire university community and its responses.

More and more young Americans refuse to accept any disparity between American ideals and American realities. I say there is something great about a generation that questions a doubtful war, questions racial injustice, questions poverty amid plenty, and is concerned with the vast social and economic problems convulsing our society. Let's keep that generation on our side by bridging any generation gap, by keeping open the lines of communication between them and us, by dealing swiftly and harshly with those who flaunt the rule of law to effect their purposes, but always recognizing that these youngsters have something to say, that they are not all irresponsible, and that they are not altogether wrong when they tell us that they don't like everything about the world we have created for them and they want to have a part in changing that world for the better. And above all, we must avoid suppressing the symptom of their complaints without administering to the disease.

The university may well be destroyed by the onslaught from both sides of opposing factions, on the one hand by those flaunting legal procedures and constitutional guarantees of everyone except themselves, and from the other side, by the wave of backlash to these illegal acts by those who may be willing to burn down the barn to rid themselves of a few rats. If it is, it will be destroyed, as John Gardner in a commencement address at Cornell so well expressed it, by the "savage crossfire between uncritical lovers and unloving critics. On the one side those who loved their institutions tended to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from life-giving criticism. On the other side, there arose a breed of critics without love, skilled in demolition but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish. Between the two the institutions perished."

But the university as the home of reason, persuasion, and free discussion in the search for truth wherever that search may lead us, will not perish. It will be preserved from the onslaught of both those who would destroy it from within, and those who in their attempts to meet the challenge inside the university would tear down and weaken its mission and purpose from without. Both of these assaults on our free institutions are equally dangerous. In our desire to cope with one, we must be careful never to fall prey to the other.

EVOLUTION OF A VIABLE AMERICAN POLICY FOR EUROPE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, our preoccupation with the problems of Southeast Asia since the early part of this decade has worked to the detriment of the evolution of a viable American policy for Europe. Once we are able to turn our attention back to this vital part of the world, we must deal with allies of long standing which now will forcefully demand the same equality in their relationships with us that we insisted governed our alliances with smaller Asian states. The difficult issues of the European and American roles in NATO must be met head on with the realization that European nations have matured and gained a new economic and

political self-confidence which militates against the traditional dominant position of the United States economically and militarily.

As difficult as we find it to understand these subtle changes in relationships between nations, David Calleo, a noted American scholar of Europe, has brilliantly examined the ramifications for our European policy of a change in American mood in reaction to our involvement in Vietnam. Vietnam will undoubtedly affect Europe and Mr. Calleo's article, published in the Times of London for July 29, 1969, frankly discusses the possibilities of a changed role for both the United States and Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHANGING U.S. MOOD COULD FORCE DEFENSE REVIEW

(By David Calleo, of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research)

European audiences these days are frequently warned of the dangers of reviving American isolationism. The term "isolationism" is misleading. Many supposed advocates are familiar names in Europe—like Fulbright, Mansfield, Galbraith or Kennedy—and are not easily classified as prewar American provincials. In a sense, neo-isolationism in the Government, universities and general population reflects not revulsion against foreigners, but an American revulsion against the United States.

It is not isolationism that is reviving in the United States, but humanism. Prodded by the prolonged agony of Vietnam, many Americans now perceive grotesque distortions in their Government's values. The United States, they believe, is sacrificing the quality of its national life to the demands of a military empire.

For those disposed to worry, it is not difficult to see ample evidence of America's militarization. The American regular armed forces, at 3,500,000, are larger than either Russia's or China's. In 1968, nearly 9 per cent of men of military age (between 18 and 45) in the United States were engaged full time by the military in contrast to 7 per cent in Russia and roughly 4 per cent in Britain and Germany.¹

About 1,200,000 civilians in the Defense Department, several thousands in the diplomatic and intelligence bureaucracies, the scientists and professors on Government contracts, and much of industry's best managerial and technological talent have been drawn to the service of United States power. Increasingly, it seems, American elites are bemused by the stoic satisfactions of "world responsibility" and the Nietzschean thrills of "crisis management".

All this is rather expensive. The American military budget is nearly \$80,000m.—more than half again that of the Soviet Union by conservative estimate. Indeed, a Defence Department estimate in 1968 reckoned that, for \$50,000m. each year, the United States could "buy" the entire military establishment of the Warsaw Pact, pay the men at American scales, and build their equipment in American factories.²

Given their country's domestic turmoil, it is not surprising that many Americans suspect an imbalance in the Government's priorities.

¹ 6. Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 1968-1969*.

² 5. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Systems Analysis) *Evaluation of Nato and Pact Conventional Forces in Central Europe*, October 22, 1968.

PRIORITIES CALL

These sentiments have clearly begun to affect the Congress. Last month, at the conclusion of a congressional conference on the military budget and national priorities, nine Senators and 35 Congressmen issued a sweeping statement attacking the military budget and demanding a drastic change in national priorities:

Since the end of the Second World War, we have spent more than one trillion dollars, or two-thirds of the total expenditures of our Federal Government, on armaments and armed forces. Today, 80 per cent of our federal expenditures go for defense and defense related costs—an amount greater than all federal, state and local outlays for social security, health, education, housing and agriculture.³

Moreover, the momentum of military spending is such, the report notes, that existing programmes will by 1973 or 1974 absorb any savings from ending the war in Vietnam. And anti-ballistic missiles (ABMs) could carry the military budget well beyond its present total. Therefore, the Congressmen conclude, nothing less than a radical re-evaluation of the defence budget can restore a sane balance to national priorities.

If opposition to military spending becomes widespread, as it may, what are the likely long-range consequences?

Tighter discipline over procurement and a general military reorganization might save considerable sums. But any serious reduction in the United States defence establishment may, in fact, be possible only if there is a corresponding cut-back in the military and diplomatic commitments which justify that establishment. Here, presumably, is the bridge between humanism and isolationism.

It is a bridge many people may not cross. Many oppose the war in Vietnam, for example, without dropping that view of America's world role which presumably justifies it. Others would have the United States withdraw from Asia, but are eager to support the American military hegemony institutionalized in Nato.

There is, nevertheless, a certain logic at work which may reach even to Nato. Indeed, Europe might seem an excellent place to begin seriously reducing America's excessive overseas involvements. The American public was talked into the present external commitments not to build a series of client regimes, but to buy time for others to regain their prewar strength or to build new nations. This strategy, if it is ever to be made to work, should logically start in western Europe.

COST PROBLEM

Once they think about it, Congressmen may find it increasingly hard to believe that countries with the populations, industrial resources and military experience of Britain, France and Germany could not organize some reasonably effective military coalition to counter-balance the Russians. Nothing would prevent the United States from attaching some troops to these arrangements. But 25 years after the Second World War, and 20 years after the founding of Nato, why should an American general continue to command Europe's armies, and why should the United States continue to take the principal role in running Europe's defence?

The argument that Europeans would prefer to be dominated by Russia rather than come to terms with each other is not likely to evoke much sympathy. It will be difficult to explain to a war-weary public why young Americans should be drafted for the defense of Europe, but not young Europeans. Moreover, Nato's net cost in foreign exchange—estimated in January, 1968, at \$1,500m. an-

³ Report of the Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities, June 1, 1969. To be published by Viking Press.

nually—is one of the principal causes of America's recurring balance of payments difficulties.⁴ In the long run, it may prove easier to cut back Nato than to sustain the present controls on foreign capital investment.

Anyone interested in abdicating America's pre-eminent role in European defence will have little difficulty finding convenient military doctrines. The increasing capability for a rapid large-scale movement of troops has already inspired the Mansfield resolution advocating a substantial American troop reduction. It might also be noted that the majority of Warsaw Pact forces in central Europe consist of Czech, east German and Polish forces.

To some observers, counting these eastern forces as equivalent to their western counterparts seems disingenuous. There is also the widespread practice of comparing numbers of divisions without noting that the average Nato division in central Europe has nearly twice as many men as the pact division there. Indeed, American divisions are three times larger.

For several years, officials in the United States Defense Department have been arguing that an effective conventional defence of Western Europe is within Nato's grasp, and without any dramatic increase in European manpower or expense. An authoritative memorandum, released last October and widely circulated in Congress, while opposing American troop reductions, also concluded that when "real factors . . . rather than nominal formations" are counted, and when men and equipment, especially in air forces, are compared qualitatively, "we find a rough equality of numbers in central Europe and in the alliance as a whole". Any relative inadequacies spring from "readiness deficiencies that Nato has not thought worth fixing".

The main trouble with Nato, many agree, is the unwillingness of its principal European members to take its conventional defence seriously. Yet Britain, France and Germany alone have nearly 1,400,000 men under arms, alongside which the American European contingent of about 250,000 is relatively marginal. Perhaps placing the vastly greater European forces under an American commander has not been the best way to encourage Europeans to take the primary initiative in organizing their own defence.

There would probably be little question about an American devolution if conventional forces were the only consideration. But an essentially European defence of Europe would tend to suggest a serious nuclear deterrent for Europe—a force or forces which, however much coordinated with the American, would nevertheless be independent.

Americans, however, have always resisted this logic. Our formula has been "burden-sharing", which would leave nuclear deterrence exclusively to the United States—a formula which almost demands widespread American military presence abroad. Not only does credibility suggest stationing substantial American forces on the guaranteed territory, but it seems intolerable not to control the area's local military situation when America's own cities are, in effect, hostages for its defence.

The official conclusion is, therefore, not to reduce American forces abroad. But if strong pressure for troop reduction continues, another conclusion may be to abandon the concept of a single non-communist deterrent—at least in the Atlantic world.

The concept is anyways being undermined by another set of arguments arising in the ABM debate. If, in fact, Europeans will not organize a conventional deterrent against Russia, and have no credible nuclear forces of their own, then America's European commitment logically demands a first-strike capability against the Soviet Union. The im-

plications for the arms race are not pleasing. Hence, it would not be surprising if there were a renewed interest in indigenous regional nuclear deterrents, especially where national nuclear forces already exist. Those who argue that such deterrents are redundant do, I believe, miss the main point.

COMMON INTEREST

It is not difficult to imagine ways to organize a European military coalition, coordinating conventional and nuclear forces. Such a coalition would doubtless only be "confederal" in form. Those powers with the principal resources would naturally have the principal say, even if the strong wishes of the others could not be ignored. But the common interest in military defence is relatively clear. Coalitions have functioned reasonably effectively before without requiring an artificial supergovernment.

All these schemes have been much discussed, but never taken seriously by governments. The status quo has been safe and comfortable and avoided the irksome tasks of coming to terms with ancient neighbours. But plans for the future of Europe which assume an indefinite continuation of America's pre-eminent military role may prove unrealistic.

Perhaps such developments can be described as an unfortunate resurgence of American isolationism. Perhaps they can also be seen as the gradual restoration of balance between Europe and America—to the profit of sanity in the latter and self-respect in the former.

DISAPPROVAL OF VIETNAM MORATORIUM

MR. BENNETT. Mr. President, a movement such as the October 15 moratorium has a way of distorting actual public opinion. When the press and TV coverage was completed, one would think that all America stood with those people who intentionally or unintentionally are undermining the President of the United States in his quest for peace.

I still feel that the movement represents a small minority faction and that the publicity given to them far exceeded their strength.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to me by a student editor in Utah, Norman Robinson, be printed in the RECORD. It reflects, I think, the view that on campuses and in cities throughout America a vast majority of our people ignored the moratorium movement and went about their activities in a normal way.

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

OCTOBER 12, 1969.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senator from Utah,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On Wednesday, October 15, many of my fellow students on this campus and many others throughout the Nation will demonstrate their disapproval of the present situation in South East Asia by not attending classes.

I for one will be in class that day.

My belief in the United States of America is great and my faith in Her leaders is great. While I do not applaud or enjoy the situation which exists, I don't feel that my absence from classes will bring an end to the conflict, but rather hinder efforts for peace.

Because of my beliefs, I would like you and your associates to know that as a citizen of this beautiful and great land, I have desires for Peace and express my faith that

you and other of this Nation's leaders will act wisely and with integrity in seeking peace.

Thank you.

NORMAN ROBINSON,
Editor, Student Newspaper, Southern
Utah State College, Cedar City, Utah.

TAX REFORM NO. 4: DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP TAX REFORM BOOK

MR. METCALF. Mr. President, today I shall place in the RECORD another section of the tax reform book prepared by the Democratic Study Group in the House of Representatives. Today's section discusses many areas of interest including the repeal of the 7-percent investment credit, the tax treatment of cooperatives, the foreign tax credit, depreciation allowed regulated utilities, and the tax treatment of corporations.

The Committee on Finance has already announced decisions that it has reached in many of these areas. One important subject that should also be included in this area of discussion is the tax treatment of financial institutions.

The House bill took an important step forward by cutting back on the tax preferences presently afforded financial institutions. However, the Committee on Finance has already watered down the House provisions by accepting a proposal urged upon it by the American Bankers Association. The Wall Street Journal of October 17 contains a detailed and informative analysis of what the committee has agreed to do in this particular area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Fred L. Zimmerman, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE UNIT REJECTS HOUSE PLAN TO BOOST BANK TAXES—MILDER ABA PROPOSAL VOTED
(By Fred L. Zimmerman)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Finance Committee, continuing to water down the tax-reform bill, rejected a House plan for sharply increasing the taxes of commercial banks and substituted much milder proposal from the American Bankers Association.

Committee Chairman Long (D., La.), announcing the decision, said nothing about the ABA, but explained that the committee had decided the bank-tax provision in the House bill was too "complicated."

Other sources said, however, that the committee's decision matched precisely the position the ABA had urged on committee members in private letters distributed to them the day before the vote. This was confirmed by John Holdton, an ABA lobbyist, who waited outside the room as the committee considered bank taxes.

The administrative assistant to one committee member said he had been given a three-paragraph letter from an ABA executive and told, "make sure your boss has this in his hand when the committee starts talking about bank taxes."

NAMES WEREN'T RECORDED

The names of members voting for and against the ABA proposal weren't recorded, but committee sources state that in recent closed drafting sessions the only members who seemed consistently to be pushing for major tax-reform legislation were Sen. John Williams (R., Del.) and Sen. Gore (D., Tenn.)

Several liberal Democrats on the committee are frequently absent from drafting sessions.

* Press conference of Under-Secretary of State Katzenbach, January 7, 1968.

Republican members, who have a good attendance record, are said to be heavily opposed to most reform provisions of the House bill.

The decision on tax treatment of commercial banks was the major part of the committee's work in adopting a section of the bill regarding taxation of financial institutions.

The committee also lightened, but to a lesser degree, the House bill's provisions tightening the tax treatment of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

This section on financial institutions is one of the biggest revenue-raising features of the House reform bill. The House version would increase Federal revenue by about \$460 million annually, when fully effective. A staff official said yesterday's committee action probably reduced that projected revenue gain to about \$150 million.

Because of this and earlier committee actions, the Treasury's expected revenue pickup from tax-reform legislation is dwindling considerably. The House measure eventually would raise nearly \$6.9 billion a year through higher taxes on corporations and wealthy individuals. But this would be more than offset by sizable rate cuts and other tax breaks for low and middle-income persons.

REVENUE IMPACT UNKNOWN

The revenue impact of the Finance Committee's decisions so far isn't known. House sources are beginning to wonder if the committee will be able to vote much of a tax cut for individuals after it finishes diluting the House bill's reform provisions. Sen. Long, however, has suggested that the Finance Committee might vote for substantial tax cuts even if they would result in a big revenue shortfall. "After all," he remarked last week, "we're entitled to have some fun, too."

Next week the Finance Committee is due to vote on several other big revenue-raising items in the House bill, including elimination of the alternative capital-gains tax rate (annual revenue gain, \$360 million) and reduction of mineral-depletion allowances (annual revenue gain, \$400 million).

Based on earlier actions, it seems unlikely the committee will sustain the House decisions in those areas.

The committee's decision on commercial bank taxation centers on a feature of current law that allows commercial banks to maintain, for tax-deduction purposes, a bad-debt reserve of 2.4% of outstanding uninsured loans. If banks were treated as other taxpayers, they would be allowed a reserve totaling less than 0.2% of these loans.

HOUSE VOTED LOWERING RESERVE

The House voted to lower this reserve gradually to a level generally equaling the actual bad-debt experience of commercial banks, which is thought to be about 0.2%.

But the Finance Committee, as requested by the ABA, rejected the House plan and voted instead to trim the banks' bad-debt reserve to 1.8% from the current 2.4%.

Committee staff officials provided the following tentative assessment of the effect of the decisions on taxation of financial institutions:

According to staff estimates, commercial banks now are taxed at an effective rate of 23%. This would rise to 30% under the House bill, but only to about 25% under the Finance Committee version.

Mutual savings banks are taxed at an effective rate of 4% currently. The House bill would raise this to about 19%; the Finance Committee would raise it to about 13% or 14%.

Savings and loan associations currently are taxed at a rate of about 15%. The House bill would raise that to 29%, but the Finance Committee would raise it only to about 19%.

The committee adopted a House provision requiring financial institutions to treat gains from transactions in certain bonds as ordinary income rather than capital gains.

But the committee specified that through 1974 any gains on sales of bonds held currently will be treated as capital gains.

SAVINGS BANKS

The committee generally accepted the House provisions regarding mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations, but made two principal changes. Current law allows these institutions to compute bad-debt reserves by deducting 60% of taxable income. The House bill would reduce that figure to 30% over 10 years, but the Committee voted to reduce it only to 50% over four years.

The committee added a new provision that would require these institutions to allocate evenly their 85% credit for corporate dividends received between income subject to tax and income that is untaxed because of bad-debt reserves.

A proposal, not contained in the House bill, to require the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest at their source was overwhelmingly defeated.

MR. METCALF. Mr. President, I should also point out that on October 15 the Committee on Finance agreed to delete those provisions of the House bill, sections 431 and 432, which would have reduced the foreign tax credits available to taxpayers with income from foreign sources. According to published accounts the deleted sections would have gained about \$65 million of annual revenue for the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the section of the "DSG Fact Book on Tax Reform" which discusses in detail many important areas of consideration contained in the House-passed bill. Tomorrow I shall place in the RECORD still another section of the book.

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

DSG TAX REFORM FACT BOOK: SECTION THREE—CORPORATION TAXES

DISCONTINUE TAX-FREE EXCHANGES ON CORPORATE STOCK TRANSFERS FOR MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS

The problem

The Federal Trade Commission estimates 90% of the 352 largest corporate acquisitions in 1967 and 1968 were tax-free transactions. Presumably most of them involved exchanges of common stock. Hence, under present law, the sale of one corporation to another involves widespread avoidance, or at least deferral, of capital gains.

Present law

Tax-free mergers under this provision include: (1) "statutory mergers" defined by the relevant state law; (2) exchanges of voting stock where the acquiring corporation has at least 80% of the acquired corporation after the transaction, and (3) exchanges of voting stock in the acquiring corporation for "substantially all of the properties" of the acquired corporation.

Pending proposals

H.R. 7489 (Mills) would change the law to deal with certain aspects of tax-free and tax-deferred mergers. H.R. 10180 also proposes changes designed to deal with the merger problem.

Revenue impact

Treasury has not provided estimates of savings that would result from provisions to end tax-free exchanges.

Proponents and opponents

Assistant Attorney General McLaren, head of the anti-trust division, was one of several government witnesses urging the Committee to work out remedial legislation. The AFL-

CIO supports changes that would end tax-free transactions involved in the wave of mergers and acquisitions.

Administration action

Ways and Means was told that Treasury is undertaking a basic study of the general treatment of tax-free corporate reorganizations. This apparently is as far as the Nixon Administration is prepared to go now on the tax-free exchange problem. The Committee did not attempt to write legislation to deal with this problem.

House action

The House did not deal with the tax-free exchange problem in the tax reform bill.

Resource references

Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 7. DISALLOW CORPORATION DEDUCTION OF INTEREST ON MONEY BORROWED TO FINANCE MERGERS

The problem

A recent study disclosed that one of every six companies that made *Fortune*'s 1962 top-500 list has completely disappeared in the industrial warfare that has marked the greatest merger wave in history. Another study shows the value of firms taken over since 1967 totals \$11.4 billion. The disturbing thing is that this corporate piracy is fueled by tax provisions that allow corporations to deduct interest payments on money borrowed to finance takeovers.

Present law

The law permits an acquiring company in a merger situation to trade bonds for stock in the target company. The surviving merged firm, as a result, pays tax-deductible bond interest rather than taxable stock dividends and gains a substantial tax advantage.

Pending proposals

The main anti-merger proposal is H.R. 7489 (Mills), which would limit deductions of interest on bonds and debentures used in mergers and acquisitions. H.R. 10180 is a similar bill.

Revenue impact

An FTC spokesman testifying at Committee hearings said the tax loss resulting from transactions involved in corporate mergers could total "hundreds of millions of dollars."

Proponents and opponents

Hamer Budge, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, was one of several regulatory agency spokesmen who testified on the corporate merger problem. All urged the Committee to try to work out ways to curb the rash of takeovers.

Administration action

The Nixon Administration advised the Committee that Treasury is seeking to develop a regulation to distinguish debt from equity for purposes of determining whether an interest deduction will be allowed.

House action

The House bill provides that a corporation can not deduct more than \$5 million in interest on certain types of indebtedness (bond, debenture, note or certificate) issued as consideration for acquisition of stock in another corporation, or acquisition of assets of another corporation if at least two-thirds of the total value of all the assets of that corporation are acquired pursuant to a plan of acquisition.

Resource references

Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 7. ESTABLISH EMERGENCY TAX ON EXCESS WAR PROFITS

The problem

Production of weapons and other war-related items is concentrated in aircraft and electronics firms and other segments of the so-called defense industry. These companies are in a position to make substantial profits over a sustained period at little risk, yet pay taxes at the same rates as other industries

that do not engage in high-profit defense work.

An emergency tax on excess profits was imposed on corporations during both world wars and again during the Korean War. The most recent version gave corporations two options: (1) pay a tax on profits in excess of those in a previous peacetime base period, or (2) pay tax on profits in excess of certain return on capitalized value.

Present law

There is no present law. The excess profits tax was repealed shortly after the Korean War ended.

Pending proposals

Several bills calling for re-enactment of such a tax were introduced in the House this session. H.R. 11907 (Farbstein) would impose a new tax on corporations equal to 37% of excess profit taxable income. Similar or identical bills are H.R. 11754, 11974, 11991, and 12256.

Revenue impact

It is estimated that taxing excess profits along the lines proposed in the House bills would raise around \$10 billion a year.

Proponents and opponents

The excess profits tax approach would draw vigorous opposition from such business-oriented organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Administration action

The Administration has neither commented on nor taken a position on these proposals.

House action

The House took no action on these bills.

Resource reference

Congressional Record, June 30, 1969, pp. 17842-17852.

REPEAL 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The problem

The 7% investment tax credit was enacted in 1962 to stimulate business investment in new machinery and equipment. It was liberalized somewhat in a 1964 rule change and suspended for a five-month period late in 1968.

Present law

Present law allows businesses to deduct 7% of the cost of new machinery and equipment from their federal income taxes (not taxable income). The first \$25,000 is fully deductible. If more than \$25,000 is claimed, however, the deduction may not exceed one-fourth of the taxes due after the initial \$25,000 is deducted. Unused credit is carried both forward and backward.

Pending proposals

Pressure for repeal began early this year as a large number of bills were introduced. The Joint Economic Committee, in its April 1 report, said the first priority in tax reform should be repeal of the investment tax credit. Following discussion in the Democratic Study Group, the issue was taken to the Democratic Caucus and repeal was endorsed as a party objective.

Other proposals calling for repeal (some with exceptions) are H.R. 5250, 6233, 6770, 6791, 7040, 7045, 7746, 7585, 8144, 9195, 9762, 9852, 9893, 10253, 10339, 11545, 11017, 10669, and 11174.

Revenue impact

The Treasury has estimated that repeal of this tax forgiveness law would boost revenue \$2.5 BILLION in 1970 and \$3 BILLION in 1971.

Proponents and opponents

Main opponents to repeal during House consideration were the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Administration action

The Administration backs repeal.

House action

Repeal was a major provision of H.R. 12290, the bill to extend the surtax that passed the House, 210-205, on June 30, 1969.

The House included the same general proposal in H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill. It included these special exceptions: (1) unorderd and unbuilt barges built for use on ocean-going vessels, pipeline for use on projects pending with the Federal Power Commission and machinery and equipment needed to complete the C5A program. The House bill also would provide a rapid tax writeoff provision to enable industry to amortize the cost of air and water pollution equipment over a 5-year period instead of the normal 20 years.

Resource references

See Ways and Means Report (H. Rept. 91-321).

ELIMINATE OPTION OF ORGANIZING MULTIPLE CORPORATION TO GAIN SURTAX EXEMPTIONS

The problem

The multiple corporation loophole stems from a provision included in the Revenue Act of 1950 as a break for small business. It provided a two-rate structure for corporate income taxes with the lower rate, called the surtax exemption, applying to the first \$25,000 of corporate income.

Many large corporate organizations now carry on business with a series of separate corporate entities, dividing the total income of what is in reality one large enterprise among numerous entities, each claiming a surtax exemption. In many cases, the corporate entities are arranged so most have less than \$25,000 of income. As a result of this substantial and unintended tax break, almost all the organization's income is claimed to be taxable at the lower rate.

The 1964 Revenue Act attempted to narrow this loophole by adding a 6% penalty tax on the first \$25,000 of income of each corporate unit actually controlled by a larger corporate complex. This merely reduced the value of each surtax exemption from \$6,500 (48% less 22% times \$25,000) to \$5,000 (48% less 28% times \$25,000).

Present law

The first \$25,000 of a corporate unit's income is taxed at a 28% rate rather than the regular 48% corporate rate. There is no limit to the number of separate corporate entities within a large corporate organization that can qualify.

Pending proposals

A number of proposals have been made to repeal the multiple exemption option. H.R. 5250 (Reuss and others) would repeal the option provision and limit companies to a single \$25,000 surtax exemption. Identical or similar proposals are H.R. 229, 1039, 1119, 1379, 2142, 3655, 5196, 6206, 6233, 6721, 6769, 6770, 6791, 7040, 7045, 7346, 7585, 7980, 8144, 9195, 9691, 9759, 9762, 9852, 10044, 10237, 10253, and 11353.

Revenue impact

Treasury estimates eliminating the option, when fully effective, would increase revenue \$235 million a year.

Proponents and opponents

Testimony against the proposal was presented on behalf of Retail Jewelers of America, Inc.; Genesco, Inc.; Diana Stores, Inc.; Rockauer Bros., Inc.; National Consumer Finance Council, and Volume Footwear Retailers Association. Supporters include the AFL-CIO and UAW.

Administration action

The Administration has proposed phasing out the option over five years. It would do this by allowing a corporate organization to

claim no more than 100 surtax exemptions the first year, 50 the second, 25 the third, 10 the fourth, five the fifth, and one in the sixth and subsequent years.

House action

The House bill would eliminate multiple surtax exemptions by controlled groups or corporations over an 8-year period. During this time the amount of each additional surtax exemption would be reduced by about \$3,000 a year.

Resource references

See Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 10; Treasury Studies, Part 2.

REQUIRE COOPERATIVES TO PAY AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF PATRONAGE DIVIDENDS IN CASH

The problem

Present tax treatment of cooperatives was set by Congress in the 1962 Revenue Act. It provides single tax treatment when certain patronage dividend provisions are met. Congress rejected the two-tier tax system, which would have imposed a corporation tax on cooperatives and made patronage dividends distributed to patrons taxable on the same basis as corporation dividends.

Present law

Under present law a cooperative (whether tax exempt or not) is allowed to deduct, in computing its taxable income, the qualified patronage dividends allocated to its patrons. This deduction is allowed, however, only if at least 20% of the patronage dividend is paid to the patron in cash. Up to 80% of the remainder can be retained by the cooperative for expansion and other business purposes. Normally a certificate bearing a cash redemption date and covering the non-cash portion is provided to the patron. The patron, however, is taxed as if he received the entire patronage dividend in cash.

Pending proposals

H.R. 7318 (Gilbert), the only bill introduced to deal specifically with this issue, would tighten laws regarding tax exemptions for cooperatives.

Revenue impact

Revenue estimates are unavailable and the effect is considered negligible.

Proponents and opponents

Few witnesses touched on cooperative taxation during the hearings and the testimony received little notice. The National Tax Equality Association urged the Committee to recommend tighter restrictions on taxation of cooperatives. Former Rep. Joseph Resnick suggested a 5-year limitation on redemption of certificates (there is no limit now) and a cash payout requirement for patronage dividends of up to 80%.

Opponents of any revisions in cooperative tax law were not aware until the markup phase that Ways and Means was giving serious consideration to restrictive changes. However the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and other spokesmen for cooperatives mounted a strong campaign against possible changes when it became clear they would be part of the House tax reform bill.

Administration action

No recommendations dealing with taxation of cooperatives were submitted by the Administration.

House action

The House bill provides that the patronage dividend deduction allowed cooperatives would be continued only if at least 50% of the dividend allocated is distributed in cash. The proposal includes a 10-year buildup to the 50% minimum mandatory requirement from the present 20%. It also would require cooperatives to redeem all retention certificates for cash within 15 years.

Resource references

Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 3.

ELIMINATE SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR STOCK OPTIONS*The problem*

Stock options have had special tax treatment for many years. Any gain in value of stock issued to top executives and certain other employees now is taxed as capital gain rather than ordinary income when certain conditions are met. Further, when the option is a statutory stock option, special rules generally postpone the tax until the employee retires or the shares of stock are sold or exchanged. The stock option loophole was narrowed substantially, but not closed, in the 1964 Revenue Act.

Present law

Three types of stock options qualify for special tax treatment—qualified stock options, employee stock purchase plan options, and restricted stock options. In all three instances gain realized from sale or exchange qualifies for the lower capital gain treatment when the holding period and other requirements are met.

Pending proposals

Several stock option bills are before Ways and Means. H.R. 5250 (Reuss and others) would disallow capital gains treatment on the difference between the option price and the market value of the stock when the option is exercised. This gain would be taxed as ordinary income at the time the option is exercised. Identical or similar bills are H.R. 229, 1379, 2142, 3655, 5196, 6206, 6207, 6721, 6233, 7744, 6769, 7980, 6770, 10327, 7040, 7045, 7346, 7585, 8144, 9195, 9852, 10040, 10253, and 11174.

Revenue impact

It is estimated special provisions for tax treatment of stock options cost the Treasury about \$150 million a year.

Proponents and opponents

Several witnesses, including a representative of the Association for Advanced Life Underwriting, testified against changes in taxation of stock options. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce also opposed all stock option changes in its general testimony. Most of the comments on this subject dealt with restricted stock option plans.

Administrative action

The Administration, noting that there has been rapid growth in restricted stock option plans, has asked that tax laws applying to these transactions be tightened. It would do this by providing that (1) where an employee receives stock or other property as compensation, he should be subject to tax when his rights in the property become nonforfeitable, and (2) the amount subject to tax at that time should be the full current market value.

House action

The House bill generally adopts the Administration plan for tightening laws governing taxation of restricted stock plans.

Resource references

See Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 7.

ELIMINATE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT*The problem*

The law since 1918 has permitted a tax credit (a credit is a direct writeoff of taxes rather than taxable income) for foreign income taxes paid by U.S. companies. It was designed to avoid double taxation of profits of U.S. businesses operating abroad.

The tax credit has been criticized a good deal in recent years, partly because of steady expansion of U.S. business activity abroad and partly because many feel foreign governments keep raising taxes on these companies at least as high as the level required to use up all the credit. The Treasury, as a

result, gets little revenue from U.S. business activity abroad.

Present law

Under present law, the foreign tax credit can be taken (1) with respect to a first-tier foreign corporation only if at least 10% of the stock is owned by the domestic taxpayer, and (2) with respect to a subsidiary of such first-tier corporation only if at least 50% of its stock is owned by the first-tier corporation.

Pending proposals

None of the tax reform bills introduced in the House this session called for elimination of the foreign tax credit.

Revenue impact

Treasury reports that in 1966, the latest year for which tax return information is available for corporate firms, the foreign tax credit for all U.S. taxpayers totalled \$2.9 billion. Firms classified as mineral and petroleum industries accounted for \$1.3 billion of the total.

Proponents and opponents

Much of the criticism of the foreign tax credit has come from organizations that oppose preferential tax treatment of the petroleum industry. Changes to liberalize the credit were recommended to the committee by a long list of groups that included the U.S. Council of International Chambers of Commerce, Institute on U.S. Taxation of Foreign Income, and Manufacturing Chemists Association.

Administration action

Neither the Treasury nor the Nixon Administration recommended any changes in the foreign tax credit.

House action

The House bill provides that tax benefits claimed due to a loss in a foreign country could be recaptured to the extent of profits realized in subsequent years in that same country. Also, where the overall limitation is used, excess credit generated from foreign mineral income would not, under certain conditions, be used to reduce U.S. taxes on other foreign income.

Resource references

Ways and Means Hearings, Volume 7.

REQUIRE REGULATED UTILITIES TO DEPRECIATE WITH STRAIGHT LINE FORMULA ONLY*The problem*

Many regulated utilities, especially the larger ones, gain a tax advantage from the option allowed for computing depreciation. They can use straight line, which results in higher taxes, and get higher rates. Or they can use accelerated depreciation, which results in lower taxes and accumulates larger reserves, and pay out so-called tax-free "dividends" to stockholders. It is estimated that in 1968 private power companies alone made tax-free dividend payments totaling \$260 million.

Present law

Under existing law many of the regulated utilities are able to make tax-free distributions primarily as a result of the use of accelerated depreciation.

Pending proposals

H.R. 6659 (Fulton) deals with authority of a regulator agency to require the flow-through of accelerated depreciation reserves to consumers.

Revenue impact

Treasury estimates federal revenue will be reduced as much as \$1.7 billion a year eventually if state regulatory agencies continue to allow utilities to adopt accelerated depreciation.

Proponents and opponents

Chairman Lee White of the Federal Power Commission was a leading proponent of a straight-line depreciation requirement.

Administration action

The Nixon Administration recommended that tax-free dividends, currently paid out of accelerated depreciation reserves, be made taxable after a three-year phase-in period.

House action

The House bill would "freeze" the current situation regarding methods of depreciation for most utility companies. It would require gas and oil pipeline, telephone, gas and electric utility, water and sewage disposal companies to depreciate most new properties by the straight line method. And it would end tax-free distribution to utility stockholders resulting from accelerated depreciation deductions.

Resource references

Ways and Means Hearings, Volumes 10, 11.

EMPLOYMENT OF DISADVANTAGED MEN AND WOMEN IN CHICAGO

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, I invite attention to an article on the JOBS program, published in a recent issue of Chicago Today. I feel that this piece does a fine job of describing their activities, and I consider it appropriate to be placed in the RECORD.

The Chicago Alliance of Businessmen has 610 member companies—200 more than in 1968. These companies have pledged nearly 33,000 jobs to be filled by hard-core unemployed by June 30, 1970. A total of 24,775 disadvantaged men and women have now been hired as a result of our program; and of those hired, 12,805 are successfully on their jobs today—a retention rate of 51.7 percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Today, Sept. 9, 1969]

JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS—A BOOMING BUSINESS

(The demands of Negroes for more jobs in the high-paying construction industry has spotlighted the extent and adequacy of inner city employment training programs. The blacks claim they have been excluded from apprentice training programs which could fit them for more of the construction jobs which now total between 80,000 and 100,000 in the Chicago area alone. Outside the construction industry, however, job training programs are a booming business. Here's a report.)

(By Don Harris)

Job training programs of all descriptions—public and private—are a booming business.

From 1962 through June 30, 1968, the federal government spent 87 million dollars on manpower development and training projects in Illinois.

In addition, private industry invested millions more trying to get the so-called hard core unemployed into the economic mainstream.

During roughly the same period, the Illinois State Employment Service, local administrator of manpower programs, placed nearly 1.5 million persons in jobs.

These programs figure to continue taking in "students" as long as business in general continues to boom.

At the first sign of an economic slowdown, however, the experts agree job training programs and the persons they are designed to help will suffer.

There is a program, funded by the manpower administration under the United States department of labor, for practically

every segment of unemployed and underemployed.

To fill the gaps, if there are any, private firms have set up their own array of jobs programs. Some are geared to train people how to get and hold a job. They don't teach a skill, simply good work habits.

Probably the most heralded of all is the J. O. B. S. [Job Opportunities in the Business Sector] program, sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen.

It is considered the most successful of all job training efforts because private industry is directly involved in the operation.

Locally, the Chicago Alliance of Businessmen is headed by Donald M. Graham, chief executive officer of the Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust company. The J. O. B. S. director is Glenn W. Ramshaw, Continental bank vice president.

Ramshaw, who heads a task force of 100 executives on loan to the N.A.B., is convinced that companies participating in the program are likely to benefit as well as the disadvantaged they hire.

He noted that these so-called hard core unemployed often develop into stable, productive employees.

The N.A.B. was created in January, 1968, and began its first drive on April 2, of that year. It met its goal to place 11,000 hard core individuals on jobs by this July 1.

Latest figures show 17,251 were hired with 9,094 still on the job. That is a retention rate of 52.7 per cent.

The Alliance's second year goal is to find jobs for 22,000 more disadvantaged unemployed by July 1, 1970.

To keep the N.A.B. going, nine executives, including two from the state employment service, were loaned for all of 1968. It is estimated that Chicago area businesses contributed one quarter of a million dollars in wages, services, and materials to the local program during the year.

The federal government has contributed more than 13 million dollars toward offsetting the added costs to employers of special training and counseling.

These funds are available to any firm willing to enter into a contract with the government. However, the involved recordkeeping that goes with federal funds has caused many companies to skip government help and bear the cost alone.

The N.A.B. works closely with the state employment service, Jobs Now, Tri-Faith Employment project, Chicago Urban league, Chicago Youth centers, Opportunities Industrialization center, Youth Action project, and the Chicago Federation of Settlement Houses.

Briefly, here is how some of these private jobs efforts operate:

Tri-Faith—considered one of the most successful ghetto-run employment projects in the country. About 35,000 applicants are expected to seek jobs thru Tri-Faith's six neighborhood centers this year.

Jobs Now—sponsored by the Y.M.C.A., the Chicago Urban league, the Illinois state employment service, and several other agencies. It seeks out applicants for orientation job preparation.

Chicago Federation of Settlement Houses—14 centers thruout the city are recruiting hard-core job applicants. Officials expect to secure 2,000 to 3,000 such job-seekers.

Chicago Youth centers—maintain contact with hard-core jobless at the community level.

Youth Action project—workers go into the streets in search of the so-called hard-core to be recruited and referred to job training programs. They plan to work with nearly 10,000 youth, including 4,000 hard-core.

Opportunities Industrialization center—a job-preparation effort originated in Philadelphia. Officials expect to identify 500 hard-core applicants for job referral here.

A workhorse in the entire job-training field is the state employment service.

The ISES is the local arm of the federal

manpower development and training program. Tho it is a state office under the Illinois department of labor, it is funded entirely by the federal government.

It compiles and maintains an extensive list of job openings, points out where the greatest shortages in manpower are, and goes about the important task of matching people with positions.

Virtually all job programs rely in some measure on the ISES resources and information.

Walter E. Parker, ISES superintendent, commented on some of the changes that have taken place in recent years in the employment field.

Parker noted that many employers have reduced hiring requirements so that high school drop-outs have a better chance to get a job.

"This has been a big help toward solving the problem of the so-called hard-core unemployed," Parker said.

The ISES has been successful in getting many employers to do away with written tests that stood as a barrier to the under-educated. Nonverbal picture tests are being used much more extensively than ever before, Parker said.

In setting up a training program, the ISES works thru the state education department. Public school buildings are generally used for the training site.

In addition to the major job programs funded and directed by the federal government, here is a capsule comment on some lesser known projects:

Work Experience training—gives work experience to poor adults and youth to prepare them for regular jobs.

Operation Mainstream—pays older workers in rural areas and small towns to improve their communities.

Work Incentive program—helps people move off welfare rolls into self-supporting jobs.

Job training also is active in penal institutions. At County jail, federal money is used to prepare convicts for a job on the outside.

A recent comment by Rober P. Mayo, federal budget director, could spell trouble ahead for job training programs. Mayo indicated that the unemployment rate today "is better than we can hope for in the long run."

INTERVIEW OF PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the popular Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, was recently interviewed in New York by Michel Salomon of the ADL Bulletin. The interview provides an excellent insight into the policies and broad vision of Israel's able leader. On the vital issue of peace and war, Mrs. Meir said:

We are above all interested in having people live. Our ideal is neither to kill nor to die. But we will defend ourselves. At the same time, you will not find songs of war and glory in our streets. . . . Have you ever heard any Israeli proclaim that we must destroy Egypt or Jordan? We are happy that we can defend ourselves successfully, but there is no joy here in war. . . .

I ask unanimous consent, that this lively interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the ADL Bulletin, October 1969]

INTERVIEW WITH GOLDA MEIR

(By Michel Salomon)

The last time I saw Golda Meir was several years ago in New York. She was a featured guest at an unusual fashion show—models showing *sheitels*, the wigs worn by

ultra-Orthodox women. She showed great impassivity, looked tired and extremely aged. The woman I now interviewed in the office of the Prime Minister of Israel looked ten years younger—her face radiated energy and spirit.

"It is Egypt," Mrs. Meir said, "that has always drawn the whole Arab world into conflict with us. Since Nasser has been in power it is more than ever the country that makes the decisions. The other countries follow, not necessarily because they are in agreement, but because they know from past experience that they will be cooked otherwise."

I mentioned the idea of a separate peace agreement between Israel and, say, Hussein of Jordan.

"We are ready to sign a peace treaty with any Arab country," she replied. "Perhaps some day the Arab states will surmount their fears and their inhibitions and realize that they can tolerate no more suffering—you know that the Arab people suffer much more than we do from the continued belligerence. Perhaps some day one or two of these states will decide to make their own destinies and free themselves from Nasser's intervention in their affairs.

I asked the Prime Minister if she didn't think that Arab leaders might feel psychologically awkward meeting a woman as the head of a state that has defeated them. She smiled at the thought but said it would probably make little difference.

"What would you say to President Nasser if you met with him?" I asked.

"I would simply tell him," she replied, "that we want negotiations without any preliminaries or conditions." She paused as if to weigh the chances of such negotiations, and then she said sharply: "We will not make peace if each of us on his own side makes declarations on the radio. I do not know of any peace treaty which was signed in that way. But it seems that Nasser wants to regain what he lost in the war by issuing sweeping statements from his Cairo office or by ordering blind artillery fire at the Suez Canal. I'm afraid he will waste a lot of saliva and a lot of munitions. But he has had little success, and perhaps some day he will examine his conscience and will decide to let his own people live in peace and develop themselves."

The suggestion has often been made, I said, that Nasser sits on a fragile throne and cannot take the risk of peace. The Prime Minister bristled.

"He certainly took the risk of war," she said. "But if you are implying that the Arabs are governed by hopelessly irrational motivations, you are not entirely right. For if that were so, then this vital area of the world and its dozens of millions of inhabitants are destined forever to be led by people who can only take them from one war to another, from disaster to disaster, and who place on their shoulders an unbearable weight of suffering. Surely you know that the Egyptian standard of living is one of the lowest in the world, that their infant mortality is one of the highest. Must one accept with a kind of fatalism that this must be the destiny of thirty million human beings for all eternity?"

I saw a genuine compassion in Golda Meir's eyes. This momentarily fled, however, when I mentioned the obvious confidence the Egyptian people have shown in their leader.

"A man who brings his people a heavier burden of calamity with each passing day!" she exclaimed. "I don't know a people willing to be governed this way. But if it is the wish of the Egyptians, then why should Israel suffer for it? . . . Do we have to line up and drown in the Mediterranean to please Mr. Nasser? What actually disturbs me most is not Nasser, but those people who expect Israel to resign itself to this madness. Since Nasser has neither the ability to win wars nor the courage to make peace, Israel is therefore obliged to do something to help him remain in the saddle! That logic would

October 21, 1969

be laughable were it not so odious. Is it our sin that we won the war?"

Mrs. Meir's apparent bitterness on this point extends to those who accuse Israel of having been the aggressor in 1967. She said: "Recall the words of Nasser just before the Six Day War began—his triumphant laugh when he visited the soldiers in the Sinai. This was going to be the ultimate war for Arab purposes. Read again the orders of the day from Hussein to his army. My God, how normal people can reread these appeals to murder and then say that no one should have taken them seriously!"

And on the question of negotiation: "We are ready to meet at any time with Nasser, Hussein, anyone. Do you know of any historical precedent of a people, having been attacked and then having been fortunate enough to win the war and bring it into the homeland of the enemy, then themselves—the victors—having to beg for peace?"

The Prime Minister paused, leaned back and took a wistful look at the sunlight streaming through the window. Her face became both softer and more solemn.

"I will tell you a simple thing," she said, now speaking more slowly than before, "something far beyond the splitting of hairs. We have decided to live, to live here and to live in peace. It is as simple as that. The entire theory of the return of the Jewish people to the land of their ancestors is a peaceful concept. But if we must fight for our life, we will do so. And if the Arabs are incapable of conquering us in a war, we are not going to throw ourselves at their mercy in peace."

In the remainder of my time with Golda Meir I ranged over a number of topics on which she expressed herself.

On peace and war: "We are above all interested in having people live. Our ideal is neither to kill nor to die. But we will defend ourselves. At the same time, you will not find songs of war and glory in our streets . . . Have you ever heard any Israeli proclaim that we must destroy Egypt or Jordan? We are happy that we can defend ourselves successfully, but there is no joy here in war."

On the annexation of territory: "We did not fight the Six-Day War in order to annex territories. One must not take the effects for the cause."

On the question of Jerusalem: "How did the old city fall into the hands of the Jordanians—by an act of God? In 1948 the Arab legion of Abdullah occupied it with the aid of the British. Everybody was satisfied and accepted the fact that for nineteen years Jews could not visit the holy places there, and all Jews living there were savagely expelled. Now there are some people who cannot sleep because we have unified the city. And what have we done wrong? Have we chased the Arabs out of the city? No. What we have done is to clean it up, to bring in running water and electricity. They bombed our synagogues and profaned our cemeteries—and who cared in the United Nations? I hate to sound bitter, but we have decided for once and for all we will determine for ourselves just what we ourselves will consider just—whether or not certain people find that an acceptable notion. We demand the same rights as any other people in the world to exist."

On the Palestinian Arab refugees: ". . . We won the war in 1948. That was our first sin. The Arabs fled; we did not chase them out. We declared, *urbi et orbi*, that we were prepared to compensate financially for goods abandoned by the fleeing Arabs. Is Iraq ready to do the same for the Jews they expelled? Or Egypt? Or Morocco? Or Syria? Israel respected the resolution on the partition of 1947, and the Arab countries did not . . . I do not say that the refugees do not suffer, or that they do not constitute a humanitarian problem. But who created this problem? And why have they done nothing to resolve it?

"We were 600,000 Jews here when we began to receive the immigration of 100,000 persons each year. There were not enough roofs, or food, and we rationed eggs, tomatoes, shoes, everything. Of course, we received generous aid from Jews in other places. But what does that represent in comparison with the gold mine of royalties from Arab oil? And what, then, was the contribution to their own refugee problem of Kuwait, or of the Sudan? We welcomed and housed and fed our refugees from all over, and we integrated them into our society . . . Why have the Arabs not done the same for theirs?"

On anti-Semitism: "Many who speak of 'Zionists' are really thinking 'Jews.' The Soviets have always done that . . . This is revealing of a latent anti-Semitism. Well, we have lived with anti-Semitism for two thousand years; we know it in all its guises and all its masks. It comes wrapped in packages labeled justice, or humanism, but inside it is the same merchandise. And there are other people who are not anti-Semites but for whom the Jews can only be unfortunates, can only be objects of pity. They had pity for us before June 5, 1967—but we survived. What kind of Jews are we that we do not get killed, that we do not become objects of pity? There are people who just find it impossible to accept us as equals, people who just cannot accept us as neither angels nor devils, but just as men and women like all others . . ."

ADMINISTRATION'S MARINE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, the Vice President announced the establishment of a five-point program to improve and expand marine research.

As one who has applauded our efforts in space, I feel that they need to be matched by intensive study of the potential of our oceans and large inland lakes. The balanced proposal of the administration, which focuses attention on both the destructive and productive effects of man's use of his water resources, is to be commended.

Coming from a State surrounded on three sides by the Great Lakes, I am particularly pleased by the administration's specific emphasis on the pollution problem in the Great Lakes. These unique bodies of fresh water are particularly vulnerable to harmful exploitation. Unless special efforts are made to control and prevent pollution of these lakes, irreversible contamination is possible.

The pilot study of lake pollution, proposed by the National Council on Marine Resources, and the anti-pollution demonstration program for the Great Lakes, established by S. 7, are two important steps forward in the battle to save the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's release and the details of the program released by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

A five-point program to strengthen the Nation's marine science activities was announced today by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, as Chairman of the National Council

on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

The Vice President reported five areas that the Administration has selected for immediate special emphasis in the next fiscal year. These areas are:

Coastal Zone Management: A new Federal policy will be established to promote the rational development of coastal areas and the Great Lakes, with a grant program to aid States to plan and manage activities along the coast.

Establishment of Coastal Laboratories: Coastal marine laboratories will be established to accelerate environmental research needed for effective management of coastal activities.

Lake Restoration: A pilot technology study of lake pollution will be initiated to guide restoration of the Great Lakes.

International Decade of Ocean Exploration: The United States will propose a range of specific programs as its initial contribution to the International Decade of Ocean Exploration during the 1970s.

Arctic Environmental Research: Ocean-related research will be accelerated on the interaction of man with the Arctic environment.

The Vice President said that details of the program have been worked out with the approval of the White House.

Additional funding above current levels will be provided for implementing these programs. Primary responsibility for development of each program will be assigned to an appropriate Federal agency while studies of the Government's organization of marine science activities continue.

Selection of the five priority programs followed an intensive Government-wide review of urgent needs of the nation in relation to marine affairs. These particular needs cannot await the result of longer range studies, the Vice President said.

The study was requested by President Nixon in February following submission of the Report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, *Our Nation and the Sea*.

The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, headed by Roy Ash, is now evaluating the Commission's recommendation to create a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency. The Administration will also continue to evaluate other Commission recommendations, strengthen on-going programs, and seek improvement of Federal management of ocean programs. The President's task force on oceanography, headed by James H. Wakelin, Jr., will be of particular assistance in formulating the longer term goals of the national program.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development was established at Congressional initiative by Public Law 89-454 to assist the President in the development and coordination of national marine science policies and programs. The Council membership is as follows:

Chairman: Spiro T. Agnew, the Vice President.

Members: William P. Rogers, the Secretary of State; John H. Chafee, the Secretary of the Navy; Walter J. Hickel, the Secretary of the Interior; Maurice H. Stans, the Secretary of Commerce; Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; John A. Volpe, the Secretary of Transportation; Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; William D. McElroy, Director, National Science Foundation.

Observers: Lee A. DuBridge, Director, Office of Science and Technology; Robert P. Mayo, Director, Bureau of the Budget; Paul W. McCracken, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors; Thomas O. Paine, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; John A. Hannah, Administrator, Agency for International Development; S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Executive Secretary: Edward Wenk, Jr.

[From the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Oct. 19, 1969]

DETAILS OF FIVE-POINT INTERIM MARINE SCIENCE PROGRAM

1. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Legislative proposals will be submitted to the Congress to establish a national policy for the development of coastal areas and to authorize Federal grants, with matching State contributions, that will encourage and facilitate the establishment of State management authorities. Such legislation will assist to insure the rapid coastal development does not destroy limited coastal land and water resources and that all interests in the coastal regions would be assured consideration—for port development, navigation, commercial fishing, mineral exploitation, recreation, conservation, industrial development, housing, power generation and waste disposal.

Grants are anticipated for (1) initial development by States of planning and regulatory mechanisms; and (2) operation of the State management systems that are developed. The latter grants would be made contingent on a State demonstrating a capability to prepare plans that provide for:

Balanced use of the coastal margin, both land and water, that considers viewpoints of all potential users;

Access to management-oriented research, including coastal ecology studies;

Regulatory authority as needed—such as zoning, easement, license, or permit arrangements—to insure that development is consistent with State plans;

Consideration of the interests of adjacent States;

Land acquisition and power of eminent domain as necessary for implementation of the plan; and

Review of proposed Federal, Federal-assisted, State and local projects to insure consistency with plans.

States have responsibility for management of coastal resources but have often lacked regulatory and management capabilities. They have been faced with a diversity of coastal jurisdictions and the absence of ecological information. This program should thus strengthen the States' capabilities, lessen the need for Federal intervention, and facilitate integration of planning, conservation, and development programs among diverse public and private interests.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COASTAL LABORATORIES

Steps will be taken toward establishment of coastal laboratories, supported by the Federal Government, to provide information on resource development, water quality, and environmental factors to assist State authorities and others in coastal management. Existing facilities will be strengthened and consolidated as necessary to provide capabilities to:

Develop a basic understanding and description of the regionally differentiated ecology of our 13,000-mile coastline;

Anticipate and assess the impact on the ecology of alternative land uses, of pollution, and of alterations to the land-water interfaces;

Operate coastal monitoring networks; and

Perform analyses needed for coastal management.

Establishment of these capabilities will be phased with the development of coastal management plans to foster State access to environmental data and research capabilities.

3. PILOT TECHNOLOGICAL STUDY OF LAKE RESTORATION

The feasibility of restoring the Great Lakes with technological as well as regulatory mechanisms will be determined by a pilot study of a lake of manageable size. Existing environmental technology and techniques

will be tested, including pollution measuring devices, methods of artificial destratification by aeration, mixing and thermal upwelling techniques, thermal pollution control and enrichment, artificial bottom coating, filtering, harvesting of living plants and animals, and restocking of fishery resources. The program will reinforce current investigations, and bring together additional competence from industry, academic institutions, and Federal laboratories.

4. INTERNATIONAL DECADE OF OCEAN EXPLORATION

Funding will be provided for the U.S. contribution to the International Decade of Ocean Exploration during the 1970s, proposed by the United States and endorsed by the UN General Assembly in December 1968. The United States will propose international emphasis on the following goals:

Preserve the ocean environment by accelerating scientific observations of the natural state of the ocean and its interactions with the coastal margin—to provide a basis for (a) assessing and predicting man-induced and natural modifications of the character of the oceans; (b) identifying damaging or irreversible effects of waste disposal at sea; and (c) comprehending the interaction of various levels of marine life to prevent depletion or extinction of valuable species as a result of man's activities.

Improve environmental forecasting to reduce hazards to life and property and permit more efficient use of marine resources—by improving physical and mathematical models of the ocean and atmosphere which will provide the basis for increased accuracy, timeliness, and geographic precision of environmental forecasts.

Expand seabed assessment activities to permit better management—domestically and internationally—of ocean mineral exploration and exploitation by acquiring needed knowledge of seabed topography, structure, physical and dynamic properties, and resource potential:

Develop an ocean monitoring system to facilitate prediction of oceanographic and atmospheric conditions—through design and deployment of oceanographic data buoys and other remote sensing platforms;

Improve worldwide data exchange through modernizing and standardizing national and international marine data collection, processing, and distribution;

Accelerate Decade planning to increase opportunities for international sharing of responsibilities and costs for ocean exploration, and to assure better use of limited exploration resources.

This U.S. contribution to an expanded program of intergovernmental cooperation reflects four recent developments:

(1) Increased population concentration along the coasts of the United States and other countries, with attendant threats of harmful degradation of the ocean environment, and increasing demands on the coastal margins and marine resources.

(2) Evolution of technology that is rapidly opening new ocean frontiers.

(3) Recent scientific advances that can improve environmental forecasts if better ocean data is available.

(4) Sharply increasing interests by 100 coastal nations in extracting benefits from marine activities.

The Decade will accelerate needed understanding of the ocean—permitting nations individually to plan investments and collectively to develop arrangements for preserving the ocean environment and managing common ocean resources.

The global character of the oceans and the scope of work to be done make international cost-sharing and data exchange especially attractive. International cooperation in marine affairs is expected to facilitate communication with developing nations, with the Soviet Union, and with others.

The U.S. proposals are compatible with the framework of the expanded and long-term international program of ocean exploration recently developed by UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. The extent and nature of the U.S. contribution will depend on the contribution of other nations participating in this program.

5. ARCTIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Arctic research activities will be intensified, both to permit fuller utilization of this rapidly developing area and to insure that such activities do not inadvertently degrade the Arctic environment.

The program will be directed to (1) the polar icepack including its impact on transportation and global weather and climate; (2) the polar magnetic field and its effects on underlying the Arctic lands and polar seas both as potential mineral sites and as hazards to construction and resource development; (4) balance of the Arctic eco-system; (5) the presence of permafrost; and (6) slow degradation of liquid and solid wastes under Arctic conditions. Behavior and physiology of man in this environment also will receive increased attention. Initial emphasis will be on strengthening and broadening Arctic research capabilities. Consideration will also be directed to formulating an overall policy framework for Arctic-related activities.

FRENCH COMMEMORATE PRESIDENT EISENHOWER IN SILVER

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, just a week ago today, this body took deliberate and responsible action when it passed Senate Joint Resolution 158 by a large majority and sent the measure to the House for its consideration.

Senate Joint Resolution 158 provided for the minting of a 40-percent silver-clad dollar bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

At the time of the debate, I stated it was my belief that a silver coin would be revered and cherished by our citizens. I also pointed out the continued weekly sales of Treasury silver by the General Services Administration was bringing an average price of \$1.87 per ounce to the Treasury.

It was my belief, and still is, that the taxpayers should receive full value for the surplus silver held in our Treasury. A 40-percent silver commemorative dollar will see the U.S. Treasury receiving more than \$3 per ounce for its remaining stocks of silver and at the same time will permit the Nation to commemorate properly one of its outstanding citizens.

As Senators are aware, the House substituted its own language in Senate Joint Resolution 158, which included the minting of a silverless dollar. The joint resolution has been sent back to the Senate for further consideration.

Since the passage of the Senate bill, my mail has reflected complete agreement with the Senate's position. In fact, just yesterday I received a thoughtful letter from a Nevada friend and constituent, Mrs. Victor Cottino, of Pioche, Nev., which reads as follows:

I have read with interest and listened to over the radio and television the debate over whether to have a silver content in a dollar honoring former President Eisenhower. It seems a little odd to me that France could strike a coin honoring President Eisenhower, the Kennedy brothers and

October 21, 1969

Martin Luther King and offer it for sale in the United States when it is composed of 99.99% silver, and then our own government argues about putting a silver content of 40% in a dollar. Please find enclosed a page from the Sears Roebuck Christmas catalog which lists the commemorative medals for sale. I trust that you are not in favor of this copper clad dollar which is being proposed.

I agree wholeheartedly with my constituent. It makes little sense to me that another nation, such as France, can mint silver commemorative coins of 99.99 percent silver and sell these coins to our citizens through large private business outlets for \$10 each, when our Nation is in fact making silver available to any nation at the ridiculously low price of \$1.87 per ounce.

I have commented many times that our foreign friends would purchase Treasury silver stocks and sell the silver back to our citizens at an increased price when silver was in short supply.

As the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) stated in the debate last week, it is estimated that 200 million ounces of Treasury silver are stored in England and on the Continent.

This silver which we have sold at bargain prices will be coming back to the United States just as the silver commemorative coins now produced at the French Mint are now being offered at \$10 each in this Nation.

I hope that Senators will not accede to the substitute language as agreed upon by the House Members when Senate Joint Resolution 158 is again before the Senate.

COLLEGE STUDENT AT 84

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an interesting news article about a longtime friend, Perry W. Porter, was published in the Unionville, Mo., Republican of September 24. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ONE IS NEVER TOO "YOUNG" TO LEARN

Putnam county could have the distinction of having the oldest student enrolled at N.E. Missouri State at Kirksville in the person of Mr. Perry W. Porter, local insurance and income tax man.

Mr. Porter enrolled in a 9-week Income Tax course being offered at the college on Monday evenings of each week. He will receive one hour of college credit when completed. Perry may be the oldest person on the campus, but we will make a wee-wager that he has the sharpest pencil on the campus when it comes to figures.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. Porter celebrated his 84th birthday last February 23, and his many activities in the insurance business, helping friends and neighbors and clients for many years in the preparation of their income tax returns, and in many civic good works, including responsibility for leading the singing every week for the Unionville Rotary Club, are all evidence that one is only as old as he feels. The fact that Mr. Porter, in addition to his other activities, has now gone back to college proves that he is feeling mighty young.

Mr. President, I would hope that our colleges throughout the country will continue to offer courses of interest to our "young adults"—whether they be 24 or 84.

LOS ANGELES URGES ENACTMENT OF S. 2625, THE URBAN AND RURAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, from my city of Los Angeles, I have received an endorsement of the Urban and Rural Education Act, which I introduced on July 15, in the form of a letter from Superintendent of Schools Jack Crowther. He has worked with me on various legislative proposals, and I am very grateful for his help and support.

I ask unanimous consent that Superintendent Crowther's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD
OF EDUCATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 15, 1969.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
Senator, State of California, U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your letter of July 22, 1969 and the accompanying material on your Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969. You may count on our enthusiastic support of this measure.

If it should be your desire to have us appear to testify in support of the bill, we would appreciate it if your office could inform us as early as possible in advance so that we can be adequately prepared both in terms of available staff and supportive materials.

In light of the fact that the California Legislature apparently intends not only to limit additional state school aid to what approximates a cost-of-living adjustment and to restore the ceilings on local property taxes for school support, your bill offers the only hope we have at this time of obtaining additional funds to enable this school district to deal with the mounting educational problems that are so well described in your excellent statement.

Please accept my sincere thanks and appreciation for sponsoring this much needed legislation. We stand ready to assist you in any way we can to obtain congressional approval.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JACK P. CROWTHER,
Superintendent of Schools.

THE IMBALANCE OF POWERS: CAN CONGRESS SURVIVE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) recently addressed the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco about "the vast agenda of unfinished business" our Nation faces in domestic and foreign affairs. With the same eloquence and insights we in the Senate are so frequently privileged to hear, Senator HARTKE told my fellow Californians that we must "meet head on the crises of our Nation, in all their difficult ramifications, and to do so with the courage to abandon wrong causes and obsolete policies."

Pointing out the imbalance of powers between the executive and legislative branches of Government, Senator HARTKE predicted:

If the trend towards executive centralization continues, there is little doubt that the wellsprings of innovation will dry up in Congress just as they very nearly have in the States.

So that all of us may have the opportunity to read the speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE IMBALANCE OF POWERS: CAN CONGRESS SURVIVE?

(Remarks by Senator VANCE HARTKE before the Commonwealth Club of California, Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., October 17, 1969)

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I received the invitation to address the Commonwealth Club.

Aside from the fact that this is a forum renowned as a marketplace of ideas that sooner or later affect national policy. I greet any opportunity to revisit San Francisco with special joy.

Long before the Harris poll revealed that most people prefer it to other cities, I have had San Francisco high on my own list of preferences—although as a gentleman from Indiana, I can think of at least one place more to the taste of an unreconstructed Hoosier. Your bay area, it is true, stirs with a certain colorful vitality; but it is also true that in my State, along the banks of the Wabash, one may still enjoy the harvest of a quiet eye.

I first went to the Senate in 1958, a young man from Evansville, with an inherited vision of what our country might be. Those were the last of the Eisenhower years—those years when the lamp of illusion shed its benign light over the Nation.

In retrospect, it is clear to me that even before I went to the Senate, the forces that have brought us to our present crisis were already churning despite the rhetoric to the contrary. The races were in conflict; the cities were in deep trouble; there was violence in the streets; there was discontent among the young; and the seeds of the Vietnam war had already been planted. Indeed, all the harsh realities of the last third of the 20th century were assaulting the assumptions we lived by.

We needed then, as we do now, a declaration of a new political truth—some bold, new effort at social invention, through which the American people might adapt itself to the sweeping technological scientific, social, and political changes that now challenge us—and the world.

I know that no one can confront the problems of national policy without recognizing their enormous complexity; but I also know that to deny the complexity of our problems is an abdication of both political responsibility and power. There are no simple answers to big problems. But the big problems are here, and they are getting bigger, and more complex, and finally more dangerous. A President may deny them by seeing only what he believes, or like the old judge, render a decision on the premise that his conclusion proves the facts. The human condition, however, is real, and the facts speak for themselves.

When there is a broad divergence between national policy and the facts of life, the door is open to widespread discontent. Thus, there is now abroad in the land, a general notion, mostly articulated by the young, that what we do—and try to do—in and out of Washington is irrelevant to our needs; and in all truth there is very little evidence that our national policies reveal any fundamental awareness of the world around us.

The facts speak for themselves, and they define a totally new set of circumstances,

without reference to anything in our past. And they demand a totally new set of policies.

The fact of nuclear arms has made obsolete the historic forms of diplomacy, and has created throughout the world a brooding sense of fear.

It is a fact that the population of the earth will double by the end of this century, and this has raised the alarming prospect of widespread death through mass starvation.

It is a fact that there are now over 160 sovereign nations on this planet, all eager for power and influence. And it is also a fact that the have nations are mostly white and the have-not nations mostly non-white. And the question is asked: Will this not lead to a global racial war?

It is a fact that the genius of America has produced a miraculous technology, capable of supplying an ever-increasing abundance of goods and services. But it is also a fact that this same technology despoils our environment, dirties our waters, and ploughs filth into the air. And the question is legitimately asked: At what point will the health of the entire nation be endangered.

Here we are, a nation of metropolitan man, concentrated in great urban areas, and year after year we watch the erosion of our cities—we watch them decay and become more unlivable and more unworkable. And it is a fact that we do not have a national policy and a national commitment to an overall urban renewal.

Instead of new policies, we have a vast agenda of unfinished business in international affairs and in domestic programs, all of which bear directly on the fate and future of our nation. But we are wasting ourselves in the Vietnam war, which we should have avoided in the first place, and which we should now leave entirely in the hands of the Vietnamese, to do with what they will, but not with our young men, and not with our treasure.

The time is now long overdue when we must get on with the larger business at hand, which is to meet head-on the crisis of our nation, in all its difficult ramifications, and to do so with the courage to abandon wrong causes and obsolete policies.

In an address to the Congress of the United States, in December 1862, Abraham Lincoln said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves . . . the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation . . ."

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion."

"We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthral ourselves."

Lincoln's call in 1862 has a real and sudden applicability to our own time, for we too must shed the dogmas of another day, and act anew with a belief that our rational faculties can join in a common cause.

We have more affluence than was dreamed possible. Our technology in a sense, is miraculous. We opened the door to the age of Apollo, and brought the moon and the planets directly into the orbit of human experience. Fifty million of our children go to school and seven million of them go to college. Many Americans are poor, but most are not. There are many who are ill-housed, ill-clothed and ill-fed; but most are not.

Yet no recitation of these achievements now suffice to reassure Americans that they are safe and secure and on the way to a better life.

The Vietnam war certainly dominates the consciousness of the country, and raises grave doubts not only about the credibility of the Government, but also, and more importantly, about some widely assumed postures of the United States. We are not, for

example, invincible as we once thought. We have the most powerful military establishment in the world, but we cannot win a war against a little people with only an ounce of our resources. We pretend to be the exporter of democracy, but we have no reluctance to support with arms and money corrupt and dictatorial governments. These moral contradictions finally take their toll, for when the gap between appearance and reality becomes very obvious, citizens everywhere find their faith torn. When they are young, they desert our institutions, and when they are middle-aged and old, they turn to despair.

But over and above the demoralizing effects of the war and our foreign policy, there is mounting discontent and now a considerable doubt as to whether or not successive administrations in Washington have had the wisdom and statesmanship to formulate policies and programs that really relate to our problems.

Consider the contradiction that our so-called longest period of sustained prosperity is in fact something of a delusion, since the vast majority of American people are now so overburdened with the high cost of living that the present administration is faced with the real prospect of a taxpayer's revolt.

Or consider our fidelity to the economic policies of the past, which we cling to in the face of the world's declining liquidity and the mounting pressures for radical changes that will unlock the channels of world trade.

Or assess the effect on our people when they hear that Lake Erie has become a swamp, or that air pollution may cause emphysema in epidemic proportions, or that nearly 60,000 people will be killed on our highways this year, or that in the richest nation in the world 12% of the population live in abject poverty, or that our wildlife is being made extinct. And while the people may not express their concerns in loud and angry rebuke to their Government, they are perplexed and anguished by all this. For we have been brought up to be a generous people, with a reverence for life, but all around us we see that life is held in some contempt.

And we can go on to recall all the failures and frailties of our national policies. We can talk about the lost opportunities for peace, and the failacies of our programs for our racial minorities, and the insanity of escalating our nuclear capabilities, but finally we must consider the role of political leadership. For what that is and how it functions is the ultimate determinant of what we are and where we are going.

It seems to me that for too long now we have put our faith in the idea of a leader—the President of the United States. We have permitted ourselves to believe that leadership must necessarily reside in this one man and whatever palace guard of advisers he chooses to have around him.

Surely no notion runs more directly counter to the essential spirit of the American political system than this. As every civics student knows, the founding fathers dispersed power throughout the system both horizontally and vertically: Horizontally through separation of powers at the national level and vertically between the central government and the States. They did this not only because they wisely feared the concentration of powers at a single source, but also—and more subtly—because they recognized that this new nation's very survival would depend on its ability to innovate in the face of new challenges. And innovation, they realized, could never be safely left to a single locus of government.

So let me now offer a preliminary answer to the question posed in the title of my remarks, "Can Congress Survive?" The answer is, yes: It can because it must.

I think it is perfectly clear that no great and diverse society can hazard its existence on the judgment of any one man and his handpicked advisers. Confronted with life

and death problems of such terrifying complexity as those we face today, the judgment of a solitary leader is simply not good enough. And let me make it clear that I am not talking only about Richard Nixon or Lyndon Johnson, but about John Kennedy and Harry Truman, and Franklin Roosevelt as well.

Complex problems demand complex judgments—the kind that can only come from the dialectical clash of divergent ideas.

That is why the Senate is such an admirable and necessary institution. Composed as it is of 100 generally able men and women of sharply different backgrounds and political perceptions, it offers the opportunity at least for subjecting every proposed policy to a truly rigorous examination. And because it never denies a Member the chance to be heard on questions of concern to him, it maximizes the likelihood that policy choices will be fully and carefully explored.

This, it seems to me, is the genius of the Senate as an institution. And it serves the Nation best when it is true to its genius—as in the great debate this year on national commitments and on military procurement. It serves the Nation far less well when it is false to itself—as in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of 1964 when we lost sight of our own constitutional responsibilities in our eagerness to allow the President to inflate his hawks.

By the same token, if policy judgments on complex problems cannot safely be left to the exclusive province of the Executive, neither can policy initiatives. A homelier way to put the same point is to say that we can never have enough good ideas.

Yet that is precisely the point that we ignore when we surrender to the doctrine—so tirelessly put about these days, especially by liberals—that the Presidency should be the source and fount of policy initiatives in our system. So pervasive has this belief become within the past 30 years or so, that even a great many of my colleagues seem now to view bold new ideas originating in Congress as somehow suspect until they can win the administration's stamp of approval. And what is true of Members of Congress is thrice-true of the news media people, who do so much to shape the public consciousness.

But valuable policy initiatives do continue to originate in Congress. And it would take a very severe wrenching of facts to argue that these are somehow intrinsically less worthy of attention than those that originate in the executive, which, after all, is composed at its highest levels of a variety of former governors, businessmen, Wall Street lawyers, political organizers, and college professors—many of whom have had little or no practical experience in dealing with the affairs of their office or agency.

If you will forgive me a personal reference, I should like to give you an example from my own legislative record of the kind of new effort at social invention which I mentioned earlier.

On August 7th of this year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 145 to establish a Joint Committee of Congress on National Goals. Its purpose would be to identify specific—I emphasize the "specific"—National Goals and the means to achieve them by the bicentennial year of 1976. The sort of goal I suggested in my speech of introduction included the elimination of poverty, the cleansing of our air and waters, making the streets of our cities safe to walk upon, and providing decent housing, education, and transportation for all Americans.

Are these goals too visionary, too impractical? I am convinced that they are not. I argued in my speech that the success of Apollo 11—the greatest technological feat in the history of mankind—demonstrated beyond challenge that we have both the technology and the resources to achieve any materially feasible goal. All we have so far lacked for a coordinated, successful attack on the domestic problems that blight our

October 21, 1969

society is the will. And if you doubt that we really do have the resources for so massive an assault on our ills, let me point out that the military part alone of our Vietnam folly has since 1965 cost us over one hundred and six billion dollars.

In essence, then, my proposal would set in motion the institutional machinery to devise and launch the first coordinated, concentrated assault on the besetting ills of our society that we have ever attempted. That proposal has now been endorsed by such different but influential sources as Walter Cronkite, Parade Magazine, and President Nixon. Given this kind of support, I am hopeful that the resolution will now begin to make some proposals through the legislative mill.

The central point, however, is that this initiative, which I believe to be sound and I hope will prove fruitful, originated with a member of the Senate. If it is a more ambitious proposal than most, it is by no means more imaginative or creative than many others that have been put forward in Congress. But if the trend towards executive centralization continues, there is little doubt that the wellsprings of innovation will dry up in Congress just as they very nearly have in the States—which, let me remind you, only a few decades ago were often vital laboratories of social and political experimentation.

I said a few minutes ago that Congress will survive because it must. Let me confess that I have more confidence in the "must" than in the "will". An institution that has lost its constitutional vitality is all too likely to lose the caliber of men who alone can give it force and meaning in the total government context.

The challenges we face today are more terrifying than any we have known since the Civil War. We desperately need every ounce of judgment and creative initiative we can get. And Congress, I have argued, is a superb repository of both judgment and initiative.

There is one last point to be made in this connection. The American mission is unique in all history. It is, in James Madison's words, to prove the impossible: That a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society can make peace with itself, and rise finally to that level of life which is the vision of all mankind.

This proposition is now being tested throughout the land and in the deliberations of government. And in this struggle for a new life, it is the Congress of the United States that is the ultimate custodian of the loftiest American ideals.

Like all great efforts at creation, there is pain and anguish and sometimes violence; but these should be viewed as a prelude to success. For we will succeed, even if the price is high, so long as we preserve the sovereign right of the people to speak and act and create through their elected representatives.

THE STERLING HEIGHTS CLINTON RIVER CLEANUP

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, at a time of increasing need for initiative at local levels, it is especially heartening to see the successful results of a well-organized community project.

Recently, the town of Sterling Heights, Mich., received national attention, including a congratulatory telegram from President Nixon, for its efforts in cleaning up the nearby Clinton River.

In just 2 days, under the leadership of the Sterling Heights Clinton River Cleanup Committee and with the aid of some 2,000 residents, approximately 12,000 tons of debris were hauled from a 10-mile stretch of the river.

The benefits inuring from this project are not limited solely to environmental aspects. The cost savings achieved through the volunteer effort can be seen merely by examining the probable rental cost of the 200 pieces of heavy equipment which were donated. The intangible benefits in terms of community pride and individual participation are immeasurable.

This significant accomplishment should help to restore faith in the potential and resourcefulness of local government. The citizens of Sterling Heights are to be commended for setting an example to the Nation of responsible community action.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the October issue of the Rotarian describing the Clinton River cleanup, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLEANUP ON THE CLINTON (By Frank S. Fayssoux)

"Polluted—Unsafe for Swimming."

The sign, white lettering on dark stained wood, juts up from the weed-strewn banks of the Clinton River as it flows through Sterling Heights, Michigan, just 14 miles from downtown Detroit. A glance at the river and a sniff of its odor makes the sign unnecessary. In a word, the river stinks. In a phrase, it is an eyesore. This is because, to borrow a remark from the former U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, it has grown "heavier with the debris of our spectacular civilization": junked cars, old tires, oil drums, baby carriages, washing machines, beer cans, and hundreds of tons of other kinds of rubbish.

"A river is more than an amenity—it is a treasure," said former U.S. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. The Clinton, then, has become a badly tarnished treasure: The dark, dirty waters flow between refuse-strewn banks and in spots, obstructed by debris, slow into still pools streaked with heavy green slime. The odoriferous, cluttered Clinton River, to put it bluntly, is bankrupt.

This, at least, was the story until the weekend of August 16 when a project spearheaded by the Rotary Club of Sterling Heights launched a community-wide cleanup campaign. Under gunmetal gray skies and occasional blue, in driving rain and intermittent sunshine, some 2,000 people from Sterling Heights and the surrounding area worked for two days from dawn to dusk cleaning up their burdened river.

It didn't all happen overnight. These things never do. It happened because of good planning, strong leadership, and lots of cooperation among all involved. In fact, the logistics of the clean-up smacked of a well-planned military operation. Much of the planning and leadership was provided by a big, ruddy-complexioned salesman of school supplies named Al Martin. A Rotarian and city councilman, Al is chairman-president of the Sterling Heights Clinton River Clean-up Committee.

"Why don't we do something about the river?" Al asked Ray Filipchuk, President of the Sterling Heights Rotary Club and director of public services for the city, soon after the Club was chartered on May 9, 1969.

"How are we going to do it?" Ray responded.

This question led to other consultations and conversations within the Club. Barely one week after its founding, the Club agreed to form a Spearhead Committee and embark on a community project to clean up the Clinton.

With headwaters in Michigan's Oakland County some 20 miles west of Pontiac, the

Clinton River flows toward Lake St. Clair in three branches: the Main, Middle, and North. The entire river is not yet polluted and there is still good fishing along the North Branch. The Main Branch, which flows through Sterling Heights, was once an angler's dream which pollution and debris turned into a nightmare.

Although the river has been a problem for area residents for years, it has only been a city problem since July 1, 1968. An unincorporated township up until then, Sterling Heights on this date officially came into being and automatically became the second largest city in area (36 square miles) in Michigan. Population increased from 14,000 in 1960 to 47,000 in 1968, and planners now predict a population of 150,000 by 1980.

In the current tradition of a swing toward youth, the young city and even younger Rotary Club combined forces to combat the polluted river which too many citizens used as a garbage dump. With Club members serving as chairmen or co-chairmen on all of the 12 subcommittees, the Clinton River Clean-up Committee received pledges of support from other civic and service clubs, sportsmen's organizations, local and county government agencies, and individual citizens and businessmen.

"We believe this grass roots effort has great significance for the entire U.S.A., because citizen volunteers are doing something for the community instead of waiting to see what government is going to do about the Clinton River problem," Chairman Al Martin wrote in a letter the committee sent out seeking support.

The problem of waiting to get the job done "through regular channels," according to committee members, is the large number of overlapping governmental agencies which become involved. These include 14 to 20 different city governments, a number of county drain commissions, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. A clean-up campaign was recently completed along eight miles of the Main Branch's downstream area near the mouth of the river. Another clean-up is scheduled "through channels" along another seven mile stretch of the river. This project will cost \$17 million and take five years. Rather than wait the five or six years committee members think it would take the authorities to reach their stretch of the river, the Clinton River Clean-Up Committee took the plunge itself.

And so in the first gray dawn of Saturday morning, August 16, volunteers began arriving—men, women, and children ready to go down to the water (and into it) to seize and carry away with their own hands the floating flotsam which had collected through years of neglect. Soon after 6 A.M. the first full bus load of volunteers (a group of teenagers) were on their way to assigned work areas.

Along the ten miles of the Clinton to be cleaned were 24 work areas, 12 on each side of the river. The entire effort was directed from main headquarters, a trailer at Dodge Park No. 8 across the street from the Sterling Heights municipal building. Communications were maintained between all work sections by 30 mobile radio units and 30 walkie-talkies provided by the Sterling-Utica-Shelby REACT (Radio Emergency Associated Citizens Team).

In the early morning mist, heavy machinery (some 200 pieces of it) churned into operation. It was placed in position along the river Friday on roads and trails previously carved out for this purpose. Canoes, flat-bottom boats, and an amphibious vehicle plied the river's surface, while bulldozers, cranes, cherry pickers, and trucks worked in unison along the water's edge. Logs and other debris were dredged up and hauled away.

During the months of June and July, the Sterling Heights area was steadily pelted with rain. The forecast for this weekend of work was for good weather. Chairman Al and the committee had counted on it. But the

gray skies at daybreak were a bad sign. Around 9 A.M., the first rain began to fall—slow but steady.

Soon it was a downpour. Wet clothes stuck to wetter skin and the roads became trails of mire. Some of the heavy equipment bogged down in the deepening mud. Instead of drenching the workers' spirits, however, the rain seemed to strike a spark and all the "river rats" redoubled their efforts—slogging about with gusto and good humor.

"These operators of mine are real prima donnas and usually pack up and go home at the first sign of rain on a regular job," said one of the contractors who donated heavy equipment for the clean-up. "But I'm real proud of them out here. They're donating their own time and all of them are working harder than ever right through the rain."

The Clinton River clean-up spirit seemed to infect everyone. Women ferried food from headquarters to the work sections in station wagons. Some hustled hot coffee on foot. Children of all ages were busy in the river or around headquarters. On Sunday, people who weren't involved with the clean-up held picnics around the headquarters area in Dodge Park. But this didn't slow down the clean-up crews for one minute. They knew if the river was to be cleaned up, someone had to do the work.

Saturday night, workers in many of the sections along the river begged for flood lights so they could continue. The lights weren't available so everyone trudged home, tired but contented. It rained during the night, and Sunday dawned gray as a battleship. However, except for some light misting, the rains never came and sometime during the afternoon the sun actually flashed a smile or two through clouds. Volunteers showed up in droves again and most of the bogged down equipment was freed from the mud.

"We're actually on schedule because of the dedication and determination of these people working out here," Al said at headquarters Sunday morning. "We lost very little time because of the rain."

Ingenuity was the order of the day. Some kids assigned to cleaning up small debris from the river used an Irish setter to haul the stuff from midstream to the bank where they could pick it up. The dog did a good job, but he did have trouble trying to pick up flat whisky bottles.

Safety was stressed at the outset and it paid off. The first aid tent treated mostly minor complaints, including scratches, bruises, a case of poison ivy, and a finger lacerated by a pop can.

By Sunday night, the hard-working crews completed 80 percent of the Clinton River clean-up project. Some 12,000 tons of debris and junk (more than 400 truck loads) was hauled off to proper dumping grounds. The fired-up volunteers, not contented with an almost finished project, voted to return the following Saturday and complete the remainder of the job.

Labor, equipment, food, fuel, and many other items were donated, but the two-day clean-up campaign cost some \$10,000 in cold, hard cash—most of it contributed by local citizens, businessmen, and industry.

"This project would probably cost more than a million dollars if it had been undertaken by governmental agencies," Al says. "In figuring such costs, there are other intangible values involved. For instance, we plan to open the river as a fine canoe facility which should bring tourists into the area. We also hope to develop hiking and nature trails along the flood plain."

The Sterling Heights Clinton River Clean-up Committee has been incorporated for a three-year period so it may continue to encourage maintenance of the river and involve other adjoining communities in similar projects.

"We also hope to raise \$5,000 so that we may donate it to the city for recreational facilities along the river," says Al.

With Lake Erie lying "dead" from pollution some miles beyond the city limits of Sterling Heights and the problem of water contamination continuing to proliferate around the world, the Clinton River clean-up takes on added significance. It shows that something can be done at the "grass roots" level—without waiting for governments (whether they be city, state, or national) to untangle their skein of red tape and finally act.

It shows, too, that a properly aroused Rotary Club can provide the impetus for community action. As the Sterling Heights Club "spearheaded" the Clinton River clean-up project, so have other Clubs provided the needed action for other conservation projects:

The Rotary Club of Lincoln, Nebraska, promoted organization of the Salt-Wahoo Watershed Association project. This involved some 5,200 individual farms in a complete program of water conservation, flood abatement, erosion control, and recreational development of the area.

The Chagrin Valley, Ohio, Club originated a similar watershed conservancy district embracing 11 communities and 260 square miles.

Other Rotary Clubs as far separated as Horse Cave, Kentucky; Howray, India; and Yokote, Japan, are interesting themselves in their water problems.

Along the Clinton River in Sterling Heights, most of the job the clean-up committee cut out for itself is completed. The river is still polluted (this is a problem that will have to be attacked at another source), but now most of the debris obstructing the river is gone. Perhaps canoeing will become commonplace on the Clinton once again, as it was some 30 years ago. Whatever work remains to be done, Al Martin and the Clinton River Clean-up Committee remain around to help do it.

If, as Justice Holmes said, "A river is more than an amenity—it is a treasure," then the people who labored long and hard along this particular river have helped restore the legacy of the Clinton's treasure. For this, the ultimate "thanks for a job well done" will come from their children.

J. A. TERRY, ROANOKE, ALA., BLACK BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

MR. ALLEN. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an event that will take place in Roanoke, Ala., on Wednesday, October 29. On that day the local chamber of commerce will hold a luncheon to honor J. A. Terry, a lifelong resident of the community, who in just 6 years has built a family sewing operation into a million-dollar-a-year industry that now employs more than 60 persons.

Mr. Terry typifies the Horatio Alger hero who makes boyhood dreams come true through the sweat of his own brow. His success is also a reminder that the American family unit is still a powerful force when it works together to meet a common dream.

Mr. Terry was educated in his local high school and trade school and then worked for a number of years for the Air Force where he became expert in sewing operations.

His dream was to enter the garment business. In 1963, with only small savings but great ambitions, he started the Terry Manufacturing Co. in his hometown. Because of his high character and good reputation, he gained financial assistance from local lending institutions and Small Business Administration.

He trained his own employees, drawing them from the ranks of the unemployed, those on welfare or from those working as domestics. He started with five sewing machines in a small wooden building.

Today, the Terry Manufacturing Co. operates in a modern 16,000 square foot plant where more than 60 employees produce clothing valued at more than \$1 million wholesale per year.

Mr. President, this is truly a remarkable success story to tell in an age when so many left leaners are saying such success is not possible. I take a pardonable pride in this story because it is taking place in a small city in a rural area of a southern State, my home State of Alabama.

When he was asked why he decided to start his business in Roanoke, Ala., Mr. Terry, who is a Negro said:

We wanted to show that black people can promote themselves; that they can be an asset to the town, to the country, to the economy; we wanted to do something to improve conditions rather than running away from those conditions.

Mr. Terry has been named "Black Businessman of the Year" by the National Association of Market Developers which is joining the chamber of commerce in sponsoring the luncheon on October 29.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Birmingham News of October 15 and a fact sheet relating to the Terry Manufacturing Co.'s history and telling some of its plans for the future.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Oct. 15, 1959]

ROANOKE WILL HONOR NEGRO BUSINESSMAN

ROANOKE, ALA.—J. A. Terry, a Negro who earned the respect of the whites in this eastern Alabama community by building a million-dollar garment-manufacturing business from a shoestring says he wanted to show that black people can be an asset.

"We wanted to show that black people can promote themselves; that they can be an asset to the town, to the county, to the economy," the 55-year-old Terry said. "We wanted to help build something for ourselves."

Recognition of Terry's efforts comes Oct. 29, when the Chamber of Commerce will honor him at a luncheon. It may be the first time in the rural South that an all-white Chamber of Commerce has paid such a tribute to a Negro.

Terry is proud of the honor. "We've worked hard to get where we are today," he said in an interview Tuesday. "We'll have to work even harder to show people that all the nice things they're saying about us are justified."

When Terry says "we," he means his employees, himself and his family, which includes his wife and three sons who have worked closely with him since the beginning. "Without the unity of this family, we could not possibly have come this far," he said.

Terry, a native of Roanoke, received his education in high school and trade schools. He then learned and supervised practically every type of sewing operation while working for the federal government at Wright-Patterson Air Base experimental station for seven years in the 1940s.

He decided to enter the garment business and saved every penny he could. Little help was available when he started Terry Manufacturing Co. in 1963, but he picked up the

support of banks in Roanoke and nearby Wadley and the Small Business Administration along the way.

He started with five power sewing machines, housed in a small frame building and began manufacturing garments, training new employees as he expanded. Most of these employees were either unemployed, on welfare, or employed as domestic earning \$10 to \$15 per week.

Today he employs more than 60 persons, is housed in a new 16,000-square-foot plant and wholesales more than \$1 million worth of clothing a year.

He said he thought about leaving his home to seek greener pastures but rejected the thought. "The idea was that we should do something with what we had, do something to improve conditions rather than running away from those conditions," he said.

Many Negroes were leaving this Randolph County town of 6,000 in 1963 in search of jobs.

Terry hopes to increase employment to about 100 persons.

Most of his sales are to wholesalers, but he is trying to develop retail outlets. He said this prospect "looks pretty good."

One of his products is Afro-style garments for men and women. Individuals and small shops are being recruited to sell the Afro garments on and near the nation's black college campuses.

"This is just in the beginning stage," he said. He added the white community has shown no adverse reaction to the garments' manufacture.

In fact, the white community thinks he's doing an outstanding job.

"He's doing something for his race, instead of inciting them to riot," said J. C. Washington, manager of the local Chamber of Commerce.

Terry, named "Black Businessman of the Year" by the National Association of Market Developers which is jointly sponsoring the luncheon to be held in the National Guard Armory, is looking forward to Oct. 29.

"It's rewarding to know that at least you've overcome many things," he said. "It's gratifying to find out that someone else is concerned with what we're trying to do."

FACT SHEET OF TERRY MANUFACTURING CO., ROANOKE, ALA.

I. BACKGROUND

In early 1963 Jesse A. Terry began the long, hard struggle to implement the idea which he formulated in his mind many years earlier. He put together every penny that he had saved or that he could earn in his successful upholstery business in order to buy sewing machines and pay wages to the ladies who he began to train as power machine operators. While his upholstery shop was earning a good living for himself and his family, J. A. Terry had a deep belief that the skills which he had learned could be used to provide employment for a larger number of his people, and at the same time to build a potentially profitable business. Having learned and supervised practically every type of sewing operation while employed by the Federal Government at Wright-Patterson Air Base experimental station during the 1940's, the apparel industry was the obvious choice. Training began with about five machines, and a like number of ladies willing to learn. Since that time the small frame building has grown, with three expansions, to a thoroughly modern 16,000 sq. ft. plant employing more than 60 highly skilled persons. All of these persons were trained by, and at the expense of, Terry Mfg. Co. Most of these persons were either: (1) unemployed, (2) on welfare, or (3) employed as domestics earning \$10.00 to \$15.00 per week. While this training has been a tremendous expense for the company, Mr. Terry feels that the future will well justify the cost. Although little help was available at the beginning, Mr. Terry has picked up the support of local banks (Roan-

oke and nearby Wadley) and the Small Business Administration along the way. This help has been an absolute necessity in securing the present physical facilities, but has been inadequate to provide the working capital necessary to build what Mr. Terry terms "a truly first-rate manufacturing and sales organization.

II. STAFF

Working closely with Mr. Terry since the beginning have been the other members of his family, his wife and three sons. "Without the unity of this family," he says, "we would not possibly have come this far." Mrs. Velma Terry has provided invaluable assistance as floor supervisor since the first day. Roy Terry traveled the 80 miles from Atlanta to Roanoke as often as possible while attending Morehouse College and the Atlanta University School of Business and is now vice-president of the company. Rudolph Terry, a recent Phi Beta Kappa Morehouse College graduate, is now the Production Manager. William Terry, although still in school at Morehouse, spends quite a bit of time traveling and purchasing for the company.

In addition to the Terry Family, the management team includes other key individuals. Mrs. Ramonia Drake serves ably as Quality Control Supervisor. Miss Willo Strickland, who will graduate from Albany State College (Ga.) in June, is the Operator Efficiency Supervisor. In addition, Mr. Terry states that he is searching for persons who have skills and talents in all phases of the apparel industry, from sewing to selling, or persons who are willing to learn.

III. PRODUCTS AND SALES

The highly versatile plant has made numerous types of clothing, from blouses to bell-bottom slacks. However, the main area of concentration now centers around ladies' dresses and uniforms.

The present plant produces some 6,000 to 7,000 of these items per week with a wholesale value of more than \$1,000,000 annually. While most of Terry Mfg. Co.'s sales contacts are with wholesalers rather than the retail outlets, their garments reach the ultimate consumer through most of the major chain stores. The direct sales made to the large retailers have so far been "less than overwhelming," according to Roy Terry. "However, some of them now seem to be expressing genuine interest, especially in our Afro style garments for men and ladies and our ladies' uniforms."

Plans are also now in the process of being implemented which will supply these items to other markets. Individuals and small shops are being recruited to sell the Afro Dashiki garments on and near the nation's black college campuses. Also, the uniforms are being catalogued for mail-order sales through persons in local communities (e.g. nurses, beauticians, etc.) who will take orders on a commission basis.

IV. THE FUTURE

The future for Terry Manufacturing Company looks bright. Plans are already being made to increase employment to about 100 persons so that expected increases in sales can be adequately provided for. There is a solid nucleus of management and production personnel who expect to build a much larger and better organization. Mr. J. A. Terry undeniably deserved the "Black Businessman of the year for 1969" award recently presented to him by the National Association of Market Developers. Further testimony to the contribution to "black capitalism" made by Mr. Terry and his company is the Awards Luncheon for him on October 29, 1969 sponsored by the local all-white Chamber of Commerce. It is believed that this is the first time that a black man has been so honored by a Chamber of Commerce in the rural South.

A high level federal government official will deliver the keynote address. Representatives of education, business, and government on the local, state, and national level are ex-

pected to attend. All major news media have been invited. On this same date, open house for the guests and the general public will be observed in order to exhibit the recently expanded plant facility. Local citizens look forward to this day as a history-making event for the community and the nation.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM—ADDRESS BY MAYOR SAM YORTY

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, on October 13, 1969, the distinguished mayor of Los Angeles, Sam Yorty, made what I consider to be a most forthright and perceptive speech to the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers at their annual convention.

Mayor Yorty very clearly pointed out what most of us understand "down in our consciousness" about the effect on Hanoi of the October 15 moratorium.

Mr. President, believing that Sam Yorty has articulated the majority view, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks on this matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY LOS ANGELES MAYOR SAM YORTY

And so what's happening? We find again this great crescendo, this great building up of subversives, dupes, and people who don't understand, who think they are just marching against war—we are all against war—and they are trying to put the pressure on President Nixon to concede to the Communist demands.

They want the President to just pull out of there or agree to pull out on a certain timetable so that the Communists can know then that if they just hang on, they have a chance to victory and this is where they are planning to win the war now. They are not going to win it in South Viet Nam any more and they know it. We have paid horribly to get into this situation, more than we needed to, more than our allies needed to, but we have paid it already and they are in sad shape and they know they have to do something to try and force Nixon not to even take them out of the war.

I want you to remember what President Eisenhower did, and I asked him in Palm Springs after he retired. I said, "General, I have heard so much about what happened in Korea, I'd like to just hear from you just what did you really do?" He said, "Mayor, it's simple." He said, "I got tired of waiting for them to negotiate and I sent word to them through diplomatic channels 'if you don't want to negotiate, I am going to take the restrictions off of American weapons and where we are to use them.'" And he said, "In ten days I had a note that they wanted to sit down and negotiate and have a ceasefire."

So we are reaching a point now where the Communists know that President Nixon has walked the last mile. He has given them about all the rope he intends to give them. They know there is going to be a decisive change and they want some assurance that the change will be that we will pull out and that the President won't have the backing of the American people to see that we are not going to turn tail and be defeated with the consequences to the world, which I hope our people understand.

And so this great moratorium that they are talking about, this march, can only do one thing—it can encourage the Communists to stay in the war and increase American and allied casualties. So believe me, I don't think much of the politicians encouraging this moratorium and I hope that somewhere down

in their consciousness, they have some conception of what they are doing with American kids out there on that line risking their lives. And I say again, as far as I am concerned, I have told President Johnson and I have told President Nixon, that I don't think any President has the right to send kids out there to risk their lives under these restrictions because when you send them out there and say "risk your lives" but at home we say "don't escalate", what are you really saying? You are saying "let the kids risk their lives but don't do anything to risk mine because if you escalate, I might get involved and we are afraid of the Russians." Well, I'll tell you I'd rather we'd risk our lives than those kids'. They have their whole lives ahead of them.

We have reached the point that what we need is for the President to hear from the rest of the people of the nation and not just from the loud dissenters and the marchers who are the same kind of people who insisted on the appeasement of Hitler which brought such catastrophe to the world.

North Viet Nam, with just the right kind of ultimatum and if they really think we mean it—will get out of South Viet Nam and get out pretty fast. We have the power to absolutely eradicate that country in a couple of days if we wanted to do it and it is about time we let them know that the great United States of America is not about to be defeated by the kind of Communist tactics, both there and subversion at home and around the world, that they are practicing against us.

COMMENTS ON NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE OF OCTOBER 16, 1969, ON PACIFICATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the New York Times article of October 16 on pacification represents an independent assessment of the real progress which has been made in this area in Vietnam over the past year. It confirms what our own officials are reporting about the substantial improvements which have been made in reestablishing security in the rural areas in Vietnam.

This progress in pacification is attributable to three major factors:

First, the offensive tactics used constantly by American and Vietnamese military units in seeking out enemy forces and preventing them from massing in a manner which would enable them to disrupt pacification.

Second, the increase in numbers and improvements in training and armaments of the Vietnamese Regional Forces and Popular Forces who provide security to the Vietnamese people at the village and hamlet level.

Third, the increasing effectiveness of the Vietnamese Government in carrying out the pacification program, starting with the special 3 months "accelerated pacification campaign" of November-December 1968 and January 1969. Formerly pretty much an American program, the Vietnamese Government has now taken on this program as its own.

The most striking corroboration of progress in pacification, as the New York Times article indicates, is through the improvement of road security and the return of tens of thousands of refugees to their hamlets of origin. The article speaks of these people as "leaving the Communist-controlled areas and moving into those more or less under Government control." Actually, these people left Communist-controlled areas in most

cases 4 or 5 years ago and are now moving back to their own hamlets in areas over which the Government has recently taken control from the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

PACIFICATION IN RURAL VIETNAM MAKING BIG BUT FRAGILE GAINS (By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, October 15.—The road that runs south from Saigon to Cantho is clogged these days with trucks and cars that rattle along with careless abandon.

Sixteen months ago, in the wake of the Lunar New Year offensive, a drive along the stretch between My Tho and Cantho was a perilous adventure. Vietcong guerrillas regularly planted mines under the pavement and floated explosives under the bridges. In the evening and early morning snipers fired at passing cars from the trees lining the road.

Today as an extensive auto trip has confirmed, the only danger along Route 4 is the traffic, which is dreadful, and the potholes, which can shatter an axle.

The improved security along the road is one of the more visible examples of the progress achieved over the last year by the allied pacification program. While the enemy has concentrated his attacks on military targets, the \$600-million-a-year effort to secure and develop the South Vietnamese countryside has proceeded almost without opposition.

The gains during the period have been striking. Rural security has been greatly increased—although American officials concede that it is still fragile—and the Saigon Government's control now reaches deeper into the countryside than it has for at least two years.

The expanded security in the countryside is a result of a combination of the pacification program and the enemy's decision during the last 10 months to concentrate on military targets.

With an eye toward escalating American casualties, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have directed their principal efforts this year against Allied military installations rather than civilian targets. As a result, the forces assigned to the pacification program have encountered little opposition as they have pushed deeper into the countryside.

They have been operating in a sort of military vacuum, and the American officials in charge of the program are quick to concede that the progress that has been made would not have been possible had the enemy been determined to frustrate it.

Nonetheless, the officials, capitalizing on the opportunity, have redoubled their efforts during the widespread lull that has descended over the battlefield since the middle of August. They are attempting to make the most of it because they realize that it cannot last indefinitely. They acknowledge that the major test lies ahead, when the enemy turns his attention to the fruits of the program.

The officials well remember the Tet offensive of 1968, which delivered a severe setback to the gains achieved by the pacification program in 1967 and shattered the boundless optimism that characterized the official American attitude at the time.

"WE REALIZE ITS LIMITS"

Varied and widespread though it is, American officials readily acknowledge, the security that prevails in much of Vietnam could easily be upset by a determined enemy effort.

"There has been a steady expansion of security and Government control throughout the year," William E. Colby, who directs the pacification effort, said in a recent interview.

"But I realize its limits. We know it is still thin in many areas. It is thin at night and in the rural areas away from the towns."

To test the security, this reporter set off with two others on a five-day, 400 mile drive through the heart of the Mekong Delta. Unarmed and in a Volkswagen sedan, we drove the length of Route 4 from Saigon to Cantho, then up the bank of the Mekong River to Chaudoc, a lovely province capital on the Cambodian border, and back through Sadec and My Tho to Saigon.

NO SOUND OF GUNFIRE

We passed through towns, villages and hamlets and through miles of lush, green paddy fields without hearing a shot. Men and women are working the fields without visible concern for their safety, and in the towns the restaurants were busy until the curfew forced them to close.

A handful of mining incidents were reported during the week on some of the roads we used, but we encountered none of them.

The areas toured seemed prosperous as well as secure.

Television antennas poked up from innumerable thatched roofs, and in the towns gleaming new Japanese motorcycles crowded the sidewalks.

As another example of the improved security, Jim Clare, a reporter for Stars and Stripes, the Army newspaper, recently hitchhiked the length of Route 1—the late Bernard Fall's "Street Without Joy"—from the demilitarized zone to Saigon. He made the trip in 13 days without incident, arriving here last week.

In January, 1967, Michele Ray, a French free-lance journalist was kidnapped by the Vietcong when she attempted the same trip. She was released after three weeks in captivity. No one else had tried it since.

Gerold Hickey, the anthropologist who first came to Vietnam in 1962, recently compared the present security to the conditions that prevailed in the summer of 1964, before the vast American buildup was under way.

STILL MANY RISKY AREAS

"We used to drive up and down the coast and all through the Delta in those days," he said. "Now people are doing it again. You can drive from Danang to Dongha now. A year or 18 months ago it would have been suicide."

None of this is to say that there are not areas that the Vietcong dominate either wholly or in part. There are still many districts in the Delta and in the north where an American driving in anything less substantial than a tank is risking his life.

And there are still many areas that the Vietcong can rely on for sanctuary, support and supplies. Even in many of the regions where the Government presence has recently been established, the Vietcong still conduct their business at night and collect taxes on a regular basis.

But the pendulum has swung in the direction of the Government during the last year, and the shift is reflected in the much-maligned computerized analyses prepared each month by the experts on pacification. In the past their findings have been sharply challenged, by members of Congress among others.

According to official American figures, 89 per cent of the South Vietnamese people were living under "relatively secure" control of the Saigon Government as of Aug. 31—15.3 million of a population of 17.3 million. In the rural areas the figures are lower but still high; 84 per cent of those outside the cities enjoy "relative security."

A DEFINITION BY THIEU

In some cases that security is very relative—particularly at night, when the Vietcong are most active. In a recent speech President Nguyen Van Thieu came up with a definition of a relatively secure area that most people agree with. It means, he said,

October 21, 1969

an area that "Government representatives can visit without military escort in the daytime."

Even President Thieu would readily acknowledge that the situation can easily change at night or from one day to another.

The generally improved security is mainly a result of the enlarging and equipping of the regional and popular forces, nicknamed the Ruff Puffs, which along with the regular army, have taken over a large share of the military side of pacification. As a result of relentless American prodding, and in the absence of significant enemy opposition, they have spread out into the countryside and taken up the front-line defense of much of the rural population.

In addition a home-grown militia composed of men too young or old for the draft and of some women and girls has been developed over the last year and a half. There are about 1.5 million members of these people's self-defense force who guard their own villages or hamlets at night. About a million of them have received some rudimentary military training, and they have some 300,000 arms.

Although their contribution to defense may not be great in purely military terms, their presence has provided a major boost to morale.

SHIFT FROM VIETCONG AREAS

The relative security, despite its thinness, is attracting people into the newly pacified communities. Increasing numbers of refugees are leaving the Communist-controlled areas and moving into those more or less under Government control. Politics is not usually involved; people are simply in search of an opportunity to live and work in peace—a rare luxury in Vietnam.

Few officials doubt that the tide would be running in the opposition direction if the people believed they had a better prospect in the Vietcong areas.

There has also been a stirring of political life in the villages during the last year, and this too is a by-product of the pacification program. Elections have been held in about 1,900 of the 2,300 villages in South Vietnam, and though some difficulty was experienced in getting enough people who were both qualified and willing to run, the voting is said to have had a generally positive effect.

New village officials have been given substantial budgets to use for local development, and they now have administrative control over the rural development workers sent by the central Government as part of the pacification effort.

As a result the officials are operating with greater autonomy than they have had since President Ngo Dinh Diem suspended village elections 14 years ago. Returned to their traditional role, they have a vested interest in continued Government control.

Government troops and pacification workers recently pushed into an area in Sadec Province, in the Mekong Delta, long held by the Vietcong and known as the Triangle. They secured three villages that had been abandoned for more than a year, and within a month refugees poured back into the area. The fields surrounding the villages have been planted for the first time in several seasons, village elections have been held and the Government presence appears to be firmly established.

"The elections have produced the beginnings of community awareness and responsibility in the villages," Mr. Colby said. "But let's not overdo it—it's just a beginning, and we know it."

"The important thing is whether the structure we have set up is strong enough to resist the shock of an enemy attack," he said. "We have been working for the past year in a relative vacuum, but now we have documents that indicate that the enemy feels he must do something about the situation. So it's up to us to prepare for it."

The pacification program is a massive assistance and advisory effort that employs 14,500 people, including 7,300 Americans. Its goal is to extend the Government's presence in the countryside and rejuvenate economic and political life in the rural areas that have been disrupted by the Vietcong. But its primary task is security, and that is how its success is measured.

Officials of the pacification program have been expecting some enemy response since early this year, and they acknowledge that they have been mystified by the lack of it.

Now, as the result of the capture of a command-level enemy document, they expect it shortly. The document, which American analysts believe to be authentic, calls for a concerted military and political campaign to reverse the gains achieved.

In its ominous way the document is a compliment to the program—the first clear indication that the enemy is sufficiently concerned to attempt to counteract it.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SUPPORT SENATE RESOLUTION 271

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on October 13, I introduced, with 35 other Senators, Senate Resolution 271, calling on the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front to take certain steps toward bringing an end to the Vietnam war. I have received considerable response supporting the resolution, a response which is most encouraging, from a group whose devotion to this country and its ideals is unchallenged and unwavering.

Today I received a letter from Raymond P. Neal, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, endorsing Senate Resolution 271 and supporting it in principle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1969.
Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
New Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: Thank you very much for sending us the copies of S. Res. 271 and remarks which you made upon introducing the resolution in the Senate.

The resolution calls upon the North Vietnamese Government and the National Liberation Front to take the following steps:

(1) acknowledge that a just and mutually agreed settlement is the best hope for lasting peace;

(2) show at the Paris peace talks the same flexibility and desire for compromise which the Allies have clearly demonstrated over the past year;

(3) agree to direct negotiations between representatives of the National Liberation Front and of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam as proposed by the latter;

(4) withdraw their insistence on Allied surrender through their demand for the overthrow of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam before genuinely free elections could be held; and

(5) provide information on the status of United States prisoners of war held in North Vietnam and by the National Liberation Front, and give evidence that these prisoners are being treated humanely in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention;

The resolution resolves that it is the sense

of the Senate that the United States must maintain its one fundamental goal in Vietnam of peace, with self-determination for the South Vietnamese people.

The five principles set forth in the resolution are, in our opinion most sensible, reasonable and practical and should appeal to all Americans who have a genuine concern for the security and welfare of our Country.

The DAV supports S. Res. 271, in principle; and, like you, we urge the North Vietnamese representatives to come forward with a positive and meaningful response.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND P. NEAL,
National Commander.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—LXVIII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a report on the relationship between DDT and hazards to human health was recently issued by the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., an organization of scientists and attorneys with headquarters in Stony Brook, N.Y.

Evidence has definitely confirmed that DDT is causing the extinction of some species of fish and wildlife. Yet the effects of these same pesticides on human health have never been clearly understood, although evidence suggests links to liver and stomach ailments and to cancer. Now, recent studies on mice conducted by scientists supported by the National Cancer Institute confirm that DDT is a tumor-causing agent.

This is another aspect of the pesticide controversy about which we should be seriously concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that the Environmental Defense Fund press release be printed in the RECORD.

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

STUDIES SHOW DDT TO BE CARCINOGENIC—
PETITION TO FDA REQUESTS ZERO TOLERANCE IN FOODS

Recent studies by a team of scientists supported by the National Cancer Institute have confirmed earlier evidence that the insecticide DDT is a carcinogenic or cancer-causing agent. The experiments were done with mice, but earlier work with rats and trout gave similar results. Another study showed that people dying of cancer contained higher than average amounts of DDT in their fat, a finding that could be interpreted as being consistent with the animal experiments.

This information formed the basis of a petition to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) filed today by California Rural Legal Assistance on behalf of five pregnant or nursing women and the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. (EDF), an organization of scientists and attorneys based in Stony Brook, New York. The petition requests FDA to lower the tolerance limits on DDT residues in human foods to zero, based on a law stating that carcinogenic materials cannot be tolerated in human food. Traces of DDT are widespread in foods, and all humans carry some DDT in their tissues.

As early as 1947 a study by FDA itself showed that when DDT was fed to rats there was an increased incidence of liver tumors [Fitzhugh & Nelson, J. Pharmacol. Exp. Therap. 89, 18-30 (1947)]. Similar results were obtained recently using rainbow trout, where DDT in the food of the fish caused the formation of hepatomas [Halver, Bur. Sport Fish. Wildl. Res. Rept. 70, 78-101 (1967)].

Hungarian scientists examined more than

1,000 mice from five generations after adding 3 parts per million (ppm) of DDT to their diets. Leukemia appeared in 12.4% of the DDT mice, but only 2.5% of the non-DDT mice; 28.7% of the mice getting DDT developed tumors, while only 3.8% of the mice on clean food had tumors. Most of the malignancies in the DDT group were in the later generations [Tarjan & Kemeny, Ed. *Cosmet. Toxicol.* 7, 215-22 (1969)].

In a recent, definitive, and large scale study supported by the National Cancer Institute, DDT added to the diet of mice quadrupled the frequency of tumors of the liver, lungs, and lymphoid organs. The dosage level was many times higher than that normally found in human foods, a standard procedure used to increase the sensitivity of the experiment in testing for carcinogenic activity. DDT was clearly carcinogenic to the mice because it caused cancers of the same kind and at approximately the same frequency as did known cancer-causing agents [Innes et al., *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 42, 1101-14 (1969); *Congressional Record*, S. 4412, 1 May 1969].

In studies done at the University of Miami School of Medicine, human victims of terminal cancer were found to contain more than twice as much DDT in their fat as did victims of accidental death. The accident victims carried 9.7 ppm, which is about average for Americans, while the cancer victims contained 20-25 ppm in their fat [Radomski, Delchmann, and Clizer, *Fd. Cosmet. Toxicol.* 6 209-20 (1968).] In this study there was no way to tell whether the increased retention of pesticides caused the disease, whether the disease caused the increased pesticide retention, or whether there was no relationship between the two.

ADDITIONAL DEATHS OF CALIFORNIANS IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, since Thursday, October 9, 1969, the Pentagon has notified 14 more California families of the death of a loved one in Vietnam.

Those killed were:

Maj. Moses L. Alves, husband of Mrs. T. Mary Alves, of Highland.

Pfc. John T. Baker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Claude D. Baker, of Bakersfield.

Pfc. Domingo Y. Garcia, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jesus A. Garcia of Five Points.

S/4 James H. Graham, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence B. Graham, of Garden Grove.

Lance Cpl. Michael L. Holtz, husband of Mrs. Sandra L. Holtz, of Redding.

Sgt. William O. Jackson, husband of Mrs. Gwendelyn Jackson, of Compton.

Pfc. Gary L. McCloud, son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis L. McCloud, of Sacramento.

S. Sgt. David L. McCombs, husband of Mrs. Diane L. McCombs, of Chula Vista.

Pfc. Elvis E. Mullen, husband of Mrs. Debra S. Mullen, of Elk Grove.

Lt. James L. Rhodes, husband of Mrs. Linda L. Rhodes, of Fallbrook.

Sgt. Harry C. Shepard, Jr., husband of Mrs. Jeanette Shepard, of Cannino.

Pfc. Gary D. Taylor, son of Mr. Clark F. Taylor, of Menlo Park.

Pvt. John E. Duarte, Jr., husband of Mrs. Inez N. Duarte, of Los Angeles.

Sgt. Tommy R. Thomas, son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy G. Thomas, of South San Gabriel.

They bring to 3,840 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH URGES INCREASED EDUCATIONAL AID FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I am privileged to serve, has written an excellent article for the September issue of the *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. In the article, entitled "The Learning Disabilities Act of 1969, a Commentary," Senator YARBOROUGH discusses the tremendous unmet needs that exist, and our efforts to provide handicapped children with the education which they need and deserve.

In the following passage from the article, Senator YARBOROUGH illustrates the huge gap that exists between the plans Congress has made to assist in the education of the handicapped, and the unwillingness of Congress to provide the necessary funds for this effort. In addition, he relates this tremendous gap between our authorizations and appropriations for this vitally needed program to the need for our Nation to reorder its priorities. Senator YARBOROUGH writes:

It can be said that we have taken the first step toward providing all children with the education they need and deserve, but there are many steps ahead. We can be justifiably proud of the increasing national commitment to education for the handicapped, and at the same time somewhat awed by what is before us. We should be humiliated by how little has been appropriated to do what the Congress has already authorized to be done. For the current year, only \$29 million was appropriated for Title VI grants, when the authorization was \$200 million. With over 5 million handicapped children, not counting children with specific learning disabilities, the basic support program is providing only \$5-\$6 per child.

This is a time when funds are scarce, but we will spend our dollars on what our society demands. There will be money enough for whatever we feel is truly important. We must decide, individually and as a nation, just what it is that we believe to be important.

Senator YARBOROUGH has drawn upon his experiences as a member of the Subcommittee on Education for almost 12 years in introducing S. 1190, entitled the "Children With Learning Disabilities Act of 1969." The bill would provide the authority and the commitment which I believe is necessary to stimulate our Government into the kind of support which is needed in the field of education for the handicapped, and I am proud to support it and work for its passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LEARNING DISABILITIES ACT OF 1969. A COMMENTARY

(By RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas, chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

Educational programs for 6 million handicapped children are needed. Only 2 million presently receive educational services. The lag between large Congressional authorizations and minimal appropriations limit funding to \$5-\$6 per handicapped child. Children with specific learning disabilities totaling between 500,000 and 1½ million are in espe-

cially bad plight with only 18% receiving assistance. The Federal government can and should play an influential role in the development of effective education for children with specific learning disabilities.

In the years that I have been privileged to serve in the United States Senate, 11½ years of that time on the Senate Education Subcommittee, I have had a chance to help develop and pass many major education bills which have enhanced the educational opportunities for countless numbers of the nation's citizens, tiny children just getting their start, primary youngsters, youth, and adults. Much of the effort has been directed to children in our elementary and secondary schools for strengthening the capability of the schools of our land to provide quality education for all children. Emphasis has been on better trained teachers, use of updated instructional materials and appropriate educational technology, relevance in curriculum practices, and the provision of special counseling, health and other services to meet individual needs so that youngsters may learn. Institutions of higher education have been assisted, not only in providing more opportunity for college students through financial assistance, strengthening of the graduate and undergraduate academics, but through the expansion and strengthening of those departments which concentrate on training of educational personnel.

In addition to providing the means to improve the educational systems, Congress has, as we so well know, given special attention to those unfortunate children whose special needs the education system must satisfy if they are to develop to their potential and participate as first class citizens in our society. I am referring to our children who suffer from extreme economic or environmental deprivation, or from physical or mental handicaps. Not only have we set a goal for excellence in education, but we have made a basic commitment in our nation to provide educational opportunity to every child.

However, there are areas where we are obviously falling short of our goals. We are only beginning to meet the needs of the handicapped and our gaps must be recognized and remedied if we are to move ahead. Called to my attention are recent figures from the state education agencies which point out that only 2.1 million of approximately 6 million handicapped children are receiving the educational services they need. Among these whose needs are not presently being met are those who have been found to have specific learning disabilities.

The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children has advised the Congress on the plight of these children and gave a conservative estimate indicating that between 500,000 and 1½ million, or 1 to 3 percent of the school age children are included in this category. Available data from federal reports indicate that less than 18 percent of children who may have been classified in this group are receiving services. This estimate is based on the annual reports received from the 50 states and the District of Columbia required by Title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a program which assists handicapped children in elementary and secondary schools.

To meet the needs of these children, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has estimated that over 22,000 teachers and specialists need to be trained immediately, and put into the field. Although there has been much progress in the education of handicapped children in recent years, at the state and local levels as well as federally, the gains we have made merely emphasize the needs which still exist.

The child with a learning disability frequently has an invisible handicap; however, it can be recognized. Authorities in the field tell me that the symptoms are revealed

through the child's persistent behavior deviations and learning difficulties. While it may frequently be an organic problem in its original cause, its major treatment rests within the educational program. The prognosis for improvement is dependent upon the recognition of the symptoms and proper diagnoses at the earliest possible age, with intensive remediation directed to the learning problems.

The progress which can be made by handicapped children when their educational needs are fulfilled is very, very impressive. We have seen many formerly handicapped youth join the ranks as productive members of society with the ability to take their places along with their fellow men without any hardship because of their handicaps. They received education and career preparation. They were given special educational services; they are as adjusted as the next man to the ways of life. I have seen many, unfortunately, whose handicaps have been multiplied as they became older, who had personality problems, lacked educational skills and the ability to make personal adjustments and the ability to hold a job. While in school, no one recognized their special needs or knew how to deal with them, so they experienced persistent school failures, became discouraged, turned inward into themselves and withdrew or were excluded from school. This must not happen! It is my personal conviction that many handicapped children, with appropriate education can be helped to enter the main stream of society, and this society must not fail them!

In an effort to bring the needed assistance to learning disabled children, on February 28th of this year, I introduced a bill, S. 1190, in this 91st session of the Congress, entitled: the *Children with Learning Disabilities Act of 1969*. This bill would provide for the types of special services so necessary at this stage in the development of the field of learning disabilities. It would authorize programs of research and related activities, surveys and demonstrations related to the education of children with specific learning disabilities; professional or advanced training for educational personnel who are teaching or preparing to be teachers of children with specific learning disabilities, or to support the training for persons who are preparing to be supervisors of teachers for such personnel. It would also provide for model centers for improvement of education of children with specific learning disabilities. Model centers could provide testing and educational evaluation to identify children with specific learning disabilities; develop and conduct model programs designed to meet the special educational needs of such children; and assist the appropriate educational agencies or professional organizations and institutions in making such model programs available to other children with specific learning disabilities.

It is my belief that through expanded research efforts we can find more effective methods and materials that will improve the education of these children. Through supporting training we can provide that supply of trained personnel without which all educational programs are impossible, and by establishing model centers we can demonstrate the best of current practice and provide the means by which others can emulate these good practices.

Aside from financial assistance, the federal government can and should play an influential role in the development of effective education programs for children with specific learning disabilities. One of its most important functions is to recognize and publicize the most critical needs of the field as they arise. It would seem that the most immediate and significant need in the field of learning disabilities right now, aside from those needs of identification, diagnosis, and ultimate remediation of learning problems, is that of leadership and teacher training. The training

of leaders and advanced graduate students subsequently results in the training of researchers, the setting up of supplemental services and research centers to improve diagnostic and remedial techniques, and the training of teachers. In addition, in-service programs could be facilitated for teachers who already work with children, thereby providing immediate and direct service to school districts as well as face-to-face contact with learning disabled children across the country.

For years, children whom we now recognize as having specific learning disabilities have slipped through the cracks of educational diagnosis. They have been called by a multitude of names, or lumped into larger heterogeneous groups. Despite old definitional difficulties, however, the fact remains that the problems of these children are finally beginning to be explored and understood. We have stopped giving definitions, and are now defining programs. What is needed now is a comprehensive program on the national level to serve these children, and to prevent future instances of misdiagnosis as has happened all too many times in the past.

In view of these needs, the members of the National Advisory Committee suggested in their recommendations to the Commissioner of Education, that the problems of children with specific learning disabilities are so important as to justify special attention and special consideration by the Congress. While it has been possible for children with specific learning disabilities to participate to some extent in the federal programs designed in the last few years to increase educational opportunity for handicapped children, these efforts are not comprehensive enough to provide a full-scale attack on the problem.

Personally, the kind of programs to help these youngsters which I support are those which will place the emphasis where it belongs: on an analysis of the learning task, on the development of special teaching techniques and materials, on meaningful use of these materials to find the learning abilities of the child, and to determine barriers to learning which must be circumvented. Coming to terms with these children in designing educational programs is going to help us to learn more about education for every child. It is going to help us to realize that children have individual learning styles and characteristics, and that we are going to have to do more than pay lip service to these individual differences. Educators should be able and will be able to design special, individualized, approaches to the learning tasks which face children.

In examining our recent efforts, we find that in 1966, Congress passed legislation creating Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This established a program of grants to the states, the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Title VI, also called the *Education for the Handicapped Act*, was more than a collection of several new programs... it was a symbol of a national concern for handicapped children. It was a statement of policy. In effect, the Congress said... "We recognize that the handicapped child and his parents have not been getting the full benefit of our educational system, and we feel that it is a national priority to do something about it. We must aid the local schools and the states in meeting this challenge."

It can be said that we have taken the first step toward providing all children with the education they need and deserve, but there are many steps ahead. We can be justifiably proud of the increasing national commitment to education for the handicapped, and at the same time somewhat awed by what is before us. We should be humiliated by how little has been appropriated to do what the Congress has already authorized to be done. For the current year, only \$29 million was appropriated for Title VI grants, when the au-

thorization was \$200 million. With over 5 million handicapped children, not counting children with specific learning disabilities, the basic support program is providing only \$5-\$6 per child.

This is a time when funds are scarce, but we will spend our dollars on what our society demands. There will be money enough for whatever we feel is truly important. We must decide, individually and as a nation, just what it is that we believe to be important.

People often ask how politicians think and what it is that we value in life. The true measure of our lives is what we have done in office to improve the lot of our fellow man, to improve the quality of our civilization. To me, steps such as we have taken in the past and will continue to take in the future to aid the handicapped are an important reason for our arduous exertions to assume and retain the offices we hold. Without progress in these and other areas of greatest need, governmental service would be a bleak and gloomy life. Only by aiding others can our work earn the title of "service."

CONTRACTS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH NATIONAL LEAGUE OF INSURED SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President, under our AID program a series of contracts involving expenditures of \$355,000 has been negotiated with the National League of Insured Savings Associations wherein this organization is supposed to furnish the services of construction inspectors and technical supervision for the inspection of housing and all other work requiring certification under the housing guarantee program in Latin America.

The National League of Insured Savings Associations, with Washington offices or Washington representatives, is a lobbyist for the U.S. savings and loan group.

Under our democratic system there is nothing wrong with American industry joining together and employing Washington representatives or lobbyists to keep them informed of legislation affecting their industry, but it is strange to find the Federal Government entering into contracts with these same Washington representatives or lobbyists and paying them to act as advisers to the Government on programs under which they as an industry could be affected.

As an example as to how this can raise questions of a potential conflict of interest, I call attention to a situation wherein one of the individuals assigned to carry out the duties under this contract was an officer and member of the board of directors of the association and also the president of a Federal savings and loan association operating in Hyattsville, Md. The Inter-American Development Bank, which was involved in financing the Latin American operations, arranged a loan for a savings and loan association in Peru, and one of the requirements of this U.S. Government loan to this Peruvian savings and loan association called for the dollar deposits in a U.S. institution. These dollar deposits by the Peruvian Savings and Loan Association, which received the loans from IDB and which were required to be deposited in American banks, were placed in the Hyattsville bank of which this offi-

cial was the president. In fact, as recently as July 31, 1969, a call to this Hyattsville savings and loan association confirmed that he was still carried as an officer and active member of that bank.

This potential conflict of interest was called to the attention of AID, and presumably after what they described as a thorough review of the circumstances they concluded there was no conflict of interest and that the above circumstances were merely coincidental.

One of these task orders for services—contract No. 4—the largest, was entered into on March 29, 1968, with a cost limitation of \$95,000. Less than 7 months later this task order cost limitation was increased to \$355,000. As of April 30, 1969, \$193,321 had been paid.

Subsequent amendments to their contract expanded the services of the contractor to provide program development services for international savings and loan conferences, seminars, exhibits, training programs, and related meetings designed to achieve the objectives of the Latin America housing investment guaranty program. Many of the stipulated services outlined under contract No. 4 appeared to be duplications of the first contract.

This contract with the National League of Insured Savings and Loan Associations provides that they can set up Washington offices and charge AID for executive and clerical salaries, office supplies, travel expenses, telephone and telegraph, publication subscriptions, and so forth, to which they can add 20 percent before they begin charging for task orders and contracts they are supposed to carry out in Latin America. In the period January 16, 1967, through April 1969, \$200,391 was paid to the National League for administrative costs, plus \$22,000.00 for overhead, making a total of \$222,391 as administrative costs to support task orders amounting to only \$177,855.

It appears that the National League of Insured Savings Associations may be using this contract with AID to defray a portion of the expenses for maintaining a Washington office for their organization whose primary duties are to keep their membership advised of the legislative processes at the national level and on occasions to testify before Congressional committees expressing the views of the organization which they as lobbyists represent.

I recommend that this contract not be renewed.

NURSING HOMES FOR THE AGED AND INFIRM

MR. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for thousands of our Nation's elderly the problem of finding a good nursing home involves a painful and anguishing search.

It is a sad commentary on our society that many of its nursing homes are cold, callous, and cash oriented and only a very few are warm, helpful, and caring.

The articles published in Parade magazine and the Trumbull Times describe the kind of love, care, and service that can be built into these homes.

St. Joseph's Manor, in Trumbull, Conn., run by the Carmelite Sisters for

the Aged and Infirm, has often been the subject of study and praise. I have visited this home, and I know its administrator, Mother Bernadette. St. Joseph's and Mother Bernadette well deserve the kind remarks made by these authors, for St. Joseph's fully provides the warmth, love, and care that should be found in all our homes for the elderly.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Parade magazine]

NURSING HOMES FOR PEOPLE, NOT PROFIT

(By Sid Ross and Herbert Kupferberg)

Are there any good nursing homes in the U.S.? It's a question that is being asked more and more frequently by thousands of old people moldering in institutions which often provide inadequate, indifferent care, and by sons and daughters who pay large sums to keep them there.

The answer to the question is: "Yes, but far from enough." Many nursing homes fully deserve their notoriety as "elephants' graveyards" where old people come to die in hopelessness and despair. But there exists a handful of excellent establishments which disprove the theory that nursing homes have to be cold, callous and cash-oriented. These good nursing homes constitute maybe 5 percent of the 25,000 which exist today. But there's no reason why they couldn't total 95 percent, provided they regarded their residents basically as people to care for rather than "bodies" to make money from.

"We want our elderly residents to live out their lives as independently and happily as possible." That's the policy enunciated by Mother Bernadette, the administrator of St. Joseph's Manor in Trumbull, Conn., and it's the philosophy that motivates the better nursing homes throughout the land, most of which are affiliated with religious or philanthropic groups.

St. Joseph's, where 265 men and women are living out their years in comfort and contentment, is one of a number of old-age establishments run by the Carmelite Sisters for the Aged and Infirm. The Roman Catholic order regards old people as objects of love, not charity, and considers it just as important to have a first-rate pastry chef to serve them as a gleaming, up-to-date clinical laboratory. Although many of the residents at St. Joseph's are ill, they're never called "patients." They live in cheerful rooms with private baths, they have a broad range of social activities available, but they're not pushed into doing anything. They don't even have to eat in the pleasant dining room—if they prefer, they can take meals in their rooms or get a snack in the "Wedgewood Room," a comfortable lounge that has a cocktail bar tucked away in the corner.

NO PRESSURE

The average age of the dwellers in St. Joseph's is 82, and some of them have spent time in other institutions before coming there. "I've never seen another place like it," says one 84-year-old woman. "There's no pressure, everything is right where I want it, and the sisters are marvelous." Smiles St. Joseph's administrator, Mother Bernadette: "Our philosophy rests on respect for the human being—respect for his soul and spirit as well as his body."

The one problem with a place like St. Joseph's is the difficulty of getting in. Most of its residents come from Fairfield County, Conn., and the majority are Catholics, though other religions are represented. There's a long waiting list. Unlike some institutions, St. Joseph's and similar homes demand no life contracts, assignments of assets or other money-grabbing arrangements.

The base rate paid by its occupants is \$463 a month. It operates at a loss, of course, which is made up by donations from the Bridgeport Diocese and by the devoted services of the Carmelite Sisters.

Deficits—and services—also are the stories of such excellent institutions as the Isabella Geriatric Center of New York City, affiliated with the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, and Golden Acres of Dallas, Tex., which has the support of the Dallas Jewish Welfare Federation.

The administrators of these institutions call them places "to live, not to die." The elderly residents themselves describe them even more eloquently.

IT HAS EVERYTHING

Says Miss Bessie Bishop, an 85-year-old retired New York City schoolteacher who pays \$321.50 a month for one of the 231 cheerful apartments in Isabella House, a beautiful new 17-story edifice in upper Manhattan: "I get everything here. A beautiful apartment, good meals, and a wonderful feeling of security. I don't have to worry about getting sick at night. I just press the buzzer. I stay cheerful and enjoy myself. I go out every day, visit friends, go to the theater. I wouldn't be anywhere else."

Adds 91-year-old woman who lives down the hall: "I love it here. They don't let you rot away. They make you feel that you not only have a brain but that you should use it as long as you're alive. They help give you the grit to keep on living. That's why I won't ever give up."

Director Herbert Shore of Dallas' Golden Acres agrees that a good home should have as its prime objective to preserve social and intellectual skills, as well as bodily well-being. "We want to treat the total person," he says, "not just a broken hip or cardiac condition."

Golden Acres, which gives its 164 residents keys to their rooms and to the front door, and lets them come and go as they please, will run risks to help foster a spirit of independence. It once sent a busload of its elderly residents 250 miles to the HemisFair in San Antonio. "We decided we'd take the risk of someone dying on the trip," explains Shore. "At that age, they could die suddenly in bed. On an enjoyable outing, at least it's with their boots on."

Shore also has an unexpected word of understanding for families who want to send aged parents or grandparents to a nursing home. Most families, he says, haven't got the know-how, to say nothing of the money, to care for the aged. "Children," he contends, "shouldn't give up their lives just for an old parent, especially when this care can almost never be as well as it should be."

A 76-year-old man living at Golden Acres agrees with him: "I have seven daughters and I could live with almost any one of them. But they have their own lives to lead, and so do I. With them, I'd feel left out and in the way. I'm better off here."

LONG WAITING LISTS

At Golden Acres and at Isabella, as at St. Joseph's, there are hundreds waiting to get in. For though homes such as these can and do operate throughout the country, there simply aren't enough of them. Instead the U.S. has seen a tremendous upsurge in recent years of private, proprietary, profit-making nursing homes—their growth abetted largely by Medicaid and Medicare payments from the government. It's estimated that federal expenditures for nursing home patients amount to \$750 million a year. Currently, new nursing home issues have burgeoned on the stock market, with the magazine *Harvest Years* reporting that such securities "are hotter than they've been for years."

Officials of places like St. Joseph's, Isabella and Golden Acres acknowledge that the private nursing homes have a function to

October 21, 1969

perform—they only wish that some of them would perform it better.

Parade visited one of the better private nursing homes, Hillhaven of Orange, Calif., one of a chain of such institutions. It's a pleasant, modern one-story building with a 112-bed capacity. Fees are \$35 a day for a private room, \$22 for two in a room, \$17 for three. Anything above basic services costs extra.

Unlike St. Joseph's Isabella and Golden Acres, Hillhaven isn't a geriatric center operating at all levels of old age care, accommodating those in good health and bad alike. It's strictly for sick people, and since a great deal of medical care is often required, bills can soar. The average length of stay is seldom more than 90 days. Explains Hillhaven's administrator, Mrs. Florence Kirkland, a registered nurse: "A place like ours can't take all long-termers. We'd become a warehouse. Also, we couldn't afford it; we'd lose money."

GOOD EATING

To a visitor, a Hillhaven hasn't got the heart or the warmth of an Isabella, a St. Joseph's or a Golden Acres. But its staff is ample, its administrators patient, its upkeep meticulous, and its meals excellent. Most of the patients seem to be reasonably content as they sun themselves outdoors, watch TV in their rooms, or chat with visitors in lounges. To relatives of old people who might have guilt feelings about sending them "away," places like Hillhaven are a paradise compared to many nursing and old age homes.

But do they provide an adequate answer in a country whose over-65 population now is over 18 million, and is rising rapidly as new advances in medicine and science expand the average span of life? Many responsible authorities are of the opinion that while the private establishments should continue to play an important role in meeting the problems of our aging population, a much more comprehensive, systematic, and communally supported approach is needed. Sums up Isabella's Lawrence E. Larson: "Laws and regulations must be changed to recognize that this kind of care is not a function of charity, but a public responsibility."

[From the Trumbull Times]

NURSING HOMES DO NOT REPLACE THE FAMILY

(By Cip Ayalin)

Loneliness affects any person, but more so when one faces old age.

"This can happen to anyone, regardless of his financial situation or health condition," says Mother Bernadette, administrator of St. Joseph's Manor. The manor is nine years old today. It was dedicated Oct. 2, 1960, as one of the 32 old age establishments in the country run by the Carmelite Sisters for the Aged and Infirm.

Mother Bernadette continues: "And if they live in a fine hotel, their own home or an apartment but lack companionship, their lives can be empty. This is true of any man or woman who is left alone because of a spouse's death."

Another problem is suitable living accommodations. "In most of their lists of priorities, I have found that they want adequate housing that meets their particular needs. Those who are perfectly well at their age may want an independent living arrangement where they can do some of their own cooking or housekeeping, but may still need some form of service like meal services, medical, social and some specialized services offered in one place of a good residence for the aged."

At St. Joseph's, the aim is to provide the best possible care for the residents. Although many of the residents at St. Joseph's are ill, they are never called "patients." The Roman Catholic order regards old people as objects of love, not charity. They live in cheerful rooms with private bath. They have

a broad range of social activities available, but they are not pushed into doing anything. They do not even have to eat in the pleasant dining room. If they want to, they can take meals in their room. "We want our elderly residents to live out their lives as independently and happily as possible," says Mother Bernadette. She had just arrived from a two weeks trip to Dublin, where she attended the Eleventh World Congress of the International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled.

Mother M. Bernadette de Lourdes was born in Dublin and entered the Carmelite Sisters in New York in 1932. Educated in Ireland as well as at Fordham, New York and Columbia Universities where she studied social work, public administration and public health, she has held many administrative posts relating to the Carmelite Sisters' function.

"My interests in the physical, social, emotional and spiritual welfare of the aging was the reason for my entering this particular congregation," she says.

She mentions several levels of care in talking about the elderly. "Each older person is in the position to obtain the kind of care he needs at this particular time. True, needs can be raised but in most states such as Connecticut, older people do not have a tremendous financial problem because they have resources of their own. Usually they are eligible for assistance they can purchase either in a rest home with good nursing supervision or in housing for the elderly. Many people do provide for their old age but I cannot support any statistics whether or not the majority of the aged have financial problems. They have Social Security benefits although these benefits are not adequate to meet some of their needs at the present time.

"Many have pension plans from former employments. Older people are really making more plans for their retirement. Those who are becoming old now have more resources in their old age than older people, say 10 years ago.

The Carmelite sisters operate 31 facilities for the aged in this country and one each in Scotland and Dublin, maintaining their position as leaders in the field of geriatrics. St. Joseph's is the largest of their establishments. Here, 265 men and women are living out their years in comfort and satisfaction. Supporting this group, whose average age is 82, are part and full time professional help including 23 nuns. Perhaps what makes the place more cheerful are the young faces of about 100 volunteer high school girls—the Carmelites—who aid the residents of St. Joseph's. The program began about the same time St. Joseph's Manor was established.

"Any good residential care facility for older people should be a combination hotel and house care facility," says Mother Bernadette. "This is really what it amounts to here because we have four levels of care. First, it is their home. There is a hospital care for them with extended care services from skilled physicians and nurses as well as special care sections for those who are blind."

Mrs. Annie C. Powell just turned 82 two weeks ago. A quiet woman, she has a reserved sense of humor while she played her "talking book." The record player is next to her and she listens to her favorite mystery stories: "Ellery Queen."

Mrs. Powell is partially blind. She has been a resident of St. Joseph's for nine years and comments: "This is home away from home. The nuns are all wonderful," demonstrating with her hand a fingered "O" and grasping for the right word, says in her soft voice, "Excellent!"

Mrs. Powell, who shares the room with another woman, has had two operations. "The nuns visited me everyday when I was at St. Vincent and Bridgeport Hospitals," she says, turning to her newly finished pink and white crocheted pillow case. "I knit this for five days, all by feel," emphasizing the date of Dec. 1 when she will exhibit

her work for the St. Joseph's fair. On her table are pictures of her two daughters and grandchildren; she proudly mentions their names.

Like Mrs. Powell, many of the residents came to St. Joseph's and in their stay, learned various art and craft work. Mother Bernadette says that proceeds from the exhibit will be used for various activities, like occasional bus trips.

Another resident is 79-year-old Mrs. Emily Sevick, a Trumbull resident for 15 years and five years at St. Joseph's. "I like it here, although it took me five months before I could get in," she said. She likes the entertainment provided by the Sisters and television makes Mrs. Sevick happy. "It's a godsend. Just like anybody, I guess, I spend hours watching the shows."

Mrs. Sevick has her own private room in the fourth floor of the building overlooking the antique wooden water tank and windmill located outside in the resident compound. "My son and his family visit me occasionally and sometimes take me to their home in Huntington," she says.

It does take time to be accepted at St. Joseph's because of the long waiting list, but nobody is excluded from entering. Basic age requirement is 65 and its occupants pay the base rate of \$463 a month. The home operates at a loss but is made up by donations from the Bridgeport Diocese and by the services of the Carmelite Sisters. Most of the residents at St. Joseph's come from Fairfield County and the majority are Catholics although other denominations are accepted.

Mother Bernadette explains: "Older people prefer to live close to their family and friends and to past associations."

Mother Bernadette, who has served on and is serving on numerous state and local committees concerned with services and program for the aging, has received a number of awards related to her work. Among them are the Distinguished Service award from the Courtland Gardens Convalescent Hospital at its second annual symposium on aging and the David C. King award for services to the elderly from the Connecticut Society of Gerontology of which she is a member. She is a fellow in the Gerontological Society, the organization concerned with the study of the aging process.

During her past term as vice president of the American Association of Homes for the Aging, she was honored for creative and distinguished services to non-profit homes. The AAHA is the national membership organization of non-profit voluntary and governmental institutions for senior citizens. It was founded in 1961 with the assistance of a Ford Foundation grant, and sponsored by the National Council on Aging of which Mother Bernadette is also an active board member. She is also a member on the Governor's Advisory Council on Aging.

In 1960, she served on the National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging and on the advisory committee of the Federal Housing Administration. At the invitation of former President Johnson, she witnessed the signing of the "Older American Act of 1965" at the White House.

Her published works include the book, "Where Somebody Cares" published by G. P. Putnam's and Sons. The book is used as textbooks on social welfare by some universities. She has served on the advisory committee for the publication of "Standards of Care for Older People in Institutions" and for the film, "A Place to Live."

Carmelite Sisters for the Aged and Infirm celebrated their 40th anniversary early last month in Germantown, N.Y. The order was founded Sept. 3, 1929, by the present mother general, Rev. Mother M. Angelina Teresa. Mother Angelina began her work with six companions and seven elderly guests in a small house on upper Broadway

in New York City. The congregation has now grown to about 500 sisters.

During the anniversary, Mother Angeline expressed the progress in the care for the elderly. "Throughout the past 40 years the objectives of the Carmelite Sisters has always been the same—to meet the needs of the elderly according to the times. But, these needs do change. As the Carmelites, other groups, and the public have in the last 40 years been able to adapt programs to meet these changing needs, they will continue to do so in the future, with more and more creative and innovative programs and more and better care for our growing elderly population."

"The families of these people have changed too. Where once a family spent generations in the same place, our more mobile society has given the elderly the dilemma of choosing whether or not to leave the old home town with the moving family, or leave the family and remain in town. Nursing homes provide a substitute which is the next best thing to one's own home in a familiar environment."

"Nursing homes do not replace the family, nor do they relieve relatives of their responsibility toward the aged person. Carmelites have always encouraged the family to be involved and to take responsibility in planning for the future," she concluded.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN MICHIGAN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently Gov. William G. Milliken, of Michigan, proposed a bold and imaginatively conceived program of statewide educational reform. His recommendations, which include significant structural changes in school operations and financing, are designed to meet the educational demands of today and provide the flexibility so essential to educational excellence.

In my opinion, a review of his proposals for Michigan will benefit those throughout the Nation who are concerned with educational reform.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Milliken's special message to the fall session of the legislature be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN'S SPECIAL MESSAGE TO THE FALL SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM, OCTOBER 9, 1969

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature: I am grateful to all of you, as members of the Legislature, for extending me this opportunity to appear before you today in joint session to submit a detailed plan for improving the quality of education in Michigan.

My recommendations will be specific, and they will be followed by bills to implement these recommendations—bills which will be ready for introduction Monday night.

The Commission on Educational Reform, of which I served as chairman, spent hundreds of hours in assessing our educational problems and in recommending solutions to these problems. This Commission fulfilled its task in cooperation with a Citizens Advisory Council and functioned on a completely non-partisan basis. Legislative action, I believe, must be equally non-partisan. Of all the issues we face, none lends itself more logically or compellingly to cooperation than educational reform—cooperation between the Legislature and the Governor, between the two houses of this Legislature, and between the two parties. We owe it to the future, for our future is bound inseparably to the future of our children, and their future is bound inseparably to education.

The Commission report, which has been presented to you, points out that our state structure is lacking in accountability, and that our systems of school tax collection and distribution are inequitable.

I am absolutely convinced that the people of Michigan are willing to pay more for education if they can be convinced they are getting their money's worth. I believe this is true among Republicans, Democrats and independents. Your legislative questionnaires, many of which you have sent to me, bear this out.

I also believe the benefits of educational reform will far offset the costs.

Education is not an unrecoverable cost. It is a productive investment which has a lifetime rate of return, and pays dividends through an improved society and greater opportunity for individual members of that society. It is the Legislature, acting for the people, that will make the decisions which will determine whether we can make quality education not only our highest goal but also our best investment.

All indications are that parents are highly concerned, not only about the costs of education, but also about the quality of education, including such matters as class size, classroom discipline, school facilities, vocational training, teaching performance and integration.

My proposals will relate to these matters and others.

They will require two constitutional amendments, substantive changes in organization, bold alterations in our tax collection and distribution systems, a decrease in property taxes, and increases in other taxes. The proposals will require three years to implement.

They are submitted to you now, in this special session, so that you can deal with them unhampered by the myriad bills which will require your attention in the regular session beginning in January.

An important part of the over-all reform, of course, is the legislative program for next year, which must be responsive to immediate needs and consistent with long-range goals.

THE 1970-71 YEAR

A. School aid bill

I am strongly recommending that you pass a school aid bill for 1970-71 during this fall session. The bill that I am proposing stresses increased program and financial equity and provides for the beginning of a smooth transition to the implementation of the classroom unit concept in 1972-73.

The bill includes increases of \$183 million over the current fiscal year for the various state aid programs. Of the new monies, \$70 million would be allocated for improving financial equity in the basic membership allowances. My bill would lessen significantly the financial inequities faced by districts with local property valuation per pupil at or near the statewide average.

The bill would provide a uniform basic membership grant per pupil based on \$535 minus 14 mills times the SEV per pupil in the district. The minimum millage rate for participation would be set at 12 mills and the rate for maximum participation would be 16 mills. This formula will provide new monies to those districts presently having the most severe resource constraints, particularly the larger urban areas of the state.

Another significant aspect of the bill is a \$30 million recommendation to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in the districts presently having the highest pupil-teacher ratio. By appropriating \$30 million for approximately 3,500 additional teachers, greater program equity is provided and the transition to the classroom unit outlined in the "Professors' Equal Quality Plan" will be eased considerably. To insure that these funds reach districts presently making substantial efforts to raise school revenues locally and which still have a high teacher-pupil ratio,

I am recommending that this assistance be available only to districts currently levying 20 mills for operation and with a pupil-teacher ratio in excess of 26-1.

The school aid bill I am proposing will continue the existing special aid categories taking account of cost increases.

Our retirement system obligations mandated by the Constitution will require over \$45 million in new money for 1970-71.

The bill will also include a section appropriating \$25 million during the 1970-71 fiscal year to assist in paying salaries of an estimated 5,800 certified lay teachers of secular subjects in accredited non-public schools.

B. Quality, evaluation and improvement in basic skills

Education is a process embodied in a structure.

I am proposing basic structural changes designed to adapt the educational process to our complex and rapidly changing society. But the whole process, including the proven elements and the new elements, needs continuing evaluation and improvement.

I am preparing separate legislation establishing a unique and comprehensive program of evaluation and improvement in the basic skills—reading and mathematics—focusing upon the following objectives:

1. To establish meaningful achievement standards in these skills and to identify children with the greatest educational need in relation to the standards.

2. To provide the general public with periodic and readily interpretable data regarding progress of the educational system in this state.

3. To establish a climate for continued evaluation of child achievement by local districts so as to encourage program improvements likely to influence the educational attainment of needy students.

4. To provide every school system with strong incentives to introduce new and promising educational programs to improve the education of children in the essential skills—model programs to raise the level of achievement of those with the greatest need as well as model programs to raise the level of achievement of all students.

5. To provide the state with the information needed to allocate scarce dollars and professional services in a manner best calculated to equalize educational opportunity for all children in all districts in order that they might achieve competence in essential skills.

My proposal specifically requests a statewide testing program in the basic skills for all students in grades 1, 2, 4, 7, and 10. This assessment effort is expanded from the yet-to-be implemented Department of Education program in grades 4 and 7 in order to identify at the earliest possible time the individual students who are having the most difficulty in the basic skills.

Identification of educational deficiencies is not enough. We must vigorously pursue the development, implementation and evaluation of remedial programs aimed at improving educational performance and achievement. This process will take several years and generally follow the steps of testing for basic skill deficiencies, diagnosis of causes of deficiencies development of remedial programs, and evaluation of impact of these programs.

For 1970-71, I am recommending the appropriation of \$1 million for costs of testing program development and implementation of the testing effort in the five grades cited above.

C. Neighborhood education centers

Special consideration must be given to the problems of urban schools, and the proposed reforms that I have outlined will focus the attention of the state more directly on this issue. But special problems require special steps. One such problem is the prob-

lem of school dropouts requires totally new approaches to education.

In order to help redirect dropouts toward positive educational and career goals, I am proposing the establishment of a public non-profit corporation to be known as Neighborhood Education Centers of Michigan, Inc. This corporation will combine the expertise and resources of state government, the education community, and private enterprise to establish in selected cities education centers that will work with school dropouts. These centers would be similar to the street academies initiated by the Urban Leagues in Detroit and elsewhere.

During the next several months funds from the private sector will be sought for the corporation. Meanwhile, I urge you to appropriate \$100,000 for planning and implementation of the neighborhood education centers.

D. Community schools

The community school concept, extending the use of school facilities and the impact of school programs, has been adopted successfully by urban school districts throughout the nation.

This program, developed by private initiative, merits increased support from public sources. The Legislature has appropriated \$1 million to be coupled with local funds for community school programs. I recommend that an additional \$1 million be appropriated for this program during 1970-71.

E. Teacher incentives

The state should take the lead in experimenting with incentive pay systems for teachers. In order to begin moving in this area, I am proposing that the State Department of Education, in cooperation with the teacher organizations in the state, develop a four-year experimental program of incentive pay for teachers in four school districts.

The first year of the program would be devoted to planning the effort and to creating the administrative machinery. I recommend a \$50,000 appropriation for this purpose.

F. Vocational education

The traditional approach to vocational education prevailing today is not adequate for the needs of students or the society.

Clearly, the impetus for a more relevant approach to preparing young people for the world of work best resides with the proposed regional education centers. The regional center in conjunction with local school districts and community colleges can marshall the required expertise and resources for vocational education from both the public and private sector.

I am optimistic that the Senate Education Committee, currently studying vocational education, will concur with this view. Moreover, I am sure that this study will provide considerable information about improving vocational education programs in the state.

If the revitalized vocational education program in Michigan is to succeed, there must be a correlation between students' skills and occupational needs. To assist in achieving this goal, I am proposing a vocational assessment and computer counseling system.

This system will provide current information about students' skills and interests and will relate this data to projected occupational needs in the state. Equally as important, this system will provide information to educators about the relevance of their occupational training efforts and will indicate directions for reforms in obsolete programs.

This vocational assessment and computer counseling program can be effective prior to the adoption of the regional center concept. Therefore, I recommend the establishment of this system in one large school district in the state. An appropriation of \$150,000 will be needed in 1970-71 to develop the program.

G. Research and development

Far too little effort is being made in educational research and development.

The State has the primary responsibility to spearhead innovation in education. We are beginning to move slightly in this area with the statewide assessment program administered by the Department of Education.

I believe that the regional education centers will have an important responsibility in this area. Moreover, the Senate Education Committee will undoubtedly be submitting some recommendations as a result of its current telecommunications study.

In the meantime, I am exploring a variety of ways in which state government can cooperate with local school districts, universities and the private sector to improve the research and development capacity in our state's educational system.

H. Education Commission of the States

I recommend that Michigan become a member of the Education Commission of the States, the interstate compact for education.

Formed in 1966 and with a current membership of more than 40 states, the Commission has been effective in developing a working relationship and an exchange of experiences among governors, legislators, and educators for the development of new approaches to education in the states.

Michigan cannot afford to be isolated from new developments in education in other parts of the country. The Education Commission of the States is the most effective way to bring new ideas to our attention and give us an opportunity to share our ideas with others. The annual membership fee for Michigan is \$18,500. I believe this is a small price to pay for the benefits that would be opened by membership in the compact.

I. Migrant Programs

I will recommend programs to identify existing gaps in educational services to Spanish-speaking students, including migrants, and develop programs to meet these needs. My Migrant Labor Task Force is drafting recommendations.

STATE REORGANIZATION

The pursuit of excellence often requires a willingness to change. We need basic structural changes if we are to achieve not only excellence, but also adequacy, in education.

I believe strongly that the state must more adequately fulfill its constitutional responsibility for education in Michigan. I question seriously whether our existing cumbersome state structure is capable of effectively discharging increased responsibility, when it has proved inadequate for its existing tasks.

We must have substantially increased performance accountability to the people through their representatives—the Governor and the Legislature—than we have at present. Leadership must replace confusion and the public spectacle that has characterized our system in recent years and recent days.

The best means, in my judgment, to establish accountability and focus leadership is through a State Director of Education, in place of the existing board and superintendent mechanism. The Director should be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate and qualifications for the Director must be spelled out in law so there will be no chance of a purely political appointment. I propose a constitutional amendment to accomplish the change in structure, which should be voted upon by the people in November of 1970.

At the same time I believe that special mechanisms are needed in education to insure broad representation of many diverse elements in policy making. In no way am I proposing a monolithic structure for education, as will be clear from my specific proposals.

REGIONAL

Next, I believe that our existing system of 60 intermediate school districts must be re-

placed by 10 to 15 regions. These regions, instead of floating in semi-autonomous limbo between the state and local districts as do present intermediate districts, should be treated as administrative units of state government.

They should be assigned important operational duties in special and vocational-technical education. We cannot do the job we need to do for children with their special needs unless we are organized on a scale that will produce effective programs in these areas.

All we know about modern business techniques and technology teaches us that important improvements can be made in various educational service areas, if they are organized on a regional basis. Transportation, central purchasing, data processing, other business services, budget review, and educational media lend themselves to effective treatment on a regional basis.

The legislation I propose for regional organization will lay the groundwork for achievement of these objectives. It should be viewed in that light. It is the first necessary step to a sound regional approach, with the details of specific regional programs to be worked out in subsequent legislative sessions.

Specifically, the bill provides a method for establishing regional boundaries, assigns functions and duties to the regions, outlines for their organizational structure, and fixes the time schedule for implementation.

First, establishing regional boundaries is a delicate and important task, and one which requires a great deal of careful deliberation. I propose that a boundary commission be created, and that within legislative guidelines it be empowered to recommend the precise boundaries to the Legislature. The Commission should report on or before March 1, 1970 and the Legislature should then have 30 days to consider the report. If not rejected within that period, the report should stand as law.

Second, specific functions and duties should be assigned to the regions in the areas I have mentioned. Planning should begin immediately, so that detailed legislation in each of the functional areas can be passed and implemented in the next two legislative sessions, with the regions fully operational by July, 1972.

Third, great care must be exercised in the organizational structure of the regions to insure that they are truly responsive to local needs as well as to state responsibilities. I, therefore, propose that each region have a central regional board composed of representatives selected by the school boards of the constituent districts, and that these representatives each have voting power on the Board in proportion to the pupil population of the constituent district.

I propose the regional board have veto power over the selection of regional director, and power to create and establish procedures for Advisory Boards in functional program areas, and to advise the regional director on execution of regional program responsibilities. To insure accountability to statewide policies, I propose that the regional director be appointed by the state director, subject to veto by the regional board, that he be the chief executive of the region, that his qualifications be carefully spelled out in legislation, and that he and all other regional employees be members of the state classified service.

I propose that the regional structure be established as soon as possible after the election in 1970 and that in the interim period, planning for implementation move forward under the direction of an Educational Regional Planning Commission.

LOCAL REORGANIZATION

At the local level we have need for further reorganization and consolidation, if we are to have districts which can offer students the kind of comprehensive program necessary to

prepare them for modern life. We now have over 300 districts which are either too small to operate comprehensive programs or which operate less than a K through 12 program. These should be merged into larger units.

The bill I propose in this area sets forth the criteria which should be used in achieving consolidation. Principally it would mandate a minimum size of 2,000 pupils, adjusted for population trends and distances students must travel.

In addition, the bill makes clear that every effort should be made to achieve consolidation within the framework of state criteria, through voluntary local initiative. My proposals concerning a statewide property tax for school operations should make the voluntary process more fruitful, as a chief obstacle in the past to consolidation has been the differing financial burden of neighboring school districts. In those few cases where voluntary approaches fall, I propose there be a hearing process which could result in orders mandating the essential consolidation.

STATEWIDE PROPERTY TAX

One of the keys to a fundamental reform is an adequate and equitable revenue base. We now raise our money in a most inequitable manner, with the amounts people pay in support of education varying tremendously in various parts of the state. The reason for this is that half of our money for operation of our education system is raised locally from local taxes on property.

Most persons who have studied this system condemn its gross unfairness. Districts with low state equalized values must make tremendous tax rate efforts to raise small sums while other districts, sometimes because of the presence of industrial-commercial property, can raise larger sums with considerably less of an effort.

Dr. James B. Conant, in his monumental study of education has said, in effect, that the only way to improve local decision-making on issues of educational strategies is to divorce such strategies from consideration of local taxes. Dr. Conant also has pointed out that when the local district is impoverished, or has exhausted most of its financing responsibilities, its local options, though considerable in theory, are extremely limited in practice.

We must reduce the reliance of the education system on the property tax and we must devise a statewide property tax system to create a fair and equitable system of taxation.

I propose a constitutional amendment which all enable the Legislature to impose a statewide property tax, in lieu of local property taxes, for the operation of schools. The initial maximum permitted statewide rate would be 16 mills (8 mills below the present state average) and present maximums in the Constitution on local taxes would be reduced correspondingly. In subsequent years, the tax imposed would not be permitted to exceed that necessary to produce the same percentage contribution to state expenditures for schools as that contributed by the 16-mill levy in the first year. This would permit property tax relief in the amount of \$300 million to \$400 million and would reduce the reliance on the property tax for operations from the present average of 24 mills to a maximum of 16 mills. This would mean relief for 92.6 per cent of the property taxpayers.

Such a statewide tax can be administered through the existing tax structure with a minimum of effort.

Fairness in property taxes must also be insured by greater uniformity of assessment practices statewide. I will prepare detailed legislation in January to cope with this problem.

At the same time, however, I believe that local communities must have the opportunity to enrich their programs beyond the level provided by state support. We should

not cut off local creativity and initiative. We must insure equity between school districts, so that local effort, not a district's wealth, is recognized and we must make certain that local money goes, in fact, for enrichment programs.

To do this, I propose that local districts have the authority to raise up to 3 mills over and above the statewide maximum, that the state allow each district a yield from such tax as though each district had a state equalized value of \$30,000 per child, and that the types of enrichment programs—such as better utilization of school facilities, broadened curricula, programs for gifted or underachieving students—be carefully spelled out, so that the money thus raised can go only for such programs.

Such a program at the 3-mill level with state support would provide a statewide enrichment fund of over \$200 million, if all local districts participated.

DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PRIORITIES

The creation of a statewide property tax also gives us the opportunity to strengthen the local school districts in their responsibilities for operation of local education programs. Present preoccupation with finance and revenue raising has distracted many local boards from their primary duty of determining program needs and assuring implementation of quality educational programs.

Instead, the boards must devote their main energies to attempting to deal with a situation beyond their control. They have no control over revenue raising and the collective bargaining process has left them with little control over spending. We must help the local districts to do the job of education by removing the frustrations accompanying instability of income and inability to allocate available resources.

I believe deeply in effective local control over the quality of education. This control can only be achieved when the local districts are free to concentrate on educational attainment of their pupils, undistracted by impending financial crises beyond their power to control or impede.

I propose to replace the existing cumbersome and inequitable system of state aid formulas and local revenues with a management process which will require response to guidelines for development of budgets and programs directed to meet our pressing educational needs. Under this approach, the allocation of our available money can be made on a more rational and equitable basis, and programs can be more responsive to actual needs.

My proposed legislation in this area is enabling legislation, describing the planning mechanism and the types of budgetary guidelines that should be introduced. It is designed to outline a process which should begin now, be in full operation by March 1971, in order to have appropriations approved in time for the beginning of the 1972-73 fiscal year.

Obviously, the first thing needed is to agree on the process itself and the kinds of factors that must be taken into account in order for the system to be fair and to work.

I propose that spending responsibility remain largely a local district policy matter, but that all operational spending be divided into two broad categories—professional-related costs and overhead costs—with the state through the budget process determining the maximum amount that can be spent by the local district for these two categories.

In order to measure the amounts the state should appropriate for each district for these two categories, guidelines should be developed reflecting the professional-pupil ratio which the state will support. This ratio should be adjusted upward for those districts with severe underachievement programs, a base level salary support, varied perhaps by region and by the training and experience of various professionals. Overhead should be de-

termined as a percentage of professional costs.

The budgets would be prepared by the districts, within the guidelines, with ample provision for dissent, and with room to make special program requests. These budgets would be reviewed at the regional and state level, subject to procedural safeguards to protect local districts from arbitrary decisions. Ultimately, these budgets, along with regional and state budgets, would be submitted to the Legislature as part of the Governor's budget proposals. The guidelines would then be subject to legislative review and action.

An accompanying accounting system would enable program studies to be made to determine effectiveness of spending patterns statewide.

At the same time, the local district would be free within the gross amounts appropriated by category to develop the most effective education programs. The local district board would determine curricula, conduct teacher negotiations, supervise personnel, structure its teaching force, and make educational policy decisions.

TAXATION

To pay for the greater costs that will come with a higher quality education, and to spread the tax costs more equitably, I propose that during the fall session of the Legislature you take the following action:

(1) Increase the cigarette tax by 5¢, effective January 1, 1970. This will provide an estimated additional \$18 million for the second half of the current fiscal year and an estimated \$45 million in fiscal year 1970-71. It will bring Michigan cigarette taxes into line with those of neighboring states.

(2) Eliminate the property tax credits on the state income tax due in April 1971. This will yield about \$116 million. Property tax credit reimbursements due or to be due property owners on their 1969 returns due in April 1970, will be paid by the State as provided under existing law.

If the people approve the Constitutional amendment providing property tax relief, property taxes would be reduced, effective December 1, 1971, for school operating purposes. Amount of the total reduction would vary from about \$300 million to about \$400 million, depending upon the state equalized valuation and average levy for operating purposes at that time. Taxpayers who would benefit most would be those who had been paying most. If the amendment does not pass, there would have to be a modest tax increase to pay for additional costs of further educational improvements.

Assuming that the property tax reduction amendment passes, there would have to be corresponding tax increases to make up the revenue loss and provide additional amounts needed.

Because the amendment will not be voted upon until November of 1970, it is not my intention to propose any new revenue measures other than already mentioned either this year or the next session beginning in January.

Assuming passage of the amendment, there would have to be substantial new revenue from the income tax, or a combination of revenue sources. By way of example, if income tax were the only source, budget projections indicate that in 1971, the personal income tax would increase by 1.5% (from 2.6% to 4.1%); the corporate income tax by 2.1% (from 5.6% to 7.7%); and the financial institutions tax by 4% (from 7% to 11%).

In financing better education, however, we must do much more than look for new sources of revenue. We must close tax loopholes that provide unfair advantages. We must constantly examine and re-examine all state spending to eliminate waste and duplication wherever it occurs. We must examine and re-examine our priorities.

TRENDS

Although state financing of local education may seem to some a radical departure from existing practices, the national trend is in that direction. In Hawaii, Alaska, Delaware and North Carolina, state support ranges from 70 to nearly 100 per cent. In 21 other states, it exceeds 50%. A trend is indicated by the fact that in 1940, only nine states were above the 50% support line.

Neither is the idea of a Governor-appointed Director of Education revolutionary in nature. This is now the case in four states, as compared to eight states which now operate on the present Michigan system. In 21 states, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is elected through the political system—a process that Michigan abandoned with the 1963 Constitution. In 15 states, the Superintendent is appointed by a State Board of Education, which is, itself, appointed by the Governor. In one state—New York—the Director of Education is appointed by the Legislature.

CONCLUSION

In my special message to the Legislature on Education, in April, I outlined the major problems facing Michigan because of the inadequate, inequitable and antiquated structure we have for operating and financing our schools. I said that collectively these problems add up to an educational crisis in Michigan, and that if we failed to move toward educational reform intelligently in the very near future, the crisis would become an educational disaster.

Evidence of this mounting crisis is upon us.

It is evident in the loss of public confidence in the State Board of Education.

It is evident in strike-torn school districts.

It is evident in the collective bargaining whipsaw effects that are forcing too many districts into deficit financing.

It is evident in the large number of unresolved contract disputes.

It is evident in student disorders.

It is evident, above all, in the growing public dissatisfaction with our educational processes.

We must move now, and we must move with boldness.

We will not achieve total educational reform with only token responses.

I believe that the plan I am submitting to you is a reasonable and responsible response to these problems.

The proposals are the result of several months of research, study, and debate. During these months we have consulted hundreds of persons, including members of the Legislature.

The recommendations are mine, and I intend to fight for them. If Legislative debate results in further improvements, I will welcome these improvements.

This plan is very much interrelated. As with any plan, it is subject to some refinement. But I must caution you that by adopting some parts, while omitting others, you could weaken overall effectiveness of the plan. I must also caution against adopting changes that would adversely affect other parts of the package, and thus the thrust of total educational reform.

I will welcome constructive criticism by any legislator, but, in my judgment, it is incumbent upon any legislator who criticizes to offer a better solution. Blind criticism will not be productive. It will contribute only to confusion—not to conclusion. Compromises which detract from our overall objectives, to any extent, must be your responsibility.

If you have a better idea, I welcome it. But we need more than criticism; we need constructive alternatives. It is one thing to theorize, to analyze, and to criticize. Now we must act. We must move from theory to practice with specific programs.

How we move now is mainly up to you. In your debate, and in your voting, I hope you will act as though Michigan's future depends on the outcome.

It does.

NOW IT IS THE POLAR BEAR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, an article published in Sunday's Washington Post reported that unexpectedly high concentrations of DDT residues have been found in polar bears in a remote Arctic region of Canada.

The polar bear is not the first species of wildlife living in remote areas with little or no direct contact to man that has accumulated high levels of DDT residues. Living creatures around the world have been reached by the drift of pesticide residues through the air, soil, and water. The reindeer of Alaska, the penguin of the Antarctic, and the petrel of Bermuda have each been found to be contaminated by the spread of pesticides through our environment.

High levels of pesticide residues in wildlife lower down on the food chain have proved disastrous. Many species of fish and birds, including the American bald eagle, are now on the endangered species list because pesticides have interfered with their reproductive systems and threatened their survival. Like man, the polar bear is at the top of the food pyramid. Yet the use of hard pesticides continues, largely uncontrolled with the exception of steps taken by progressive States, such as Arizona, Michigan, California, and Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF DDT FOUND IN NORTHERN CANADA'S POLAR BEARS

EDMONTON, ALTA.—Preliminary testing of Canada's polar bear population in the high Arctic has disclosed unexpectedly high concentrations of DDT residues in some animals, the Canadian Tundra Conference has been told.

Charles J. Jonkel of the Canadian Wildlife Service in Ottawa said the insecticide concentrations were found in fat samples taken from polar bears killed in a remote Arctic region.

"We are now selecting groups of samples for further analyses from five regions of the Canadian Arctic," Dr. Jonkel told delegates from all over the world, assembled here for the three-day conference on productivity and conservation in northern circumpolar lands.

"The surprising discovery of high insecticide levels in fat tissue of polar bears deserves special attention," he said. "We plan to determine these levels for . . . different areas of the Arctic by sampling every year."

"As polar bears are at the top of a food pyramid, insecticide residues may eventually reach even higher levels in this species."

"Polar bears are of economic importance to our Eskimos and Indian hunters; we seem to have most of the world's polar bears; and the range of the species includes a major portion of the Canadian Arctic."

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR GOODELL, SENATOR JAVITS, AND MAYOR LINDSAY BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOL AND NARCOTICS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I recently testified before the Special Subcom-

mittee on Alcohol and Narcotics when it held hearings in New York City. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, also testified on the critical nature of the heroin problem now victimizing the people of New York.

I discussed with the subcommittee the need to commit the Federal Government to a major role in helping to reduce and control heroin addiction and drug abuse in that city and in the nation.

I also made other recommendations to the subcommittee, many of which are included as provisions of a bill which I recently introduced, S. 2921, the Drug Abuse Services and Marijuana Study Act of 1969. Senator JAVITS and eight others joined me in cosponsoring that measure, which addresses itself to many of the problems raised so effectively by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) and his distinguished subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement to the subcommittee and the statements of Senator JAVITS and Mayor Lindsay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHARLES E. GOODELL BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTICS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, OCTOBER 2, 1969

Mr. Chairman: Members of the Committee: it is a pleasure to appear before this Subcommittee today. In New York City, there is an area in Harlem called "the fix market." In that market hard drugs are bought and sold in large volume in broad daylight and throughout the night.

It could be in Bedford-Stuyvesant, or in the South Bronx or in Chicago, Los Angeles or Washington, D.C.

It could be in any one of a number of large American cities. That market is made up of people who form the nucleus of the culture of poverty in America, and who are imprisoned in the slavery of narcotics addiction.

Their desperate and hopeless lives revolve around the chemical of heroin and it is their crutch, their reason for living, and the catalyst of crime and fear, which victimizes their own communities and brutalizes their own families and neighbors.

Narcotic addiction and drug abuse pose a serious danger to the health and well-being of millions of Americans. They pose a social and law enforcement problem of the highest magnitude for the City of New York.

Here narcotics addiction has reached the proportions of an epidemic.

Here live one half—perhaps 100,000 persons—of all the narcotic addicts in the nation.

Here one-half of all street crimes and burglaries are committed by addicts to support a habit.

Here the average age of the narcotic addict is 24—30 out of every 100 are under the age of 21.

Here 90% of all narcotic addicts have a prior arrest record.

Here the average addict spends approximately \$30 a day for drugs.

Here during the month of June, 40 teenagers died from overdoses of heroin. There were 730 known heroin deaths in New York in 1968. In 1969, it is estimated that 900 will die from such overdoses.

The high schools and junior high schools in many sections of our city are becoming drug markets. Pushers sell habit forming

drugs cheap or give them away in order to get young children hooked. In some schools, as many as one-third of the students are probably well on their way to becoming addicts.

Drugs are a major source of black resentment against whites. The black community knows that it is white racketeers who import and wholesale the stuff, making hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Black citizens see every day the failures of government to stop the traffic. They feel they are the victims of this enforcement failure.

Social programs to alleviate poverty in the ghettos have little chance to succeed in a drug-infested environment.

True, stopping the drug racket is by no means enough to solve the problems of New York's slums. Obviously, we must expand our efforts to create new jobs, improve the schools, rehabilitate the dilapidated housing and reform the outdated welfare system.

But how can even the best educational program work when heroin is being peddled openly in the schools? How can even the best job programs for the hard-core unemployed succeed, when many of the jobless are addicts unable to work? Trying to improve the social environment of the slums without stopping the drug traffic is, as one resident of Harlem told me, "like feeding a man with a tapeworm."

Mr. Chairman, drug addiction is a problem for which there is no clear solution; in fact, there may be as many solutions to drug dependency as there are drug users. The problem is compounded by the fact that it no longer touches only the inner city, but is spreading to youth from urban to suburban middle income families.

In public debate its parameters change depending upon the perspective brought to it by various segments of our society. Regardless of point of view, however, we must all recognize that there are bound up in the drug problem complex questions of psychology, sociology, and physiology.

We must recognize that it is clouded by misinformation and misconception. These persistent misconceptions range all the way from the idea that once a person becomes addicted to heroin he is beyond all hope of rehabilitation and productive reintegration into our society, to the ridiculous notion that one injection of heroin causes addiction.

We must recognize that there is virtually no public recognition that drug abuse may reflect serious and deep rooted personality disorders founded upon the inability of the addict to cope with his existence.

Therefore, we cannot define drug dependency in medical or social terms alone, but must approach the problem through the knowledge and insights of several disciplines.

We cannot fail to recognize that the ever-increasing incidence of drug abuse throughout our modern American society raises deep and disturbing questions about the kinds of environments people have created for themselves. It calls into question fundamental issues concerning the quality and purpose of life in America.

Mr. Chairman, the concern and the distress of the American people over this issue is well known. The long standing failure of the federal government to respond to that concern is unconscionable and must now be remedied. We must adopt new measures aimed at creating a more effective law enforcement capability to reduce the supply of hard narcotics. Simultaneously, we must support a serious, fully funded program of prevention and rehabilitation to reduce the demand.

Last year, the federal government spent \$26 million to investigate and control illegal drug traffic. This is by far the smallest budget of any federal crime control effort. It is less than what the federal government spends on enforcing alcohol and tobacco regulations.

The amount sometimes seized in a single

arrest—about 250 pounds of heroin—is worth as much as the \$26 million the federal government spends on narcotics enforcement each year. Several hundred times this amount of heroin is brought into the country illegally each year.

The amount the federal government spends on narcotics enforcement is less than one-tenth of the amount that organized crime makes on this traffic. It is a tiny fraction of what society pays for crimes addicts commit.

The federal government has done virtually nothing to support the state and local prevention and treatment programs.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Justice Department now has about 640 investigative agents. About 20% work in the New York area.

The Customs Bureau has about 320 customs agents who serve as top-echelon criminal investigators. About 20% are in the New York area. The Bureau also has about 490 Customs Port investigators and enforcement officers performing investigative functions (other than routine customs inspections) at airports, harbors, and border crossings. About 40% of these are in New York.

A major increase in the number of these investigative agents is essential.

I have long proposed that we double the number of investigative agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs by July 1971. This would raise the number of these agents to over 1,200. The cost of this increase will be about \$4 million a year.

I have long proposed that we triple the number of customs agents of the Customs Bureau by July 1971. This would raise the number of customs agents to over 900. The cost of this increase would be about \$5 million a year.

I have also recommended that we provide an increase in the number of Customs Port investigators and enforcement officers needed to complement the proposed increase in customs agents. I estimate that this would require doubling the number of these officers. These improvements in the federal narcotics enforcement capability must be adopted if we are to reduce the supply of heroin in New York City.

I believe that the greatest challenge facing those who are concerned about the narcotic problems is in the area of prevention and rehabilitation of drug addicts and drug abusers.

In the past, public health programs have responded in the short run by providing temporary channels of escape from the destructive environments of addicts. They have failed to recognize that narcotic addiction most frequently occurs among individuals who present patterns of behavior which are inconsistent with successful living in our society.

Therefore, any effective rehabilitation program must provide services which seek to overcome the initial resistance and helplessness of the addict, to cure him of psychological drug dependence and to prepare him for a stable and productive life in his own community.

It is crucial that such a program seek to establish positive attitudes in the addict and to help him to develop a capacity for responsible, independent functioning in our highly competitive and demanding society.

It is with these objectives in mind, that I recently introduced in the Senate the "Drug Abuse Services and Marijuana Study Act of 1969."

The bill would provide a five year \$350 million program to assist states, units of local government and non-profit, private organizations in the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and the rehabilitation of drug addicts.

It would provide for a comprehensive program within each state designed to meet the costs of constructing, equipping, and operating treatment and rehabilitation facilities, including post-hospitalization and

after care neighborhood rehabilitation centers for narcotic addicts.

Provision is made for the recruitment, training and utilization of "Community Narcotic Prevention and Rehabilitation Officers." They would serve with and under the direction of professional medical, psychiatric and social welfare personnel in narcotic addiction treatment and rehabilitation programs. I believe that it has been demonstrated beyond question that former addicts can and must play a major role in narcotic rehabilitation programs of all kinds.

The bill will also authorize the funding of programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in correctional and penal institutions. In cooperation with schools, law enforcement agencies, courts and other public and private agencies special efforts should be made to assist such programs aimed at juveniles, youth offenders and young adults.

Any comprehensive program of this type must also provide services for outpatient counseling of former narcotic addicts to include employment, welfare, legal, education and referral assistance, in cooperation and coordination with the welfare and rehabilitation departments of local political subdivisions within the State.

It must, in addition, establish enlightened, comprehensive programs of public education about the prevention of drug abuse and narcotic addiction. My bill would commit the federal government to a major role in meeting these pressing needs.

The use and abuse of marijuana and the stringent criminal penalties applicable to violations of laws governing its possession and use present a special problem.

Some authorities say that 50 percent of college students have tried marijuana at least once. Dr. James L. Goddard, former head of the Food and Drug Administration, has stated that 400,000 Americans may be using it regularly. We must clear away the haze of misconception and establish, once and for all, the facts about the dangers inherent to marijuana use and abuse.

The Marijuana Study Commission created in Title II of my bill would be composed only of persons with experience in the medical, mental health and social problems attendant to marijuana use. It will be located in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Health and Scientific Affairs. It would report in eighteen months on most aspects of marijuana use and specifically on the physiological and psychological effects of infrequent, temporary and longterm marijuana use.

One of the most effective means of dealing with the problems of drug abuse and narcotic addiction is the Neighborhood Service Center. Two weeks ago I had the pleasure of visiting one such facility on New York's lower east side. The Center, operated under the direction of the New York City Addiction Services Agency is doing an outstanding job. It is a concrete example of dedicated and effective effort, and proof that rehabilitation of hard-core narcotic addicts is possible.

This program utilizes staffing by indigenous non-professionals, a mental health orientation, and the joining of service and community action in a carefully phased sequence.

Two years ago, New York State and its Narcotic Addiction Control Commission made an unprecedented groundbreaking commitment to the solutions of the narcotics problem in this State. It has made progress to achieve that goal. The encouraging and imaginative efforts of the Addiction Services Agency have resulted in new hope for addicts who heretofore were without hope. The resourcefulness demonstrated by many, non-profit, private organizations have also contributed much in our recent efforts to control drug abuse. All of these activities underscore the need for the federal government to take up the responsibilities it has long evaded. Organizations such as these cannot

survive and go forward without our broad financial assistance. As I have previously indicated, they also desperately need our help on the law enforcement front.

Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, the battle is on. There is a growing national awareness of the need for a massive community education program directed toward the general public, the professional community and, most important, potential addicts among our youth. We at the federal level must also play a more significant role in this area.

But the most crucial need today is for adequate funding of rehabilitation and prevention programs, and the acquisition of large number of professional staff personnel. I believe that the use of former addicts in such programs is not only useful, but necessary. However, they cannot take the place of professional staff personnel at all levels of the rehabilitation process.

The salvation of the damned—the addict imprisoned in his own personality and environment—may not be possible in all or even most cases. But we have made a promising beginning. We have demonstrated that prevention and rehabilitation can work. We must continue to learn how to assist our people to regain their freedom, and to prevent others from going down a road fraught with agony and degradation.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTICS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, OCTOBER 2, 1969

The special subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has recently concluded the first round of hearings on what has become a matter of much anxiety and yet, paradoxically, little action by our nation—the problem of narcotics and drug abuse. The Committee, of which I am ranking minority member, has heard much distressing testimony by researchers and physicians, former addicts and present drug users. An all too clear picture has emerged. I would like to share the details of that picture with you today and make some recommendations.

The National Institute of Mental Health estimates there are 100,000-125,000 active narcotics abusers in the United States. (New York City alone has records of some 42,000 heroin addicts but that does not include addicts not in prison nor in voluntary treatment.) The total number of non-narcotic drug abusers, including those addicted or habituated to marihuana, LSD, sedatives, stimulants, and related drugs, and certain tranquilizers is estimated at between 250,000 and 500,000 persons nationally. The number of juveniles and adults who have used marihuana at least once is conservatively estimated between 8,000,000 and 12,000,000.

These, then, are the statistics. Few of us, however, have attempted to get beyond the abstract figures so often cited to understand the problems of the individuals who comprise these numbers. We are aware that narcotics addiction and drug abuse is on the increase. We are aware that it now touches every sector of our society, from the dimly lit corridors of the urban slums to the shopping-center parking lots of suburban communities. We can define the costs, socially or economically, in terms of the maintenance of an elaborate apparatus of jails, courts and clinics, through which pass the identified drug users. We can identify the human toll in terms of the auto injuries, aggressive crimes, ruined lives (and families) and deaths brought on by drug experimentation and addiction. This toll has been set by the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, Dr. Yolles, in the range of \$2- to \$3-billion yearly. But there has been a strangely fundamental and stubborn unwillingness by our society to investigate the measures we have taken to cure this problem and to offer real help to those involved in it. Instead we seem satisfied to

continue quoting the figures and turning our backs on their implications.

Perhaps this is because we are basically a society of drug users—albeit legal drug users—and we do not intend to do anything that might alter our own "habit." Each year, we produce and consume more varied, more potent and great quantities of mind-altering chemicals, including such medical preparations as tranquilizers and sedatives; such over-the-counter remedies such as aspirin, mild stimulants, pseudo-tranquilizers; and such approved—yet deadly when taken in temperately—social substances such as alcohol and tobacco. Drug abuse today can be many things. It can be the narcotics addict injecting his daily "bag" of heroin, the methedrine-user high on "speed," the college student "taking a trip" on LSD, the teenager smoking "pot," the 12-year old sniffing airplane glue. Drug abuse can also be the adult starting the day with a pill for a "pick-me-up," having several drinks at lunch to "unwind" and using a barbituate at night to "knock him out." We are living in a nervous, confusing and restless age, and we increasingly turn to these drugs to ease discomfort, to combat insecurity, to escape, to achieve a transient euphoria.

In this respect, the impoverished ghetto-born dope addict who steals to buy his escape—heroin—is related to the affluent suburban executive who is functioning, achieving and outwardly successful but who also is a heavy drinker. Thus it is apparent that many people abusing drugs have many different reasons for initiating drug use and different patterns of drug use. The fact that the problem of drug abuse is spreading among the young and the affluent is, therefore, not surprising. But most adults stubbornly refuse to empathize with those drug addicts and young experimenters, hypocritically viewing their own practices as separate from the "drug scene." Yet, as Weldon H. Smith, Coordinator of California Narcotic Programs stated, "It is a matter of the degree of pain that determines what drug you use and how much. And the drug that offers the ultimate in surcease and escape from pain, for those probably hurting the most . . . is heroin."

This attitude of avoidance on the part of our citizenry is the key to the inadequacy of our Federal and local efforts to meet the growing problem of drug abuse. Our primary reaction has been to punish the easily-labeled drug "offender" with strict prison terms, offering too little distinction between the felonious drug pusher and the youthful experimenter, and little understanding of the psychological problem of the latter. It is no surprise that those dependent on drugs rarely are cured of their habit through punishment. More often, they return to outside life more cynical, more insecure, and—due to the traffic of narcotics within the penal system—often more knowledgeable in the sale and use of narcotics than before they began serving their terms.

The more important target of research, after-care treatment, and rehabilitation for these addicts has been grossly under-funded by the Government. The thrust of Federal activities takes the form of financial assistance to the National Institute of Mental Health to stimulate support for the development of community-based programs for treatment of addicts on a community level. The total expenditures for the NIMH narcotic and dangerous drug program, including Federal facilities at Fort Worth and Lexington, amounts to \$35,000,000, a fantastically small pittance in comparison to the scope and gravity of the problem in a complex and myth-ridden field. To quote Dr. Richard Clum, author of *Drugs and Society*, "Drug problem prevention has not been able to compete successfully for priorities in a nation beset with social needs and international policy implementation costs."

There is a great deal we do not know about narcotics. But we do know that present Fed-

eral programs are inadequate to meet this problem. We recommend and enact new categorical programs and urge more rigid application of criminal sanctions against narcotics addicts. But, in fact, we devote pitifully small national resources to a problem which extracts enormous costs from our society in terms of broken lives, urban crime, community decay, and fear.

We do not need new categorical programs—we have them—nor are more stringent penalties against narcotics addicts the answer.

What is required is a Federal commitment—adequately funded—to state, local and private programs of research, experimentation, and demonstration in narcotics prevention; and for rehabilitation and after-care services.

Broad-ranging residential rehabilitation programs (half-way houses) at the state and local level are among those which should receive expanded Federal support.

Most addicts are unable to cope with the stresses of their environment, and increased and expanded residential facilities are needed for many of them. Richard Atkinson, Director of the Washington, D.C., Drug Addiction Treatment and Rehabilitation Center has told our committee: "Basically, real therapy must be a process wherein an addict can be confronted with his own elaborate and extensive system of defenses and help him to see himself. In the long tedious process of self-realization he must learn to cope with his own internal feelings and frustrations that none of us are immune from."

This Federal commitment should include expanded and more intelligent law enforcement.

Aggressive law enforcement by Federal authorities is essential. But, enforcement efforts should be particularly directed at disrupting the flow of dangerous drugs into and within the country and at destroying the powerful elements of organized crime which feed upon and profit from the drug traffic. But we will be deluding ourselves if we believe that aggressive law enforcement alone against the individual narcotics user can contend with a disruptive community problem which takes root in emotional instability, psychic disorder, and social breakdown.

Federal support for education into the attraction and danger of addiction must be increased. Young people must understand better than they do the dangerous potential of mind-altering substances and how so many of our young people use them to "act out" their particular fantasies, psychological defects and character disorders.

Further research, too, is needed to elucidate the effects of use of the drug which has probably generated the most popularity and concern in our society—marihuana.

In recent years, there has been a dramatic and continuing increase in the smoking of marihuana or "pot," particularly among urban and suburban youth. It is estimated that more than 50 percent of our college students and 20 to 40 percent of our high school students are using or have experimented with the drug. About \$100,000,000 a year is spent illegally on marihuana. In the past year or two, use has spread to junior high and grade school students. The substance, currently classified as a dangerous narcotic by Federal law, is viewed as a non-addicting, relatively mild intoxicant by many young people who claim to use it as a recreational drug, much in the manner their parents enjoy alcohol. There is as yet no hard evidence that there is permanent, physical damage caused by this illegal drug, as there is for other currently legalized drugs. Nor is there as yet any proof that marihuana smoking leads inevitably to addiction to, experimentation with, or use of other drugs. Because of these conclusions, and because of the acknowledged failure of penal laws to suppress the incidence of drug use, there has been widespread student demand to legalize the sale and possession of marihuana.

Before any conclusion is reached as to whether marihuana is or is not a dangerous drug, we must focus on research to provide basic scientific data on acute and chronic effects. Only if we obtain from such research affirmative scientific evidence that it is an innocuous drug can it be legalized. In the meantime, however, there is enough evidence to rationally reduce the penalties for possession and use as distinguished from pushing and sale.

Marihuana is not an opiate or narcotic. We must therefore seek a more just handling of its use by our disillusioned youth, who rightly cannot understand our drug-ridden society's confused morality on this issue. The increased use of marihuana in the presence of stringent laws prohibiting it makes it imperative that marihuana should be reclassified under our laws dealing with hallucinogens. At most, it should be controlled by the Drug Abuse Control Act, which provides less severe penalties for violations. Our courts also must become more flexible. Our judges should not only have full discretion to suspend sentence, but a full range of services should be available to the courts for diagnosis, counseling and treatment for drug abuse and narcotics addiction.

A sampling of Federal and State statutes concerning the use and possession of marihuana reveals a pattern of stringent repressive penalties. Our Federal laws impose a 2 to 10 year sentence for first offense for marihuana possession and a 5 to 20 year penalty for the sale of marihuana. In our own State—New York—we have a more enlightened approach to possession with a variegated penalty structure depending upon the amount of marihuana in the possession of the offender, while in California the minimum sentence for an offender without a prior conviction is 1 year with a maximum sentence of 10 years. In Texas the penalty for possession can be 2 years to life imprisonment. In Massachusetts, to be in the presence of marihuana without knowing it carries a 5-year penalty while oddly enough, to knowingly possess marihuana carries a maximum penalty of 3½ years.

Above all, it is essential to make a clear distinction between those who employ the drug, potentially harming themselves, and those who grossly profit from its illegal sale. I will introduce appropriate legislation to achieve this. We must consider, too, what the effect of legalizing marihuana would have on the vicious, destructive drug scene present in the nation's poorer areas in the present state of uncertainty about the effects of marihuana. Here total escape mechanisms have been more frequently seized upon in the face of what seems to many to be insurmountable problems of discrimination, victimization, and abject poverty. Larry Bear, Commissioner of the Addiction Services Agency of New York City, testified to our committee: "We should have to consider the negative effect of inundating these same communities with legal marihuana whose cannabinol content would certainly eventually qualify it as a serious hallucinogenic drug. With importation unrestricted, cannabinol content undetermined, individual users' characterological deficiencies unknowable, and advertising techniques freely available, legalization could literally send the ghettos up in smoke."

It is indeed unfortunate that our society has legally and socially permitted and promoted the use of substances for "recreation" which have proved to be far more dangerous than marihuana—particularly alcohol and tobacco. Their use strikes a tragic toll of death and bodily harm each year. But we cannot, as a just and pragmatic society, condone yet another such substance, no matter how widespread its incidence comes to be, until we really know about its effects.

But again, I must reiterate that law enforcement *per se* is not going to end the tragic occurrence of drug abuse in this coun-

try. We must, as a nation, acknowledge the complexity of drug problems, understanding that some are linked to mental and physical ill health, others to lack of information, some to overexposure or undercontrol of drug-using situations. We must in the end, come to understand the need for a shift in our values on this issue, and our blindness in the past to our own responsibility for inaction.

If we can reexamine our conduct, and begin to help those who desperately need our help, we will have succeeded in the first and most difficult step. For if we can show the alienated, those who view the establishment to be hypocritical and base, that society does care, then the need for escape would be far less. The work of our subcommittee is not over. We are considering here not only a health problem, not only an educational problem, but the very success of our society. And in considering the drug problem, we are striving for a society dedicated to the useful participation of all its citizens, and to respect for each individual within it.

TESTIMONY OF MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADDICTION AND ALCOHOLISM, OCTOBER 2, 1969

Thank you very much, Senator Hughes, Senator Goodell, and Senator Javits. I would like to thank you for bringing your hearings to our town. We are most appreciative of that. It shows almost for the first time an organized senatorial directive on the problem of narcotics and drug addiction, which we appreciate.

Our two senators from New York, Senator Goodell and Senator Javits in his long career, have shown in the Senate a constant concern and leadership on this whole subject.

Senator Javits was chiefly responsible for bringing VISTA aid and Teacher Corps staff into New York and it was Senator Javits who assisted in the development of the Bedford-Stuyvesant restoration effort. This project, in turn, led to the development of new methods in our program on methedone.

Senator Goodell has been energetic in his leadership in this area with the increasing interest and concern he has shown.

Senator Hughes, we would like to thank you for, even in your brief tenure in the Senate, demonstrating such a determination to get at the roots of narcotics addiction.

My testimony this morning will be chiefly on the subject of heroin. I do that for a very important reason. It is not to deemphasize the importance of other drugs or alcohol. This is of tremendous concern in every respect in our City of New York.

The reason I am concentrating on heroin is because our time is limited and I want to put first things first. Heroin is the drug which is responsible chiefly for the majority of crimes that strike terror into people's hearts and minds, street crime, muggings, breakings and enterings, burglaries. That's why I wish to concentrate on heroin today.

It is of immediate and prime concern, and indeed we don't have much time to deal with it.

My statement will be quite brief and then I shall ask Commissioner Larry Baehr, sitting on my right, who will make a very brief statement introducing our Addiction Services Agency program; he will describe it very briefly.

Then I will ask Mr. Irving Levine, who is sitting on my left, who is an ex-addict, to talk briefly of some of his experiences in the world of addiction and what it means in terms of crime and involvement.

And immediately after that, with the Chairman's permission and with the cooperation of the press, with no picture taking, I would like to bring up two police officers, one recently under cover and the other a sergeant who has worked for eighteen years in Harlem. They will speak on the subject of law enforcement and narcotics. They are

not under cover at the present time, but for obvious reasons pictures and their names are to be avoided.

Well, the main thing I want to do today, Mr. Chairman, is to make a specific proposal, and that is a proposal for a partnership between New York City and the Federal Government that can bring heroin addiction under control within five years.

This is no slogan and it is no posture; that is a thing that can be done. We can bring heroin addiction under effective control within five years if we get the support we need from the Federal Government and what I ask you today is to make this five-year goal a specific deliberate national priority, as real as the landing of the men on the moon in this decade. It is in fact more basic than was the moon landing, for it is a priority not to demonstrate our power, our grandeur or our scientific capacity. It is a national priority aimed at the survival and renaissance of our cities and of New York City in particular.

If we can set a time limit to put a man on the moon, we ought to be able to set a time limit to put a man on his feet.

You will hear today about what narcotics addiction means in and to New York City. It can be put very simply.

Heroin addiction ravages New York; it fills our streets with terror, destroys thousands of families, totally degrades and brutalizes its victims, and those victims in turn, wreak fear on innocent citizens every hour of the day.

This poison feeds and bloats the masters of organized crime. It is a daily tangible system of systematic lawlessness and cruelty in our society. It is a sickening, humiliating scourge upon our country's greatest city and you will be told today something of what addiction costs New York City, of the one hundred thousand addicts who dwell here, of the fact that among those between 16 and 35, addiction is the largest single cause of accidental death.

But you will not hear the things this terror does to people. Not long ago a woman in a store in Harlem looked out onto the street and saw a girl, perhaps as old as twelve, being led down the street by an older man. Fearing a child molester, she rushed out into the street and protested.

The young girl looked at her coldly. "On your way, Mother," she said, "This is my customer." The girl was twelve; she was a prostitute so that her fourteen year old brother could support his heroin habit.

And there are too many such tragedies, too many who have given up on themselves because they have given up on us.

But we have not given up on these human beings. We have taken more steps than any other city in history, steps which I can detail for the record, but which I can sum up briefly.

We have more than doubled the Police Narcotics Bureau, so that it will have five hundred full-time officers working solely on breaking the back of the narcotic traffic. We have ordered every man on our 32,000-man police force to make narcotics offenses his highest priority.

We have launched borough commands in our narcotics rescue task forces to link local detective work with top police command personnel. We began our initiative on our federal-city task force with the cooperation of Attorney-General Mitchell and Police Commissioner Leary. That task force is now under way and we have begun the only municipal agency in America to deal exclusively with addiction and prevention.

That organization is the Addiction Services Agency headed by Commissioner Larry Allen Baehr.

Under the ASA, as it is called, which now operates fifty facilities in our city, more than 1,500 addicts are now receiving treatment linked to characterological self-improvement and more than two thousand youngsters,

parents and concerned citizens are involved each week in our ASA prevention program.

Further, we have started the largest methedone maintenance experiment in America, with the help of the Central Brooklyn Model Cities area, under which five thousand addicts can get help within five years on the street level.

Well, this is a vital part. It is more than any other city is doing, but it should be twenty times a greater effort. That is why I am here today, for the fact is that the Federal Government has a direct tangible role it must play in controlling addiction. At present, the Federal Government simply is not doing its job.

It is not enforcing its responsibility which is total and absolute in controlling international traffic. Opium and its derivative, heroin, does not grow in Brooklyn. It flows into this country from abroad at a staggering rate.

A Federal Government research and treatment program for 1970 simply does not exist. There is no coherent policy in this vital field and clearly no commitment. There are national institutes to study arthritis, allergies, eye disease and neurological disorders. There is none for addiction research. There is for research into new weapons and anthropological inquiries in Asia; there is not one penny available for addiction research.

The source of narcotics addiction clearly lies in the field of mental health of prospective addicts. Yet the total federal grant money nationwide to fight alcoholism and addiction from the community mental health program is \$12 million.

There are up to one hundred thousand addicts in my city alone. Yet the entire Federal Government's hospital resources comprise two hospitals in the entire country treating fewer than a thousand patients at any one time.

That kind of effort makes a mockery of pledges to act. President Nixon said last July 14, "A new urgency and concerted national effort are needed at the federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace to the general welfare," but the deeds do not match the words.

New York City, which has increased its spending in the fight against narcotics ten-fold within the last five years, is asking the Federal Government to put its resources where its rhetoric is and to help bring this problem under effective control by 1974.

How? There are five specific steps the Federal Government can take now to make a difference.

First. The New York City area needs an immediate minimum level of one thousand full time federal narcotics agents towards the ultimate goal of three thousand. This base has been supported unanimously by the five district attorneys of New York City who have been meeting with me on this subject. The five of them and myself, based upon the best evidence we have available, concluded that this minimum level is immediately needed in New York City and we think we are being conservative in our figures.

These men would guard the Ports, work at investigative efforts in narcotic traffic and work at nothing other than smashing this deadly cycle.

We must multiply the pitifully small force of federal agents overseas.

Two. We need help in effecting new international agreements in blocking the importation of heroin, bilateral treaties and the full force of foreign governments put to work to cut this dead at its root.

Third. We must have a real attack on organized crime, the key economic profiteer from narcotics poison.

Here in New York the U.S. Attorney, Robert Morgenthau, has led in fighting this, but he must have help from Washington.

It is time we had a war on organized crime. The generals of the enemy are putting more money, men and equipment into this than we are. On those terms we cannot win.

Fourth. We must have a federal commitment to real research such as work to produce non-addictive blood agents, chemical antidotes and vaccines.

The Federal Government's influence and medical research are now at a peak. It would require nothing more than an act of will and legislation to direct a small portion of our research empire into addiction research.

Fifth. Federal coordination is vital. Today the Federal Government is like the marshal who jumped on his horse and rode off in all directions at once. Drug Administration officials and high-ranking administrators tell us the drug laws are irrational, while legislation is proposed by the administration to harden those irrationalities even further.

We need a single concentrated, coordinated strategy for addiction control.

We need one more thing: money. We can put a dollar figure on a program to treat every addict in America nationwide. It would take \$600 million a year for a nationwide treatment and prevention program. About half of that, \$300 million a year, would reach every addict in New York City, which holds half of the national addict population.

In other words, if you choose to make the control of heroin addicts a real national priority, it will cost \$3 billion over the next five years, \$1.5 billion for New York City alone.

Now that last figure is high. It is also, however, \$500 million less than the cost overrun on the C-5-A cargo plane. One year of that New York City effort is a little more than four days of the cost of the war in Vietnam.

So it is for you to judge whether this is too much to ask. We know the kinds of programs that will really work. We know what an enormous difference the control of addiction will mean to New York City, cutting half of the crime away from our streets, stopping the spread of suspicion and fear, providing hope for something better among all our people, and we know that without money all of the Washington rhetoric about law and order is just some disagreeable joke on the people of New York City.

So I leave it in your hands. Is the salvation of America's greatest city a worthy national priority? Does it match a trip to the moon or a new bomber in importance? Is the city's soul a proper national priority? I believe it is and I commend it to the President and the Congress as one worthy of their support.

THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the destruction of the air, water, soil, plants, and animals of our planet home earth is accelerating at such a rapid rate that the continued existence of life is increasingly becoming questionable.

Man's general indifference and disregard for the natural resources in his drive for profit and comfort could someday be the end of him. If man is to save himself and the planet on which he lives, man must learn that he cannot conquer nature. He must learn that he can only live with nature and make certain that he does not continue to violate nature or nature will revolt and leave man without the necessary elements of existence.

Much of the world today faces a serious hunger problem and the arrogant disregard of this problem and the destruction of the natural resources portends the grave possibilities of future famine conditions of monumental consequences.

A valuable discussion of the the world food crisis appeared in a well documented and presented discussion in an edition of the Kaiser Aluminum News. The company publication, unlike the average limited, parochial house organs of in-

dustry, devotes the entire issue to the phenomenon of the time. All the articles, researched, written, and edited by the publication editor, Don Fabun, are worthy of reprinting.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from one issue of the publication—"The Biological Fire," "The Ecologic Storm," "The Protein Path," and a "Modest Proposal"—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIOLOGIC FIRE—SOIL'S BUT ROCK ON ITS WAY TO THE SEA

Our everyday lives are so filled with miracles that we tend to discount them as commonplace. For one thing, we think of soil as dirt and express our contempt for it in the expression, "dirt cheap." Yet without the thin film of soil that covers all too few areas of the earth, there would be no life on land; no plants, no animals, no humans.

The soil on which earth's civilizations are based today is the end product of literally millions of years of evolution. Out of these millions of years, just like plants and animals, the soil has differentiated into clearly defined species and subspecies, as different, one from one, as the lion from the bear, as the sunflower from the tulip. Like other living things, the soil is born, grows, renews itself, and ultimately dies. Like other living things, it can be hurt, nurtured, killed.

The end result of the greater part of man's activities on earth has been to destroy the soil, just as man exterminated the buffalo and the passenger pigeon, the grasslands of the Great Plains, and the forests that once carpeted Greece and Italy.

For many thousands of years the agricultural practices of clearing and burning, harvesting a crop and then moving on to clear and burn again; of stripping forests down to barrens of stumps and rocks; of allowing vast herds of sheep, goats, and cattle to overgraze the land until the soil is dead—all of these destroyed huge areas where today nothing grows or can be made to grow. These practices have been going on since neolithic times; they still go on.

In more "sophisticated" areas, the killing takes a different form. Under the inroads of the bulldozer, beneath the concrete and asphalt of highways and roads, below the ever spreading urban and suburban buildings, the living soil, cut off from sun, air and water, dies. It is an irony that in many places of the world, the growth of cities destroys the very soil whose productivity created them. And finally, in other areas, intensive over-farming has resulted in ever larger harvests—with an ever falling food content—as witness the steadily declining protein content of wheat in Kansas since World War II, although the harvests themselves are of record size. The soil has not been killed, it has lost a part of its life-giving vitality.

Only in those places (and they are relatively few) where man has learned to treat the soil as a living thing; where he fitted his processes into the life cycle of the soil, replacing, at the end of each growth cycle, the nutrients he has taken out of it, has it been possible to reap harvests rich in food content and abundant in quantity from the same acreage, season after season. Even the most inexpert farmer would not expect to get milk from his cow if he did not feed it; but he often expects the soil to give and give without itself being fed. When urban sewage and garbage are dumped in the river or the sea, or otherwise treated so that they do not return to the soil, the land becomes impoverished. Inorganic fertilizers, where used, help in part to restore what is lost, but not entirely, because the organic nitrogenous compounds are not replaced in this way.

And so we arrive at this point in time

where the amount of new land area that can be put economically under cultivation is less and less and where the real productivity (i.e., the protein content) of the much of the land that already is being cultivated is being steadily reduced. The heart of the food crisis lies not only in the population "explosion" but in the misuse of the planet's soil, both historically and in modern times. The more pressure that is put upon the soil, the more marginal becomes the return for the effort expended. The vicious circle may, indeed, become a spiral to oblivion.

Someone has said, both poetically and scientifically, that "soil is but rock on its way to the sea." And this is as good a description as any. The journey is a long one, often taking millions of years. The staging areas on this long trek are the places where plants grow and where man can farm.

The journey begins with the alternate expansion and contraction of rock through changes in temperature. The cycle of freezing and thawing is repeated endlessly until—just as when we bend a piece of metal back and forth, it finally becomes fatigued and fractures—on the mountain peaks and stony ridges small particles of rock are broken off. Winds scour and sculpture them, rainwater lifts and carries them, gravity pulls them toward the sea. The particles jostle and grind each other, producing even smaller fragments.

Where the slope is gradual, the journey slows, and the rock particles accumulate, perhaps at the rate of an inch each thousand years. Fine dust from volcanoes, ashes from forest fires, microscopic dust carried down by rainfall, settle on the deposit. Because of their different weights and shapes, the particles tend to form well defined colonies, smaller ones sifting into the interstices between larger ones.

Rainwater, sometimes carrying nitrogen oxides formed by lightning discharges, seeps down through the open spaces between the rock particles. Mixing with the salts of the splintered rocks, it forms an electrolytic solution. Here the exposed, electrically charged faces of the rock splinters begin complex electrical interactions, carried as currents in the electrolyte of the salt-laden water. The soil has become, if not alive, something close to it.

Plants send down roots, fingering their way through the interstices between the tiny particles of rock. Down the tubes of the root stalk flows hydrogen and carbon dioxide, manufactured by the plant's leaves from the air above the ground, using the sun's radiation for power. Tiny root hairs spread out from the main root, each hair carrying on its surface a colloidal atmosphere enshrouded by hydrogen carbonate. Within this highly charged atmosphere, hydrogen is exchanged for the ions of nutrients surrounding the soil particles. Gaseous pockets form in the interstices between the tiny particles of rock, oxygen and carbon are present, and thus, the condition for life.

Into this pulsating community come microscopic forms of life, billions and billions of them to every teaspoonful of rich earth seeking the nutrients freed by the electrolytic reactions in the salt-charged water. Following them come larger beings, feeding on the microorganisms and each other. Like monsters from outer space, earthworms burrow down, carving tunnels for the entry of water and air, leaving behind excretions rich in organic nitrogen. There also are beetles and ants and grubs and mites, their passage opening the pores, providing new tunnels for air and water. These tiny living things act as mobile factories, converting the inorganic nutrients of the soil into organic ones and leaving behind them when they die the legacy of their nitrogen-rich bodies. Leaves and other organic debris sift down, disintegrate, and the particles filter down

into the gaseous pockets between soil particles where they are consumed by oxygen, constituting a slow fire—the biologic fire that smolders wherever the soil is living. Out of all this activity, nitrogen and other elements are released in a form that plants can use for the formation of those complex chemical compounds—among them proteins and amino acids—without which animal life could not survive.

This now interlocking system of the organic and inorganic is incredibly rich with life. (One count of the top eighteen inches of forest soil in Illinois indicated a frequency of 65 million insects per acre. Other studies have shown as many as 1,450,000 earthworms per acre in highly fertile soil.)

Immediately above this slowly smoldering biologic fire, drawing nutrient and warmth from it, is a layer of surface and air-borne life; a shimmering haze of insects that are themselves a part of the system. Surveys have shown that hovering above one acre of rich soil in the morning there may be as many as 3,000 insects in flight and in the evening as many as 11,000 or more. Here's where the birds and many small animals, including the reptiles and rodents, take over and forge another link in the precarious food chain that leads up to man.

In time, geologic changes steepen the gradient upon which the soil community has come to rest. Hard rains strip away the topsoil; accelerated by gravity, the tiny particles are carried by rivulets one step further to their ultimate destination, the sea. The layers of newly exposed subsoil rock, hammered by rain, bombarded by sun, alternately expanding and contracting with changes in temperature, receiving the constant sifting down of dust and windborne debris, begin again to build a new generation of soil.

The fractured part of the old community is carried by wind and stream and river finally to some new staging area, and ultimately to the sea, where its rich minerals form the base for the prodigious plant and animal life of the oceans, another source of man's food supply—one rich in proteins.

What we have described here, in often halting, certainly oversimplified terms, is a delicate, highly complex system that requires as much exacting and skillful attention as does any living creature, if it is to thrive and to produce food for man's needs. Agricultural technology, at its best, recognizes the system and fits itself into it: irrigation, tillage, the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers, liming, fallowing—all are means of hastening or preserving the complicated electrochemical transactions of the soil community.

Unfortunately, the scientific understanding of soil chemistry has only been known to us for about a century; it is still unknown to most of the farmers in the world today. Unless this understanding and these techniques can be made known to them, and understood by them, then their struggle to force more and more food out of the soil to feed an ever-expanding population may indeed destroy, perhaps for thousands of years, the very source of food itself.

At the base, then, of the world food crisis, is a problem in communication. It is perhaps of more than passing interest, in a world where more go hungry every day, that we seem to be able to sell soft drinks and petroleum products to even the most isolated village in the most benighted countries, but we are somehow unable to impart even the simplest agricultural techniques that would save their peoples' lives.

THE ECOLOGIC STORM: WHEN LILACS LAST IN THE DOORYARD BLOOMED

Think of the earth as a living thing, swimming through space. The great rock mountains are its ribs, the seas are its blood,

the soil is its flesh and plants are its fur. Men and animals crawl upon it like lice.

Of all the earth's surface, some seven tenths is covered by water. Of the remaining three-tenths, soil can be found only in a few scattered parts; the rest is mountains, glaciers, arid deserts, volcanoes, barren islands and reefs. Of the whole land area, only seven percent is currently being farmed.

Soil is, as we have described earlier, a rare and delicate electro-chemical and biochemical community that has taken millions of years to develop. It is the flesh of the earth, and as sensitive as flesh.

What happens when the steel plow slashes like a surgeon's knife through it; when the digging stick pokes it, the harrow rips away the skin, the bulldozer smashes great bruises on it? What happens when the delicate ground cover is eaten to the root tops by herds of grazing animals? What happens when man-made smog obscures the radiant energy that gives it life; when vast fires sweep over its surface? Just the same sort of thing that happens to an animal's skin and flesh when similar attacks occur. It develops scar tissue, changes in character, may even die.

In the wake of wherever man disturbs this age-old community of plants and soil, there is an ecologic storm; the pattern of things changes, new species arise. The heavy tread of the tractor compresses the soil, forces out the air, makes it more dense. The little particles no longer discharge their energies from clusters of ions on their surface, but now, compact, resemble the original rock from which they came; hard, impenetrable to water and root alike. All the little dwellers of the soil, crushed and torn, slowly disintegrate, but their latent fires are no longer kindled by the pockets of oxygen that once filled the interstices between the particles of rock. Water stands upon the impenetrable surface, collects into rivulets, then torrents, and runs seaward, destroying in its path whatever pockets of soil remain. Nearly everyone has seen once verdant farmland, now abandoned to the ravages of erosion.

The harrow and plow rip the surface, letting oxygen in. The biologic fire burns more briskly; the soil quite literally has a fever. Like the last days of one suffering from tuberculosis, here is a final flush, a burst of energy, and then no more; it is the difference between baking a cake, and burning it up in an over-hot oven. The plow increases productivity—for a short span. Unless reinforced by other techniques (like transplants?) the soil dies in the end.

When a flock of sheep or herd of cattle denudes the land, nibbling the ground cover down to the root tops, the flood of carbon dioxide and hydrogen no longer is pumped down into the soil; the leaves that made them have disappeared. And the leaves no longer soften the rainfall nor filter the harsh radiation. The soil solidifies; scar tissue forms.

In the face of man's onslaughts, the soil community has developed its own defense. Now where the succulent foliage grew, move in the cactus, the thornbush, the thistle, all the spiny, bitter poisonous growth that the grazing animals will not eat. And wherever man walks a constant path, the plants that survive his footsteps will be harder; more stem than leaf. Ecologists state that they can tell where once man lived by the wild profusion of weeds around the spot, though the remnants of the habitations have long since disappeared.

Similarly, the natural system reacts against the indiscriminate drenching with insecticides and herbicides; new species of resistant plants and insects arise. Meanwhile, the powerful chemicals have been introduced into the food chain—to what final consequence we do not know.

In the long run, man cannot conquer nature; he can only learn to live with it and to integrate his own needs into the system. As we enter an era where we contemplate crash agricultural programs to stave off a threatened famine, it is well to remember that an ecologic storm follows wherever we tamper with nature, and the scar tissue on the earth is the legacy of similarly motivated men in our ancient past.

THE PROTEIN PATH: HUNGER BEGINS WITH A HUNGRY PLANT

"Whatever is necessary," says W. H. Ferry in another context, "is possible." It will be noted that he did not say "probable," only possible. Here we will examine solutions that appear to be possible (because necessary) in the alleviation of the world food crisis. At the present time, their probability seems quite low.

Earlier we presented a list of sub-problems that, added together, constitute the world food crisis. They lead to some seemingly inescapable conclusions. One is that a piece-meal attack, though helpful, is not likely to solve the over-all problem—at least not within the next ten years. The sub-problems are too inter-related, too dependent on multiple and simultaneous solution for that.

Perhaps, then, we should examine other forms of solution that might, just possibly, "buy the time" necessary to find integrated solutions to the sub-problems.

Nearly all of the solutions proposed for the sub-problems are quantitative in nature—their aim is to produce more food for more people in more places. Yet it has been well said, "Hunger begins with a hungry plant." The hungry plant is deficient in proteins for human use. Could we suggest that a qualitative approach might help reduce the magnitude of the quantitative problem, and that perhaps we do not need such vast quantities of new food, so much as to increase the nutritional quality of foods that already exist?

There are a number of currently feasible ways to raise the protein content of already existing foodstuffs, or at least the consumption of them, without planting another acre, without substituting the tractor for the bullock, without changing age-old food habits in any substantial way.

In most of the diet-deficient areas of the world, there are sufficient local sources of protein-rich foods that are not being used because the people who live there do not know about proteins. This is pretty excusable, because many people in the "developed" countries don't know, either. There are examples of how trained nutritionists, moving into back-country villages, have significantly raised the protein intake of local citizens, just by using whatever was growing nearby. But we will start with fish, because of all the world's existing sources of protein, this is, in most areas, one of the most neglected. As Gilbert and Sullivan said (*in "Patience"*) . . . "There's fish in the sea, no doubt of it, as good as ever came out of it."

The plain truth is that out of the 25,000 known species of fish, only a few dozen are used directly or indirectly as food for man. In the protein-deficient countries—Asia, Africa, and Latin America—the consumption of fish products (marine and fresh water) is only about seven pounds per person each year. And yet the fish are there, and it is conservatively estimated that the annual catch of salt-water fish could be raised to far more than the 55 million tons projected as the annual catch in 1969, without the danger of destroying the oceanic food chain.

This would involve a tremendous effort; new ways of raising and harvesting fish instead of hunting them; new types of ships, new port and processing and storage facilities. No such effort is now underway, but this is not to say that it could not be made.

Probably the most efficient use of a greatly increased fish harvest would be in the form of Fish Protein Concentrate, which may be defined as "any inexpensive, stable, wholesome product of high nutritive quality, hygienically produced from fish." The fish, in its entirety, is ground up, reduced to eliminate the water and fish oil, and the resulting product emerges as a powder-like concentrate that is about 80 per cent protein. One hundred metric tons of fish yields 15 metric tons of concentrate, equivalent to 12 tons of 100 per cent protein. The concentrate can be used as a food additive to traditional foods, although some problems of taste and consumer acceptance remain. About 25 grams of Fish Protein Concentrate, used as an additive to already available foods, provides sufficient protein intake per day for an adult.

Costs are high, but not prohibitive. A 90,000-ton capacity plant, capable of producing enough protein for one million people per year, would require a capital investment of about \$2.5 million, plus two fishing vessels of 120 feet in length, costing about \$3 million, plus dock, handling facilities and distribution. Some \$7 million over-all would meet the protein supplement needs of a million persons per year, at a cost of less than two cents per person per day.

Another important source of both whole fish and Fish Protein Concentrate lies in the protein that can be yielded by inland fisheries—the growing of fish in ponds, rice paddies, lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and coastal estuaries. It should be pointed out that some species of fish, as protein producers, are as efficient as chickens, and considerably more so than pigs and other domesticated animals raised for food.

At the present time, inland fishery catches supply about 16 million tons—or 30 percent of the world's total fish yield. Unfertilized ponds yield from 50 to 500 pounds of fish per acre per year; fertilized ponds from 150 to 1,500 pounds; fed and fertilized ponds from 2,000 to 5,000 pounds per acre, when agricultural wastes are used. Where ponds are enriched with grains and seed meals, the yield is from 1,000 to 16,000 pounds per acre. These gains are important; the yield is not only high in protein content, but where ponds are fertilized, one pound of fertilizer yields from five to eight pounds of fish.

The point is, not only are there many already existing bodies of water not being used for fish raising and harvesting, but building new ponds is relatively inexpensive. If the average cost for pond construction is \$500 per acre, then the cost of new ponds to meet recommended consumption of inland water fish as a protein supplement for the world's population by 1975 would average only about \$80 million annually.

Another possibility is to raise fish along with rice, in those areas where rice is the main source of food. There are approximately 197 million acres planted in rice each year. About 30 per cent of these are covered with water long enough to raise fish along with the rice. In Indonesia alone, there are 150,000 acres of combined rice-fish cultures producing an average of 300 pounds per acre—a total of 45 million pounds of fish annually. In addition, it is estimated that about 150,000 tons of wild fish, not deliberately raised, are produced in rice paddies each year, intensive programs to increase the raising and harvesting of fish in rice cultures, where it is feasible, could do much to supplement protein intake in those large areas of the world where rice is the principle source of food.

To this could be added the deliberate use of salt water estuaries for the production of fish and shell-fish. Where these areas are used—as on the Asia mainland, and in Japan, Formosa and Indonesia—yields are from 400 to 2,000 pounds of fish product per acre each year. In many areas of the world, these rich

potential sources of protein are not being exploited at the present time. Unfortunately, it doesn't appear that much is likely to be done about them, either, although the costs are minimal and the results significant.

Already growing, already being harvested each year, is a low-cost source of high quality protein that is equal to all the protein produced by all the livestock in the world. Most of it is fed to animals or used as fertilizer; large amounts are discarded as waste.

This rich, virtually untapped source is the protein that can be extracted from soy beans, cottonseed and peanuts. Had the 1965-66 protein content of these been processed into protein for human use, it would have been the equivalent of 33.3 million tons of protein, compared to a total of 22 million tons produced from meat, milk and eggs. Each additional one percent increase in production of the 1966 soy bean crop would have yielded enough to correct the lysine deficiency in one million metric tons of wheat.

Concentrate from soybeans ranges from 40 to 95 percent protein content, at a cost of from 14 to 40 cents per pound. This material is amazingly versatile; it can be used as an additive to cereal products, in high protein beverages, baked goods, desserts, and processed into a wide range of meat products that, when properly prepared, are virtually indistinguishable from the "real" thing. Moreover, these foods can be produced in factories at costs that range from one-half to one-fifth what it costs to produce similar animal products.

Since soy beans grow best in temperate areas, it would probably be most economical to produce them there and ship the concentrate to the diet-deficient tropical countries. However, in some places it could be produced economically on the spot. According to Agricultural Chemistry (April, 1967), the USDA had developed a simple hand process for making soybean flour in areas where there is neither skilled labor nor electrical power. Five men can produce 300 pounds of soya flour in an eight-hour day, enough to supply the daily protein requirements for 1,600 adults. The flour can be used in beverages, yeast bread, corn bread, noodles, unleavened bread, mush, gruels, soups and desserts.

While not as versatile as soy bean, cottonseed still represents a highly useful, virtually untapped source of protein. It has the great virtue that, unlike soy beans, cottonseed comes from a plant that is indigenous to protein-poor tropical areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Upon removal of oil and the seed coat from cottonseed, a concentrate with 50 to 55 percent protein can be obtained. This can be further concentrated—to 70 percent protein—by extracting the carbohydrates. Either concentrate can be used directly for feeding humans, or indirectly as cattle feed.

The great advantage here is that the cotton is already grown and harvested for its fibers and oils so that the cottonseed is a by-product; it can be produced economically by techniques already developed, and in the areas where additional protein is most urgently needed.

Peanuts, which are called groundnuts in most countries, offer a rich and economical source of protein. They grow well in both temperate and tropical areas and are indigenous to the Caribbean Islands, South America, and Africa. Although peanuts can be, and are, eaten directly by man, about 65 percent of the world's production is crushed for oil, which furnishes about 20 percent of the world's trade in edible oils. After the oil is removed, there remains a 50 percent protein concentrate that could be used for human food. Further processing, to remove the carbohydrates, raises the protein content to 70 percent. Although peanut protein is deficient in three amino acids, it can be fortified with synthetic materials.

Again, here is a widely produced crop, already growing, the by-products of which are rich in protein; and the crop grows in areas that are most in need of protein enrichment. Concentration of the protein itself is a relatively simple task, requiring neither high cost equipment nor technical skills. Certainly its use would provide a rich source of badly-needed protein at much less cost than extensive irrigation or new-land farming projects. However, little is currently being done about it.

LEAF PROTEIN

Another virtually unused source of protein is the leaves and grasses which are usually wasted, or at best fed to animals. Nearly all of the essential proteins consumed by man are derived from amino acids originally created in the leaves of green plants, and those that remain in the leafy parts are the same composition as other plant proteins.

Leaf proteins can be introduced into man's diet either by eating them directly (like spinach, turnip greens, lettuce, etc.) or by processing the leaves into high protein concentrates. In the latter, the leaves are pulped and pressed, and the resulting juice, when processed to a dry state, contains about 65 percent protein. The fiber from which the juice was pressed can be used as animal food.

The pressed cake of leaf protein concentrate is green in color and tastes like spinach or tea. Further processing, if desired, can remove most of the color and flavor, as is done in Israel; or in the green state, it can be used as a high-protein filler in native dishes such as ravioli. If a number of kinds of leaves are pressed together, the leaf protein produced appears to be better than cereal proteins and as good as animal proteins other than eggs and milk.

Leaf protein can be produced by hand methods, or with low power input, at low cost, since the raw material is usually considered a waste product anyway. On a village basis, using an input of two tons of feed and an output of 60 kilograms of protein an hour, protein would cost six to seven cents per kilogram (with labor figured at 15 cents an hour—which would be high in many agrarian areas). So far leaf protein has been produced in Jamaica, India, Uganda, New Guinea and Israel, but no large scale research, development or application projects are underway at present, nor, apparently, contemplated.

Whether oilseeds are used, or leaves, or both—there exists at the present time both the raw materials and the techniques for the large-scale production of high quality protein from products largely wasted, using production facilities well within the means of world industry. Precious little is being done about it.

SYNTHETIC AMINO ACIDS

As detailed earlier, the cereal foods that constitute the largest part of the world's diet, particularly in the diet-deficient countries, are deficient in several "essential" amino acids. These nitrogen compounds are "essential" because the body cannot manufacture them itself. Since the grains are already being raised, processed, distributed and consumed, it would appear that one of the most promising approaches to the problem of world malnutrition would be to "fortify" grain cereals with the missing, or deficient, amino acids, produced synthetically.

Fortunately, such a technology already exists. The three essential amino acids that are deficient in most cereal grains are called lysine, threonine and tryptophan. Lysine can be produced by mass-production factory methods for as little as \$1 per pound. The others presently can be synthesized for \$2.50 to \$4.50 per pound, but in mass production probably could be produced for prices close to that of lysine. These synthet-

ic materials, different combinations or patterns of nitrogen, hydrogen and carbon, can be produced as colorless, odorless, tasteless crystals.

Their introduction into the already existing food production system would probably be most effective at a central processing point, such as a flour or corn meal mill, where the process would be no different than the current fortification by vitamins and minerals. Thus the people who purchase the flour (or the commercial products made from it) would not in any way have to change their regular food consumption habits. The difference is that they would be eating foods nearly as rich in essential proteins as milk or meat. To extend this system to those areas where the cereals do not pass through central processing, but are prepared on the farm or in the village itself, presents a different sort of problem. However, since what is required is not more difficult than the addition of salt, except that the flavor is not changed, there should be no taste, religious, or cultural obstacles.

"The medium is similar to that for the growing of yeasts on sugar, except that oil is substituted for the sugar. Nitrogen is added to the medium in the form of ammonia salts; phosphorus and potassium are supplied in the form of general fertilizers; trace elements and growth vitamins are added. The product is more than 50 percent protein.

"When the yeasts grown on petroleum have been dried and purified, the concentrate is in the form of a powder or whitish flakes with no pronounced odor or taste . . . Like concentrated protein from meat, fish, yeast or soybeans, the protein from petroleum can be transformed into many different foods."

Dr. Champagnat has calculated that with an outlay of some 40 million tons of petroleum (a small fraction of the total crude oil produced annually in the world), 20 million tons of pure protein could be produced per year. Other advantages are that the organisms feed on the wax in the crude oil, which makes the oil suitable for diesel engines and domestic heating, that petroleum is available in most of the diet-deficient areas, and that the processing equipment can be added relatively easily and economically to the existing 700 refinery complexes throughout the world, thus reducing distribution costs.

The cost of protein thus produced is from 20 cents to 40 cents per pound, still more expensive than oilseed meal containing 40 to 50 percent protein. However, the fact that waste products are used (which are expensive to dispose of, and in any event contribute to the growing air and water pollution program) should be taken into account.

A number of major petroleum firms have undertaken feasibility studies of the single cell protein process, and at least one American firm has been awarded a research project (by the U.S. Public Health Service) to study the production of protein from newspaper and agricultural waste products.

It has been estimated that a research program launched now and costing \$10 to \$30 million over a period of two to four years might launch a single cell protein industry whose contributions could be significant by the 1975-1980 period. No study of such proportions has so far been undertaken.

GENETIC MANIPULATION

The approaches we have been discussing all involve, at some point, the concentration of proteins in such a way that they can be added to the bulk protein deficient foods that make up most of the diet in the world today. Obviously, if the fortification step could be eliminated, raising the world protein availability could be greatly accelerated, and substantial cost savings might be achieved.

One way of doing this would be to increase the natural protein content of the world's principal cereal crops—wheat, corn, and rice. This can be done through deliberate "genetic manipulation," i.e., choosing and breeding strains of plants that have higher protein content.

This already has been done with corn, for instance, where a superior variety of corn

protein, but would help in solving some of the world's waste product disposal problems.

Other advantages of what is called "single cell protein" production are that the microorganisms grow very rapidly, doubling their weight every five hours or less, which is several thousand times faster than farm animals can synthesize protein. The microorganisms can be grown in tanks requiring no soil or sunlight or rainfall, and they belong to the plant kingdom, so that when harvested and introduced into traditional food systems, they do not run up against religious or traditional obstacles.

The techniques for single cell protein production already are well known. Louis Champagnat, who has developed a sizable pilot scale operation in Lavaur, France, has described the basic process (in *Scientific American*, October, 1965) thus:

"The medium is similar to that for the growing of yeasts on sugar, except that oil is substituted for the sugar. Nitrogen is added to the medium in the form of ammonia salts; phosphorus and potassium are supplied in the form of general fertilizers; trace elements and growth vitamins are added. The product is more than 50 percent protein.

"When the yeasts grown on petroleum have been dried and purified, the concentrate is in the form of a powder or whitish flakes with no pronounced odor or taste . . . Like concentrated protein from meat, fish, yeast or soybeans, the protein from petroleum can be transformed into many different foods."

Dr. Champagnat has calculated that with an outlay of some 40 million tons of petroleum (a small fraction of the total crude oil produced annually in the world), 20 million tons of pure protein could be produced per year. Other advantages are that the organisms feed on the wax in the crude oil, which makes the oil suitable for diesel engines and domestic heating, that petroleum is available in most of the diet-deficient areas, and that the processing equipment can be added relatively easily and economically to the existing 700 refinery complexes throughout the world, thus reducing distribution costs.

The cost of protein thus produced is from 20 cents to 40 cents per pound, still more expensive than oilseed meal containing 40 to 50 percent protein. However, the fact that waste products are used (which are expensive to dispose of, and in any event contribute to the growing air and water pollution program) should be taken into account.

A number of major petroleum firms have undertaken feasibility studies of the single cell protein process, and at least one American firm has been awarded a research project (by the U.S. Public Health Service) to study the production of protein from newspaper and agricultural waste products.

It has been estimated that a research program launched now and costing \$10 to \$30 million over a period of two to four years might launch a single cell protein industry whose contributions could be significant by the 1975-1980 period. No study of such proportions has so far been undertaken.

GENETIC MANIPULATION

The approaches we have been discussing all involve, at some point, the concentration of proteins in such a way that they can be added to the bulk protein deficient foods that make up most of the diet in the world today. Obviously, if the fortification step could be eliminated, raising the world protein availability could be greatly accelerated, and substantial cost savings might be achieved.

One way of doing this would be to increase the natural protein content of the world's principal cereal crops—wheat, corn, and rice. This can be done through deliberate "genetic manipulation," i.e., choosing and breeding strains of plants that have higher protein content.

This already has been done with corn, for instance, where a superior variety of corn

(opaque-2) has been discovered and developed. It contains about 65 percent more lysine, more tryptophan and a better amino acid balance than ordinary hybrid corn. Since corn is an important part of the human diet in much of Latin America, parts of Africa, southern and eastern Europe and parts of Asia, the importance of this discovery is of supreme importance. However, it takes considerable time to develop a sufficient amount of seed corn of a new variety to be able to make it available to farmers on a global basis, and even longer to break down established patterns in order to get it introduced. Thus, while holding enormous promise, the genetic approach involves a period of five or ten years of concentrated effort; an effort not being made at the present time.

Another genetic approach is to create new species of plants that have desirable growing and protein characteristics. In June, 1967, the University of Manitoba announced successful production of the world's first man-made grain, called triticale—a cross between durum wheat and rye. It is a new grain, not a hybrid of an old one. It grows well in very dry country and has a protein quality four percent higher than wheat. Work began on it in 1954—it may be on the market as seed grain by 1970.

The search for improved nutritional characteristics in other cereals has either been initiated or planned, including programs in Mexico for wheat and maize, in the Philippines for rice, and in India for sorghum and millet.

Like everything else mentioned in this section, the technology is there; the will to implement the technology is sadly lacking. We have the way, but not the will. And that is the crux of the world food crisis.

A MODEST PROPOSAL

When, in the 18th Century, the plight of the poverty stricken in Ireland became intolerable, Jonathan Swift published "A Modest Proposal," in which he suggested that if the rich would fatten and eat the children of the poor, both food and population problems would be solved. Though eminently logical, for some reason the plan was never carried out.

Something like "A Modest Proposal" appears to be needed now, on the eve of "The Time of Famines." Each sub-problem in the complex that makes up the world food crisis requires enormous commitments of capital for its solution. These commitments are at least equal in magnitude to those made by the U.S. for military purposes—tens of billions of dollars over decades. The commitment would be far larger than the over-all aerospace program and would persist over a longer period of time. Without such a commitment, it does not appear that the world food crisis can be met, short of the kinds of civil and military disruption that would, in the end, cost even more than the commitment.

An approach recently suggested by world business and political leaders would be the formation of a World Resources Corporation, with a divisional World Food Corporation. The general financing and structure of a World Resources Corporation could follow along somewhat the same lines as those established for the Communications Satellite Corporation, which was created under the authority of a law enacted by the U.S. Congress—the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. This formed the legalistic basis for what became an international joint venture—the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium—in which 61 nations are participating. Shares of the original COMSAT stock were offered to two groups: common carriers in the communications field, who would be expected to use the satellite services, and the general public. The five

million public shares were sold out, through underwriters, on the day of the offering.

There are several points to be emphasized here, because they are pertinent to the world food crisis. The first is that the approach was global. The second is that it involved both government authority and private enterprise, particularly that portion of private enterprise with a specific interest in the project. Third, public support and participation were invited. Fourth, there was nothing in the way of collateral except projections of future needs for global communication and a technology that, when further developed, could help meet those needs. No promise was made that the common stock would pay dividends, although it was implicit in the offering that, if the project worked out as expected, it would do so.

There are close similarities here to the world food situation. A World Resources Corporation, enlisting participation from worldwide "agri-business"—the manufacturers of agricultural chemicals, fertilizers, farm equipment, distribution systems, storage facilities, food processing, packaging and marketing—and the general public, on a common stock basis, could generate the magnitude of capital required. The collateral in this case would be the known but not yet exploited resources of the participating countries and the agricultural know-how already generated in the technologically advanced countries. The expectancy of a pay out, for the agri-business firms, would be participation in a rapidly expanding world market as the technology took hold. The expectancy on the part of the public subscribers would be that ultimately the venture would be profitable and would return dividends.

The management of the corporation could be made up of representatives of agri-business concerns and the appropriate heads of participating nations. Implementation could take place through such already established agencies as the Food and Agricultural Organization and the World Health Organization of the United Nations, or similar institutions could be created. The program could draw support from private foundations which already have made important contributions to agriculture in the diet-deficient countries, and from agricultural colleges, universities and research institutions throughout the world.

Vast man-power would be required. It could be drawn in part from organizations such as the International Executive Service Corps, in which retired executives volunteer their expert services in marketing, processing, distribution, etc., and from such rich sources of young and energetic power as the Peace Corps, Vista, or the proposed National Service Foundation. Properly directed, the program could create meaningful jobs for literally tens of thousands of young people whose ethnic and racial backgrounds would make their efforts particularly acceptable in the diet-deficient areas.

The World Resources Corporation's program could begin with something still sadly lacking—a world resources inventory, upon which could be based the selection of feasible targets for development. Since agriculture cannot develop without an industrial counterpart, the Corporation's projects would include mining, manufacturing, transportation, and the development of power sources, in order to create the urban and industrial purchasing power to provide a profitable market for an expanded agriculture. The World Food Corporation Division would concentrate on the agricultural part of the program on at least three levels: basic research to relate temperate zone agricultural technology to other climate and soil areas; development of already existing agricultural systems to a higher level of productivity; and stop-gap projects which can be implemented in a relatively short time—such as protein fortification programs, aimed at al-

leviating immediate malnutrition problems while the longer range solutions are being explored.

It may be—probably will be—objected that such a system cannot be made to work because of the difficulties of private enterprise and governments working together (although the aerospace program proves it can be done); because of extreme nationalistic policies on the part of participating countries (which hasn't stopped the World Health Organization from functioning) or because there simply isn't enough capital to do it (although it always seems possible to raise this magnitude of capital investment for military purposes, even in peacetime).

It does appear that whenever it has been necessary to overcome these obstacles, they have been overcome. There is no reason to believe this would not also be true in meeting the world food crisis. The alternatives are too awful to think about.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on the District of Columbia has devoted a substantial part of its effort this year to the problem of combating crime in the National Capital area.

We have been working closely with the President and his administration to enact the new legislation necessary to help the law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia to substantially reduce the crime rate.

Our committee was the first to report any part of the President's crime program.

We will complete our action within weeks on all of the bills the President has sent to Congress to combat District of Columbia crime.

Recently, the President held a conference at the White House involving congressional leaders, officials of the Department of Justice, and Chief of Police Jerry Wilson to discuss the crime problem and the congressional action necessary to help meet it. At that time, I reported to the President on the progress we are making, and we had a very useful exchange of views on that subject. The White House has released the transcript of a portion of that meeting which will be of interest to Members of Congress and to the public as well.

I ask unanimous consent that that transcript, plus a summary to date of the activities of the District of Columbia Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Remarks of the President and other participants at a bipartisan congressional leadership meeting in the Cabinet Room at the White House, Oct. 9, 1969)

The PRESIDENT. Let me open the meeting by saying that in speaking of crime in the District of Columbia, everybody around this table knows that we speak of an issue that is certainly not partisan. What we are talking about here is a problem that is national and it is a problem in which the Congress traditionally has had a function which is very special in relation to the District and also special in relation to what the District can be in its example to the Nation.

I have noted in reading the statements that all of us have made in campaigns, and on the subject generally in nonpolitical speeches about crime in this country, that we have

pointed to the fact that the Nation's Capital, the first city in the world, should really be an example to the Nation and to the world of a safe city, a city in which not only the citizens of this city but the ambassadors and others who visit this city can feel safe, within reason, at least, having in mind the problem that any city, any place, is going to have some crime.

We all know that the situation with regard to crime in the District in the past, going back over several years has not been one that we can be proud of. This is not said in any partisan sense. It has run through all administrations and today it has reached crisis proportions, as the presentation by the Chief (Jerry V. Wilson, Chief of Police of the District of Columbia) will indicate.

Now, what we do about this is something we will discuss after the presentation has been made. But I will simply summarize my opening remarks by saying what is done is certainly related to the actions of three different groups.

First, the Congress has a responsibility. We are, in a sense, the legislative body of the city. It is true that home rule is now being established, but the Congress has the primary responsibility in terms of legislation in this field.

Second, the city government has some responsibility. It can take some action that will be indicated in this briefing.

Third, in the administration of justice, the Department of Justice has some responsibility, and we will have the Department of Justice here to make a presentation with respect to how they are going to meet their responsibilities.

All I am saying here, I emphasize, is simply to present in a preliminary way the situation as I see it. This is not a partisan question, it is a national question. It is a question which I think we want the facts on. We want to know what to do and then it is time to get going and to do it because nobody feels comfortable about sitting on what I think is an explosive, and frankly, when we see these statistics, a disgraceful situation with regard to crime in the District of Columbia.

We cannot point our finger to the other cities or the national crime statistics unless we do something about crime here where we are and were we have the responsibility.

Chief, you tell us the facts.

Chief of Police JERRY V. WILSON. Mr. President, Members of Congress, members of the press:

I have a few statistics here, but this is not a statistical presentation, because I think all of you are generally familiar with the statistics, but it is merely to set a stage for the problems we have.

This is the data of criminal index offenses, January through June of 1969. As you can see, the District of Columbia is second in actual number of offenses and second in offenses per thousand population.

In the more problems areas, for example, robbery, we were first, but there are other cities that are close to us. It is a national problem, as the President said. Baltimore is close and San Francisco is close behind. The San Francisco area has a higher rate than we have in the Washington area, but we do have an extreme problem with robbery in this city at this time, and with crime across the board.

We have also presented data which has been published in the press of comparisons of crime in the District, January through June of 1968 and 1969, showing a 22 percent increase in crime in D.C. and suburbs, compared to a national urban increase of 9 percent, an increase in our own metropolitan area of some 9.6 percent.

I would point particularly to the problem in robbery. We have, again, a real problem area in this city at this time of robberies. In this we have nearly a 50 percent increase in robberies during this period.

To put it in perspective with the past, I have presented data for 1958, 1962, 1966, and 1969. I want to say at the outset that our data for the past years has some question to it. I am not sure how much, precisely. When we say that 1958 was our low year for crime in the city, I am willing to say to you that we were fudging on our statistics some then.

I will give you a 10 or 15 percent edge, and say that our crime may have been 10 or 15 percent more than it is now, but even if you wanted to say that robberies were double in 1958—which was 348, and I don't believe it would double—we have had a tenfold increase in robberies. These are not pickpockets and purse snatching, these are FBI robberies which include force and violence and armed robberies.

We have had an increase in burglary from 1,700 to 10,000 offenses in 11 years, and in auto theft, some 900 offenses to some 4,600 offenses.

This is a projection of trends based on our data for 1966 through 1969, showing a projection indicating that we will rise, unless something is done, from 55,000 annually as of 1969, to some 80,000 offenses annually as of 1972. Note that in our total offenses and in our offenses against persons, we are already going ahead of the trend. That would indicate we have may have even more.

These have been statistics, and again, I am not willing to make a statistical presentation. I want to talk a little bit about what crime is subjectively to people who live and come through the city. I want to talk about Safeway stores, and I don't mean to advertise them, but Safeway stores as a grocery chain, have a large number of intercity chain stores—42—and since July 1 they have had 53 holdups.

They have tried to combat this with armed guards. The consequence has been that they have had one armed guard killed and another shot. They have difficulties now hiring them. These holdups range from one individual who holds up a check-out clerk and the manager doesn't know she is held up until he is gone, to an incident 2 weeks ago in Northeast where five armed men go in and make 100 customers lie on the floor until they rob the store.

This does something to the stores. They can't get competent help to work in the store. It forces the residents of the downtown area to go to the suburbs to shop because they are afraid to go to the neighborhood store.

Safeway will have a quarter of a million dollars in holdups this year.

I will talk about High's stores, 156 holdups since July 1. It is a favorite of the holdup men. In this case, they tend to hire low-paid women who live in the neighborhood. These women often know who held them up, but they are afraid to tell the police because the man is often back on the street. So it is impossible to find out who held them up.

Liquor store holdups are generally down this year. The holdup man has learned that when he goes to the liquor store he is taking that man's money, and that man is going to shoot him. So they go to Safeways, High's, or the deliverymen on the route.

The PRESIDENT. What do you mean they know that the man is going to shoot them? Do you mean they are armed?

Police Chief WILSON. The liquor store people are armed. It is their money. In the High's store it is the clerk who is hired. The store has a good policy, I would suggest, of saying, give them the money, and the cleaning truck driver on the street is going to give it up, but when they go to the liquor store it is that man's money.

Let's talk about the downtown merchants. If you go downtown, you will see that the clerk is going to have a key on a chain around his neck, because the cash register is locked.

They have groups of kids—10 or 15. They go into stores and take what they want and go.

Shoplifting is a problem, but it is not the old pilferage shoplifting, it is going in and grabbing and running. It is a real problem. We have worked hard with the downtown stores with this, because the city cannot afford to lose these stores to the suburbs, and this is what happens. The stores give up and move to the suburbs.

Talking about poor people, I had a call yesterday afternoon from a community leader of the Barry Farm Welfare Mothers. The woman was almost crying, saying that the mothers lose their money. The burglars go in and take furniture and appliances. She was telling me about the problem they have in public housing with the children on dope, the 12 and 13 year olds.

This is the problem throughout our city. Two weeks ago a court of general sessions judge called me and said, "My God, I don't know what is going to happen. These holdup men stand in front of me and smirk because they know I have to let them go."

I went to U Street 2 months ago, to one of the real estate offices. He had a sign, "All rent must be paid by check. No cash accepted." The door is locked and the clerk comes to see you before you go in.

I went to a Baptist Church service. They had signs throughout the church, "All officers and employees are prohibited from leaving money on the premises." That is so the burglar will know there are no valuables on the premises.

Even prostitution is rampant in this city, and we arrest prostitutes who tell us they are brought to town with the promise that they are not going to get jail terms on the first or second arrest; they will get fines that they can pay.

Let's talk about the factors that have led to problems of crime. I will not beat the dead horse of the Mallory Rule that happened a long time ago. Our crime has come up. We had a ban on investigative arrests in 1962. We have had some crime increase since then.

There are other factors at work in crime. We have had crime throughout the city where these factors didn't come to work. It is very pointed though, that following enactment of the Bail Reform Act of 1966, crime has shot skyward, beginning in June or July of 1966, and again last fall, as I will discuss later, but largely when the many thousand cases from the April, 1968, riots went to court.

These are the long-term trends. I think there has been in effect just a general tendency to look towards hard law enforcement or firm law enforcement as being a bad policy.

Another factor that has come about has been an explosion of the narcotics problem, and this occurred in 1966. Part of the narcotics problem, of course, is the fact that we have no facilities in this city for treating narcotics. We have no facilities that realistically treat the narcotic addict.

There is a statute on the book which permits the involuntary hospitalization of the addict, but it has never been fully implemented. It was dropped almost entirely in 1966.

Again, I suggest we have poor sentencing policies. We have a policy in this city where all persons get concurrent sentences. The word is, when a man is arrested for a holdup, he knows he is free and he is going to get out on bail reform, and while he is out he might as well live high because he will get concurrent sentences for anything he does after that.

The growth of the juvenile problems has to be mentioned. That amounts to 45 percent of our robberies, 13 percent of the burglaries and 60 percent of the auto theft. All of these problems were accentuated by

the 1968 riots, which clogged the total criminal justice system.

I am one who believes that the total criminal justice system is one that has to be treated. I do not believe that treating the police department is going to solve the problem. But the problem is, we don't have swift justice. Chief Justice Burger said that many people will be deterred from serious crime if they believe the justice is swift and sure. Nobody believes that now, and they are right.

With robbery, we had our long-term trend of crime which literally exploded in our face last fall, especially in armed robberies. In November, December, and January our armed robberies went to unusual highs, from the level of about 300 a month to a level of almost 700 a month.

We had an abrupt drop in February, March, and April. What happened, of course, we think, is that the clogging of the courts from the riot cases probably made the holdup man know he was not going to get to trial.

The other thing was, of course, during Thanksgiving, in response to this, we beefed up police patrols, but in January before the drop came, Judge Hart gave a 15-year to life sentence to an armed holdup man and said he would give it to any armed holdup man who came before him.

At the same time, a general sessions judge, with a petty larceny case, gave the man 2 years.

I think no doubt most important, the court of general sessions in February obviously began disregarding the Bail Reform Act of 1966. This change is clearly reflected by the fact that in April, just before our robberies jumped up again, the Court of Appeals footnoted their letters and opinions by saying they had more repeals under the act than they had during the entire preceding 8 months.

Mayor Washington pointed out in August that something must be done. We need, as the President has said, movement on all fronts; legislative movement, appropriations movement. We need treating of the whole justice system.

I recommend, Mr. President, that the thing that we need most at this time is pretrial detention. I think the conclusion is inescapable that early action has to be taken on change of the Bail Reform Act of 1966. I think this action alone might abate our armed robberies.

We also need court reorganization, but we know that that will take a year or two before it takes effect. We need stronger sentences. We need more than anything else, other than the Bail Reform, to institute the involuntary hospitalization for narcotic users. We need to take them off the street. Our estimates at this time are that as many as 35 to 50 percent of our holdup men are narcotic users. If we can get them off the street, it will be a lot harder for the pusher.

In police manpower, in August the mayor authorized us to spend a quarter of a million dollars in overtime for policemen, but frankly, we have not seen that much effect from it. I don't think this is really an economical way of achieving change. The total justice system has to be treated and I can't emphasize that too much. My greatest fear is that Congress may go home without this being done.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS. Chief, I wonder if you would give the President an idea of how many—a conservative figure—narcotic addicts are released each month pending trial, without any facility whatever.

Police Chief WILSON. I have no count of the number.

Senator TYDINGS. Would 500 be a conservative figure?

Police Chief WILSON. There are at this point some 1,600 persons out on bail release at this time, and our data, which is not good data, indicates that about 50 percent

of these serious offenders are probably narcotic addicts.

The PRESIDENT. Fifty percent?

Police Chief WILSON. Of all serious offenders, probably 50 percent.

Senator TYDINGS. Would it be fair to say that in the last 8 to 12 months that the narcotic addict has moved into the field of armed robbery, away from just burglary?

Police Chief WILSON. Positively, yes, sir. There is no question that the narcotic addict who formerly was involved strictly in crime against property has moved to armed robbery. There is no question.

Senator TYDINGS. As you pointed out, the average robber or holdup man is arrested; he figures he has about 1 year in which to commit as many more robberies as he wishes because of the concurrent sentencing and because he knows he will not be brought to trial for at least a year.

Police Chief WILSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT. In concurrent sentencing, as all the lawyers around here understand, the point is that it doesn't make any difference if he is on that kind of a kick, or how many crimes he commits. He is just going to get the same sentence and that is why you get the double impact, as I understand, the moment you let him out. He has no incentive not to commit a crime.

Police Chief WILSON. And no real fear of getting caught, Mr. President. I am satisfied that this is why we have not had more policemen shot apprehending armed robbers, because their best bet is to give themselves up.

Senator TYDINGS. One more question, if you took 200 or 300 of these people out of circulation, what would happen to these statistics?

Police Chief WILSON. If we could get the right 300 people off the street, I think it would probably almost cure the problem. I think that it would do two things: It would get those committing most of the crimes, and the thing that I am afraid has happened is that we have created an atmosphere that not only perpetuates the hard criminal, but also draws into it the youngster who sees it.

The PRESIDENT. Who are the right 300?

Police Chief WILSON. The narcotic addicts.

The PRESIDENT. Not the young ones?

Police Chief WILSON. No.

The PRESIDENT. These are the hard, tough ones who are completely hooked?

Police Chief WILSON. Yes, sir, but we also need to do something about the youngsters on narcotics, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. I agree, but you are talking about the hard 200 or 300, and treat the others?

Police Chief WILSON. It is relatively few. There are probably less than 100 professional holdup men who repeatedly get out on bail bond, and we could probably lick the problem.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. Chief, to get away from this concurrent sentencing, some of us have introduced legislation which would make the sentencing mandatory if you used a gun in the perpetration of the crime, and it would not run on a concurrent basis with the crime itself, but you would be sentenced separately and positively.

The first offense would be 1 to 10 years, the second would be 25 years. The judge would have no discretion, and in that way the man would be punished, one, for carrying a gun, and secondly, for the crime he committed, but they would not run concurrently, which is the case in so many places today.

Police Chief WILSON. There is legislation now for additional penalties for a crime of violence while armed, and I have never heard of it being enforced, although it is on the books.

The PRESIDENT. We can have more questions later.

At this time Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst and Mr. Santarelli will make the presentation of Justice.

Deputy Attorney General RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST. Mr. President, Members of the Congress, and gentlemen of the press:

I would like to divide this presentation into two parts, a brief thumbnail sketch of what the Justice Department has done, and then have Mr. Santarelli, the Associate Attorney General, who has been intimately involved in the details of the problem for the last several months, go more into depth.

In response to the President's message to the Congress on January 31 with respect to the District of Columbia and crime, the Attorney General brought about his first reorganization of the Justice Department to accommodate and meet this problem. That was done in the Office of Criminal Justice.

In the prior administrations, the Office of Criminal Justice had been a philosophical thing, with two or three people dealing conceptually with the whole problem of criminal justice in the United States.

On February 1, the administration converted this into an action team, addressing itself to the problem of crime in the District of Columbia. Instead of three persons thinking about the problem, we have a permanent staff of five persons, headed by Mr. Santarelli, together with a task force of ten lawyers who have been working continually on the problem, and together with the assistance of other persons and departments of the executive branch.

As a result of their efforts, working some 60 hours a week for some 5 months, within a 5-month period of time, they have put together nearly 500 pages of carefully thought-out legislation in response to the President's message on January 31 dealing in a comprehensive manner with the whole problem of crime in the District.

I would like to outline for you, just by name and description, the present status of this legislation which was presented to Congress on July 11, 1969.

The first bill was the Bail Reform Bill to which the Chief alluded. It is in the Congress as Senate bill 2600 and in the House as House of Representatives bill 18036. So far as we know, no action is planned on it in the Senate. In the House, there is a hearing set on it on October 16.

The second bill is the court reorganization bill and criminal law reform bill.

The PRESIDENT. The hearing is in the District Committee?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. It will be in the Judiciary Committee.

Senator TYDINGS. The Urban Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

The PRESIDENT. I would like to have you tell us the committees.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. That is the only bill that is not in the District Committee. It is in the Judiciary Committee. All the other bills I will be referring to are in the District Committee of both Houses.

The next bill is the court reorganization and criminal law reform bill. In the Senate that is divided by the Senate District Committee into two parts, the court reorganization part, which was passed on September 16, 1969, with slight modification, and the criminal law section of it remains in the Senate and is subject to scheduled hearings in the Senate.

Senator TYDINGS. The hearings are complete. It is subject to markup.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. In the House, the bill has remained intact in both of its parts, and is subject to hearings, and so far as we know, there are no immediate prospects or plans for hearings with respect to the entire bill in the House.

The public defender bill is pending in both Houses and Senate and we are pending markup on the public defender bill.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. The fourth is the bail agency bill. The Senate passed a similar version of the administration's bill on July 8. The administration's bill was introduced on July 11, and both bills are scheduled for hearings in the House.

Then on September 26, a juvenile court and law reform bill was submitted to the Congress. The delay in the juvenile court bill was necessitated by virtue of its comprehensive nature, and although significant and important just in terms of priorities for congressional action dealing with the crime problem in the District, it was felt it would take less priority position so far as crime.

I would also like to make a comment with respect to a request by this administration for increased appropriations from the Congress. We have requested on behalf of the Department of Justice a loan of \$1½ million additional to permit the Department of Justice to address itself to the specifics of crime in the District of Columbia, and the District government itself has requested an additional \$8 million to deal specifically in terms of increases in crime in the District of Columbia. That \$8 million would be part of a total package of \$20.6 million.

The Department of Justice requests have passed the House and are before the Senate and neither House has passed a request of the District of Columbia with respect to those increased appropriations.

At a later time, we might concern ourselves, Senator Tydings, with these requests for appropriations, particularly looking to the narcotics problem and the treatment of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia.

That is a thumbnail sketch, Mr. President. I would like to have Mr. Santarelli briefly describe, in depth, the significance of each of these pieces of legislation.

Associate Deputy Attorney General DONALD E. SANTARELLI. Mr. President and gentlemen:

We will start with the Bail Reform proposal. By way of understanding the context of this, I think it is important to recognize that since 1789 we have assured the right of bail in capital cases. Over the years capital cases eroded, and now almost no serious offense is capital except murder.

Now under the reform of the Bail Law, there was enacted a statute which made it mandatory to release persons in noncapital cases, pending trial. The problem with this is that for 176 years, the courts devised a method by which to detain dangerous people. By doing that, the court detained persons prior to trial.

Since 1966 this is no longer possible. Now all persons who are no longer charged with capital offenses are released prior to trial, and since we now have a delay factor of up to 10 months to a year in the District of Columbia for serious felonies, this means that all persons are released.

We have proposed comprehensive legislation to revise the bail law that was passed in 1966. This bill which Mr. Kleindienst mentioned, does a number of things. It specifically allows the court to take into consideration dangerousness to the community by the defendant's release when it sets those conditions of release, or in the alternative, it can detain persons prior to trial in the event that the court finds them to be dangerous.

We have also provided in that bill for extensive due process procedures to assure that no person will be detained improperly. The court has to go through a series of findings before it can order detention, and then only for 60 days, and the trial shall be expedited in those 60 days over and above other less dangerous persons.

We have provided in that bill additional conditions for bail jumping and we have provided that they are consecutive rather than concurrent in their application. That is in the Judiciary.

We have provided a comprehensive proposal for court reform. This applies to the District of Columbia. Presently, it is in the District Committee. The proposal would transfer all of the local, State-like felony crimes and civil jurisdiction from the present United States District Court to a newly created Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

The Superior Court would consist eventually, over a period of 3 years, of 50 judges. That is 23 more judges than presently sit on the court of general sessions.

The Superior Court would incorporate into it the court of general sessions, and we would have a very large court, hopefully able to keep very current with its calendar. We would also expand the present District of Columbia Court of Appeals and create a unified court system, trial court, appeal court, and the appeals going directly to the Supreme Court. We would no longer have a double appeal in the local appeals court and the U.S. Court of Appeals which we presently have.

The jurisdiction would be transferred in stages over a period of 2 to 3 years. In the first stage, 15 or more felony crimes, and finally all civil jurisdiction over the 3-year period.

The new court would have some unique aspects to it. We would give life tenure to the Judges of this Superior Court subject to mandatory retirement at age 70, and subject to good behavior removal. We would create a removal commission which would have the power to suspend, remove or retire for cause, judges who are convicted of crimes, who fail to perform their duty or conduct themselves in a manner prejudicial to the administration of justice and tend to bring disrepute to the office.

This panel would consist of seven members; one judge, three members of the bar and three residents of the District of Columbia, two of which could be members of the bar.

Another aspect that it would have would be a Chief Executive for administration. This Executive would have very broad powers to administer the court in the most technologically advanced and specific manner available.

We wrote into the bill that computers would be used to the greatest extent to calendar cases. We would have a comprehensive Director of Social Services in charge of all the social programs in the court, both probation and in the family court structure. Part of this new court would consist of a family court division, a rather novel situation in which juveniles and their families could be treated together in one comprehensive civil type procedure with a civil remedy of sanction and injunction rather than criminal penalties in a family situation.

A very significant part of the court reform bill is procedural change. We strongly believe that it was not enough to simply add more judges, but we have to have more efficient and fair procedures rather than to rock along with the obstacle-like procedures that we presently have.

We have changed the rules of evidence and changed the rules relating to mental health commitments. We have provided a local wire tap statute, a local conspiracy statute, which we do not have in the District of Columbia.

We have provided for recidivist statutes, including life status for three-time felons. We have rewritten the arrest power and made clear what the power of the police is to deal with crime. We have provided for citizen arrest provisions, a prohibition on resisting arrest, new notions on search and seizure and new powers for the prosecution, including prosecution appeal.

Another aspect of our court reorganization and juvenile bill which was submitted on the 26th of September is a totally new treatment of the juvenile problem. We have made waiver of juvenile persons accused of

crime to adult courts a much easier practice. We have lowered the age to 15, so those few hard-core 15-year-olds could be waived to adult prosecution.

We have provided that 16 and 17 year olds charged with violent felony crimes shall be prosecuted as adults, and we have required the practice of requiring jury trials in juvenile cases.

We have elevated the standard of proof requiring new evidence, and we have safeguarded their rights, rights to lawyers, rights to medical examinations and recordkeeping confidentiality.

We have provided a bail agency bill. In this case we are very much concerned that persons who are released prior to trial on pretrial release, with or without a condition, have no effective sanctions against them for their conduct prior to trial. If they do not conform to the condition put on by the court, no one is to know the difference. If they commit crimes, no one is to know the difference.

Therefore, we propose to establish an agency for those people to insure that their conduct conforms to the order of the court.

Senator TYDINGS. That is the bill that passed the Senate in July.

Mr. SANTARELLI. That is correct. We submitted our July letter somewhat different than yours, Senator.

We would also provide for a public defenders office in the District of Columbia, a comprehensive office, capable of representing 60 percent of the indigent persons accused of crime. We have a small agency now which represents 10 percent.

The PRESIDENT. But no public defender. Is there any other city where there is not one?

Senator TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President, but this is a good bill.

The PRESIDENT. I was thinking of San Francisco and New York, for instance.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. They are not adequate in any city, frankly.

The PRESIDENT. This goes further?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT. It also goes back to the point we made earlier, and some of these are highly technical matters which lawyers can argue on the committee and on the floor, but what appeals to me about the program that has been presented is that it moves into areas in which you are looking around the country and picking the most advanced kinds of approaches. Things that have been tried before and didn't work, you have thrown out, and things that have been tried and worked, you have incorporated. Also there are some new approaches which brings us to this fundamental point that the District of Columbia could well be a city where we set an example for the rest of the major cities, and particularly because you have here, let's face it, on the Judiciary Committee of the House and Senate, and on the House District Committee, people from all over this country, people who should have the capability and also the responsibility to lead rather than to simply follow.

I think that is really the point. That is the spirit in which I think this has been prepared. I know when we talked about the matter earlier, I urged the Department of Justice in its recommendations to come up with a program not to just patch up some of the old laws we have, so that this city could be an example.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. We think that is what this program is, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Incidentally, I want to say to Senator Tydings, we don't consider it to be the end result, I think your suggestion in terms of the treatment of the juveniles in the narcotics field is an area where we ought to be in the leadership, also. I think that is an area we ought to discuss.

Mr. SANTARELLI. The bail agency bill would provide for new concepts in the representation by the Public Defender's office in all

areas, parole, probation, juvenile representation which is not presently existing in the District of Columbia in all misdemeanors.

Turning to appropriations, I think it is significant in view of the interest expressed here this morning to note that presently pending in the District of Columbia, in the government's request for a narcotics treatment program, is a request for \$400,000 in addition for their narcotic treatment programs, and also a request for a reprogramming of \$200,000 previously requested into a narcotics treatment program.

With respect to correction, which everyone is interested in and does not lend itself to substantive specific legislation, but far more to appropriation legislation, the District government has in its present budget \$8 million in additional funds for an improved correctional system for almost 500 additional positions for persons in the system, for new administrative techniques, work release programs and a training academy for correctional officers.

In addition, the police budget for the District of Columbia has a \$4 million request for 1,000 new police officers which the President called for back in his message.

The PRESIDENT. I have one fundamental question. In this field of crime, as all of us who are lawyers are quite aware, it is imperative to have a balance between an approach which emphasizes stiff penalties and an approach which gets at what is perhaps the heart of the problem, the repeater.

In other words, it is the treatment of the first-offender and the treatment of those who commit a crime and then go out and commit another one.

Do you consider this program to have that proper balance?

Mr. SANTARELLI. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. I think we have also addressed ourselves to the essential interest in the care of the innocent at the same time.

The PRESIDENT. Do you have a figure in the District of Columbia with regard to the percentage of crimes that are committed by people who have committed crimes before?

Mr. KLEINDIENST. The recidivism rate in the District is one of the highest in the country.

Senator TYDINGS. I think it is something like 67 per cent within 5 years and maybe a little less within 1 or 2 years.

The PRESIDENT. That gets to the heart of the problem. The Chief mentioned a moment ago that if he could get the 300 most wanted that you could break the back, you think, of this crime wave in the District. I think, also, would you not agree, Chief, that in addition to getting those 300, that if we could have a new approach to the person who commits a crime and then who is going to continue to commit crimes, a new approach to attempt to reduce that tendency that would also be helpful.

Do you agree with a need for that as well? I want this said while the press is here. Chief Wilson has impressed me with his presentation now and also because of his record, and also because he does not approach this simply in the routine way that sometimes very dedicated law enforcement officers do; saying, "more penalties will do it."

He recognizes the penalties and the modifications of the Bail Reform are needed. But you endorse this kind of an approach which gets at this, particularly these young people who commit a crime and then within a year commit another one.

Police Chief WILSON. Mr. President, I think one of the worst parts of our criminal justice system, not only in the District of Columbia, but in the nation as a whole, because the recidivism rate is 73 percent within 5 years, is really that we don't rehabilitate criminals. Criminals really just grow too old to get out and commit crime.

What happens is that they come into the system at 16 or 17 or 18 and go in and out of the institutions until 26 or 27 and perhaps get married and settle down because they are too old to get out on the street at night.

This is what rehabilitates crime in the streets now and it is a sad commentary on our system.

I think at this point in time stricter penalties would help. I don't see that as a long-term solution.

The PRESIDENT. But you need the penalties now?

Police Chief WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator TYDINGS. Between swifter penalties and stiffer penalties, which, in your opinion, would be the most effective?

Police Chief WILSON. If I could get a man 1 year, 3 weeks after the crime was committed, I would take the 1 year, if I could get it.

Mr. KLEINDIENST. I think the Chief and the Senator have emphasized the due process as a preventive process to the arbitrary bail which is posed by judges on a very arbitrary basis. This gives us precise terms in which you can determine safety in a community with appropriate due process safeguards and I think it would be one of the most significant innovations with regard to this problem.

Police Chief WILSON. The 16-year-old sees the 18-year-old hold up a store and is arrested and he sees him on the street the next day. Two or three years later he has forgotten the fact when the holdup man goes to jail. If you could get them to jail sooner I think it would remove the idea that nobody goes to jail—and they are right.

The PRESIDENT. To what extent has the question been raised about the increase in robberies, due to the fact that narcotics enforcement has become more effective?

Police Chief WILSON. We don't see that a large factor, Mr. President. This doesn't seem to have affected it.

The PRESIDENT. I noted the speculation in the press to that effect. You don't see it?

Police Chief WILSON. Our observation was an immediate rise in narcotics prices which immediately dropped off and it was probably more in the area of profiteering than a real shortage in the market.

We have a feeling that some of the merchants were saying there was a shortage in order to jump the price, but this has dropped off and the price seems to be what it was before.

I think our real problem is almost obviously the problem with the Court of Appeals and the Leathers decision and the subsequent decisions in June.

NOTE.—The President spoke at 8:47 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. As printed above, this item follows the text of the White House press release.

(Also present for the bipartisan meeting were: Senators Winston L. Prouty and Roman L. Hruska; Representatives Gerald R. Ford, Archer Nielsen, William M. McCulloch, Glenn R. Davis, and William H. Natcher.)

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF ANTI-CRIME ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I. COURT REFORM TO CUT THE BACKLOG OF CRIMINAL CASES

February 18—Senator Bible introduces S. 1067 and S. 1068 on Court Reform.

February 28—Senator Tydings introduces S. 1214 and S. 1215 on Court Reform.

March 25-26—Hearings on court reform cancelled because Administration bill not ready. Committee begins own hearings on narcotics instead.

May 19-22—Hearings scheduled for May 19-22 on Administration bill cancelled. Administration bill still not ready. Hearings held on S. 1067, S. 1068, S. 1214, S. 1215 instead.

June—Court hearings postponed again because Administration not ready.

July 1—Chairman Tydings warns in speech to Board of Trade "I have made every effort possible to wait for the Administration. But I cannot postpone the final court hearings any longer. The Committee will conclude its court hearings the week of July 17 and will proceed in due course to report a bill. I hope the Administration can be ready by mid-July. But we can have no more delays."

July 11—President sends his "D.C. Crime" bill to Congress.

July 15-16-17. Hearings on President's bill (S. 2601).

September 4—Committee orders Court Reform portions (80%) of President's bill reported.

September 16—Report filed in Senate.

September 18—President's Court bill passes Senate.

II. AMENDMENTS OF CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

July 11—President's bill received.

September 18, 25 and October 2—Hearings held and concluded. Scheduled to be reported to Senate by November.

III. STRENGTHENING THE BAIL AGENCY TO REDUCE PRE-TRIAL CRIME

January 22—Senator Tydings introduces legislation (S. 545).

February 1—Hearings held.

April 22—Department of Justice declines to comment on bill.

July 3—Committee reports S. 545.

July 8—Senate passes S. 545.

July 11—President submits his own bill as part of his "D.C. Crime" bill.

IV. JUVENILE CRIME

June 5—Senator Tydings introduces legislation (S. 2335) for extradition of juvenile delinquents.

August 8—Hearing on S. 2335.

August 11—S. 2335 ordered reported by full Committee.

September 18—Passed Senate.

September 26—President's Juvenile Court bill, promised last spring, is sent to Congress.

October 1—Senator Spong opens hearings on violence in Public Schools.

V. NARCOTICS

February 11—Senator Tydings asks courts and Bail Agency to institute narcotics addiction tests on criminal defendants.

March 2—Senator Tydings asks President to support creation of Metropolitan Washington Regional Narcotics Treatment facility.

March 25-26, April 9-10-11, June 17. Narcotics hearings.

March 26—Senator Tydings calls for Grand Jury to indict major narcotics traffickers.

April 21—Senator Tydings asks Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments to establish task force to coordinate area antinarcotics program.

July 29—Narcotics Crime Conference of Baltimore and Metropolitan Area Law Enforcement Officers, called by Senator Tydings, plans regional narcotics crack-down cooperation.

COMMITTEE ACTION ON OTHER PARTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROGRAM

I. MASS TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT

May 16—President's bill introduced by Senator Tydings (S. 2185).

June 10-11—Hearing held.

July 1—S. 2185 ordered reported by Full Committee.

July 8—Passed Senate.

II. HOME RULE

April 25—Committee bills on Home Rule introduced.

April 30—Hearings on Committee Bills.

May 13—President sends his Home Rule bills to Congress.

September 25—President's bills reported to Senate.

October 1—Senate passes President's Home Rule Bills.

III. REVENUE

August 11—D.C. Revenue Bill passed by House (H.R. 12982) (As a tax measure, it had to originate in the House).

August 12-13—Hearings on H.R. 12982.

August 13—H.R. 12982 formally referred to Committee by Senate.

September 24—H.R. 12982 reported to Senate.

October 3—Senate passes H.R. 12982.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, since its beginning in 1919, the League of Women Voters has shown itself as an effective force for public good. Working on all three levels of Government, the league puts primary emphasis on an informed citizenry, the essential protection for a democratic society. I would like to add my congratulations to the League of Women Voters on its 50th anniversary and my best wishes for the future. I can only hope that the league will be as productive in the next 50 years as it has been over the past 50 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the New York Times editorial entitled "League of Women Voters at 50."

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

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS AT 50

For fifty years the League of Women Voters has done admirable work across the country in trying to encourage the participation of citizens in their Government. Now, in its semi-centennial year, the League is carrying on an \$11-million national drive to enable it to expand its efforts. It deserves support.

As Election Day approaches 150,000 members of the League, located in all of the fifty states and organized into 1,270 local Leagues, are actively engaged in trying to provide accurate, unbiased information about candidates and issues to the voting public. Millions of copies of the League's "Facts for Voters" and "Voters Guides" will be distributed.

The League will arrange countless forums, radio and TV programs at which candidates will have an opportunity to discuss their stands. In this city one of the three confrontations to which the three mayoral candidates have agreed will take place on the League's Direct Line program.

But the League's activities go far beyond its participation in campaigns. Its members study major public problems and seek to develop effective policies for needed changes. In this state, for instance, it has been one of the leaders in the long fight for judicial reform, still not won. Its publications carry highly informative material.

President Nixon, former H.E.W. Secretary John Gardner, and other national leaders have urged support of the League's drive. Contributions may be sent to the League of Women Voters, 105 East 22d Street, New York, N.Y., 10010.

THE TV NETWORKS AND THE NEWS—THE SILENT MAJORITY COMES INTO FOCUS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, those of us who have complained about biased news coverage by the television networks have

until recently taken all kinds of abuse from network sources and from certain elements of the press.

According to some of the statements that were made, a man had to be some kind of right-wing extremist to accuse the television networks of anything less than 100-percent objectivity.

It is welcome news that most of the responsible TV executives today recognize the fact that much of their news coverage in the past has been slanted or biased, that there has been too heavy an emphasis on the negative aspects of our society, and that the networks now are making efforts to rectify the situation.

This change in attitude is the subject of a remarkable article entitled "The Silent Majority Comes Into Focus," published in TV Guide for September 27, 1969.

According to the article there is a general recognition among TV executives now that:

There has been too much one-sided attacking of the United States, its institutions, and its citizens.

ABC's Lester Cooper is quoted as saying:

I want to do a show on what's right with America. We've heard so much about what's wrong. I'm not a chauvinist, but I am a patriot. There's a great America out there to cover.

Bill Leonard of CBS and Eliot Frankel of NBC both describe new programs designed to show "what is right with America."

In addition to admitting that there has been far too much emphasis on what is wrong with America, the network executives interviewed were very frank in admitting that their coverage of the Chicago riots and of other crisis situations had been seriously biased.

NBC documentary producer Shad Northshield was quoted as saying about the public reaction to the network coverage of the Chicago convention:

I was stunned by the public reaction to Chicago. We all were. I was stunned, astonished, hurt. It's the key thing that opened my eyes to the cleavage between newsmen and the majority. We didn't know 56 percent would have thought we were unfair. It raises enormous questions about journalism.

Desmond Smith of CBS was even blunter in discussing the question of bias. This is what he said:

There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are getting to feel they're not getting the whole story.

And Bill Leonard of CBS, while defending their coverage of Chicago, nevertheless gave voice to a bitter attack on bad reporting. Here are his words:

Most reporting is lousy. It's lousy because people are lazy, because people don't think ahead, because they approach things in rote ways. We have these kinds of reporters here, unfortunately. The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question—the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote an attack but doesn't go to the other side, because the answer might kill his story. . . . And these producers who develop and edit a broadcast from the point of view of the way they want it to turn out—with their own prejudices showing. That happens quite

often. . . . If we could get rid of those people we'd be a lot closer to our goal of objectivity.

Mr. President, I welcome these numerous indications that the networks are rethinking their position and that they are openminded enough to admit their past failings. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE "SILENT MAJORITY" COMES INTO FOCUS (By Edith Efron)

"The Riots."

"Chicago."

They stick like giant burrs in the newsmen's minds—symbols of the clash between them and the majority of the public.

That clash has not yet been resolved. It still flares up at the slightest provocation and is a chronic issue at the networks, where top executives wait tensely for the day's mail and look back nostalgically at the days when five critical letters were a crisis.

The nature of the public's simmering anger is well-understood. CBS's Bill Leonard says: "The right and the middle complain that we put on irresponsible people from the left." ABC documentary producer Steve Fleischman, too, says: "People feel we've given too much play to the radicals." And NBC News president Reuven Frank says: "The general view of the public is that we have too many radicals in the network news departments."

The newsmen's awareness of the seriousness of this situation was brought to a peak by the "conservative" electoral results—"conservative" being the odd "new politics" label for an amorphous antiradical coalition encompassing the spectrum from "Establishment Democrats" through the Nixon center to the far-right Wallace voters. This active antiradicalism of the majority has reoriented important aspects of the newsmen's professional thinking. As a result, something new is happening in programming. It is a development that will please many Americans and anger others.

What is happening results from a change in newsmen's thinking—so we'll start with that.

The most obvious change is the sudden emergence in strength of an attitude that has been commonplace among viewers for years. Namely, that there has been too much one-sided attacking of the United States, the institutions and its citizens, on the airwaves. This opinion, once viewed as "flag waving" by many newsmen, today is enunciated as follows:

ABC's Lester Cooper: "I want to do a show on what's right with America. We've heard so much about what's wrong. I'm not a chauvinist, but I am a patriot. There's a great America out there to cover."

CBS's Bill Leonard, on an upcoming documentary: "It will capture the spirit of America. We'll be showing strengths as well as weaknesses. It's a wonderful country and it's absurd. You'll be laughing and crying. That's what the U.S. is all about."

NBC's Eliot Frankel: "One of the themes in First Tuesday is to show what's right with America, as well as what's wrong. There's a lot that's right. Decent people, leading decent lives, knocking themselves out for others. . . ."

A good many men are also engaging in intensive soul-searching into the issue of biased reporting. NBC's documentary producer Shad Northshield says: "Bias is on everybody's mind. We've claimed we don't have it. And the viewers say, 'Yes, you do.' I was stunned by the public reaction to Chicago. We all were. I was stunned, astonished, hurt. It's the key thing that opened

my eyes to the cleavage between newsmen and the majority. We didn't know 56 percent would have thought we were unfair. It raises enormous questions about journalism."

One of the issues it raises for Northshield and others is a pronounced bias in favor of minority coverage in past network operations. "In TV news departments," says Northshield, "we appear to know a lot about the black minority. It's the silent majority we must explore. We haven't done it. We didn't know it was there!" CBS's Phil Lewis says: "We're beginning to realize we've ignored the majority. America doesn't end at the Hudson!" CBS News star Joseph Bentz says: "We spend so much time on angry blacks, angry youth. But what about the vast forgotten army out there? How many hard-working, law-abiding whites are mad as hell because their story isn't being told?"

Other men have taken their analyses further, in an attempt to get at the causes of this pro-minority emphasis. CBS's Desmond Smith is one of those who suspects that the newsmen have been politically used: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are getting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Fred Freed of NBC goes further yet. He attributes the situation to the newsmen's own liberal ideology: "This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of *Newsweek*, of *The New York Times*, of all media. Men of like mind are in the news. It's provincial. The blue- and white-collar people who are in revolt now do have cause for complaint against us. We've ignored their point of view. It's bad to pretend they don't exist. We did this because we tend to be uppermiddle-class liberals. We think the poor are 'better' than the middle class. We romanticize them. The best thing that happened to me was a month I spent walking in Detroit slums after the riots. I stopped romanticizing the poor.

"I've come to understand that it's really the same with all classes. You've got to sit down with the cop, with the little store-keeper, and get their views. They're human beings like everyone else. Their attitudes emerge logically from their interests and their values. They should be covered that way."

There are those in top managerial positions who don't pour out such confessions. CBS's Bill Leonard, for example, claims objectivity for CBS News, and declares vehemently: "We have nothing to apologize for, nothing—and I personally include our coverage of Chicago." But, in the course of several hours of conversation, Leonard relaxes and launches into an attack on "bad reporting"—which turns out to be a powerful disquisition on bias: Most reporting is lousy. It's lousy because people are lazy, because people don't think ahead, because they approach things in rote ways. We have these kinds of reporters here, unfortunately. The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question—the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote an attack but doesn't go to the other side, because the answer might kill his story.... And these producers who develop and edit a broadcast from the point of view of the way they want it to turn out—with their own prejudices showing. That happens quite often.... If we could get rid of those people we'd be a lot closer to our goal of objectivity."

And finally... there are those who are not theorizing about bias because they're too busy traveling back and forth between New York and Washington, coping with Congressional investigations into their alleged practice of it. CBS News producer Jay McMullen says the following: "We're getting a lot of

fiaf from Congress and the FCC—a lot of harassment. The Congressional focus is on the news area. It has to do with this whole business of our coverage of the riots, of Chicago. Producers are being called down to Washington and asked to explain their news decisions."

With all of this ferment going on behind the scenes, what, precisely is happening to news and public-affairs programming? The trends are exactly what you might guess: there is a shifting of coverage patterns at the polar ends of the usual spectrum covered by the network. The basic coverage, which has a moderate-liberal orientation, will remain the same. But in network news there is a distinct deflation of the coverage of radical left and of radical-left causes, particularly those of a militant type.

Prime-time news, for example, which operates in a restricted time slot, is upping its coverage of the middle and lower-middle classes. CBS has inaugurated a polling service to be used in key controversial stories to check on nation-wide opinion. Regular coverage of suburbia and lower-middle-class areas in the environs of New York City is being stepped up by CBS and NBC New York stations.

These trends are far more visible, however, in the documentary realm, where subjects are few and where the selective process is readily apparent.

Much of the vigorous planned activity for the season's opening lies in the area of "exploring middle- and lower-middle-class Americans." Various broad-gauge sketches of the Nation are ready to go. Some may already have appeared before you read this. At CBS: "A Day in the Life of the United States of America"; "The Making of the President: 1968"; two on "The Generation Gap." At NBC: a two-and-a-half-hour "From Here to the Seventies"; "Election '69: What We Learned," and, on *First Tuesday*, says producer Eliot Frankel, one of the themes will be "the malaise in middle-class life."

As for ABC, there is a veritable outbreak of Americana—with a list of shows up for sale to sponsors with names like: "The American Dream," "Hemingway's Idaho," "Small Town Judge," "A Country Preacher," "American Farmer," "Forest Ranger," "The Marines" and "Sousa Sound"—14 or 15 of such projected shows, as compared to eight last year. According to documentary vice president Tom Wolf, this reflects the thinking of sponsors, who themselves are responding to "the shift of climate in this country, the new attitudes of viewers."

By contrast to this ferment of activity on the majority front, "problem coverage"—the kind that increasingly requires the inclusion of radical opinion white and black—is in decline. The same number of documentary hours is scheduled as last year—a significant proportion of them, however, now packed into two "magazine" formats at CBS and NBC, which, of necessity, have acquired a lighter, "variety" approach to coverage. The number of straight, hour-length documentaries has shrunk and with it has come a diminution of "hard" problem coverage.

Why is this happening? Because of political pressure—defined in its broadest sense, from Congress down to the smallest grass-roots hamlet. The most visible pressure is coming from Congress. Says McMullen: "The tendency, when Congress harasses, is for individual producers to pull in their horns. I think this whole Congressional thing might be affecting the documentary operation." ABC's Steve Fleischman, too, says: "The medium is generally frightened of the documentary realm."

The three network presidents are on record with strong statements that, for the past year or so—ever since some of the public started to blast away at the networks' fea-

turing of radicals and radical issues—Congressional pressures have been threatening the medium's First Amendment rights.

On the national grass-roots level, which underlies Congressional pressure, there is evidence that resistance is building up to coverage of the radicals and radical issues at local broadcasting stations—for whom network news and documentary production is destined. A nation-wide survey conducted by *Television Age* indicates that programs on these issues are declining. "It may indicate," says *Television Age*, "that the public has been satisfied with studies of... urban crises... racial tensions... dope addiction and poverty."

There are many students of the broadcasting world who believe that the networks, always fear-ridden in the realm of politico-economic coverage, can scarcely afford to become more so. ("We never did have more than four or five tough documentaries a year," concedes CBS's Bill Leonard, "and at that we had more than the other networks put together.") Protests are now surfacing from the left side of the political spectrum—from liberals, radicals and militant blacks who are beginning to charge that the news departments are going "conservative."

One prominent TV journalist describes the trend as "the Nixonization of the airwaves." *Variety*, the industry's trade paper, accused the networks of cutting back on "hard" issues. And FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson charged broadcasters with squeezing out radical thought and of censoring news of capitalist-caused "death, disease, dismemberment and degradation."

Some TV newsmen, too, view the trends in the news departments as "conservative." Says Steve Fleischman, who describes himself as "ABC's kept radical": "Television is reflecting the national trend. There's a conservative, know-nothing stream in this country. And there's a liberal-progressive-radical stream. And there's a great body of people in the middle. The majority of newsmen are in that middle group. Today, that middle group is swinging back to conservatism. It's all part of the white backlash."

Needless to say, many other newsmen actively repudiate the *Variety*-Johnson-Fleischman criticism.

CBS's Salant has already hurled an answer to Johnson into print (*TV Guide*, Sept. 20) in which he presents a long list of anti-corporation stories aired by CBS; and, in answer to the charge that there is not enough "death, disease, dismemberment and degradation" on the air, says: "Let [the Commissioner] drop into my office some time and see the viewers' mail that comes across my desk complaining that that is *all* we ever talk about."

And others too grow angry at being described as creatures of a reactionary "establishment."

Snaps Lester Cooper of ABC: "Such criticisms are made by self-conscious, self-righteous, guilt-ridden people who feel the only way they can say something is by attacking." NBC's Shad Northshield raps out: "Doctrinaire, dogmatic opinion!" And NBC's Reuben Frank groans, "Oh, it's so tendentious. Those people want so to be 'in.' The next thing you know, Nick Johnson will be wearing Pucci pants!"

What really seems to be happening is this: "Public-interest" programming—and, most of all, documentary programming—is adjusting itself in a jerky, impulsive yet fear-ridden way to the massive pressure of middle-class opinion, while straining to attain a journalistic perspective. By virtue of this trend, coverage of militant-radical groups will not be eliminated but it is decreasing. As a corollary, the view of America as one vast abscess is now being corrected.

**TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—ACTION
OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, yesterday, October 20, the Committee on Finance met in executive session and concluded its consideration of those portions of the House-passed tax reform bill which concern the use of accelerated depreciation. The committee agreed with most of the objectives of the House provisions, but it did amend the bill to continue the present recapture rules for low and moderate income rental housing.

So that Senators might follow the progress of these executive sessions, I ask unanimous consent that a press release be printed in the RECORD.

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

[A press release from the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Oct. 20, 1969]

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

COMMITTEE DECISIONS

The Honorable Russell B. Long (D., La.), Chairman of the Committee on Finance announced today that the Committee had concluded its executive consideration of the portions of the House-passed tax reform bill dealing with the use of accelerated depreciation. He reported that the Committee was generally in agreement with the objectives of the House provisions and had approved the provisions restricting the use of accelerated depreciation in the case of real property to new residential property. However, in recognition of the goals fixed by the Housing Act of 1968, it had amended the bill to continue the present recapture rules for low and moderate income rental housing.

The full details of the Committee's actions are described in the following paragraphs:

Recapture of Excess Depreciation.—The Committee adopted a suggestion by the Treasury Department that in the case of new residential housing the recapture rules of the House bill be relaxed. Under this suggestion gain, up to the entire amount of accelerated depreciation in excess of straight-line depreciation, would be recaptured at ordinary income tax rates if the property should be sold within 10 years. Thereafter, the amount recaptured at ordinary income tax rates would be reduced by one percentage point for each month the property is held beyond ten years. If the property is held for 18 years and 4 months all gain realized on its sale would be taxed as capital gains. (Under the House bill, the recapture rules would apply to the gain reflecting the full amount of the difference between accelerated depreciation and straight-line depreciation.)

Recapture on Sales of Low and Medium Income Housing.—The Committee agreed to another Treasury Department suggestion under which the recapture rules of existing law would be retained without change for certain federally assisted projects such as the so-called FHA 221 (d) (3) and FHA 236 programs and for other publicly assisted housing programs under which the return to the investor is tightly limited. Under present law the gain, up to the full amount of the difference between accelerated depreciation and straight-line depreciation, would be recaptured at ordinary income tax rates if the property is sold within 20 months; thereafter the amount subject to recapture would be reduced by one percentage point for each additional month the property is held beyond 20 months.)

Recapture on Certain Dispositions.—The Committee also agreed to an amendment

which would retain the application of the existing recapture rules where the sale of the property was subject to a binding contract in existence prior to October 9, 1969, but where the transfer takes place after this date.

Foreign Real Estate.—The Committee agreed to another amendment also suggested by the Treasury Department (but modified by the Committee), under which accelerated depreciation would be available in the case of construction of residential housing in foreign countries only to the extent that the foreign country allows accelerated depreciation on that housing.

Rehabilitation Expenditures.—The Committee agreed to the provisions in the House bill which allow 5-year amortization of the costs of rehabilitating buildings for low-cost housing. However, it agreed to limit this amortization to expenditures made prior to January 1, 1975. This will provide time for the Congress to evaluate the effectiveness, and the cost, of this new incentive.

Depreciation Allowed Regulated Industries.—The Committee adopted the sections of the House-passed bill which would enact new provisions relating to the use of accelerated depreciation by regulated industries. These provisions generally provide that as to existing property, if straight-line depreciation is presently being taken, then no faster depreciation may be used. However, if the taxpayer is taking accelerated depreciation and is normalizing, then accelerated depreciation can continue to be taken but only if the taxpayer continues to normalize. (The utility retains the current tax reductions resulting from the use of accelerated depreciation and uses this money in lieu of capital that would otherwise have to be obtained from equity investments or borrowing.) No change in the method of depreciation would be required if the taxpayer is now on flow-through. (Where the utility is earning the maximum allowed by law or regulations, the utility "flows through" the tax reduction resulting from the use of accelerated depreciation to the utility's current customers in the form of lower rates.) As to new property, a taxpayer presently on straight-line or presently on accelerated depreciation with normalization will be permitted to take accelerated depreciation on the new property only if the tax benefits are normalized. However, the taxpayer may continue to use flow-through on new property, if the taxpayer is now on flow-through insofar as the same kind of property is involved. The bill does not change the power of a regulatory agency, in the case of normalization, to exclude the normalized tax reduction from the base upon which the agency computes the company's maximum permitted profits.

The Committee made certain changes in the House-passed bill. The more important of these changes follow.

The Committee adopted a provision which will permit regulated taxpayers to elect within 180 days after the date of enactment of the bill to shift from a flow-through to the straight-line method. The regulated taxpayer could also shift to a normalization method if he is so permitted by the appropriate regulatory agency.

The Committee also deleted oil pipelines from the category of companies covered by the bill. Oil pipeline companies compete with non-regulated forms of transportation and are not guaranteed any specific rate of return. However, regulated steam producers were included within the provisions of the bill as well as Comsat.

The Committee also adopted a definition of normalization which provides that a regulated utility must not only normalize on their regulated books of account, but that these books of account must also be used as the basic source of information in setting the current rates to be charged to their consumers. Further, the Committee adopted a provision which provides that a taxpayer

would not be treated as normalizing unless the entire deferral of taxes resulting from the difference between the depreciation expenses reflected in the regulated books of account and the accelerated depreciation deducted on their return is normalized.

The Committee also changed the date for determining the status of a company under the bill from July 22, 1969, to August 1, 1969 (the date the bill was introduced in the House and its specific provisions were made public). Further, the Committee adopted a provision which provides that the status of a company will be determined in the first instance by what was done on its income tax return for its most recent taxable year. In addition, regulated companies which have accelerated depreciation (with flow-through) in computing their tax expenses on their regulated books of account for the latest monthly period ending on or before August 1, 1969, would be permitted to elect accelerated depreciation (with flow-through) for future acquisitions. Also, a utility which had filed a request before August 1, 1969, with the Internal Revenue Service, or with the appropriate utility commission, for permission to change from straight-line to accelerated depreciation would be permitted to make that change for such property and future acquisitions.

Earnings and Profits.—The Committee adopted the provision of the House-passed tax bill which provides that for purposes of computing its earnings and profits, a corporation must deduct depreciation on the straight-line method, or on a similar method which provides for a ratable deduction of depreciation over the useful life of an asset. The provision would not affect the amount of depreciation that could be deducted in determining the corporation's income tax. However, the Committee adopted a change which would make it clear that this new rule would not affect foreign tax credits. The amount of the foreign tax credit which would be allowed a company would be computed as under existing law and would not be affected by this provision of the House-passed tax bill.

POLLUTION REVOLT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before the next 10 years have passed, the Nation will be facing a grave water crisis. Many sections of the country are already having serious water problems, and the accelerating rate of business, industry, municipality, and farm pollution of the Nation's water supply portends disaster for the future.

An editorial published in the Stevens Point, Wis., Daily Journal recognizes the leadership of the Wisconsin Seventh District Representative, DAVID OBEY, and his leadership in working for the appropriation. Mr. OBEY is a young Congressman who has shown his concern for the environment and is pledged to work for clean air and water. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLLUTION REVOLT

A revolt of major proportions is building in the House of Representatives against the administration's attempts to keep the lid on new spending for water pollution control.

A bipartisan group of congressmen—208 so far—have attached their signatures to a pledge to vote for a \$1 billion appropriation for water pollution control early this month. The 7th District congressman, David Obey, D-Wausau, is in the forefront of the group.

At issue is the promise explicit in the 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act of federal matching funds to the states for construction of waste disposal plants. But for budgetary reasons appropriations have lagged far behind authorizations.

During fiscal 1968, only \$203 million of \$450 million authorized was appropriated. For fiscal 1969, a total of \$214 million was appropriated of an authorization of \$700 million. The administration would like to hold fiscal 1970 spending to \$214 million, out of \$1 billion authorized.

This is what the revolt is all about. The protesting lawmakers doubtless sense political gain in the process, but that is not the only motivation for the rebellious insistence that the full billion dollars be appropriated this year.

Obey related last week how the administration's failure to come up with money promised has affected projects in the 7th District. He outlined a program of 87 water treatment projects being developed throughout the region he represents, to cost an estimated \$12,809,533. Of this total, \$4,688,543 would be in federal aid.

These projects have been developed to a large extent in response to orders from state authorities to clean up pollution. The state issued the orders in the belief that the federal government would keep its pledge to help municipalities comply with such orders.

But only a fourth of the money promised has been provided. The result of failure to receive federal matching funds is that the project comes to a grinding halt, for municipalities have no resources of their own salted away for such contingencies. Thus, without the \$4.6 million promised from Washington, nearly \$13 million in sewage treatment improvement will not get done in the 7th District.

Only 10 more signatures are needed on the pledge to assure passage.

CONTROL OF DRUG ABUSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on September 17, Dr. Stanley Yolles, the director of the National Institute of Mental Health, presented extremely interesting testimony on drug abuse before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

Dr. Yolles is director of the Government agency responsible for research on narcotic drugs.

With the current controversy raging about the relative danger of the various illegal drugs, I believe Dr. Yolles' comments are well worth our consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Yolles' remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROL OF DRUG ABUSE

(Statement by Stanley F. Yolles, M.D., Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Associate Administrator for Mental Health, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 17, 1969)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today as a professional involved and interested in the phenomenon of drug abuse in the United States. I would like to make clear that I am not representing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department has not filed a report on the bills pending before you and therefore I cannot comment officially about them.

As a physician, my opinions, convictions and conclusions are based on almost twenty years of professional involvement in the development of research, treatment and rehabilitation as they relate to users of narcotics and other dangerous drugs. My professional experience at the Public Health Service Hospital in Lexington, Kentucky and through the succeeding years at the National Institute of Mental Health, has included consideration of all facets of the drug problem—from prevention to penalties. So I have some strong convictions on the subject, based on professional and scientific experience.

With your approval, Mr. Chairman, I would first like to summarize the drug situation and then talk about hard narcotics and marihuana as separate and distinct parts of the total problem.

Dr. Sidney Cohen, Director of the NIMH Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse will speak to the hallucinogens, the amphetamines and the barbiturates.

THE DRUG PHENOMENON

The widespread social problem of drug abuse in the United States is no longer restricted to any one part of our population.

It is found at all social and economic levels: in the core city and in the suburbs. It is no longer restricted only to the young. It involves the junior executive and the housewife, the professional individual as well as the ne'er-do-well.

In this situation, there are things that need to be said on the basis of available fact and of professional and scientific experience.

There are unfortunately no totally reliable data on the prevalence of drug abuse, but it is a problem that is growing at an alarming rate.

In the case of narcotic drugs, statistics supplied by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for 1968 indicate that there are approximately 65 thousand active *hard narcotic* addicts in the United States. This is undoubtedly a minimal estimate, since it is solely based on reporting from law enforcement agencies.

A more plausible estimate is in the range of 100 thousand to 125 thousand active narcotic abusers in the United States.

The number of non-narcotic drug abusers, including those addicted or habituated to agents such as sedatives, stimulants, related drugs, and certain tranquilizers, can only be grossly estimated.

The range of persons directly affected by abuse of these drugs, based on available data on production and illicit distribution, lies somewhere between a quarter and a half million people.

The use of LSD has apparently declined during the past two years, but there is still evidence of active experimentation with LSD by some teen-agers. It remains a drug of abuse essentially for young middle-income persons.

Marijuana use has been rapidly increasing in the past five years.

A recent survey of certain high schools suggests that as many as 50 percent of students in selected urban and suburban areas surveyed have had some experience with marijuana.

A conservative estimate of persons in the United States, both juvenile and adult, who have used marijuana at least once is about 8 million and may be as high as 12 million people.

On a worldwide basis, marijuana is an intoxicant second only to alcohol in popularity and is used by some 200 to 250 million people.

These are facts to be reckoned with in a reasoned discussion of the problem and its possible control. But because drug use and abuse touches our deepest values, our hopes, our aspirations as well as our fears, it is an emotionally-charged area.

For every false prophet advocating drug use there is a viewer-with-alarm prone to sensationalism and the advocacy of simplistic solutions. As our sensitivity to the drug problem has increased over the years, our sense of proportion seems to have diminished.

However, in recent months, there have been significant indications that we, as a population, are ready to stop defending the mistakes of the past in our efforts to control the abuse of dangerous drugs and, rather, to explore new pathways through which our society can make its decisions.

Both President Nixon and President Johnson have strongly stated this need for a new approach toward understanding the problem.

President Johnson, recognizing that a recodification and unification of the laws on narcotics and dangerous drugs was long overdue, established the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. The report of this Commission has not as yet been published, but its findings will include recommendations on drug legislation.

President Nixon, in his message to Congress on combating drug abuse, stated that "it has been a common oversimplification to consider narcotics addiction or drug abuse to be a law enforcement problem alone."

Pointing out that effective control of illicit drugs requires the cooperation of many agencies of the Federal, State and local governments, the President said, "At the Federal level, the burden of the Federal effort must be carried by the Departments of Justice; Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Treasury."

As a health professional, I am strongly in favor of this kind of joint approach to the problem of control. I recognize and support the need for reasonable enforcement measures to control the problem. However, means to control drug abuse must include recommendations from the medical community, as well as from law enforcement officers. Too often, in the past, the medical point of view has been neglected.

Drug abuse is not a simple, unitary phenomenon. Drug use and abuse are health, legal, social, economic and moral problems.

It is necessary, in dealing with such complex phenomena, for the medical community at this time to accelerate the kind of research which will yield the basic knowledge for a more rational approach to the problem.

President Nixon has also emphasized that the solution to the problem has been hampered by lack of information.

"Proper evaluation and solution of the drug problem in this country," the President stated, "has been severely handicapped by a dearth of scientific information on the subject—and the prevalence of ignorance and misinformation."

It will take some exceedingly hard work to dispel the doubts and mistrust surrounding information on drugs, because from the beginnings of efforts to control drug use in this country there has been a long parade of what might best be called "error" and what has ranged from ignorance to misrepresentation.

Dr. Thomas Parran, while serving as Surgeon General, had this to say in 1938, during the dedication ceremonies of the PHS Hospital at Fort Worth, Texas:

"Errors were at first made in the treatment meted out to addicts. From doing nothing about the narcotic problem, we started in a sudden burst of enthusiasm to clean up the situation without proper regard for human values and without considering the suffering and distress entailed in a rigid enforcement of the law as it then stood."

"The law, in effect, made criminals out of persons who were guilty only of suffering from the effects of a weakness they could not control . . ."

"It soon became evident that we were in danger of losing by too harsh application of repressive measures what we were gaining by more intelligent attention to some phases of the addiction problem. We often completed the ruin of individuals whom it was our duty to save."

What we must realize in 1969 is that—although the drug abuse problem of today is acute—it has been with us for a long time and we have accomplished little in developing techniques that might have helped us in our current dilemma.

This situation is especially regrettable, because there is a large body of information available upon which improved methods of combatting the drug abuse problem can be based.

There are few fields in which there have been so many competent and thorough investigations by committees and commissions over the years as there have been in the area of narcotics and other dangerous drugs.

They include the 1938 Mayor's Committee of New York; the 1951 American Bar Association's Commission on Organized Crime; the 1963 President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse (the Prettyman Commission); the 1967 Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice; as well as the Wootton Committee of Great Britain.

These professional groups have reported with a unanimity not often evident in such a controversial subject area and I will refer to some of their specific recommendations later on. At the moment, I merely want to point out that the Nation has not accepted or implemented their recommendations. But the findings are available for the using, so that I see no need to establish another committee or commission to study marihuana.

Instead of favoring another commission, I find myself asking, "How long, Oh, Lord, how long are we going to suggest new committees, new commissions and new task forces in lieu of doing something?"

Certainly, studies of drugs and drug users must and are continuing, many of them supported by the NIMH. I submit that these studies serve to develop new information more expeditiously than any additional review-by-commission—at least until we have made use of the opinions and recommendations already available.

In contrast to establishment of another commission, I would favor provisions to direct the NIMH to conduct research and make a basic determination on marihuana. Some relevant studies are already under way.

Such proposals call for an end to the approach that passes restrictive laws first and then gets scientific evidence afterward.

We must put a very strong spotlight on this issue, Mr. Chairman. It is basic to any improvement in the control of drug abuse.

We cannot continue to restrict use, and legislate against the use of dangerous substances without scientific basis for control.

Senator Hughes, speaking in August at hearings of the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, in pleading for "open-mindedness and a willingness to make a fresh start", said:

"We are working from a prosecution, rather than a public health approach.

"The onus of the criminal association with drugs is a severe obstacle to therapy in drug addiction; and we can't even communicate with our kids about smoking pot because, under our laws, smoking marihuana and shooting heroin are in the same league, and neither we nor our kids can forget it."

This Committee is primarily concerned today with proposed Federal legislation, but the current framework of State law also illustrates the need for a more sound basis for public policies concerning drug abuse.

In the last year, State legislatures within this country have passed diverse and sometimes contradictory laws in their efforts to control drug abuse. At least 20 States have this year either passed new laws or amended existing statutes; and another 20 are debating proposed changes.

It would be tragic if these changes continue to be based on old confusions and controversies. The disparities among laws in the States need to be lessened rather than increased and this can occur only after agreement about the degree of risk associated with the use of each drug and an appropriate proscription of use based on that risk, and the Federal Government should point the way.

One of the major difficulties in efforts to arrive at effective control of drug abuse has come from the practice of grouping dangerous drugs arbitrarily, with little regard for their differing characteristics and their specific and distinct effects.

I hope that Dr. Cohen and I can clarify these differences, to help define the degree of danger in the abuse of each of the dangerous drugs.

NARCOTICS

There can be no doubt that control of narcotics is necessary, both to protect the user and to protect society. The major dangers of abuse of drugs such as heroin are known and have been repeatedly demonstrated.

The direct result of overuse may be death. Indirect results are often ill health, or death from hepatitis, pneumonia, malnutrition, or infection and disease induced by the use of dirty hypodermic syringes. And as a way of life for the individual, there is gross deterioration in a "junkie" culture.

Stronger and more effective controls on smuggling, sale and distribution of narcotics by the underworld are needed.

However, realizing that laws seeking to control personal consumption by individuals are notoriously hard to enforce, I would urge the further expansion of high quality treatment and rehabilitation programs.

The principle that treatment and rehabilitation of the addict is to be preferred over punishment has only recently become a Federal policy, with the passage of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966.

As I have mentioned, Dr. Parran's concern over the punitive bases of treatment was expressed in 1938. Other professionals had also spoken out for reforms. But civil commitment for narcotic addicts received its greatest impetus in 1962 when the Supreme Court, in the Robinson case, declared that statutes making addiction to narcotics a criminal offense were in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

The court maintained that drug addiction is an illness "comparable to leprosy, insanity, and the common cold" and that criminal punishment could not be inflicted for it.

Ironically, although the decision was a milestone for the principle of treatment and rehabilitation, it came too late to help the addict Robinson. Free while his appeal was pending, Robinson had already died in a Los Angeles alley before the Supreme Court made its ruling. According to police reports, the cause of death was an overdose of narcotics.

The passage of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 opened a pathway to treatment of the sick addict.

The statute in no way limited enforcement of laws designed to control drug traffic, or to prosecute organized criminals. What the law recognized is the fact that the individual *addict* is sick and needs help.

The NARA legislation was adopted so that a community-based treatment and rehabili-

tation program could be developed in the United States. Research advances made it worthwhile to try some new approaches in solving the stubborn narcotics problem.

The NIMH is carrying out a comprehensive program in an attempt to develop the necessary understanding, manpower and improved techniques for dealing with the narcotic problem.

Through its administration of the NARA Act and the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act, the NIMH is actively carrying out the Congressional mandate to treat and rehabilitate, rather than punish the addict.

The program has been in operation for a year-and-a-half. Six community treatment programs for narcotic addiction were funded in FY 1968 and are in operation. Ten more were funded in FY 1969.

I am in general agreement with legislative provisions to expand eligibility for treatment under NARA, to include those addicts charged with burglary, those who have failed after three or more civil commitments and those who have had two or more felony commitments.

However, I must point out that these patients would require more intensive individual treatment than it is now possible to provide, given the current rate of funding and the personnel ceilings imposed on the program.

Even for patients now eligible for treatment, the present capability of the two Federal Clinical Research Centers at Lexington and Fort Worth is overtaxed.

Since the inception of the NARA program, Fort Worth and Lexington have examined 2,236 patients civilly committed for treatment under Titles I and III of the Act.

Of that number, only 52 percent (1,071) were in treatment by June 30, 1969. The 48 percent (1,059) had not been accepted after the thirty-day examination and evaluation period.

The patients who were not accepted for treatment, Mr. Chairman, were patients with very difficult problems. If we were to try to treat them, it would require about twice as many staff members at Fort Worth and Lexington as we now have.

As a matter of actual fact—and one which is ignored every time we talk about the treatment program for narcotic addicts—given the funds and personnel currently available, any increase in the number of patients will result in a reduction of the ratio of treatment staff available to patients. The result will be less individual treatment and poorer care.

Almost since their establishment, Lexington and Fort Worth facilities have been financially undernourished and understaffed.

If there is to be proper treatment, the facilities must have trained people to provide it.

Our hope in the long run is that the States and communities will take a more active role in developing narcotics treatment programs—aided by Federal support for construction and staffing under the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

As of June 30, 1969, the six community treatment programs funded under the provisions of NARA had a total of 1,948 addicts in treatment. By next year, the ten community programs funded in FY 1969 expect to be treating an additional 5,400 addicts.

However, far too few of these centers have been funded so far, and until more of them can be organized, the States are unable to take on much of the task.

States and communities are having difficulty in financing operations of community mental health centers as Federal support of initial staffing costs decreases and

terminates. The Act should be broadened to include support of the total cost of operation of these centers, as originally authorized, rather than only the cost of initial staffing.

Assistant Secretary Creed Black, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, presented the Administration's recommendations in this regard in July, before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"Few communities," Mr. Black pointed out, "are able or willing initially to devote limited resources in these two problem areas. Americans have very ambivalent feelings about alcoholics and narcotic addicts. The patients are very difficult to treat. Professional interest needs to be stimulated."

"We believe, therefore, that preferential matching and a longer period of Federal support than 51 months will be necessary. The necessary matching ratio is yet to be determined; but it is clear that such preferential matching is essential."

It takes people to provide aftercare for addicts when they are trying to rehabilitate themselves once they have broken the habit. It takes people to manage these programs.

In most statements on this subject, Mr. Chairman, a need for more enforcement personnel is recognized but nowhere is there mention of the need for treatment personnel, or personnel to conduct research and training programs.

If we are to make any significant headway at all in control of drug abuse, then we must place far greater emphasis on the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. The need for medical personnel for treatment must be recognized as of equal or greater importance than the need for people to enforce the law. I am pleased that legislative proposals include provisions to improve the narcotic rehabilitation program, because there has been significant progress in treatment programs for addicts, and these efforts should be expanded.

The development of experimental methadone maintenance programs and the use of narcotic antagonists, such as Cyclazocine and Naloxone, have been both exciting and controversial.

Since methadone maintenance involves the continued use of a narcotic substitute on a long-term basis, it has been the object of some criticism. Methadone does not appear to be a "universal treatment" for all addicts, nor does it result in an abstinence from drugs.

The goal of methadone maintenance is to achieve socially acceptable behavior on the part of the addict, rather than to require abstinence, *per se*. This treatment approach operates under the principle that if, in fact, any medication permits a narcotic user to become a law-abiding and productive member of society, it should be acceptable medication.

To understand all the implications of this treatment, we are supporting a wide variety of studies in this regard. And studies are also being supported to develop new and long-acting narcotic antagonists such as a depot (long acting) cyclazocine, to block the action of narcotics.

Given the proposed methods to strengthen support for community narcotic addiction treatment and rehabilitation programs, and with a wider implementation of NARA, we have on paper the capacity in this country to effect a significant reduction in the abuse of narcotics and begin effective education to prevent hard drug use.

How we transform the words of the statutes into practical results depends on men and money. Without these, present enforcement techniques in the narcotic field will only continue to spin the addict around in the revolving door from jail to inadequate treatment and back again.

MARIJUANA

Mr. Chairman: I would now like to spend the remainder of my time here in talking about marihuana.

Because of the increase in the use of marihuana and because of the confusion and controversy resulting from that use, it is of the greatest importance to present factual information about the drug itself, the effects of its use and the history of efforts to control its use.

For, unless we separate fact from fable in the public uproar over the use of this drug our efforts to achieve effective and acceptable controls over marihuana use will indeed be just "more of the same."

The marihuana story for 1969 in the United States goes back to the 1930's.

The "great experiment" was over. The prohibition of the use of alcoholic beverages, under the Eighteenth Amendment, had ended.

For better or worse, American voters had made it clear that they considered alcohol a social beverage, and chose to limit prohibition of its use through State laws which vary to this day, in terms of "wet" and "dry" jurisdictions and the age at which individuals can legally drink beer, wine and spirits.

The experiment, which we voted to terminate, had produced at least two major results: the social usage of alcohol by adult men and women had increased and the contempt for an unpopular law had spread, bringing other legal restrictions on manners and morals into question.

At approximately the same time, however, enough hue and cry over the reported evils of another intoxicant—marihuana—resulted in the adoption of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937.

We know that marihuana is not, scientifically, a narcotic drug like heroin or morphine, but is a mild hallucinogen. It should not be associated with narcotics—either medically or legally.

However, "guilty by association" with narcotics occurred for marihuana for the first time in Federal law in 1929, with the passage of P.L. 672—70th Congress—authorizing the establishment of the Lexington and Fort Worth Hospitals.

In the statute, the term "habit-forming narcotic drug" or "narcotic" was specifically defined—drug by drug—and on the list was "Indian hemp (marihuana) and its various derivatives, compounds and preparations."

Nowhere in the Committee Hearings or in the Congressional Record was there any discussion of the rationale for this drug classification.

As States adopted the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act which included marihuana, it was more widely classified as a narcotic.

And so the stepping-stone concept got its start. Once labelled as a statutory narcotic, marihuana continued to be so labelled in succeeding years.

By 1937, the use of marihuana was reported to present so severe a health danger that Federal controls were represented as necessary. And so the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 was enacted, even though many of the statements in testimony before Congress were substantially untrue.

The Report to the Senate on the Bill quotes the following testimony:

"Under the influence of this drug (marihuana) the will is destroyed and all power of directing and controlling thought is lost. Inhibitions are released. As a result of these effects, many violent crimes have been and are being committed by persons under the influence of this drug. Not only is marihuana used by hardened criminals to steel them to commit violent crimes, but it is also being placed in the hands of high-school children in the form of marihuana cigarettes by un-

scrupulous peddlers. Its continued use results many times in impotency and insanity."

Elsewhere in the testimony, a witness stated, "I believe in some cases that one marihuana cigarette may develop a homicidal maniac probably to kill his brother." (sic)

At the time of the hearings on this proposal, one of the witnesses was Dr. William C. Woodward, appearing for the American Medical Association.

In speaking about newspaper accounts of abuse of marihuana, Dr. Woodward said:

"It has surprised me that the facts on which these (newspaper) statements have been made have not been brought before this Committee by competent primary evidence. We are referred to newspaper publications concerning the prevalence of marihuana addiction. We are told that the use of marihuana causes crime.

"But as yet no one has been produced from the Bureau of Prisons to show the number of prisoners who have been found addicted to the marihuana habit. An informal inquiry shows that the Bureau of Prisons has no evidence on that point. Dr. Woodward pointed to a series of agencies including the PHS who had not been consulted.

"You have been told that school children are great users of marihuana cigarettes. No one has been summoned from the Children's Bureau to show the nature and extent of the habit, among children.

"Inquiry of the Children's Bureau shows that they have had no occasion to investigate it and know nothing particularly of it.

"Inquiry of the Office of Education—and they certainly should know something of the prevalence of the habit among the school children of the country, if there is a prevalent habit—indicates that they have had no occasion to investigate and know nothing of it.

"Moreover, there is in the Treasury Department itself, the Public Health Service, with its Division of Mental Hygiene. The Division of Mental Hygiene was, in the first place, the Division of Narcotics. It was converted into the Division of Mental Hygiene, I think, about 1930. That particular Bureau has control at the present time of the narcotics farms that were created about 1929 or 1930 and came into operation a few years later. No one has been summoned from that Bureau to give evidence on that point.

"Informal inquiry by me indicates that they have had no record of any marihuana or Cannabis addicts who have ever been committed to those farms.

"The Bureau of the Public Health Service has also a division of pharmacology. If you desire evidence as to the pharmacology of Cannabis, that obviously is the place where you can get direct and primary evidence, rather than the indirect hearsay evidence."

The indictment by Dr. Woodward, who qualified both as a physician and an attorney, of the acceptance of "indirect hearsay evidence" by the Committee brought forth neither questions nor comment at that time.

The legal history of marihuana control measures is a matter of record and I will not pursue it here. The major point I wish to make is that in the case of marihuana, legal penalties were assigned to its use that are strict enough to ruin the life of a first-time offender, with total disregard for medical and scientific evidence of the properties of the drug or its effects. I know of no clearer instance in which the punishment for an infraction of the law is more harmful than the crime.

I would like to make my professional position very clear in this regard, Mr. Chairman.

I do not, at this time, advocate the removal of all restrictions on the use of marihuana. I believe that until we know more than we now do about the long-term effects

of marihuana and other forms of *Cannabis* that use of the drug should continue to be controlled—medically speaking, I cannot give it a clean "bill of health." But, penalties for its use should be lowered, in proportion to the danger and risk to the individual and society of this drug.

Marihuana can be for some, potentially, a dangerous drug. Generally it is a mild drug, in comparison with other hallucinogenics such as LSD, or with certain amphetamines and barbiturates. To equate its risk—either to the individual or to society—with the risks inherent in the use of hard narcotics is—on the face of it—merely an effort to defend an indefensible, established position that has no scientific basis.

It is quite understandable that law enforcement officials are concerned with the misuse of marihuana. So are physicians, educators and scientists. But the degree of concern must now—at long last—be equated with the degree of mental and physical risk. For too long, the fantasies surrounding marihuana, whether fostered deliberately or through ignorance, have clouded the facts.

I would like to mention some of them here, because fallacy can only give way to fact if each is recognized for what it is.

MARIHUANA

Fact 1: Marihuana is a narcotic.

Fact 1: Marihuana is not a narcotic except by statute. Narcotics are opium or its derivatives (like heroin, and morphine) and some synthetic chemicals with opium-like activity.

Fact 2: Marihuana is addictive.

Fact 2: Marihuana does not cause physical addiction, since tolerance to its effects and symptoms on sudden withdrawal does not occur. It can produce habituation (psychological dependence).

Fact 3: Marihuana causes violence and crime.

Fact 3: Persons under the influence of marihuana tend to be passive. It is true that sometimes a crime may be committed by a person while under the influence of marihuana. However, any drug which loosens one's self-control is likely to do the same and relates primarily to the personality of the user.

Fact 4: Marihuana leads to increase in sexual activity.

Fact 4: Marihuana has no aphrodisiac property.

Fact 5: Marihuana is harmless.

Fact 5: Instances of acute panic, depression, and psychotic states are known, although they are infrequent. Certain kinds of individuals can also become overinvolved in marihuana use and can lose their drive. We do not know the effects of long-term use.

Fact 6: Occasional use of marihuana is less harmful than occasional use of alcohol.

Fact 6: We do not know. Research on the effects of various amounts of each drug for various periods is under way.

Fact 7: Marihuana leads to heroin.

Fact 7: We know of nothing in the nature of marihuana that predisposes to heroin abuse. It is estimated that less than 5% of chronic users of marihuana go on to heroin use.

Fact 8: Marihuana enhances creativity.

Fact 8: Marihuana might bring *fantasies* of enhanced creativity but they are illusory, as are "instant insights" reported by marihuana users.

Fact 9: More severe penalties will solve the marihuana problem.

Fact 9: Marihuana use has increased enormously in spite of the most severely punitive laws.

Fact 10: It is safe to drive while under the influence of marihuana.

Fact 10: Driving under the influence of any intoxicant is hazardous.

EFFECTS OF MARIHUANA

Of all those who have tried marihuana, about 65 percent are experimenting, trying the drug from one to ten times, and then discontinuing its use. Some 25 percent are social users, smoking marihuana on occasion when it is available, usually in a group context. Ten percent or less can be considered chronic users who devote significant portions of their time to obtaining and using the drug. The effects of marihuana vary with the potency of the agent, the psychological set of the user, and the setting in which use takes place. Thus, it has been estimated that half of those who use marihuana the first time experience no effects at all.

The *chronic* user of marihuana or "Pot-head" may encounter a number of psychological problems. If he is using it to escape life stress, his mental growth is impaired by not learning how to deal with frustration and problems. He tends to withdraw from here-and-now reality, loses ambition and drive, and sustains a loss of motivation. He is present-oriented rather than future-oriented. He may drop out of active involvement in school or work.

Further research is needed to elucidate more clearly both the short and long-term effects of marihuana use. The absence of good scientific data should not lead to the assumption that long-term use is harmless. As in the case of tobacco, it's possible that there are serious consequences of chronic use which will only become apparent through careful longitudinal studies.

One needs to be particularly concerned about the potential effect of a reality-distorting agent on the future psychological development of the *adolescent* user. We know that normal adolescence is a time of great psychological turmoil. Patterns of coping with reality developed during the teen-age period are significant in determining adult behavior. Persistent use of an agent which serves to ward off reality during this critical developmental period is likely to compromise seriously the future ability of the individual to make an adequate adjustment to a complex society.

Despite our acknowledgedly scanty information on adverse effects, there is reason to believe that the marihuana user is exposed to an increased risk of either acute or chronic psychologic damage each time he lights a marihuana cigarette. Though the incidence of serious adverse reaction appears to be low, by definition as the number of users increase, the total number of those experiencing adverse reactions will also rise. The effects of the drug on judgment and perception might very well be a factor in automobile accidents. Those users who already have significant psychiatric problems might readily be led to avoid obtaining necessary psychiatric treatment by this form of self-medication, only to wind up as one of the group of users whose entire life becomes absorbed in the drug culture.

It is obvious, therefore, that there are some things we already know about marihuana, in spite of the fact that many people are unwilling to accept this knowledge.

A youngster who smokes one marihuana cigarette is not a dope fiend, even though misguided individuals in the past have made this association.

There is probably not a single youngster today who believes that smoking one marihuana cigarette will automatically lead him to perdition.

In this situation, it is extremely unfortunate that by the continued, exaggerated emphasis on the supposed dire evils of marihuana smoking, we make it extremely difficult to tell people what the real risks of use of specific kinds of drugs are. And there is no doubt that we have already built up in

the new generation some of what people of our age absorbed in the days of the Volstead Act. The prohibition syndrome, as applied to marihuana, has already brought about defiance of these specific laws; additionally, it has created in the new generation a credibility gap concerning other laws and law enforcement.

This Committee, Mr. Chairman, is considering various legislative proposals. Other proposals designed to improve control of drug abuse are also before the Congress and have been assigned to other Committees.

I would like to discuss the elements in both the proposals under consideration by this Committee which I would hope to see enacted, and the elements in both that I think could be improved.

I would not favor adoption of either proposal in its present form, without further consideration of medical and scientific data, as well as further consideration of statements made by judges, probation officers, prison officials and others who oppose mandatory minimum penalties on drug offenders.

The principle and the effects of mandatory penalties defeats the whole purpose of treatment and rehabilitation of drug users; it unnecessarily limits the courts and negates the traditional American expectancy that each individual will be heard by a court of law in terms of his intent, the circumstances of his alleged offense, and his potential ability to be rehabilitated.

As a result of my professional experience with drug users sentenced by the courts, I am convinced that the social and psychological damage caused by incarceration is in many cases far greater to the individual and to society than was the offense itself. Each case of drug abuse must be decided separately, from the legal as well as the medical point of view.

From this standpoint, I would favor provisions which would make possible a definite scientifically based determination of the dangers of marihuana use and of the properties of the drug itself.

In regard to the procedures suggested for placing dangerous drugs in specific schedules or classes, I prefer flexible provisions which allow for changes in the class or schedule of a drug, as additional knowledge of that drug becomes available.

Proposals have been made that in establishing drug standards and schedules, the authority to designate rests with the Attorney General. He would be required to request the advice in writing from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and from a Scientific Advisory Committee.

Whether a substance should be added, deleted or rescheduled as a dangerous substance.

I have two main points to make here, Mr. Chairman. First, it would be preferable to specifically list the professional disciplines of the members of the Scientific Advisory Committee to be involved in decisions about scheduling dangerous substances.

There are nine criteria to be considered with respect to each substance of which the first seven are primarily within the professional competence of the medical, scientific and public health disciplines. The remaining two are primarily legal. Therefore, it would be wise to have the makeup of the committee such that its membership would have professional competence to gauge the criteria.

Changes in scheduling drugs in any piece of legislation can only have real meaning if they are based on research findings. My second point in this regard, therefore, is that social and psychological research on the use and abuse of drugs should remain a medical and health responsibility so that scientific credibility can be established.

As President Nixon has said, "In addition to gathering existing data, it is essential that we acquire new knowledge in the field. We must know more about both the short and long-range effects of the use of drugs being taken in such quantities by so many of our people. We need more study as well to find the key to releasing men from the bonds of dependency forged by any continued drug use."

"The National Institute of Mental Health has primary responsibility in this area, and I am further directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to expand existing efforts to acquire new knowledge and a broader understanding in this entire area."

Similarly, drug abuse education in schools and for health professions should continue to be the responsibility of the health professions. We have long been involved in such education programs and public response to the expanded drug education pamphlets, TV and radio spots and other visual materials indicate that when youngsters get facts instead of hysteria, they pay attention to this information.

The Department of Justice should, of course, have responsibility for the training and education of enforcement personnel, but today's youth are unlikely to accept information on drugs presented by enforcement officials.

I am hopeful that relevant, factual educational programs will begin to become significantly effective in curbing the indiscriminate abuse of all drugs as it has been in reducing LSD use.

No matter what legal reforms are undertaken, this task will be difficult, because the whole problem has gotten out of hand, and the smoking of marihuana has become an accepted fashion among millions of our citizens.

In this situation, the first place in which legal reforms can be made is in the removal of mandatory minimum penalties, in all cases of drug abuse.

I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, as you stated at the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse in 1962, that the time has come to correct the mistake that was made with the passage of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956. This Act radically departed from the existing trend in criminal legislation—a trend toward individual treatment of convicted offenders with a view to their eventual rehabilitation.

The Act has deprived Federal judges of discretion in sentencing and requires consideration of an individual defendant on a class basis, rather than in response to his specific circumstances.

If mandatory sentences really were deterrents to criminal conduct, then there would be little justification for limiting them only to narcotic and marihuana offenders.

Mandatory sentences bear little or no relationship to the public good, to public health or to mental health.

I think it important that the record of this Committee's current hearings include the results of the questionnaire that the Chairman of this Committee included in the proceedings of the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse.

As a joint project of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and National Penitentiaries, the questionnaire was sent to Federal district judges, Federal chief probation officers, Federal prison authorities and U.S. attorneys, inquiring into the effects of the mandatory minimum sentence provisions, and the elimination of probation and parole in the handling of narcotics offenders.

The results of the survey showed that ap-

proximately 75 percent of all those who responded—people who lived with this law from day to day—opposed these two basic provisions of the Act.

James V. Bennett, former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has stated "there is a real danger that, in the effort to contain the problems which stem from the hopelessness characterizing the attitudes of men with mandatory sentences, much of what has been achieved in the development of constructive programs for all types of prisoners may be wiped out."

I am strongly in favor of the specific recommendations of the Prettyman Commission, made in 1963, in its report to the President. Any legislation designed to control drug abuse should include in its provisions the concepts and recommendations of that Commission.

Its report stated:

"The Commission makes a flat distinction between the two drugs (narcotics and marihuana) and believes that the unlawful sale or possession of marihuana is a less serious offense than the unlawful sale or possession of an opiate.

"The Commission believes that the sentencing of the petty marihuana offender should be left entirely to the discretion of the courts. There should be no mandatory minimum sentences for marihuana offenders and no prohibition of probation or parole.

"The courts should have the discretion to impose a fixed sentence (with eligibility for parole), to suspend sentence, or to impose an indeterminate sentence. The Commission is opposed to mandatory minimum sentences even in the case of multiple offenders."

If one considers the actual application of mandatory penalties when, for example, a twenty-one-year-old College Junior who gives a Freshman a marihuana cigarette and then is subject to a mandatory ten years in jail, the scene becomes absurd in relation to the size of the problem as well as tragic for the individual person.

A conservative estimate of persons in the United States, both juvenile and adult, who have used marihuana at least once is about 8 million and may go as high as 12 million people.

Can you imagine what would happen to the law enforcement and corrections system of this country if each of these 12 million people had been caught by a policeman when smoking his first marihuana cigarette?

It is no wonder that law enforcement officials reportedly stay away from rock festivals and other gatherings where the marihuana smoke hangs heavy in the air and proof of possession is very easily come by.

It is time to change from a prosecution to a public health approach in dealing with drug abuse and especially in cooling the marihuana problem, and I can only repeat what I said 18 months ago to this Committee. If we are to get to the root of this problem of drug abuse, we must be prepared to identify and investigate the underlying problems which lead people to distort or ward off reality with drugs.

Until this is done, nothing said here today will achieve much more than to begin to solve the problem on paper. And since the problem is far more than a "paper tiger", we are faced with the fact that Americans must make a conscious decision relating to their acceptance or rejection of the use of dangerous drugs.

Even if it is found that there are no dire physiological effects of marihuana-smoking, the problem still remains and a decision still has to be made by our society.

To protect the few who are oversensitive to the drug, will society restrict the use of this substance by the many?

Or, in the light of scientific information,

our society may choose to remove restrictions and allow the individual to decide.

In my professional judgment, Mr. Chairman, even though marihuana is certainly not the horror it was alleged to be in 1937, it is a drug having a capacity to alter mood, judgment and functional ability. For these reasons, I believe that in the interests of public health, it is necessary—at least for the present—to maintain restrictions on the availability and use of this drug.

Although there are several pathways toward alternative, conscious decisions, any valid decision, I am convinced, must involve the scientific fact of the amount of public danger which exists, and the specific range of risk involved in the use of each drug.

If one-half-of-one percent of the population is at risk, the decision could certainly be different from a situation in which from 10 to 20 percent of the population is at risk.

The most obvious pathways to decisions which must be made very soon, if the uproar over drug abuse is to achieve any significant and acceptable results, are through legal reform and through education.

In considering both of these, however, the time has certainly come to substitute a broad and realistic look at our American society for the tunnel vision on which our legal and moral attitudes to drug use have been founded until now.

We all know, for example, that marihuana-smoking is more than a fad. It is linked with student contempt for the Establishment.

Marihuana-smoking has become a symbol of rejection of things as they are, as well as a sometimes pleasurable experience in itself.

The Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. Staggers, in commenting on the need for new legislation, said, "Unfortunately, ours seems to be, for many of our citizens, a drug-oriented, drug-taking society. Hourly, television and radio commercials assault our ears extolling the virtues of various drugs. . . . Perhaps this overall orientation contributes to drug abuse among the young."

"Perhaps the problem lies deeper. Our national rate of suicide, alcoholism, violent crime and divorce indicates that a substantial number, and perhaps the majority, of Americans find their social and human environment something less than satisfactory.

"Whether we call it anomie, alienation, or excessive concentration on material values, this dissatisfaction may lie closer to the surface in many than they would be willing (or perhaps psychologically able) to admit. If so, it seems unlikely that laws alone can accomplish what is needed, although increased research on a very fundamental level may point the way."

Dr. Dana Farnsworth, Director of University Health Services at Harvard University and Chairman of the American Medical Association Council on Mental Health, speaking at a meeting of the American Medical Association, said, "Until now, the official attitude has been 'Stamp out drug use and you'll get rid of the problem.' But the use of drugs is not the central problem—it is only a symptom, an index of the confusions and uncertainties which affect increasing numbers of young people."

"Unenforceable laws and inappropriate penalties make a mockery of the whole principle of legal control and provide one more example of the adult world's misunderstanding of the problem."

A 22-year-old former drug addict, it seems to me, expressed a rare depth of perception when he said that the problem "is a problem neither of youth nor one of drugs, but a problem of a whole society and an entire life style shared by young and old alike."

Our life style, in the 1970's, will be characterized by our ability or inability to use

the products of our technical ingenuity to help bring about our happiness and well-being.

The current patterns of drug abuse are illustrative of our inability to make the results of our technological skills work for us as servants, rather than as masters.

As science continues to offer an ever-widening choice of chemicals designed to modify emotions and behavior and to enable us to cope with our environment, ways are being found to use them detrimentally. Our ingenuity, to date, has outrun our wisdom; we have yet to find the restraint to limit ourselves to constructive uses of these products.

The first place in which legal reforms can be made is in the removal of mandatory minimum penalties in all cases of drug abuse.

If this were done, it is quite possible that this one, major step toward accommodating the law to the realities of drug use might also initiate a stepping-stone toward a greater respect for the law generally, if those laws were just and relevant.

Such a legal reform would eliminate one of the major causes of defiance brought on by the violent rejection by youth of what they see as our society's hypocrisies. And certainly, such a reform would capture the attention and, I am sure, a large amount of cooperation among the young people who smoke marihuana, as well as their parents, their teachers, and the courts.

If these millions of young people were convinced that efforts to reform the drug laws were sincere and based on scientific fact and evidence, I feel confident that they would be more receptive and less cynical about information about possible harmful effects of drugs.

There is no doubt about the scare techniques which have been used in the past have now been discredited. And the resultant disbelief in much of the information provided by any persons in authority on many subjects should teach us that the *abuse of known information* is worse than the lack of any information at all.

In our search for information about man's behavior, many of us at the National Institute of Mental Health are relating the problems of some types of drug abuse to a more general question. What is the best way of handling "crimes without victims"—those situations in which an individual at most, is harming himself?

Do these belong in the criminal code, or should they be handled in another way?

This is a philosophy, in considering man's conduct, that is worthy of serious research and discussion.

As an initial step toward fundamental changes which must be forthcoming in changing the rules of our way of life, the members of Congress and others who share the authority to do so have an immediate opportunity to revise the procedures for punishment. Society can then begin to devise procedures for protection, acceptable not only to tradition but also to our restless, rebellious, but thoughtful young people who have had enough of rhetoric and empty promises.

MEDICAL RESEARCH SACRIFICED FOR MILITARY RESEARCH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Evening Star published an article entitled "Medical Research Loses to Missiles." The article deserves the attention of Members of Congress, and of everyone else who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The writer, Orr Kelly, is an experienced military correspondent. He has often written of the relationships and activities of the Pentagon as they relate to civilian interests and to the economic base which supports the \$80 billion annual military expenditure.

In this story, Mr. Kelly pinpoints the increases in research for military hardware and so-called defense systems. One is the \$5.7 million contract just awarded for, and I quote: "Pershing missile component and power station research and development."

This is not a search for a new system. According to the Department of Defense, it is "part of a program to continually improve the Pershing system." The Pershing system is the largest nuclear weapon of the U.S. Army, a portable ballistic missile with a 20-kiloton warhead.

What Mr. Kelly describes as "the other side of the trade off" is a cut in five other research programs on how to apply medical science to the illnesses of the American people. One project to be eliminated is the pap smear test that detects uterine cancer—one of the largest causes of death among American women.

Another is a heart study aimed at foretelling heart attacks. Another is the neurological and sensory disease program including widespread testing for glaucoma; and another deals with chronic respiratory diseases and diabetes and arthritis.

Mr. Kelly states:

Cutting out the five programs is expected to save \$9 million in the full 1971 fiscal year. Spending on Pershing is expected by industry sources to total some \$16 million over the next four years, mostly for relatively minor improvements to equipment already deployed.

Mr. President, neither of these research programs is intended to accomplish some great breakthrough, either in military science or medical science. In each case, we are talking about application of something already known. In the case of medicine, however, treatment is of little value without detection and diagnosis.

This brief story aptly summarizes the tragic decisions that are taxing the American people for the support of weaponry and military science at the expense of the betterment of life, health, and environment of the American people. That conclusion is my own, not Mr. Kelly's. In support of it, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 20, 1969]

MEDICAL RESEARCH LOSES TO MISSILES

(By Orr Kelly)

This is the story of a tradeoff—not a conscious one, but something that just happened in the Nixon administration's effort to cut its 1970 budget.

On one side is \$5.7 million for improvements in an 11-year-old Army missile system.

On the other are cuts totaling \$4 million in five health research projects—including

one that was just about to pay off after 20 years of careful record keeping.

On the spending side, the Defense Department, in a routine, five-line announcement, said recently that the Army was awarding a \$5.7 million contract to the Martin Marietta Corp. in Orlando, Fla., for "Pershing missile component and power station research and development."

The Pershing, first ordered in 1958, is the Army's biggest nuclear weapon. It is a portable ballistic missile with a range of 400 miles and a choice of nuclear warheads that start about the size of the 20 kiloton Hiroshima bomb and range upward in size.

"Pershing is capable of providing fire support for the theater, as well as general support for the field Army," according to a brochure handed out by company and Army men where the Pershing was displayed outside the Sheraton-Park Hotel during the meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army last week.

"Through maneuver of the batteries in a battalion, commanders possess a powerful means of influencing the course of combat and can deliver nuclear fire over a zone of great width and depth, shifting and concentrating fire according to the situation."

The Pershing, first deployed in Europe in 1964, is now in its second generation. The missiles are being switched over from tracked to rubber-tired vehicles for greater mobility.

The Defense Department, asked why additional research and development was required in a missile that has been in the hands of troops since 1962, replied:

"The contract award is a part of a program to continually improve the Pershing system. It amounts to product improvement, to improve the maintainability and reliability of missile components and power stations."

On the other side of the tradeoff is the decision of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration (formerly the U.S. Public Health Service) to cut out five programs designed to find ways of putting the findings of research scientists to work in practice.

The projects to be cut out—by the end of 1969 rather than by the end of the fiscal year—are the pap smear test program conducted in cooperation with the Academy of General Practice to detect uterine cancer in women; the Framingham, Mass., heart study which, after 20 years, was getting to the point where it might tell why some people suffer heart attacks and others don't; the neurological and sensory disease program which includes a widespread program of testing for glaucoma, a disease that can cause blindness if it is not detected in time; and programs dealing with chronic respiratory diseases and diabetes and arthritis.

Cutting out the five programs is expected to save \$9 million in the full 1971 fiscal year. Spending on Pershing is expected by industry sources to total some \$16 million over the next four years, mostly for relatively minor improvements to equipment already deployed.

AMERICAN POW'S IN KOREA AND AMERICAN POW'S IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the fate of the American POW's in Korea makes it of the greatest importance that we accord top priority in the Paris negotiations to the question of the American POW's now in the hands of North Vietnam.

Of the 7,100 Americans taken prisoner in Korea, 3,354 died in captivity, while another 389 are still listed as missing.

A resolution adopted recently by the Lucas County Council, American Legion of Ohio, points out that there is reason to believe that some of these 389 American servicemen may still be alive, and urges Congress and the President to take appropriate action to bring about their repatriation.

I do not know whether it is humanly possible at this late date to do anything about the American POW's who may have survived almost 20 years in Communist captivity. However, I do believe that the experience in Korea is something that we should constantly keep in mind in our negotiations with the Vietnamese Communists.

In retrospect, it is obvious that we should have taken a harder line on the American POW issue in Korea from the first day of negotiations. At that time, the Communists desperately wanted a cease-fire. They wanted it so desperately indeed that, had we made an immediate exchange of all POW's a precondition for a cease-fire, there is reason to believe that they would have accepted the condition.

I do not like to be a pessimist, especially where the lives of men are involved. But in the light of the Korean experience, I think it should be obvious that if we leave the question of the American POW's until the end of the negotiations, many of those now in captivity will never return to America alive.

It is my conviction, therefore, that we should raise this matter at every single meeting with the Communist negotiators in Paris; that we should place the issue before the court of world public opinion, mobilizing all of our diplomatic resources and information facilities in the interest of arousing world opinion; and that we should not hesitate, if necessary, to warn of stronger measures if the Communists refuse to agree to the elementary, humanitarian request that they abide by the Geneva Convention on the treatment of POW's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the resolution adopted by the Lucas County Council, the American Legion of Ohio, at a regular meeting on June 2, 1969, in Toledo, Ohio.

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

KOREAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Whereas, Many of the 389 American servicemen unaccounted for since the Korean War were known to be alive and in prisoner of war camps of the Communists, and

Whereas, Recurring stories appear in magazines (Argosy, 1959—Saga, 1964) that America has abandoned these men into Communist slavery, and

Whereas, President Dwight Eisenhower stated at a news conference in 1959 that "we have had a long, serious, and even continuing discussion with the Chinese Communists trying to make them disclose where our prisoners were held" and "there are still some left there", and

Whereas, President John F. Kennedy stated at a news conference in 1961 that Chinese Communists were detaining Americans, "some of them way back since 1951", and

Whereas, there has been absolutely no evidence of the death of any of the 380 servicemen,

Now, therefore be it resolved, that Lucas County Council, The First District, the Department of Ohio, and the National American Legion call upon all Senators, Congressmen, and the President to take appropriate action to effect the repatriation of these servicemen.

CLEMENT P. DOMBROWSKI,
County Commander.
LOU L. STEPHENS,
Acting Adjutant.

EDUCATION AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS SUFFER UNDER CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, because of unusual circumstances, important on-going education and library programs are not currently receiving funds under the existing continuing resolution passed by the Senate on June 25 and signed by the President on June 30—Public Law 91-33.

The tradition has been that continuing resolutions provide funds for on-going programs at the level of the previous year's appropriation or at the current year's level in a bill approved by either House, whichever is lower. Only when neither House has passed the current year's appropriations bill does the President's budget recommendations apply, and then only if such recommendations are lower than the previous year's appropriation. To cite an official explanation, let me quote from the House Appropriations Committee Report No. 91-324 on the current continuing resolution which expires October 31, 1969:

This is the customary type of resolution brought before the House on the eve of the new fiscal year to avoid interruption of continuing governmental functions. The authority conveyed by this resolution is necessary to provide for the interim between June 30 and final approval of the applicable annual appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1970, which begins on July 1, next.

The resolution follows the basic form and concept of similar resolutions of past years. Last year's initial continuing resolution became Public Law 90-366, approved June 29, 1968.

TIME PERIOD OF THE RESOLUTION

The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is limited to the four-month period, July 1—October 31, 1969. Anything shorter than that is judged to be unrealistic, especially since the membership is proceeding under the announced plan of a mid-August recess extending beyond Labor Day, and the further fact that large segments of the budget have not been authorized by the Congress.

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, including last year, the emphasis in the resolution is on the continuation of existing projects and activities at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1969) rate; the budget request for 1970 where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses.

Thus in the normal course of events, after the House had passed the Labor-

HEW appropriation bill—H.R. 13111—on July 31, there would have been, probably by the end of August or certainly by the end of September, another continuing resolution which would have placed all Labor-HEW programs on the basis of the lower fiscal 1969 or H.R. 13111 as it passed the House. However, because of the scheduled recess in August, the current continuing resolution was introduced in June to continue to October 31, and several important educational programs are being funded on an interim basis not at the lower of H.R. 13111 or 1969 funding, but at the level of the President's budget. There are, under the present continuing resolution, no interim program funds authorized for:

Category B, students under Public Law 874;

Title II ESEA, school library materials;

Title III NDEA, materials and equipment for elementary and secondary schools;

Title V-A NDEA, guidance and counseling;

Title II LSCA, public library construction.

In addition, interim funds for other programs such as public library services and title I of ESEA are authorized on a level considerably lower than fiscal 1969 or H.R. 13111.

It is my understanding the several joint resolutions have been introduced in the House, proposing that this problem be corrected by amending the current continuing resolution to provide interim funding for Office of Education programs at the level of last year's appropriation on H.R. 13111, whichever is lower. An alternative would be for the appropriations committee to bring in a complete new continuing resolution in the traditional form in place of Public Law 91-33 without waiting for the end of October. This would provide that on-going programs in all appropriations bills, including H.R. 13111, which had passed either house, be funded on the basis of the 1969 level or the current year's bill, whichever is lower. In this way important on-going education programs on which local school districts and other education and library institutions must depend can receive the funds which they have had a right to expect when the House passed H.R. 13111 July 31.

Should the House take affirmative action to make this possible, I would assume the Senate Appropriations Committee will give immediate attention to this very urgent matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a set of tables showing, by State, the amounts the education and library programs are receiving under the Nixon budget and how much these programs would receive under H.R. 13111 or last year's level of appropriations.

The figures were compiled by the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$37,773,357	\$34,985,664	\$38,198,857	\$38,580,846	\$44,504,965
State administrative expenses.....	377,734	349,908	381,989	0	826,105
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,767,887	840,259	705,824	0	2,904,233
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	3,343,000	2,927,740	3,072,424	2,040,343	2,904,233
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	497,350	531,860	503,492	503,492	503,492
Grants for special projects.....					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,918,412	1,888,098	—	0	34,770
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		10,007			
State administration.....	36,897	35,243	—		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	463,990	315,250	219,321	0	311,027
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	46,178,627	41,884,029	43,081,907	41,124,681	49,084,592
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	9,155,000	9,530,000	6,177,000	2,362,000	11,075,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	617,391	681,900	328,000	328,000	328,000
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	9,772,391	10,211,900	6,505,000	2,690,000	11,403,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary , and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....		852,199	262,781	346,324	346,324
Subtotal, education professions development.....	852,199	262,781	346,324	346,324	346,324
Teacher Corps.....	5,116	71,204	—		
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	2,243,228	—	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	227,647	224,435	227,680	227,680	227,680
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	238,807	240,381	—		
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	2,081,890	2,007,067	1,037,770	—	0
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	3,525,974	2,092,086	1,367,691	0	510,083
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	127,207	—	—		
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	119,484	97,938	97,938	—	—
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	3,487,390	221,745	1,067,215	—	—
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,751,992	2,764,567	2,195,856	2,195,856	3,146,940
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	208,441	240,462	—		
Interest payments.....	()	—	—		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,462,758	3,563,082	3,732,752	3,733,522	3,733,522
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....					
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	961,500	—	0	0	0
Training program (EPDA, pt. E).....					
Subtotal, higher education.....	19,436,318	11,451,763	9,726,902	6,157,058	7,618,225
Vocationa: education:					
Basic grants.....	5,730,515	5,755,151	5,493,553	5,493,553	8,442,754
Innovation.....			248,333	248,333	248,333
Work-study.....	197,787	—	0	0	197,686
Cooperative education.....			267,787	267,787	267,787
Consumer and homemaking education.....			346,640	346,640	346,640
Subtotal, vocational education.....	5,928,302	5,755,151	6,356,313	6,356,293	9,503,200
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	633,492	633,492	633,492	319,145	633,492
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	600,801	397,777	168,825	0	168,825
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,443	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	337,344	—	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....					
University community service programs (HEA I).....	185,126	175,958	175,958	175,958	175,958
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	901,330	1,072,101	1,199,378	1,199,378	1,199,378
Special projects and teacher education.....	185,000	—	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....					
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,947,286	2,386,980	2,285,305	1,802,133	2,285,305
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	263,547	571,029	571,028	571,028	571,028
Teacher education and recruitment.....	425,211	—	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	27,111	—	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	7,151	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	723,020	571,028	571,028	571,028	571,028
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....	88,493	—	0	0	0
General education.....			49,600	0	0
Vocational education.....			17,866	17,866	17,866
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	88,493	49,600	17,866	17,866	17,866

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs				0	0
Civil rights education	\$525,639	50,000	\$50,000	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill act)	50,000	143,330	143,303	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes act)				0	0
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund			2,820,000	0	0
Total, Office of Education	89,470,721	72,837,766	68,940,645	59,115,383	80,879,540
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$1,816,482	\$1,725,848	\$1,731,032	\$1,731,032	\$2,093,044
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	124,897	66,568	55,918	0	70,860
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	442,566	547,744	559,471	483,700	551,348
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	171,800	242,131	239,911	0	0
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	105,239	106,156		0	13,333
Loans to nonprofit private schools		818			
State administration	10,000	13,333			
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	49,999	50,000	50,000	0	50,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	2,870,983	2,902,598	2,786,332	2,214,732	2,778,585
School Assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	12,849,000	13,379,000	7,793,000	13,935,000	15,917,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	14,977	2,616,200	1,293,000	1,293,000	1,293,000
Subtotal, SAFA	12,863,977	15,995,200	9,086,000	15,228,000	17,210,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		112,896	119,515	119,515	119,515
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	188,325		0		
Subtotal, education professions development	188,325	112,896	119,515	119,515	119,515
Teachers Corps			0		
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	95,455		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	155,376	152,468	155,378	155,378	155,378
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	7,522	8,119	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)		74,015	50,000	0	0
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	250,972	116,613	76,235	0	50,000
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	36,480	33,660	33,660	33,660	33,660
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	62,580	6,680	32,147	32,147	23,675
Direct loans (NDEA II)	76,880	83,276	66,145	66,145	94,794
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	50,000	25,000		0	0
Interest payments	(1)				
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	114,209	123,734	129,626	129,653	129,653
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search				0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	43,800		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)			0		
Subtotal, higher education	1,493,274	623,565	543,191	416,983	487,160
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	502,616	508,238	293,155	293,155	450,531
Innovation			203,530	203,530	203,530
Work-study	15,881		0	0	15,873
Cooperative education			204,951	204,951	204,951
Consumer and homemaking education			18,498	18,498	18,498
Subtotal, vocational education	518,497	508,238	720,134	720,133	893,383
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	136,935	136,935	136,935	115,172	136,935
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	115,670	124,125	86,150	0	86,150
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,169	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,017	25,017	25,017	25,017
College library resources (HEA II-A)	39,905		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	45,069		0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	106,520	105,733	105,733	105,733	105,733
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	126,288	131,891	136,550	136,550	136,550
Special projects and teacher education				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	572,306	603,410	570,094	462,181	570,277
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	49,391		0	0	0
Research and innovation			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	487		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	149,878	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:				0	0
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	\$10,723			0	0
Vocational education	46,835		\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	57,558		15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs				0	0
Civil rights education				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	\$50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	950,000			0	0
Total, office of education	19,844,798	20,925,907	13,990,266	19,776,544	22,173,000

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$9,976,695	\$9,380,743	\$9,528,554	\$9,528,554	\$9,882,769
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	425,551
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	816,510	422,604	354,990	354,990	1,526,861
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III):	1,618,000	1,516,112	1,578,993	1,143,854	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):	300,954	368,490	361,205	361,205	361,205
Grants to States				0	0
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):	774,785	784,359			800,812
Grants to States		11,366		0	0
Loans to nonprofit private schools	16,782	16,488		0	16,610
State administration	211,034	147,487	102,607	0	148,584
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,864,760	12,797,649	12,076,349	11,538,603	13,162,392
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	8,700,000	9,059,000	5,139,000	6,526,000	10,825,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,832,067	1,417,300	175,000	175,000	175,000
Subtotal, SAFA	10,532,067	10,476,300	5,314,000	6,701,000	11,000,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		181,870	223,887	223,887	223,887
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	1,252,709			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	1,252,709	181,870	223,887	223,887	223,887
Teacher Corps	49,981	140,935		0	0
Higher Education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	180,951	177,936	180,964	180,964	180,964
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	166,905	166,461		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	640,961	804,224	415,830	415,830	415,830
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	1,877,254	1,228,671	803,238	0	323,980
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	452,296			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	63,780	69,419	69,419	0	0
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,184,950	176,061	847,346	847,346	624,032
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,834,280	2,195,009	1,743,464	1,743,464	2,498,605
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	3,759	95,735		0	0
Interest payments	(1)				
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,233,700	1,339,632	1,430,424	1,403,713	1,403,713
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search	130,400			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,466,500			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	9,235,736	6,253,148	5,463,685	4,591,317	5,447,124
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	2,122,115	2,133,895	2,237,119	2,237,119	3,438,112
Innovation			220,501	220,501	220,501
Work-study	83,735			0	83,692
Cooperative education			228,752	228,752	228,752
Consumer and homemaking education			141,161	141,161	141,161
Subtotal, vocational education	2,205,850	2,133,895	2,827,533	2,827,533	4,112,218
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	312,656	312,656	312,656	187,354	312,656
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	144,289	215,407	115,407	115,407	115,407
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,974	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100
College library resources (HEA II-A)	218,555			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	44,303			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	138,461	134,680	134,680	0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services—Continued					
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	\$302,940	\$346,188	\$379,898	0	0
Special projects and teacher education					
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	1,263,928	1,114,693	1,048,403	\$2,827,533	\$4,112,218
Education for the Handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA V):	103,733	224,757	224,757	224,757	224,757
Teacher education and recruitment	410,655			0	0
Research and innovation	10,525			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	2,591			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	527,504	224,757	224,757	224,757	224,757
Research and training					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	22,048	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Vocational education				0	0
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	22,048	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs					
Civil rights education	83,054			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	51,789	51,789			
Student loan insurance fund	300			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	39,139,726	33,475,036	27,243,614	28,999,630	38,347,596

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$23,491,781	\$21,806,285	\$23,525,257	\$23,525,257	\$27,408,955
State administrative expenses	234,918	218,117	235,253	235,253	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	906,017	453,532	380,971	0	447,401
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,896,000	1,713,497	1,786,306	1,266,286	1,707,779
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	328,124	388,193	371,742	371,742	371,342
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,000,044	991,055		0	978,829
Loans to nonprofit private schools		4,368		0	0
State administration	19,234	18,499		0	18,376
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
Subtotal, elementary, and secondary education	28,117,987	25,759,019	26,415,149	25,398,538	31,097,059
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	2,650,723	2,696,000	1,530,000	958,000	3,071,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815):	100,191	571,300		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	2,750,914	3,267,300	1,530,000	958,000	3,071,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)					
Training program (EPDA, pts. C and D)	538,632	187,861	232,954	232,954	232,954
Subtotal, education professions development	538,632	187,861	232,954	232,954	232,954
Teacher Corps	379,669	251,852		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	720,212			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	192,458	189,394	192,476	192,476	192,476
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	139,008	136,490		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEA I, sec. 103)	157,505	1,079,144	557,980	557,980	557,980
Other undergraduate facilities (HEA I, sec. 104)	2,424,251	1,167,862	763,483	0	283,138
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	80,915	74,344	74,344	74,344	74,344
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,660,440	148,326	713,863	713,863	525,728
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,879,706	1,849,227	1,468,814	1,468,814	2,104,996
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	7,607	122,516		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,097,662	2,140,576	2,242,508	2,242,971	2,242,971
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search	30,000			0	0
Personal development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	172,600			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	10,562,364	6,907,879	6,013,468	5,250,448	5,981,633

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	\$3,273,753	\$3,319,461	\$2,963,572	\$2,963,572	\$4,554,559
Innovation.....			225,660	225,660	225,660
Work-study.....	105,390		0	0	105,337
Cooperative education.....			235,988	235,988	235,988
Consumer and homemaking education.....			187,000	187,000	187,000
Subtotal, vocational education.....	3,379,143	3,319,461	3,612,220	3,612,220	5,308,544
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	319,716	391,716	391,716	219,830	391,716
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	398,255	346,970	128,570	0	128,570
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,336	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	211,575		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	147,398	142,316	142,316	142,316	142,316
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	538,398	631,826	701,583	701,583	701,583
Special projects and teacher education.....	200,000		0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,990,428	1,619,056	1,470,413	1,169,957	1,470,413
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	137,460	297,836	297,836	297,836	297,836
Teacher education and recruitment.....	340,493		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	2,089		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	480,042	297,836	297,836	297,836	297,836
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	700,000		0	0	0
Research and development centers.....			0	0	0
General education.....	6,242		0	0	0
Vocational education.....	26,000	67,707	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination:					
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal research and training.....	742,970	67,707	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs:					
Civil rights education.....			0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	128,540	31,000	0	0	0
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Student loan insurance fund.....	85,107	85,107	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	1,604,000		0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	50,809,796	41,844,078	39,637,040	36,984,953	47,524,439

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$85,936,416	\$80,215,617	\$84,053,448	\$84,053,448	\$97,929,519
State administrative expenses.....	859,364	802,900	840,534	840,534	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	9,337,909	4,786,011	4,020,285	0	4,801,557
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	15,774,000	14,182,781	14,922,033	9,681,939	14,208,380
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	1,895,749	1,908,448	1,847,729	1,847,729	1,847,729
Grants for special projects.....	41,491		0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	5,273,358	5,335,635	0	0	5,635,058
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		148,476	0	0	0
State administration.....	177,666	174,462	0	0	175,073
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	2,234,188	1,560,552	1,085,684	0	1,566,092
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	121,530,141	109,114,882	106,769,713	96,423,650	126,163,408
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	74,952,000	78,042,000	40,218,000	25,225,000	88,431,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		11,047,600	460,000	460,000	460,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	74,952,000	89,089,600	40,678,000	25,685,000	88,891,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		1,027,178	1,503,032	1,503,032	1,503,032
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	6,493,971		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	6,493,971	1,027,178	1,503,032	1,503,032	1,503,032
Teachers Corps.....	1,663,949	1,729,925		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	165,000		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	523,580	519,125	523,740	523,740	
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	1,585,616	1,577,046	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	5,510,083	6,678,961	3,453,412	3,453,412	3,453,412
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	22,770,923	14,504,916	9,482,513	0	3,663,040
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	2,598,126	600,000	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	303,385	377,971	377,971	0	0

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$8,581,990	\$1,570,013	\$7,556,158	\$7,556,158	\$5,564,771
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	15,775,127	18,828,396	15,547,238	15,547,238	22,181,155
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	837,865	1,079,211	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEFA IV-C).....	13,991,767	11,874,064	12,439,497	12,442,061	12,442,061
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	304,399	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	7,583,700	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	251,828	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	80,783,389	57,609,703	49,380,529	39,522,609	47,828,179
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	17,466,034	17,471,789	18,153,766	18,153,766	27,899,577
Innovation.....			422,522	422,522	422,522
Work-study.....	919,639	0	0	0	919,170
Cooperative education.....			512,086	512,086	512,086
Consumer and homemaking education.....			1,145,491	1,145,491	1,145,491
Subtotal, vocational education.....	18,385,673	17,471,789	20,233,865	20,233,865	30,898,846
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	2,666,778	2,666,778	2,666,778	1,154,367	2,666,778
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	2,659,255	1,376,957	507,365	0	507,365
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	51,753	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	2,129,062	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	724,486	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	549,363	506,766	506,765	506,765	506,765
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,590,550	1,908,201	2,137,446	2,137,446	2,137,446
Special projects and teacher education.....	262,500	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	10,695,497	6,578,336	5,937,988	3,918,212	5,937,988
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	1,106,581	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,397,629
Teacher education and recruitment.....	1,534,379	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	900,600	288,883	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	216,828	151,339	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	3,758,388	2,837,851	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,397,629
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	3,485,000	4,171,896	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	4,423,833	0	0	0	0
General education.....	2,737,359	455,000	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	1,137,169	241,078	59,037	59,037	59,037
Evaluations.....	16,046	0	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	631,725	0	0	0	0
Training.....	541,312	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	125,000	0	0	0	0
Construction.....	91,492	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	13,188,936	4,867,974	59,037	59,037	59,037
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	3,116,709	0	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	414,306	0	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	534,067	534,067	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	1,676,000	0	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	337,243,026	290,911,305	227,009,793	189,793,034	334,627,965

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$9,606,262	\$8,911,750	\$9,087,016	\$9,087,016	\$10,655,367
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,064,689	541,044	454,481	454,481	543,947
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	2,044,000	1,744,119	1,819,046	1,307,980	1,769,391
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	347,190	410,474	401,556	401,556	401,556
Grants for special projects.....	519,924	258,547	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	812,768	806,722	0	0	837,012
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	0	14,921	0	0	0
State administration.....	20,077	19,340	0	0	19,673
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	252,472	172,995	120,354	0	175,980
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	14,817,382	13,029,912	12,032,453	11,401,033	14,402,926
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	12,765,000	13,291,000	7,539,000	3,109,000	15,522,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	1,099,028	2,525,300	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	13,864,028	15,816,300	7,539,000	3,109,000	15,522,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	\$1,851,536	\$204,815	\$258,608	\$258,608	\$258,608
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....				0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,851,536	204,815	258,608	258,608	258,608
Teachers Corps.....				0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	125,000			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	191,689	188,629	191,707	191,707	191,707
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	201,690	212,102		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	248,359	935,812	483,869	483,869	483,869
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	3,129,478	1,691,038	1,105,508	0	414,543
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	317,181	200,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	91,749	80,092	80,092	80,092	80,092
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,982,240	228,321	1,098,863	1,098,863	809,263
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,769,953	2,846,550	2,260,975	2,260,975	3,240,262
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		127,164		0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,846,965	1,603,919	1,680,296	1,680,643	1,680,643
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	75,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,941,200			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	75,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	12,996,104	8,113,627	6,901,310	5,796,149	6,900,352
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	2,427,432	2,452,139	2,410,681	2,410,681	3,704,851
Innovation.....			224,710	224,710	224,710
Work-study.....	101,059			0	101,008
Cooperative education.....			234,655	234,655	234,655
Consumer and homemaking education.....			152,113	152,113	152,113
Subtotal, vocational education.....	2,528,491	2,452,139	3,022,159	3,022,159	1,087,337
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	386,437	386,437	386,437	217,661	386,437
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	303,675	232,842	127,691	0	127,691
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,311	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	441,349			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	127,425			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	147,594	142,295	142,295	142,495	142,495
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	228,507	255,893	275,835	275,835	275,835
Special projects and teacher education.....	66,996			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,805,044	1,123,664	1,038,455	742,188	1,038,655
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	131,656	285,258	285,258	285,258	285,258
Teacher education and recruitment.....	675,135			0	0
Research and innovation.....	1,135,525	240,113		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	30,589			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,972,905	525,371	285,528	285,258	285,258
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	514,039			0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	291,383	30,002		0	0
Vocational education.....	48,230	49,982	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	119,558			0	0
Training.....	98,475			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....	71,250			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,142,935	79,984	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	103,826			0	0
Civil rights education.....	64,673			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	66,744	66,744			
Student loan insurance fund.....	3,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....					
Total, Office of Education.....	51,266,668	41,462,556	31,142,243	24,679,395	9,560,136

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$9,062,813	\$8,698,660	\$9,884,434	\$9,884,434	\$11,575,229
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	718,570
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,400,476	717,392	602,615	0	2,343,122
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	2,775,726	2,333,909	2,447,224	1,687,122	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	386,662	449,925	461,634	461,634	461,634
Grants for special projects.....				0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Elementary and secondary education—Continued					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	\$718,891	\$724,973		0	\$734,201
Loans to nonprofit private schools	9,100	41,129		0	0
State administration	26,820	26,250		0	26,375
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	337,272	234,802	\$163,353	0	235,929
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	14,867,760	13,377,040	13,709,260	\$12,183,190	16,095,060
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	3,293,000	3,429,000	1,945,000	1,503,000	3,974,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	3,293,000	3,429,000	1,945,000	1,503,000	3,974,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		238,978	310,305	310,305	310,305
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	782,618			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	782,618	238,978	310,305	310,305	310,305
Teachers Corps				0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	210,260	207,121	210,285	210,285	210,285
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	164,566	163,167		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	763,269	875,107	452,481	452,481	452,481
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	2,676,180	1,784,439	1,166,568	0	454,530
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,352,204			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	113,326	91,548	91,548	91,548	91,548
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,531,380	194,680	936,956	936,956	936,956
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,417,182	2,427,138	1,927,841	1,927,841	1,927,841
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds		146,810		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,463,032	1,505,555	1,577,248	1,577,573	1,577,573
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	231,240			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,840,300			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)	19,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education	12,781,939	7,395,565	6,362,927	5,196,684	5,651,214
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	2,643,558	2,634,697	2,613,726	2,613,726	4,016,898
Innovation			232,448	232,448	232,448
Work-study	132,821			0	132,753
Cooperative education			245,509	245,509	245,509
Consumer and homemaking education			164,925	164,925	164,925
Subtotal, vocational education	2,776,379	2,634,697	3,256,608	3,256,608	4,792,533
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	514,029	514,029	514,029	270,073	514,029
Construction of public libraries (LSCA ID)	290,157	274,398	148,935	0	148,935
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,896	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195
College library resources (HEA II-A)	422,952			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	169,107	162,263	162,263	162,263	162,263
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	394,974	457,836	503,143	503,143	503,143
Special projects and teacher education	25,000			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	1,919,865	1,515,474	1,435,318	1,042,427	1,435,318
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	170,519	369,463	369,463	369,463	369,463
Teacher education and recruitment	426,270			0	0
Research and innovation	9,324	22,500		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	87,627	8,520		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	693,740	400,483	369,463	369,463	369,463
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	134,237	23,770		0	0
Vocational education	114,322	75,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training	148,100			0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	396,659	98,770	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.					
Civil rights education	571,134			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	79,000			0	0
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Student loan insurance fund	92,547	92,547		0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	2,183,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education	#4,487,641	29,232,554	27,453,881	23,926,677	32,692,893

† Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$2,535,238	\$2,520,451	\$2,571,260	\$2,571,260	\$3,124,538
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	133,044
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	260,120	134,057	112,609	0	133,044
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	644,000	715,180	735,751	597,711	719,823
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	192,381	261,718	262,904	262,904	262,904
Grants for special projects.....	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	163,493	165,504	0	0	180,310
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	6,777	0	0	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	65,045	50,000	50,000	0	50,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	4,020,277	4,017,020	3,882,524	3,581,875	4,483,952
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	1,741,640	1,922,000	1,756,000	1,388,000	2,212,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	16	898,900	801,000	801,000	801,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	1,741,656	2,820,900	2,557,000	2,189,000	3,013,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	77,870	125,971	139,299	139,299	139,299
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	77,870	125,971	139,299	139,299	139,299
Teachers Corps.....	0	0	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	82,908	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	160,608	157,678	160,612	160,612	160,612
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	26,440	26,175	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	139,307	163,085	84,324	84,324	84,324
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	516,926	316,172	206,696	0	85,158
Graduate facilities (CHEFA II).....	0	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	94,966	47,476	47,476	47,476	47,476
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	322,720	29,757	143,214	143,214	105,471
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	216,403	370,989	294,671	294,671	422,301
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	10,000	29,209	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	271,172	293,787	307,777	307,840	307,840
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	177,000	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EDPA, pt. E).....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	2,018,450	1,434,328	1,244,770	1,038,137	1,213,182
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	632,629	623,244	478,774	478,774	735,802
Innovation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Work-study.....	25,024	0	0	0	25,011
Cooperative education.....	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer and homemaking education.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, vocational education.....	657,653	623,244	923,662	922,662	1,205,701
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	172,884	172,884	172,884	129,939	172,884
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	170,250	225,947	92,135	0	92,135
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,334	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,395
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	30,509	30,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,034	25,043	25,034	25,034
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	33,726	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	0	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	112,283	111,098	111,098	111,098	111,098
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	146,034	155,845	162,892	162,892	162,892
Special projects and teacher education.....	0	0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	737,261	770,712	643,947	499,867	637,947
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	105,723	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	2,523	26,378	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	208,246	126,378	100,000	100,000	100,000
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	0	0	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	0	0	0	0	0
General education.....	22,231	0	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	60,000	40,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....	0	0	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	0	0	0	0	0
Training.....	0	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	0	0	0	0	0
Construction.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	82,231	40,000	15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs				0	0
Civil rights education	\$99,224			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	30,000			
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	491,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education	10,213,868	10,038,553	9,556,202	8,535,840	10,858,081
OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$5,933,620	\$5,655,271	\$5,710,453	\$5,710,453	\$6,204,418
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	336,897	167,514	140,713	0	163,966
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	841,000	874,098	903,065	705,509	879,117
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	206,022	273,711	274,302	274,302	274,302
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	172,293	177,226		0	182,138
Loans to nonprofit private schools		7,660		0	0
State administration	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	83,354	59,191	50,000	0	60,916
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	7,733,186	7,378,004	7,228,533	6,840,264	7,778,190
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	5,747,400	5,984,400	3,396,000	374,000	6,744,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		908,400		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	5,747,400	6,892,800	3,396,000	374,000	6,774,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)			132,452	149,107	149,107
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	827,729			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	827,729	132,452	149,107	149,107	149,107
Teachers Corps			425,423	155,267	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)		165,197	168,166	168,166	168,166
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	108,295	101,716		0	
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEA I, sec. 103)			143,332	74,111	74,111
Other undergraduate facilities (HEA I, sec. 104)	1,469,313	746,653	488,120	0	181,288
Graduate facilities (HEA II)	237,225			0	0
State administration and planning (HEA I, sec. 105)	31,542	64,151	64,151	64,151	
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	915,250	132,064	635,596	635,596	468,088
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,715,440	1,646,480	1,307,776	1,307,776	1,874,208
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	49,818	63,305		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	810,839	707,424	741,110	741,263	741,263
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	105,840			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,131,800			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)	160,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education	6,735,362	3,770,322	3,479,030	2,991,063	3,571,275
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	769,427	774,982	650,227	650,227	999,302
Innovation			207,739	207,739	207,739
Work-study	31,280			0	31,264
Cooperative education			210,853	210,853	210,853
Consumer and homemaking education			41,029	41,029	41,029
Subtotal, vocational education	800,707	774,982	1,109,848	1,109,848	1,490,187
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	224,762	224,762	224,762	151,249	224,762
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	368,797	138,580	100,773	0	100,773
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,571	40,676	40,676	40,676	40,676
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)		39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)		25,059	25,059	25,059	25,059
College library resources (HEA II-A)	308,721			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	103,418			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	119,584	117,437	117,437	117,437	117,437
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	196,191	216,690	231,310	231,310	231,310
Special projects and teacher education	1,279,897			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	2,641,941	802,713	779,526	605,240	779,526
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,397	100,397	100,397	100,397
Teacher education and recruitment	454,447			0	0
Research and innovation	1,287,431	858,792		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	527,094	560,414		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,368,972	1,519,603	100,397	100,397	100,397

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	\$780,000	\$390,000		0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	1,836,048	949,292		0	0
Vocational education.....	618,982	243,293	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Evaluations.....	332,676			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	1,174,098	302,220		0	0
Training.....	201,919			0	0
Statistical surveys.....	53,475			0	0
Construction.....	15,948			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	5,013,146	1,884,805	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs:					
Civil rights education.....	541,059			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	130,560	152,065		0	0
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	814,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	33,779,485	23,513,013	16,307,441	12,234,919	20,677,682
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$32,933,155	\$32,012,107	\$32,717,727	\$32,717,727	\$33,044,904
State administrative expenses.....	329,332	320,928	327,177	327,177	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,648,847	1,358,173	1,140,875	0	1,385,908
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,898,000	4,530,189	4,759,524	3,182,146	4,603,634
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	652,801	709,479	679,935	679,935	679,935
Grants for special projects.....	234,000			0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	2,266,670	2,281,979		0	2,313,878
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	6,170	30,966		0	0
State administration.....	54,369	53,121		0	54,190
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	683,699	475,164	330,574	0	484,750
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	44,707,043	41,772,106	39,955,812	36,906,985	42,567,199
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	16,684,000	17,351,000	10,201,000	5,013,000	20,056,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	554,293	2,615,300	17,000	17,000	17,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	17,238,293	19,966,300	10,218,000	5,030,000	20,073,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	2,584,068	363,114	498,152	498,152	498,152
Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,584,068	363,114	498,152	498,152	498,152
Teachers Corps.....	453,772	537,734		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	676,663			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	267,693	264,313	267,743	267,743	267,743
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	386,333	398,154		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	2,329,696	2,308,003	1,193,372	0	0
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	5,526,744	3,533,473	2,309,990	0	902,586
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	440,164			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	135,710	125,891	125,891	125,891	125,891
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	3,133,560	1,370,462	1,782,958	1,782,958	1,313,069
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	4,594,743	4,618,666	3,668,541	3,668,541	5,257,482
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	17,279	325,297		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,601,075	3,910,790	4,097,018	4,097,862	4,097,862
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	69,495			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	2,399,200			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	191,986			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	23,770,341	15,855,049	13,445,513	9,942,995	11,964,633
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	7,163,350	7,143,929	7,393,929	7,393,929	11,363,343
Innovation.....				266,390	266,390
Work-study.....	272,860			0	272,721
Cooperative education.....				293,111	293,111
Consumer and homemaking education.....				466,553	466,553
Subtotal, vocational education.....	7,436,210	7,143,929	8,419,983	8,419,983	12,662,118
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	908,640	908,640	908,640	432,168	908,640
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	1,300,823	551,144	214,637	0	214,637
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	43,703	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	566,810			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-E).....	166,482			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	241,536	227,490	227,491	227,491	227,491

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services—Continued					
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	\$874,905	\$1,040,045	\$1,159,832	\$1,159,832	\$1,159,832
Special projects and teacher education.....	516,000			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	4,680,649	2,836,593	2,619,874	1,928,765	2,619,877
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	339,800	736,246	736,246	736,246	736,246
Teacher education and recruitment.....	678,392			0	0
Research and innovation.....	210,447	233,751		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	9,840			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,238,479	969,997	736,246	736,246	736,246
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	1,290,341	44,338		0	0
Vocational education.....	323,795	50,000	24,046	24,046	24,046
Evaluations.....	700			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	118,405			0	0
Training.....	344,079			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	2,077,320	49,338	24,046	24,046	24,046
Education in foreign languages and world affairs					
Civil rights education.....	337,479			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (Second Morrill Act).....	707,719	129,380		0	0
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Student loan insurance fund.....	187,558	187,558		0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	2,291,000			0	0
Total, office of education.....	107,759,931	89,906,098	75,967,626	63,537,172	91,195,269

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$37,651,381	\$34,744,894	\$37,800,275	\$37,800,275	\$44,040,582
State administrative expenses.....	376,814	347,488	378,003	378,003	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,152,555	1,089,383	915,090	0	1,086,360
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,235,273	3,625,930	3,807,496	2,519,142	3,623,910
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	577,997	628,796	588,363	588,363	588,363
Grants for special projects.....	483,412			0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	2,252,999	2,239,316		0	2,182,778
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		9,660		0	0
State administration.....	45,633	44,018		0	43,958
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	573,845	393,735	273,924	0	393,215
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	48,379,909	43,123,220	43,763,151	41,285,783	51,959,166
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	15,440,556	16,421,000	11,575,000	5,749,000	18,978,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	1,224,508	3,172,400	1,598,000	1,598,000	1,598,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	16,665,064	19,593,400	13,173,000	7,347,000	20,576,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		311,043	419,355	419,355	419,355
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	2,372,079			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,372,079	311,043	419,355	419,355	419,355
Teachers Corps.....	251,055	261,751		0	0
Higer education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	2,444,284			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	243,723	240,444	243,763	243,763	243,763
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	254,839	252,462		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	430,589	2,056,751	1,063,460	0	0
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	5,553,318	2,476,634	1,619,087	0	615,620
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	958,549	200,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	114,696	113,760	113,760	0	0
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,348,100	263,868	1,269,944	1,260,944	935,257
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,962,869	3,289,729	2,612,985	2,612,985	3,744,737
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	129,249	306,131		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,946,249	3,976,902	4,166,278	4,167,138	4,167,138
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	60,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,929,600			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	221,200			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	19,597,265	13,176,681	11,089,277	8,284,830	9,706,515

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational educational:					
Basic grants.....	\$7,106,953	\$7,105,908	\$6,961,237	\$6,961,237	\$10,698,362
Innovation.....			260,009	260,009	260,009
Work-study.....	247,836		0	0	247,709
Cooperative education.....			284,162	284,162	284,162
Consumer and homemaking education.....			439,251	439,251	439,251
Subtotal, vocational education.....	7,354,789	7,105,908	7,944,659	7,944,659	11,929,493
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	743,951	743,951	743,951	364,518	743,951
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	899,816	519,170	187,217	0	187,217
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,949	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	473,915		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	286,062		0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	207,226	196,164	196,164	196,164	196,164
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,132,351	1,352,356	1,515,610	1,515,610	1,515,610
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	3,848,020	2,919,945	2,751,246	2,184,596	2,751,246
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	314,971	682,447	682,447	682,447	682,447
Teacher education and recruitment.....	501,825		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	13,103	9,549	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	6,476		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	836,375	691,996	682,447	682,447	682,447
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	670,000	670,000	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	1,237,326		0	0	0
General education.....	499,686		0	0	0
Vocational education.....	216,400		22,639	22,639	22,639
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....	157,700		0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....	92,143		0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	2,873,255	670,000	22,639	22,639	22,639
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....			0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	562,105	319,299	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	172,456	172,456	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....			0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	922,000		0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	103,884,372	88,395,699	79,895,774	68,221,309	98,096,861

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$2,430,762	\$2,215,107	\$2,633,771	\$2,633,771	\$3,211,221
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	386,217	193,833	162,821	0	192,394
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	841,079	874,776	903,778	716,722	895,886
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	213,704	281,390	283,268	283,268	283,268
Grants for special projects.....			0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	298,618	301,047	0	0	325,337
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	31,063	9,946	0	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	94,918	66,059	50,000	0	68,374
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	4,456,361	4,105,491	4,183,638	3,783,761	4,990,213
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	8,756,000	9,117,000	5,172,000	5,741,000	10,735,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		1,785,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	8,756,000	10,902,000	5,172,000	5,741,000	10,735,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....			137,551	156,823	156,823
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	569,568		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	569,568	137,551	156,823	156,823	156,823
Teachers Corps					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	139,266		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	165,040	162,092	165,047	165,047	156,047
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	51,362	58,366	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community, colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	276,813	327,314	169,240	169,240	169,240
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	857,813	547,034	357,621	0	127,380
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	841,520		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	20,269	51,522	51,522	51,522	51,522

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$196,000	\$55,099	\$265,182	\$265,182	\$195,295
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	272,454	328,050	545,627	545,627	781,953
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	17,365	56,820	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	542,283	481,321	504,241	504,345	504,345
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	71,837	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	485,800	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	3,937,722	2,067,618	2,058,480	1,700,963	1,985,782
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,009,303	1,000,869	943,321	943,321	1,449,742
Innovation.....	0	0	210,047	210,047	210,047
Work-study.....	43,311	0	0	0	43,289
Cooperative education.....	0	0	214,090	214,090	214,090
Consumer and homemaking education.....	0	0	59,523	59,523	59,523
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,052,614	1,000,869	1,426,981	1,426,981	1,976,691
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	203,338	203,338	203,338	142,449	203,338
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	320,520	140,944	97,206	0	97,206
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,473	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	55,822	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	141,163	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	117,338	115,728	115,728	115,728	115,728
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	211,515	235,281	251,540	251,540	251,540
Special projects and teacher education.....	0	0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community centers.....	1,151,919	800,409	772,930	614,835	773,118
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	113,023	113,023	113,023	113,023
Teacher education and recruitment.....	115,744	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	3,225	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	218,969	113,023	113,023	113,023	113,023
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	0	0	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	0	0	0	0	0
General education.....	237,965	0	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	41,872	25,334	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....	0	0	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	0	0	0	0	0
Training.....	0	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	0	0	0	0	0
Construction.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	279,837	25,334	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs					
Civil rights education.....	203,182	0	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	31,661	0	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	1,000	0	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	20,869,858	19,413,496	13,948,875	13,602,386	20,795,650

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$3,095,753	\$2,945,733	\$3,006,605	\$3,006,605	\$3,488,547
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	180,068
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	360,311	180,728	151,813	0	855,370
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	831,000	858,909	887,072	689,438	0
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	217,211	283,917	278,803	278,803	278,803
Grants for special projects.....	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	360,587	358,140	0	0	356,734
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	0	3,048	0	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	94,436	64,750	50,000	0	64,139
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	5,119,298	4,858,558	4,524,293	4,403,649	5,236,994
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	2,551,000	2,656,000	1,507,000	1,044,000	3,225,000
Construction (Public Law, 81-815).....	0	138,100	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	2,551,000	2,794,100	1,507,000	1,044,000	3,225,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	142,113	135,012	152,981	152,981	152,981
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	142,113	135,012	152,981	152,981	152,981
Teachers Corps.....	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	\$102,500			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	165,858	\$162,907	\$165,865	\$165,865	\$165,865
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	62,099	65,468		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	330,390	400,064	206,857	206,857	206,857
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	854,005	546,443	357,234	0	132,503
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....		800,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	72,046	55,294	55,294	55,294	55,294
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	491,250	64,941	312,549	312,549	230,178
Direct loans (NEDA II).....	618,496	809,643	643,087	643,087	921,626
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		46,098		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	618,851	549,749	575,928	576,046	576,046
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....				0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....		192,700		0	0
Training programs (EPDA Pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	3,508,195	3,500,607	2,316,814	1,959,698	2,288,369
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,191,853	1,202,766	1,032,903	10,32,903	1,587,417
Innovation.....			209,639	209,639	209,639
Work-study.....	38,980			0	38,960
Cooperative education.....			213,519	213,519	213,519
Consumer and homemaking education.....			65,176	65,176	65,176
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,230,833	1,202,766	1,521,237	1,521,237	2,114,711
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	208,959	208,959	208,959	144,758	208,959
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	247,786	131,159	98,141	0	98,141
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,499	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	88,375			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	17,392			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	116,923	115,079	115,079	115,079	115,079
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	138,479	146,680	153,041	153,041	153,041
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	920,163	707,028	680,371	518,029	680,371
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	116,982	116,982	116,982	116,982
Teacher education and recruitment.....	133,155		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,673		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	234,828	116,982	116,982	116,982	116,982
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	9,233			0	0
Vocational education.....		50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	9,233	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.					
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	39,430	39,430			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	12,000		0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	13,817,093	13,454,483	10,884,678	9,781,576	13,880,408

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$47,565,775	\$44,407,826	\$46,788,843	\$46,788,843	\$54,513,049
State administrative expenses.....	474,998	444,130	467,888	467,888	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	5,337,276	2,681,475	2,252,460	0	2,672,463
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	9,382,000	8,223,590	8,648,036	5,650,541	8,251,199
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA IV):					
Grants to States.....	1,013,556	1,056,099	1,130,757	1,130,757	1,130,757
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	3,056,642	3,085,357		0	3,157,687
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		181,753		0	0
State administration.....	102,071	99,990		0	100,742
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	1,283,562	894,406	622,243	0	901,171
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	68,215,880	61,074,626	59,910,227	54,038,029	68,727,068

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	\$12,220,000	\$12,724,000	\$7,217,000	\$4,280,000	\$14,805,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	97,094	934,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	12,317,094	13,658,000	7,217,000	4,280,000	14,805,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	3,468,409	619,473	886,082	886,082	886,082
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	3,468,409	619,473	886,082	886,082	886,082
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,109,679	1,067,674	0	0	0
Teachers Corps:					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	1,068,000	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	389,618	385,726	389,721	389,721	389,721
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	641,295	627,907	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEA I, sec. 103).....	2,776,977	3,299,943	1,706,263	1,706,263	1,706,263
Other undergraduate facilities (HEA I, sec. 104).....	10,439,144	6,640,145	4,340,960	0	1,688,339
Graduate facilities (HEA I).....	1,500,000	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEA I, sec. 105).....	244,312	215,020	215,020	215,020	215,020
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	6,429,725	770,306	3,707,326	3,707,326	2,730,279
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	9,192,661	9,603,647	7,628,040	7,628,040	10,931,945
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	92,355	642,626	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	5,129,105	6,321,681	6,622,714	6,624,079	6,624,079
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	255,380	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	4,692,300	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	148,000	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	42,998,872	28,507,001	24,010,044	20,270,449	24,285,646
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	10,397,146	10,300,874	9,830,472	9,380,472	15,169,414
Innovation.....	324,227	0	0	0	0
Work-study.....	503,371	0	0	0	503,114
Cooperative education.....	374,227	0	0	0	374,227
Consumer and homemaking education.....	622,822	0	0	0	622,822
Subtotal, vocational education.....	10,900,517	10,300,874	11,151,748	10,377,565	16,669,577
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	1,746,355	1,746,355	1,746,355	776,280	1,746,355
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	656,395	1,653,747	354,115	0	354,115
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	47,539	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	1,532,824	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	666,077	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	359,848	333,347	333,346	333,346	333,346
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,221,492	1,460,494	1,633,780	1,633,780	1,633,780
Special projects and teacher education.....	483,000	0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	6,775,280	5,308,153	4,181,806	2,857,616	4,181,806
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	687,167	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885
Teacher education and recruitment.....	1,211,167	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	796,468	446,411	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	77,590	49,465	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	2,772,392	1,984,761	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	600,000	270,000	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	1,465,500	0	0	0	0
General education.....	1,554,377	137,690	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	1,022,991	363,581	32,100	32,100	32,100
Evaluations.....	0	0	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	64,312	0	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	314,657	0	0	0	0
Training.....	23,400	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	22,000	0	0	0	0
Construction.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	5,067,237	771,271	32,100	32,100	32,100
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	1,305,133	0	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	264,413	0	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	5,0000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	360,319	360,319	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	6,875,000	0	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	162,480,225	123,702,152	109,527,392	94,280,726	131,126,164

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$15,973,503	\$15,013,815	\$16,019,525	\$16,019,525	\$18,664,129
State administrative expenses.....	159,736	150,191	160,195	160,195	1,282,958
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,534,729	1,286,642	1,080,789	0	3,989,229
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,550,000	3,980,987	4,181,310	2,766,361	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Elementary and secondary education—Continued					
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	\$540,191	\$664,602	\$655,566	\$655,566	\$655,566
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,946,443	1,950,699		0	1,941,848
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		46,524		0	0
State administration.....	49,541	48,185		0	48,281
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	622,990	431,016	299,860	0	431,892
	26,377,133	23,572,661	22,397,245	19,601,647	27,013,903
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):					
Construction (Public Law 81-815):	4,217,000	4,391,000	2,491,000	982,000	4,974,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....		157,900		0	0
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D):	3,286,966	349,257	477,138	477,183	477,183
Subtotal, education professions development.....		3,286,966	349,257	477,183	477,183
Teachers Corps.....	507,039	244,449		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA I):	124,715			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones):	260,822	257,471	260,870	260,870	260,870
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources.....	363,716	360,578		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103):	2,991,611	2,031,939	1,050,631	1,050,631	1,050,631
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104):	4,606,774	3,386,105	2,213,649	0	844,564
Graduate facilities (HEFA II):	714,815			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105):	150,847	123,421	123,421	123,421	123,421
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):	4,029,100	433,744	2,087,523	2,087,523	1,537,367
Direct loans (NDEA II):	5,726,806	5,407,627	4,293,200	4,295,000	6,155,565
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		324,610		0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C):	2,041,745	3,352,294	3,511,927	3,512,652	3,512,652
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	57,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV):	3,028,800			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E):	64,128			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....		24,160,879	15,677,789	13,543,221	11,330,097
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	6,221,801	6,170,769	5,660,581	5,660,581	8,699,450
Innovation.....			261,231	261,231	261,231
Work-study.....	246,873			0	246,747
Cooperative education.....			285,876	285,876	285,876
Consumer and homemaking education.....			357,180	357,180	357,180
Subtotal, vocational education.....		6,468,674	6,170,769	6,564,868	9,850,484
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I):					
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II):	861,433	861,433	861,433	412,777	861,433
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III):	775,944	206,881	206,777	0	206,777
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A):	43,487	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B):	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
College library resources (HEA II-A):	23,750	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359
Librarian training (HEA II-B):	498,929			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I):	630,727			0	0
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	207,111		207,110	207,110	207,110
Special projects and teacher education.....	486,403	568,749	630,936	630,936	630,936
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	20,858			0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....		3,379,531	1,953,170	2,015,252	1,359,819
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI):					
Teacher education and recruitment.....	343,940	745,215	745,215	745,215	645,215
Research and innovation.....	463,072			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	114,982	94,169		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....		42,493		0	0
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....				0	0
Vocational education.....	523,919	107,602		0	
Evaluations.....	51,882	73,102	18,409	18,409	18,409
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....	146,557			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....		722,358	180,704	18,409	18,409
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....		697,910		0	18,409
Civil rights education.....		42,140	55,608	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act):		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act):		193,488	193,488		
Student loan insurance fund.....		9,474,000		0	0
Total, office of education.....		80,541,605	53,836,179	48,302,393	41,129,238
Total, office of education.....					58,629,516

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$15,674,581	\$14,591,735	\$14,644,700	\$14,644,700	\$16,671,027
State administrative expenses	156,746	150,000	150,000	150,000	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,448,999	722,942	607,277	0	720,857
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,561,000	2,292,489	2,403,613	1,648,450	2,281,698
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					0
Grants to States	402,486	461,077	463,524	463,524	0
Grants for special projects	825,460				463,524
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,130,606	1,119,359	0	0	1,062,143
Loans to nonprofit private schools	27,395	32,966	0	0	0
State administration	344,499	26,323	0	0	26,323
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)		235,456	163,808	163,808	234,317
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,571,772	19,632,347	18,432,922	17,070,482	21,459,730
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	3,258,294	2,605,000	1,478,000	310,000	3,033,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	113,030	240,500	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	3,371,324	2,845,500	1,478,000	310,000	3,033,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		240,053	311,932	311,932	311,932
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	1,049,489	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	1,049,489	240,053	311,932	311,932	311,932
Teachers Corps	26,584	339,668	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	723,345	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	219,543	212,383	215,572	215,572	215,572
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	257,081	244,835	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	1,185,139	1,378,575	712,803	712,803	712,803
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	3,445,771	2,136,021	1,396,413	0	515,496
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,716,940	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	121,265	104,029	104,029	104,029	104,029
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,246,830	3,303,152	1,459,009	1,459,009	1,074,495
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,799,627	3,779,492	3,001,996	3,001,996	3,402,240
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	25,899	180,209	0	0	0
Interest payments	(1)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,742,555	2,425,315	2,540,806	2,541,330	2,541,330
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search			0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,581,800	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)			0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	18,061,795	10,764,011	9,430,628	8,034,739	9,455,955
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	4,174,189	4,106,252	3,309,767	3,309,767	5,086,608
Innovation			234,892	0	0
Work-study	140,039		0	0	139,968
Cooperative education			248,936	248,936	248,936
Consumer and homemaking education			208,844	208,844	208,844
Subtotal, vocational education	4,314,228	4,106,252	4,002,439	3,767,547	5,684,356
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	550,334	550,334	550,334	284,986	550,334
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	266,179	508,148	154,980	0	154,980
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,062	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212
College library resources (HEA II-A)	491,770			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,960			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	167,349	159,710	159,710	159,710	159,710
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	251,953	284,335	309,838	309,838	309,838
Special projects and teacher education			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	1,856,357	1,609,689	1,282,024	864,696	1,282,024
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	199,790	432,885	432,885	432,885	432,885
Teacher education and recruitment	343,156		0	0	0
Research and innovation	176,203		0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	3,869		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	723,018	432,885	432,885	432,885	432,885
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	162,277		0	0	0
Vocational education	196,286	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations	79,034		0	0	0
National achievement study			0	0	0
Dissemination			0	0	0
Training	220,100		0	0	0
Statistical surveys			0	0	0
Construction			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training	657,697	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	\$66,990			0	0
Civil rights education.....	67,182			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	122,556	122,556			
Student loan insurance fund.....			0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	2,285,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	55,223,992	40,192,961	35,435,830	30,857,281	41,734,892
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$10,495,541	\$9,783,868	\$9,864,608	\$9,864,608	\$10,994,247
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	547,184
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,115,859	556,782	467,701	0	1,938,094
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	2,169,000	1,942,094	2,027,478	1,422,144	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	354,128	414,425	406,917	406,917	406,917
Grants for special projects.....					0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	898,884	898,921		0	906,782
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		16,870		0	0
State administration.....	22,338	21,680		0	21,727
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	280,900	193,924	134,914	0	194,351
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	15,486,650	13,978,564	13,051,618	11,843,669	15,009,302
School assistance on federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	8,195,184	8,534,000	4,849,000	3,302,000	9,836,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		642,400	63,000	63,000	63,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	8,195,184	9,176,400	4,912,000	3,365,000	9,899,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....			207,864	263,222	263,222
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	1,391,213			263,222	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,391,213	207,864	263,222	263,222	263,222
Teachers Corps.....					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	778,032			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	201,783	198,680	201,805	201,805	201,805
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	219,145	211,246		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	624,135	1,027,111	531,076	531,076	531,076
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	2,908,099	1,725,656	1,128,139	0	412,235
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	104,673	94,510	94,510	94,510	94,510
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,747,810	265,188	1,276,297	1,276,297	939,935
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,561,037	3,306,185	2,626,056	2,626,056	3,763,740
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	11,157	147,214		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,726,333	1,840,588	1,928,235	1,928,633	1,928,633
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	39,488			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,296,400			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	63,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	14,281,092	8,816,378	7,786,118	6,648,377	7,880,934
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	3,110,955	3,089,082	2,789,750	2,789,750	4,287,420
Innovation.....			228,104	228,104	228,014
Work-study.....	114,534			0	114,475
Cooperative education.....			239,415	239,415	239,415
Consumer and homemaking education.....			176,032	176,032	176,032
Subtotal, vocational education.....	3,225,489	3,089,082	3,433,301	3,433,301	5,045,446
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	455,789	455,789	455,789	246,149	455,789
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	292,693	211,413	139,238	0	139,238
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....		41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....		39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....		25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	467,032			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	74,880			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	154,895	149,218	149,218	149,128	149,218
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	232,402	260,619	292,224	282,224	282,224
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Education broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,677,691	1,173,645	1,133,075	784,197	1,133,075
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	156,308	338,673	338,673	338,673	338,673
Teacher education and recruitment.....	602,658			0	0
Research and innovation.....	293,077	248,450		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	6,302			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,058,345	587,123	338,673	338,673	338,673

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	\$55,988			0	0
Vocational education.....	14,640	\$69,374	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	70,628	69,374	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	305,220			0	0
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	91,385	91,385		0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	500			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	574,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	46,407,397	37,239,815	30,983,007	26,741,439	39,634,652
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$32,855,018	\$30,191,775	\$33,776,949	\$33,776,949	\$39,353,059
State administrative expenses.....	328,716	301,923	337,769	337,769	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,505,814	759,127	637,672	0	754,260
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	3,008,000	2,622,860	2,751,437	1,849,465	2,601,011
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	417,806	477,508	475,852	475,852	475,852
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,610,633	1,581,651		0	1,524,396
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		30,783		0	0
State administration.....	32,184	30,673		0	30,230
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	404,727	274,372	190,882	0	270,416
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	40,162,898	36,270,672	38,170,561	36,440,035	45,009,224
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	7,737,474	8,731,000	7,277,000	5,604,000	9,801,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	1,147,281	328,800	127,000	127,000	127,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	8,884,755	9,059,800	7,404,000	5,731,000	9,928,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		247,063	322,540	322,540	322,540
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	733,071		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	733,071	247,063	322,540	322,540	322,540
Teacher Corps.....	517,563	432,631		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	786,310			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	222,214	219,025	222,244	222,244	222,244
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	237,717	233,537		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 108).....	2,258,584	1,794,599	927,912	927,912	927,912
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	3,189,651	1,968,929	1,287,177	0	474,383
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	39,165	98,154	98,154	98,154	98,154
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,689,605	243,132	1,170,144	1,170,144	861,758
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,046,428	3,031,200	2,407,639	2,307,639	3,450,451
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	32,727	227,722		0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	2,370,942	3,130,019	3,279,067	3,279,743	3,279,743
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	128,472			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....		683,400		0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	15,685,215	10,946,317	9,392,337	8,005,836	9,314,645
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	5,414,324	5,459,534	4,984,998	4,984,998	7,522,868
Innovation.....			242,902	242,902	242,902
Work-study.....	175,651			0	175,561
Cooperative education.....			260,170	260,170	260,170
Consumer and homemaking education.....			308,872	308,872	308,872
Subtotal, vocational education.....	5,589,975	5,459,534	5,796,942	5,796,942	8,510,191
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	596,161	596,161	596,161	303,810	596,161
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	463,314	162,610	162,610	0	162,610
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,272	42,690	42,690	42,690	42,690
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	277,958			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	108,426			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	177,483	168,818	168,818	168,818	168,818

* Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services—Continued					
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	\$768,082	\$910,457	\$1,019,688	\$1,019,688	\$1,019,688
Special projects and teacher education.....	250,000	—	—	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	—	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,745,446	1,945,479	2,054,710	1,599,749	2,054,710
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	235,368	509,972	509,972	509,972	509,972
Teacher education and recruitment.....	248,413	—	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	797,404	291,530	—	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	5,957	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,287,142	801,502	509,972	509,972	509,972
Research and training:					
Research development:					
Educational laboratories.....	—	—	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	—	—	0	0	0
General education.....	38,097	—	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	52,047	—	15,919	15,919	15,919
Evaluations.....	—	—	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	—	—	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	38,400	—	0	0	0
Training.....	—	—	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	—	—	0	0	0
Construction.....	—	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	128,544	—	15,919	15,919	15,919
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	—	—	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	372,735	—	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	143,135	143,135	—	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	—	—	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	9,632,000	—	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	85,932,479	65,356,133	63,716,981	58,471,993	75,715,201

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$32,644,294	\$30,427,822	\$32,519,870	\$32,519,870	\$37,888,454
State administrative expenses.....	326,736	304,314	325,199	325,199	—
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,902,770	954,621	801,889	0	957,137
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	3,472,000	3,074,668	3,227,113	2,150,754	3,079,542
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	473,475	535,430	542,453	542,453	542,453
Grants for special projects.....	—	—	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	2,009,273	2,016,264	—	0	1,992,135
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	—	46,969	—	0	—
State administration.....	38,966	37,949	—	0	37,976
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	490,008	339,449	236,156	0	399,712
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	41,357,522	37,737,486	37,652,680	35,538,276	44,897,409
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	3,285,016	3,431,000	2,023,000	770,000	3,960,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	648,108	1,087,700	666,000	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	3,933,114	4,518,700	2,689,000	770,000	3,960,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	—	284,936	379,850	379,850	379,850
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	686,990	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	686,990	284,936	379,850	379,850	379,850
Teachers Corps.....	94,458	148,999	—	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	915,864	—	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	227,416	224,205	227,449	227,449	227,449
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	277,165	272,955	—	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEA I, sec. 103).....	1,478,016	1,817,845	939,932	939,932	939,932
Other undergraduate facilities (HEA I, sec. 104).....	3,676,876	2,317,459	1,515,027	0	564,669
Graduate facilities (HEA II).....	—	250,000	—	0	0
State administration and planning (HEA I, sec. 105).....	112,404	96,873	96,873	96,873	96,873
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,296,670	292,154	1,406,076	1,406,076	1,035,512
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,327,824	3,642,372	2,893,084	2,893,084	4,146,155
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	257,898	238,413	—	0	0
Interest payments.....	(—)	—	—	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	2,685,140	3,569,906	3,739,902	3,740,672	3,740,672
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	37,825	—	—	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,497,900	—	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	33,800	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	16,824,798	12,722,182	10,818,343	9,304,086	10,751,262

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	\$5,497,316	\$5,453,039	\$5,488,273	\$5,488,273	\$8,434,640
Innovation.....			248,605	248,605	248,605
Work-study.....	198,269		0	0	198,167
Cooperative education.....			268,167	268,167	268,167
Consumer and homemaking education.....			346,307	346,307	346,307
Subtotal, vocational education.....	5,695,585	5,453,039	6,351,352	6,351,352	9,495,886
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	631,904	631,904	631,904	318,493	631,904
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	762,779	329,744	168,561	0	168,561
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,436	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	352,050			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	135,697			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	186,934	178,251	178,251	178,251	178,251
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,061,473	1,266,373	1,414,980	1,414,980	1,414,980
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	3,235,023	2,513,915	2,501,339	2,019,367	2,501,339
Educational for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	263,543	570,824	570,824	570,824	570,824
Teacher education and recruitment.....	249,776		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	10,181		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	523,410	570,824	570,824	570,824	570,824
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	224,616	64,455	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	28,425	30,709	17,848	17,848	17,848
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	253,041	95,174	17,848	17,848	17,848
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	210,800		0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	229,904		0	0	0
College for agriculture and the mechanic arts (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	134,293	134,293			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....					
Subtotal, Office of Education.....	13,473,000				
Total, Office of Education.....	86,701,948	64,229,538	61,031,236	55,001,612	72,624,418

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$3,600,248	\$3,351,971	\$3,554,215	\$3,554,215	\$4,273,001
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	506,785	253,111	212,615	0	251,104
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,057,000	1,031,142	1,068,404	804,617	3,079,542
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	235,168	303,881	303,463	303,463	303,463
Grants for special projects.....			0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	447,007	439,486	0	0	425,881
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	10,385		0	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
121,900	82,737	57,561	0	0	81,866
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	6,128,108	5,636,046	5,346,258	4,812,295	8,428,290
School assistance to federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	2,928,000	3,049,000	1,730,000	2,213,000	3,593,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		25,500	22,000	22,000	22,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	2,928,000	3,074,500	1,752,000	2,235,000	3,615,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		149,034	174,200	174,200	174,200
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	626,339		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	626,339	149,034	174,200	174,200	174,200
Teachers Corps:					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	173,038	170,056	173,048	173,048	173,048
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	60,131	59,256	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....				283,459	283,459
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	1,353,033	595,828	389,519	0	152,426
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....			0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	57,987	62,713	62,713	62,713	62,713

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$579,900	\$62,852	\$302,492	\$302,492	\$222,772
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	808,320	783,591	622,395	622,395	891,971
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	10,000	67,789	—	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	—	—	—	—
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	628,421	703,264	736,753	736,905	736,905
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	—	—	—	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	126,500	—	—	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	—	—	—	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	3,897,330	3,053,563	2,570,379	2,181,012	2,523,294
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,484,258	1,490,962	1,387,705	1,387,705	2,132,693
Innovation.....	—	—	212,626	212,626	—
Work-study.....	51,011	—	—	0	50,985
Cooperative education.....	—	—	217,708	217,708	217,708
Consumer and homemaking education.....	—	—	87,564	87,564	87,564
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,535,269	1,490,962	1,905,603	1,905,603	2,701,576
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	258,291	258,291	258,291	165,022	285,291
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	322,961	106,355	106,355	0	106,355
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,725	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	150,755	—	—	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	—	—	—	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	124,078	121,158	121,158	121,158	121,158
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	175,918	192,097	204,502	204,502	204,502
Special projects and teacher education.....	—	—	—	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	—	—	—	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,134,478	783,343	795,748	596,124	822,752
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	153,967	153,967	153,967	153,967
Teacher education and recruitment.....	123,140	—	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	—	—	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	2,027	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	225,167	153,967	153,967	153,967	153,967
Research and Training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	—	—	—	0	0
Research and development centers.....	—	—	—	0	0
General education.....	—	6,400	—	0	0
Vocational education.....	—	—	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....	—	—	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	—	—	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	—	—	0	0	0
Training.....	—	—	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	—	—	0	0	0
Construction.....	—	—	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	6,400	—	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	—	—	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	—	—	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	48,182	48,182	—	—	—
Student loan insurance fund.....	—	—	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	190,000	—	—	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	16,769,273	14,439,597	12,763,155	12,123,201	18,619,079

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$15,482,969	\$14,445,385	\$17,464,570	\$17,464,570	\$20,347,731
State administrative expenses.....	154,830	150,000	174,646	174,646	—
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,830,047	936,620	786,768	0	947,722
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	3,177,000	2,955,164	3,101,297	2,088,229	2,980,295
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	462,140	529,969	536,320	536,320	536,320
Grants for special projects.....	359,217	—	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,304,710	1,312,943	—	0	1,326,935
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	—	45,595	—	0	0
State administration.....	35,824	34,987	—	0	35,310
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	450,499	312,960	217,728	0	315,861
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	23,257,236	20,723,623	22,281,329	20,263,765	26,490,174
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	23,862,000	24,846,000	13,893,000	3,387,000	29,362,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	3,247	520,300	23,000	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	23,865,247	25,366,300	13,916,000	3,410,000	29,385,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	\$739,788	\$281,448	\$374,573	\$374,573	\$374,573
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)				0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	739,788	281,448	374,573	374,573	374,573
Teachers Corps				0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	655,541			0	0
College of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	223,700	220,505	223,731	223,731	223,731
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	204,303	213,395	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	1,427,793	1,341,538	693,653	693,653	693,653
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	3,590,930	2,241,212	1,465,181	0	562,382
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	85,371	101,785	101,785	101,785	101,785
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,319,350	230,937	1,111,453	1,111,453	818,535
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,852,803	2,423,641	2,286,880	2,286,880	3,277,388
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	195,600	209,577	0	0	0
Interest payments	(¹)		0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,104,303	2,166,864	2,270,048	2,270,516	2,270,516
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search			0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,765,600		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)			0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	12,425,294	9,149,454	8,152,731	6,688,018	7,947,990
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	4,017,758	3,966,192	4,025,023	4,025,023	6,185,849
Innovation			244,939	0	0
Work-study	185,275		0	0	185,181
Cooperative education			263,026	263,026	263,026
Consumer and homemaking education			253,976	253,976	253,976
Subtotal, vocational education	4,203,033	3,966,192	4,786,964	4,542,025	6,888,032
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	606,374	606,374	606,374	308,005	606,374
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	318,000	423,052	164,310	0	164,310
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,319	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239
College library resources (HEA II-A)	371,245		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	120,581		0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	186,299	178,121	178,121	178,121	178,121
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	525,086	615,676	682,321	682,321	682,321
Special projects and teacher education			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities					
Subtotal, libraries and community services	2,231,654	1,930,716	1,738,619	1,275,940	1,738,619
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	227,938	493,874	493,874	493,844	493,874
Teacher education and recruitment	356,610		0	0	0
Research and innovation	138,995		0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	157,249	10,347		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	880,792	504,221	493,874	493,874	493,874
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers	741,618			0	0
General education	468,880	85,255		0	0
Vocational education	97,875	68,087	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations	91,572		0	0	0
National achievement study			0	0	0
Dissemination	309,968	147,500	0	0	0
Training	99,000		0	0	0
Statistical surveys			0	0	0
Construction			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training	1,808,913	300,842	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education for foreign languages and world affairs	94,938		0	0	0
Civil rights education	36,000	131,508	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	118,672	118,672	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund	680,000		0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund			0	0	0
Total, Office of Education	70,391,567	62,504,976	51,809,090	37,113,194	73,383,262

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$17,913,388	\$16,810,925	\$18,838,375	\$18,838,375	\$21,948,332
State administrative expenses	179,143	168,132	188,384	188,384	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,658,619	1,296,227	1,088,840	0	1,297,768
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III):	4,735,000	4,152,189	4,361,558	2,867,743	4,139,035
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	566,428	626,114	658,831	658,831	658,831
Grants for special projects			0	0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Elementary and secondary education—Continued					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	\$1,553,953	\$1,557,326	0	\$1,577,173
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	84,801	0	0
State administration.....	49,579	48,222	0	48,101
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	623,472	431,343	\$300,088	0	430,280
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	28,279,582	25,175,279	25,436,076	\$22,552,333	30,099,520
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):	15,141,000	15,743,000	9,489,000	5,971,000	18,514,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815):	1,269	621,900	465,000	465,000	465,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	15,142,269	16,364,900	9,954,000	6,436,000	18,979,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):	2,472,083	351,113	479,993	479,993	479,993
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D):	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,472,083	351,113	479,993	479,993	479,993
Teachers Corps.....	460,699	639,692	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):	272,376	268,977	272,428	272,428	272,428
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones):	505,184	507,779	0	0
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A):	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103):	1,732,775	2,156,180	1,114,870	1,114,870	1,114,870
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104):	6,379,032	4,253,422	2,708,652	0	1,038,447
Graduate facilities (HEFA II):	2,500,000	1,500,000	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105):	166,066	163,315	163,315	163,315	163,315
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):	4,945,790	575,618	2,770,332	2,770,332	2,040,225
Direct loans (NDEA II):	7,240,532	7,176,411	5,700,121	5,700,121	8,168,993
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	143,679	335,071	0	0
Interest payments.....	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C):	6,289,340	3,731,151	3,908,825	3,909,631	3,909,631
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	131,234	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV):	4,500,500	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E):	26,799	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	34,833,307	20,667,924	16,638,543	13,930,697	16,707,909
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	5,325,643	5,383,109	5,409,065	5,409,065	8,312,908
Innovation.....	261,910	261,910	261,910
Work-study.....	251,686	0	0	251,557
Cooperative education.....	286,828	286,828	286,828
Consumer and homemaking education.....	341,308	341,308	341,308
Subtotal, vocational education.....	5,577,329	5,383,109	6,299,111	6,299,111	9,454,511
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I):	940,815	940,815	940,815	445,385	940,815
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II):	227,848	825,850	219,994	0	219,994
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III):	40,100	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A):	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B):	23,750	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396
College library resources (HEA II-A):	839,866	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B):	282,954	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I):	230,913	216,889	216,889	216,889	216,889
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	635,897	750,102	835,242	835,242	835,242
Special projects and teacher education.....	250,000	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	3,510,143	2,843,119	2,322,403	1,606,979	2,322,403
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI):	346,508	750,780	750,780	750,780	750,780
Teacher education and recruitment.....	936,824	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	547,512	254,868	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	127,962	124,975	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,958,706	1,130,623	750,780	750,780	750,780
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	1,041,162	959,655	0	0
Research and development centers.....	0	0	0
General education.....	1,684,846	99,032	0	0
Vocational education.....	889,343	85,670	17,591	17,591	17,591
Evaluations.....	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0
Dissemination:					
Training.....	135,900	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	488,048	0	0	0
Construction.....	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	4,239,299	1,144,357	17,591	17,591	17,591
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	1,019,308	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	77,104	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act):	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act):	179,461	179,461	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	716,000	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	98,515,290	73,929,577	61,948,497	52,123,484	78,861,707

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$34,269,334	\$32,388,788	\$36,415,621	\$35,415,621	\$42,427,340
State administrative expenses.....	342,593	324,175	364,156	364,156	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	4,634,860	2,326,201	1,954,026	0	2,353,365
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	7,720,000	6,801,512	7,150,833	4,691,787	6,834,442
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	955,682	990,466	1,009,723	1,009,723	1,009,723
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	3,390,106	3,421,788		0	3,392,504
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	32,670	116,396		0	0
State administration.....	87,856	86,061		0	86,366
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	1,104,807	769,811	535,562	0	722,571
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	52,538,008	47,225,198	47,429,921	40,572,287	56,826,311
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):	4,393,000	4,574,000	2,594,000	2,852,000	5,211,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	8,734	183,300	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	4,401,734	4,757,300	2,597,000	2,855,000	5,214,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		550,647	781,932	781,932	781,932
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	3,260,365			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	3,260,365	550,647	781,932	781,932	781,932
Teacher Corps.....	646,968	886,855		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	222,367			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	335,949	332,282	336,028	336,028	336,028
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	642,527	629,980		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—sec. 103).....	6,981,435	3,291,573	1,701,935	1,701,935	1,701,935
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	5,678,517	6,116,396	3,998,561	0	1,469,623
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	217,585	187,096	187,096	187,096	187,096
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	6,097,311	707,638	3,405,717	3,405,717	2,508,158
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	8,851,398	8,822,344	7,007,462	7,007,462	10,042,578
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	75,000	502,588		0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,901,908	5,595,807	5,862,274	5,863,483	5,863,483
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	82,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	2,817,200			0	0
Training programs (EPDA Part E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	35,903,197	26,185,704	22,499,073	18,501,821	22,108,901
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	9,577,289	9,284,246	9,105,044	9,105,044	13,993,069
Innovation.....			306,305	306,305	306,305
Work study.....	427,817			0	427,599
Cooperative education.....			349,093	349,093	349,093
Consumer and homemaking education.....			574,525	574,525	574,525
Subtotal, vocational education.....	10,005,106	9,284,246	10,334,967	10,334,967	15,650,591
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	1,377,606	1,377,606	1,377,606	624,808	1,377,606
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	425,120	945,566	292,719	0	292,719
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	45,850	46,926	46,926	46,929	46,926
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,505	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	834,073			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	539,183			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	303,097	283,198	283,198	283,198	283,198
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	835,165	991,837	1,106,931	1,106,931	1,106,931
Special projects and teacher education.....	510,000			0	0
Education broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	4,931,844	3,710,244	3,172,491	2,126,974	3,172,491
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	585,544	1,268,699	1,268,699	1,268,699	1,268,699
Teacher education and recruitment.....	1,374,884			0	0
Research and innovation.....	549,900	249,992		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	28,809			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	2,539,137	1,518,691	1,268,699	1,268,699	1,268,699
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	800,000			0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	1,200,261	25,399		0	0
Vocational education.....	730,421	114,979	29,611	29,611	29,611
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....	269,073			0	0
Dissemination.....	6,980			0	0
Training.....	338,930	18,675		0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....	52,832			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	3,398,497	159,053	29,053	29,611	29,611

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	\$1,789,401			0	0
Civil rights education	135,189			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	297,765	297,765			
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	122,380,211	94,625,703	88,163,694	76,521,291	105,102,536
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$20,020,502	\$18,633,330	\$19,301,245	\$19,301,245	\$22,487,615
State administrative expenses	200,205	186,360	193,012	193,012	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,979,521	996,022	836,666	0	1,004,025
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,405,000	2,976,706	3,123,975	2,097,802	2,995,509
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	482,274	544,185	406,917	406,917	406,917
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,570,349	1,563,031		0	1,571,167
Loans to nonprofit private schools	1,630	53,581		0	0
State administration	37,165	35,901		0	36,211
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	467,363	321,136	223,416	0	323,919
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	28,164,009	25,310,252	24,085,231	21,998,976	29,185,363
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	2,807,000	2,923,000	1,658,000	846,000	3,367,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	2,807,000	2,923,000	1,658,000	846,000	3,367,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		292,956	391,986	391,986	391,986
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	1,110,830		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	1,110,830	292,956	391,986	391,986	391,986
Teacher Corps	54,889	270,762			
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	285,177		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	231,144	227,918	231,178	231,178	231,178
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	317,884	320,963		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,515,629	1,840,248	951,515	951,515	951,515
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	4,251,238	2,847,115	1,861,287	0	699,726
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,383,086			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	110,883	115,978	115,978	115,978	115,978
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,181,610	370,398	1,782,651	1,782,651	1,312,842
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,782,904	4,617,870	3,667,909	3,667,909	5,256,576
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	20,286	223,911		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,869,480	2,935,632	3,075,424	3,076,058	3,076,058
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	94,121			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,262,300		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, Pt. E)	220,000		0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	21,525,742	13,500,033	11,685,942	9,825,289	11,643,873
Vocational Education:					
Basic grants	4,953,529	4,942,203	4,346,673	4,346,673	6,680,177
Innovation			245,075	245,075	245,075
Work-study	180,944		0	0	180,852
Cooperative education			263,217	263,217	263,217
Consumer and homemaking education			274,274	274,274	274,274
Subtotal, vocational education	5,134,473	4,942,203	5,129,239	5,129,239	7,643,595
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	657,518	657,518	657,518	329,014	657,518
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	511,078	177,371	172,826	0	172,826
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)		43,022	43,022	43,011	43,011
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263
College library resources (HEA II-A)	520,029			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	110,450			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	186,982	177,277	177,277	177,277	177,277
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	314,574	360,302	393,947	393,947	393,947
Special projects and teacher education			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	2,362,381	1,480,262	1,509,362	1,008,021	1,509,351
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	255,057	552,623	552,633	552,633	552,633
Teacher education and recruitment	572,900		0	0	0
Research and innovation	131,620	51,643		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	8,500			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	968,077	604,276	552,633	552,633	552,633

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	\$678,000	\$800,000		0	0
Research and development centers.....	33,430			0	0
General education.....	396,107	324,300	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Vocational education.....				0	0
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....	132,359			0	0
Statistica, surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,239,896	1,124,300	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	361,562			0	0
Civil rights education.....	185,054			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	141,929	141,929		0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	4,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	3,322,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	67,431,842	50,639,973	45,077,393	39,817,144	54,308,801

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$39,559,828	\$36,593,942	\$39,842,067	\$39,842,067	\$46,419,446
State administrative expenses.....	395,598	366,015	398,421	398,421	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,173,309	589,397	495,098	0	578,180
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,746,000	2,072,827	2,166,252	1,502,449	2,056,765
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	380,091	437,838	418,029	418,029	418,029
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,330,738	1,320,102		0	1,303,096
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		7,100		0	0
State administration.....	25,594	24,641		0	24,357
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	321,854	220,413	153,342	0	217,880
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	44,933,012	41,632,275	43,473,209	42,160,966	51,017,753
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	2,511,000	2,615,000	1,483,000	1,115,000	3,048,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	23,806	120,300		0	
Subtotal, SAFA.....	2,534,806	2,735,300	1,483,000	1,115,000	3,048,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA, B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	1,107,084	214,182	272,783	272,783	272,783
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,107,084	214,182	272,783	272,783	272,783
Teacher Corps:					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	2,231,381			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	201,772	198,669	201,794	201,794	201,794
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	185,828	180,578		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	1,156,088	1,239,700	640,997	640,997	640,997
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	2,530,296	1,464,096	957,145	0	358,037
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	445,096			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	103,486	88,867	88,867	88,867	88,867
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,313,960	187,115	900,547	900,547	663,213
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,226,527	2,332,825	1,852,929	1,852,929	2,655,482
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		167,857		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)				
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,142,390	3,012,946	3,156,420	3,157,070	3,157,070
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	102,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	370,700			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	15,009,524	8,872,653	7,798,699	6,842,204	7,765,460
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	4,301,054	4,298,675	3,755,696	3,755,696	5,771,934
Innovation.....			233,534	233,534	233,534
Work-study.....	137,633			0	137,563
Cooperative education.....			247,032	247,032	247,032
Consumer and homemaking education.....			236,982	236,982	236,983
Subtotal, vocational education.....	4,438,687	4,298,675	4,473,244	4,473,244	6,627,045
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	455,712	455,712	455,712	246,118	455,712
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	354,809	139,226	139,226	0	139,226
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,629	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services—Continued					
College library resources (HEA II-A)	\$298,450			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	104,265			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	156,385	\$150,559	\$150,559	\$150,559	\$150,559
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	702,974	831,474	936,895	936,895	936,895
Special projects and teacher education	580,000			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	2,755,974	1,683,576	1,788,997	1,440,177	1,788,997
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	184,471	399,693	399,693	399,693	399,693
Teacher education and recruitment	250,817			0	0
Research and innovation	9,560			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	2,696			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	447,544	399,693	399,693	399,693	399,693
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	23,547			0	0
Vocational education		50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	23,547	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs				0	0
Civil rights education	255,574	79,971		0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	107,308	107,308		0	0
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	584,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education	72,579,709	60,432,042	59,754,625	56,769,067	70,984,731
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$24,417,125	\$22,894,858	\$23,416,581	\$43,416,518	\$27,282,338
State administrative expenses	244,171	228,982	234,166	234,166	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,236,998	1,144,401	961,306	0	1,170,511
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	4,128,000	3,576,532	3,755,489	2,481,771	3,568,682
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	533,910	596,859	607,107	607,107	607,107
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,639,964	1,655,991		0	1,688,243
Loans to nonprofit private schools		57,965		0	0
State administration	42,491	41,641		0	41,652
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	534,336	372,479	259,136	0	372,587
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	33,776,995	30,569,708	29,233,785	26,739,562	34,731,120
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	8,054,000	8,386,000	4,757,000	2,176,000	9,617,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	711,347	1,701,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	8,765,947	10,087,000	4,757,000	2,176,000	9,617,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		321,701	435,484	435,484	435,484
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	1,674,432		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	1,674,432	321,701	435,484	435,484	435,484
Teacher Corps	6,211	464,581		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,257,646			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	252,677	249,360	252,721	252,721	
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA, VI-A)	347,294	343,879		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	1,628,650	1,967,078	1,017,094	1,017,094	1,017,094
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	5,129,496	2,975,596	1,945,280	0	728,823
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	418,033	400,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	148,193	126,859	126,859	126,859	126,859
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA, IV-A)	3,551,200	399,142	1,920,990	1,920,990	1,414,723
Direct loans (NDEA II)	5,001,432	4,976,231	3,952,550	3,952,550	5,664,502
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	25,980	286,755		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HFA, IV-O)	2,303,117	3,526,985	3,694,937	3,695,699	3,695,699
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	143,280			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,708,600			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	22,969,598	15,251,885	12,910,431	10,965,913	12,900,421

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	\$5,926,270	\$5,909,451	\$5,453,944	\$5,454,944	\$8,381,883
Innovation.....			253,221	253,221	253,221
Work-study.....	216,555			0	216,445
Cooperative education.....			274,461	274,641	274,641
Consumer and homemaking education.....			344,142	344,142	344,142
Subtotal, vocational education.....	6,142,825	5,909,451	6,325,948	6,326,948	9,470,332
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	805,469	805,469	805,469	389,789	805,469
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	962,828	512,392	197,459	0	197,459
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....		43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....		39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....		25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	618,535			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	59,106			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	209,693	198,738	198,739	198,739	198,739
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	629,682	752,562	824,641	824,641	824,641
Special projects and teacher education.....	331,771			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....					
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	3,617,084	2,377,827	2,134,974	1,521,835	2,134,974
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	296,211	641,800	641,800	641,800	641,800
Teacher education and recruitment.....	570,107			0	0
Research and innovation.....	151,444			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	20,956			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,038,718	641,800	641,800	641,800	641,800
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	2,080,000	2,637,713		0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	411,591	233,564		0	0
Vocational education.....			17,737	17,737	17,737
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....		88,500		0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....	20,143			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	2,600,234	2,871,277	17,737	17,737	17,737
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	218,302			0	0
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	173,605	173,605			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	2,892,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	83,925,951	68,718,835	56,507,159	875,279	69,998,868

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$3,666,149	\$3,459,155	\$3,521,648	\$3,521,648	\$3,710,421
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	371,750	185,736	156,019	0	182,895
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	811,500	857,962	886,077	86,277	850,697
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	214,585	282,290	280,509	280,509	280,509
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	339,695	335,693		0	333,279
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	13,500	6,285		0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	93,954	64,096	50,000	0	63,172
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	5,671,133	5,354,550	5,044,253	4,638,434	5,434,306
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	4,268,000	4,444,000	2,521,000	3,690,000	5,453,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		831,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	4,268,000	5,275,000	2,521,000	3,690,000	5,453,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....			135,982	154,449	154,449
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	380,383			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	380,383	135,982	154,449	154,449	154,449
Teacher Corps.....				0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	166,038	163,086	166,045	166,045	166,045
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	59,288	59,639		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	292,342	365,857	189,170	189,170	189,170
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	1,237,001	520,832	340,491	0	129,444
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	229,794			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	66,089	55,353	55,353	55,353	55,353

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Education opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$762,650	\$70,373	\$338,689	\$338,689	\$249,429
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	858,217	877,358	696,872	696,872	998,706
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		44,594		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	2,576,281	564,130	590,993	591,115	591,115
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	49,903			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	284,800			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	57,489			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	6,639,892	2,721,222	2,377,613	2,037,244	2,379,262
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,102,142	1,116,404	971,393	971,393	1,492,881
Innovation.....			209,368	209,368	209,368
Work-study.....	38,018			0	37,998
Cooperative education.....			213,138	213,138	213,138
Consumer and homemaking education.....			61,295	61,295	61,295
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,140,160	1,116,404	1,455,194	1,455,194	2,014,680
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	210,196	210,196	210,196	145,266	210,196
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	345,689	98,347	98,347	0	98,347
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,505	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	102,979			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	45,690			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	117,167	115,187	115,187	115,187	115,187
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	146,759	156,723	164,109	164,109	164,109
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,070,735	685,611	692,997	529,720	692,997
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	112,296	112,296	112,296	112,296
Teacher education and recruitment.....	172,096			0	0
Research and innovation.....		7,710		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,000			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	273,096	120,006	112,296	112,296	112,296
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	1,000		15,000	15,000	15,000
Vocational education.....			0	0	0
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,000		15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....			0	0	0
Civil rights education.....			0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	38,665	38,665			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	492,000				
Total, Office of Education.....	20,025,064	15,497,440	12,422,802	12,682,337	16,128,694

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$6,029,159	\$5,668,814	\$6,994,964	\$6,994,964	\$8,242,079
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	742,427	374,367	314,472	0	368,323
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,471,000	1,355,131	1,409,507	1,350,932	1,024,798
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	274,980	340,817	344,772	344,772	344,772
Grants for special projects.....	152,605			0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	591,630	580,126			564,126
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		19,509		0	0
State administration.....	14,368	13,673		0	13,656
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	180,680	122,306	85,089	0	122,154
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	9,606,849	8,624,743	9,289,804	8,840,668	10,679,908
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	4,329,717	4,429,000	2,513,000	2,286,000	5,298,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		543,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	4,329,717	4,972,000	2,513,000	2,286,000	5,298,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development: Preschool elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).	\$1,104,853	\$172,525	\$209,747	\$209,747	\$209,747
Training programs (EPDA pts., C and D).				0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.	1,104,853	172,525	209,747	209,747	209,747
Teacher Corps.	371,553	482,517		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).	183,546	180,520	183,560	183,560	183,560
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).	128,821	125,481		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103).	270,275	694,437	359,064	359,064	359,064
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104).	1,966,169	1,082,752	707,844	0	273,714
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).		300,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105).	81,500	71,072	71,072	71,072	71,072
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).	1,400,800	150,368	723,689	723,689	532,965
Direct loans (NDEA II).	1,837,591	1,874,681	1,489,033	1,489,033	2,133,972
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.		44,594		0	0
Interest payments.	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).	998,419	1,237,427	1,296,352	1,296,620	1,296,620
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.	60,442			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).	538,900			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.	7,466,563	5,761,332	4,830,614	4,123,038	4,850,967
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.	2,117,322	2,135,304	1,742,754	1,742,754	2,678,348
Innovation.			217,650	217,650	217,650
Work-study.	71,223			0	71,186
Cooperative education.			224,754	224,754	224,754
Consumer and homemaking education.			109,967	109,967	109,967
Subtotal, vocational education.	2,188,545	2,135,304	2,295,125	2,295,125	3,301,905
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).	330,484	330,484	330,484	194,677	330,484
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).	239,500	256,938	118,375	0	118,375
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).	41,055	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).	23,750	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109
College library resources (HEA II-A).	199,896			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).	135,628	131,132	131,132	131,132	131,132
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.	188,955	207,912	221,891	221,891	221,891
Special projects and teacher education.				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.	1,197,268	1,032,333	907,749	653,557	907,749
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).	100,364	217,458	217,458	217,458	217,458
Teacher education and recruitment.	183,938			0	0
Research and innovation.				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.	214,214	250,338		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.	498,516	467,796	217,458	217,458	217,458
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.				0	0
Research and development centers.				0	0
General education.	26,642			0	0
Vocational education.	118,212	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.				0	0
National achievement study.				0	0
Dissemination.				0	0
Training.				0	0
Statistical surveys.				0	0
Construction.				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.	144,854	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.				0	0
Civil rights education.				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).	64,271	64,271			
Student loan insurance fund.				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.	829,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.	27,851,989	23,812,821	20,337,497	8,690,593	25,530,734

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.	\$960,917	\$887,582	\$893,858	\$893,858	\$1,174,544
State administrative expenses.	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESFA II).	218,847	113,689	95,499	0	117,828
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).	568,025	648,828	665,896	551,066	650,895
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.	186,787	259,550	255,964	255,964	255,964
Grants for special projects.				0	

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
E lementary and secondary education—Continued					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	\$115,302	\$114,394	0	\$134,580	0
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	0	1,583	0	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	13,333	0
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	52,999	50,000	\$50,000	0	50,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	2,262,877	2,238,959	2,111,217	\$1,850,888	2,397,414
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):	3,320,000	3,457,000	1,961,000	1,426,000	4,130,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815):	1,520,744	233,700	14,000	14,000	14,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	4,840,744	3,690,700	1,975,000	1,440,000	4,144,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):	86,885	122,025	133,328	133,025	133,025
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D):					
Subtotal, education professions development.....	86,885	122,025	133,328	133,025	133,025
Teacher Corps.....					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):					
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones):	156,781	153,867	156,784	156,784	0
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A):	14,966	14,561	0	0	156,784
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—sec. 103):					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104):	421,948	216,563	141,577	0	60,539
Graduate facilities (HEFA II):				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105):	42,400	37,239	37,239	37,239	37,239
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):	136,764	18,232	87,748	87,748	64,622
Direct loans (NDEA II):	217,624	227,307	180,546	180,546	258,746
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		25,000	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)		0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C):	230,375	182,457	191,145	191,185	191,185
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	22,971		0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV):	123,400		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E):	40,000		0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	1,456,869	993,625	856,258	714,721	830,334
Vocational Education:					
Basic grants.....	554,165	566,052	390,324	390,324	599,871
Innovation.....			204,616	204,616	204,616
Work-study.....	19,249		0	0	19,249
Cooperative education.....			206,474	206,474	206,474
Consumer and homemaking education.....			24,630	24,630	24,630
Subtotal, vocational education.....	573,414	566,052	826,044	826,044	1,054,831
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I):	146,589	146,589	146,589	119,137	146,589
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II):	127,559	129,580	87,757	0	87,757
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III):	40,213	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A):	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B):	23,750	25,022	25,022	25,022	25,044
College library resources (HEA II-A):	24,143		0	0	0
Library training (HEA II-B):			0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I):	110,598	109,324	109,325	109,325	109,325
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	117,374	121,076	123,829	123,829	123,829
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	648,226	611,353	572,284	457,075	572,284
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI):	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	65,749		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,266		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	167,015	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....			0	0	0
Research and development centers.....			0	0	0
General education.....	9,748		0	0	0
Vocational education.....	138,281		15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....	58,350		0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	206,379		15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....			0	0	0
Civil rights education.....			0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act):	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act):	30,000	30,000			
Student loan insurance fund.....			0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	318,000		0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	10,620,409	8,402,714	6,639,131	5,586,753	9,296,888

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$1,432,268	\$1,441,049	\$1,478,145	\$1,478,145	\$1,878,148
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	171,826
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	334,087	168,878	141,859	0	820,062
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	779,000	815,216	841,072	665,545	0
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	198,849	269,677	274,766	274,766	274,766
Grants for special projects.....		24,600		0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	262,364	259,469		0	259,521
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	6,790	11,798		0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	81,695	55,921	50,000	0	56,404
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	3,255,053	3,209,941	2,935,842	2,368,456	3,474,060
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):					
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	2,053,000	2,138,000	1,213,000	904,000	2,474,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	22,434	6,400	6,000	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	2,075,434	2,144,400	1,219,000	910,000	2,480,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):					
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	456,959	122,025	133,328	133,328	133,328
Subtotal, education professions development.....	456,959	122,025	133,328	133,328	133,328
Teacher Corps:					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	281,257			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	164,426	161,480	164,432		
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	62,362	61,584		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103).....	247,537	326,110	168,618	168,618	168,618
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104).....	856,176	509,125	332,838	0	124,716
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	402,384			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105).....	49,178	58,152	58,152	58,152	58,152
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	647,590	65,117	313,393	313,393	230,800
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	781,493	811,830	644,825	644,825	924,115
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	10,000	41,218		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	601,991	457,694	479,489	479,588	479,588
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....				0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	315,500			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	4,420,894	2,492,310	2,161,747	1,664,576	1,985,989
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	925,718	941,303	834,902	834,902	1,283,116
Innovation.....			208,146	208,146	208,146
Work-study.....	32,724			0	32,707
Cooperative education.....			211,425	211,425	211,425
Consumer and homemaking education.....			52,683	52,683	52,683
Subtotal, vocational education.....	958,442	941,303	1,307,156	1,307,156	1,788,077
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	199,116	199,116	199,116	140,714	199,116
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	100,968	152,108	96,503	0	96,503
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,454	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,503
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	27,750	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	378,499			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	116,434	114,625	114,624	114,624	114,624
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	143,716	153,033	160,283	160,283	160,283
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,044,937	723,975	675,619	520,714	675,613
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	61,023			0	0
Research and innovation.....				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	2,845			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	163,868	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Research and development centers:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	20,113			0	0
Vocational education.....				0	0
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....	36,124			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	56,237	44,575	15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	\$36,000			0	0
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	34,050	34,050			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....				0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	12,551,874	9,862,579	8,597,692	7,069,230	10,702,067
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	25,471,868	24,484,252	27,555,556	27,555,556	32,104,600
State administrative expenses.....	254,719	245,001	275,556	275,556	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	3,214,941	1,652,599	1,388,195	0	1,655,018
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	5,899,000	5,248,181	5,515,448	2,626,822	5,260,743
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	679,227	738,898	780,240	780,240	780,240
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,792,228	1,807,039		0	1,886,094
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	19,500	107,779		0	0
State administration.....	63,066	61,712		0	61,901
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	793,071	552,014	384,039	0	533,724
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	38,187,620	34,897,475	35,899,034	32,238,174	42,282,320
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	11,461,000	11,933,000	6,771,000	4,251,000	13,835,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	802,899	798,300	27,000	27,000	27,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	12,263,899	12,731,300	6,798,000	4,278,000	13,862,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	1,154,424	420,152	584,464	584,464	584,464
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,154,424	420,152	584,464	584,464	584,464
Teacher Corps.....	49,576	110,139		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	294,201	290,710	294,262	294,262	294,262
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	249,784	255,201		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—sec. 103).....	1,829,837	2,248,021	1,162,358	1,162,358	1,162,358
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104).....	5,281,400	3,425,890	2,239,658	0	854,466
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	1,196,850	1,000,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105).....	142,687	123,643	123,643	123,643	132,643
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,509,000	276,163	1,329,115	1,329,115	978,833
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,284,545	3,443,007	2,734,731	2,734,731	3,919,215
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	49,664	345,575		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	2,847,534	3,091,504	3,238,718	3,239,386	3,239,386
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	135,370			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,982,600			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	19,803,472	14,499,714	11,122,485	8,883,495	10,572,163
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	6,207,329	6,246,915	6,497,533	6,497,533	9,985,719
Innovation.....			278,202	278,202	278,202
Work-study.....	320,983			0	320,820
Cooperative education.....			309,677	309,677	309,677
Consumer and homemaking education.....			409,991	409,991	409,991
Subtotal, vocational education.....	6,528,312	6,246,915	7,495,403	7,495,717	11,304,409
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	1,090,767	1,090,767	1,090,767	506,982	1,090,767
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	611,734	545,193	244,961	0	244,961
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	44,537	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,467	25,467	25,467	25,467
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	398,075			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	165,240			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	256,589	249,254	249,254	249,254	249,254
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	888,911	1,057,036	1,177,851	1,177,851	1,177,851
Special projects and teacher education.....	523,145			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	4,040,748	3,052,597	2,873,180	2,044,434	2,873,180
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	400,066	866,823	866,823	866,823	866,823
Teacher education and recruitment.....	492,546			0	0
Research and innovation.....	3,900			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	7,513			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	904,025	866,823	866,823	866,823	866,823

^a Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	\$80,399			0	0
Vocational education.....	379,015	\$53,000	\$21,131	\$21,131	\$21,131
Evaluations.....	265,323			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....	21,000			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	745,737	53,000	21,131	21,131	21,131
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	356,924			0	0
Civil rights education.....	151,928			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Merrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	201,903	201,903			
Student loan insurance fund.....	900			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	3,355,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	87,794,468	73,130,018	65,710,520	56,462,238	82,416,490
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$10,494,933	\$9,792,738	\$9,875,844	\$9,875,844	\$10,025,844
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	585,437	288,103	242,013	0	283,617
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,176,000	1,112,240	1,153,785	860,486	1,108,128
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	255,743	319,982	315,386	315,386	315,386
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	598,278	588,214		0	596,353
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		8,085		0	0
State administration.....	11,763	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	147,918	100,395	69,846	0	100,238
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	13,420,072	12,373,097	11,806,874	11,201,716	12,442,899
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	9,726,000	10,127,000	5,745,000	6,147,000	11,299,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	810,794	779,200		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	10,536,794	10,906,200	5,745,000	6,147,000	11,299,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	231,260			184,460	184,460
Subtotal, education professions development.....	231,260	155,814	184,460	184,460	184,460
Teacher Corps.....	162,609	415,442		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	71,669			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	172,605	169,625	172,614	172,614	172,614
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	79,932	78,046		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	63,667	595,008	307,654	307,654	307,654
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	1,841,833	720,943	471,313	0	184,264
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	380,666			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	67,280	59,379	59,379	59,379	59,379
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,045,970	83,504	401,890	401,890	295,974
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,053,809	1,041,075	826,911	826,911	1,185,068
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		74,322		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,110,790	918,722	962,471	962,669	962,669
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	112,960			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NEDA IV).....	574,500			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	24,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	6,600,081	3,740,624	3,202,232	2,731,117	3,167,622
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,513,307	1,547,049	1,524,933	1,524,933	2,343,590
Innovation.....			214,256	214,256	214,256
Work-study.....	57,748			0	57,719
Cooperative education.....			219,993	219,993	219,993
Consumer and homemaking education.....			96,223	96,223	96,223
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,571,055	1,547,049	2,055,405	2,055,405	2,930,781
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	255,312	255,312	255,312	163,798	255,312
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	247,602	287,295	105,859	0	105,859
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,711	41,842	40,842	40,842	40,842
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	129,463			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	124,761	121,677	121,677	121,677	121,677
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	255,945	289,178	314,106	314,106	314,106
Special projects and teacher education.....	425,785			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,541,329	1,059,886	902,373	705,005	902,378

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	\$100,000	\$175,883	\$175,883	\$175,883	\$175,883
Teacher education and recruitment.....	278,536	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	241,741	343,473	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	620,277	519,356	175,883	175,883	175,883
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	751,867	862,244	0	0
Research and development centers.....	206,657	0	0	0
General education.....	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Vocational education.....	0	0	0
Evaluations.....	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0
Dissemination:					
Training.....	82,300	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	0	0	0
Construction.....	38,801	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,079,625	912,244	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	91,720	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	40,450	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	43,107	43,107	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	718,000	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	36,706,379	31,722,819	24,137,232	23,265,586	31,168,023

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$121,097,330	\$120,384,848	\$150,747,783	\$150,747,783	\$175,634,174
State administrative expenses.....	1,210,973	1,204,063	1,507,478	1,507,478	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	8,122,336	4,090,893	3,436,381	0	4,076,563
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	15,217,000	13,257,957	13,948,354	8,869,461	13,007,779
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	1,450,224	1,474,815	1,610,917	1,610,917	1,610,917
Grants for special projects.....	157,882	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	4,203,698	4,198,623	0	4,211,231
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	105,472	297,422	0	0
State administration.....	161,727	156,767	0	153,851
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	2,033,751	1,402,273	975,568	0	1,376,253
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	153,760,393	146,467,661	172,226,481	162,735,639	200,070,768
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	16,900,000	10,127,000	10,605,000	6,027,000	20,504,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	38,200	1,994,400	1,688,000	1,688,000	1,688,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	16,938,200	12,121,400	14,293,000	7,715,000	22,192,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	6,519,139	892,515	1,299,257	1,299,257	1,299,257
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	930,097	986,175	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	6,519,139	892,515	1,299,257	1,299,257	1,299,257
Teachers Corps.....	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	157,742	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	548,897	544,335	549,067	549,067	549,067
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	1,131,523	1,170,283	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	1,309,379	5,073,163	2,623,120	2,623,120	2,623,120
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	17,906,116	11,355,730	7,423,750	0	2,780,466
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	2,314,583	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	352,753	327,907	327,907	327,907	327,907
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	11,133,286	1,231,458	5,926,758	5,926,758	4,364,792
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	15,013,651	15,352,980	12,194,653	12,194,653	17,476,477
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	1,530,833	1,010,476	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	10,634,606	9,750,536	10,214,847	10,216,954	10,216,954
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	309,701	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	9,164,800	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	74,507,870	45,816,868	39,260,102	31,838,459	35,558,317
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	16,240,204	16,447,902	16,331,918	16,331,918	25,099,673
Innovation.....	401,206	401,206	401,206	401,206
Work-study.....	819,542	0	0	819,125
Cooperative education.....	482,191	482,191	482,191	482,191
Consumer and homemaking education.....	1,030,532	1,030,532	1,030,532	1,030,532
Subtotal, vocational education.....	17,059,746	16,447,902	18,245,847	18,245,847	27,832,727

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	\$2,840,719	\$2,840,719	\$2,840,719	\$1,225,816	\$2,840,719
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	560,044	2,521,607	536,326	0	536,326
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	52,549	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	1,862,939			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	699,272			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	542,140	493,850	493,849	493,849	493,849
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	2,446,242	2,946,251	3,299,893	3,299,898	3,299,893
Special projects and teacher education.....	279,367			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	9,345,022	8,923,086	7,291,446	5,140,217	7,291,446
Education for the Handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	1,075,982	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,331,331
Teacher education and recruitment.....	2,220,227			0	0
Research and innovation.....	1,424,168	1,107,811		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	548,630	162,459		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	5,269,007	3,601,601	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,331,331
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	3,618,385	3,632,494		0	0
Research and development centers.....	595,154			0	0
General education.....	3,121,648	286,646		0	0
Vocational education.....	385,645	315,611	53,113	53,113	53,113
Evaluations.....	156,795			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	2,073,985	532,184		0	0
Training.....	986,522			0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....		3,955		0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	10,942,089	4,766,935	53,113	53,113	53,113
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	2,785,841			0	0
Civil rights education.....	314,094			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	575,316	575,316			
Student loan insurance funds.....				0	0
Higher education fac. ties loan fund.....	10,782,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	309,778,814	240,649,459	253,050,577	229,408,863	296,678,959

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$52,715,243	\$49,385,824	\$53,482,397	\$53,482,397	\$62,311,607
State administrative expenses.....	531,238	493,970	534,824	524,824	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,353,748	1,186,993	997,083	0	1,168,551
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,527,000	4,011,337	4,213,264	2,787,844	4,020,973
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	650,943	669,081	621,617	621,617	621,617
Grants for special projects.....			0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	2,578,787	2,543,076		0	2,469,235
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	2,632	7,435		0	0
State administration.....	50,920	48,734		0	48,642
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	640,335	435,921	303,273	0	435,115
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	64,050,846	58,782,371	60,152,458	57,416,682	71,075,740
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	10,654,000	11,198,000	9,413,000	6,864,000	12,691,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	472,875	1,451,100	60,000	60,000	60,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	11,126,875	12,649,000	9,473,000	6,924,000	12,651,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		329,952	447,970	447,970	447,970
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	1,368,284			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,368,284	329,952	447,970	447,970	447,970
Teacher Corps.....	467,730	551,495		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	2,246,326			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	258,295	254,954	258,341	258,341	258,341
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	364,690	364,447		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	2,169,511	2,646,459	1,368,374	1,368,374	1,368,374
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	4,854,262	3,145,253	2,056,193	0	765,470
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	1,000,000	400,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	144,075	132,027	132,027	132,027	123,027
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	4,092,130	370,255	1,781,960	1,781,960	1,312,334
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	4,415,338	4,616,081	3,666,487	3,666,487	5,254,540
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	345,819	375,909		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,958,954	5,091,502	5,333,954	5,335,054	5,335,054
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	17,500			0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Personnel development:					
College, teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	\$2,568,800			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	205,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	26,640,700	\$17,396,887	\$14,597,336	\$12,542,243	\$14,417,140
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	8,680,047	8,749,892	7,956,680	7,956,680	12,228,673
Innovation.....			268,562	268,562	268,562
Work study.....	283,447		0	0	283,302
Cooperative education.....			296,158	296,158	296,158
Consumer and homemaking education.....			502,062	502,062	502,062
Subtotal, vocational education.....	8,963,494	8,749,892	9,023,462	1,074,738	13,578,757
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	844,066	844,066	844,066	405,643	844,066
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	1,057,319	414,534	203,885	0	203,886
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	43,407	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	649,113		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	257,441		0	0	0
University community services programs (HEA I).....	220,510	207,608	207,608	207,608	207,608
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,250,671	1,495,891	1,677,851	1,677,851	1,677,851
Special projects and teacher education.....	379,996		0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	4,774,273	3,070,992	3,042,304	2,389,995	3,032,304
Education for the Handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	371,623	805,195	805,195	805,195	805,195
Teacher education and recruitment.....	291,187		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	37,348	135,136		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	6,966			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	707,124	940,331	805,195	805,195	805,195
Research and Training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	693,744	820,000		0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	143,379			0	0
Vocational education.....	888,143		25,876	25,876	25,876
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....			4,134		0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,729,400	820,000	25,876	25,876	25,876
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	123,048		0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	811,263	202,747		0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	221,793	221,793		0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	1,879,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	122,913,830	103,765,560	97,617,601	81,676,699	116,083,982

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$4,467,399	\$4,033,581	\$4,353,378	\$4,353,378	\$5,194,875
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	331,096	162,589	136,576	0	160,353
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	790,000	815,806	841,693	653,528	802,305
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	201,759	273,216	272,624	272,624	272,624
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	341,302	331,874		0	318,932
Loans to non-profit private schools.....		6,377		0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	87,691	58,864	50,000	0	57,048
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	6,379,247	5,845,640	5,804,271	5,429,530	6,819,470
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	2,402,000	2,501,000	1,419,000	2,664,000	2,886,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		600	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	2,402,000	2,501,600	1,420,000	2,665,000	2,887,000
Education Professions Development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	996,248	131,498	147,663	147,663	147,663
Subtotal, education professions development.....	996,248	131,498	147,663	147,663	147,663
Teacher Corps.....					
Higher Education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	511,740			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	165,032	162,084	165,039	165,039	165,039
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	67,127	71,130		0	0

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	\$402,759	\$388,321	\$200,784	\$200,784	\$200,784
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	525,545	538,486	352,032	0	129,049
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	64,116	56,364	56,364	56,364	56,364
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	856,135	76,821	369,723	369,723	272,284
Direct loans (NBEA II).....	973,480	957,750	760,727	760,727	1,090,218
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		43,942		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	792,307	661,478	692,977	693,120	693,120
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	37,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	333,000			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	41,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	4,769,541	2,956,376	2,597,646	2,245,757	2,606,858
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,245,848	1,270,281	975,062	975,062	1,498,522
Innovation.....			208,689	208,689	208,689
Work study.....	35,611			0	35,593
Cooperative education.....			212,186	212,186	212,186
Consumer and homemaking education.....			61,526	61,526	61,526
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,281,459	1,270,281	1,457,463	1,457,463	2,016,516
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	203,285	203,285	203,285	142,427	203,285
Construction of public libraries (LASC II).....	57,000	256,991	97,197	0	97,197
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	28,315	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	126,024			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	115,922	113,911	113,911	113,911	113,911
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	156,675	168,753	177,469	177,469	177,469
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	748,971	848,058	696,980	538,925	696,980
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	109,151	109,151	109,151	109,151
Teacher education and recruitment.....	170,326			0	0
Research and innovation.....				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,178			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	271,504	109,151	109,151	109,151	109,151
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	98,983			0	0
Vocational education.....		50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	98,983	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....				0	0
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	42,740	42,740		0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	1,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	120,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	17,161,693	13,805,344	12,298,174	12,658,489	15,348,638

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$35,843,674	\$33,370,827	\$37,697,901	\$37,697,901	\$43,921,308
State administrative expenses.....	358,437	333,804	376,979	376,979	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	5,357,489	2,661,889	2,636,008	0	2,628,457
Supplementary education centers and services (ESEA III).....	9,299,000	8,124,450	8,543,658	5,570,394	8,132,773
Strengthening State department of education (ESEA V):					
Grant to States.....	1,078,054	1,110,464	1,124,085	1,124,085	1,124,085
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	4,080,366	4,089,849		0	4,086,302
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		125,561		0	0
State administration.....	104,331	101,489		0	101,499
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	57,433,340	50,826,147	51,010,202	44,769,359	60,902,364
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	10,143,000	10,561,000	5,990,000	1,182,000	12,384,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		567,200		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	10,143,000	11,128,200	5,990,000	1,182,000	12,384,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	\$2,532,220	\$615,679	\$880,340	\$880,340	\$880,340
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)				0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	2,532,220	615,679	880,340	880,340	880,340
Teacher Corps	610,589	537,214		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	844,660		0	0	
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	380,710	376,856	380,809	380,809	380,809
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	665,912	655,184		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	4,077,474	4,271,348	2,208,535	2,208,535	2,208,535
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	11,149,073	6,588,302	4,307,068	0	1,642,321
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)		1,200,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	174,076	205,775	205,775	205,775	205,775
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,040,322	758,574	3,650,862	3,650,862	2,688,696
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,231,770	9,457,380	7,511,862	7,511,862	10,765,447
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	896,259	639,023		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	4,051,356	6,464,602	6,772,440	6,773,836	6,773,836
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	221,664			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)		3,300,500		0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	41,033,776	30,617,044	25,037,351	20,731,679	24,666,019
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	12,105,150	12,007,320	11,817,532	11,817,532	18,161,747
Innovation			328,571	328,571	328,571
Work-study	516,364			0	516,101
Cooperative education			380,320	380,320	380,320
Consumer and homemaking education			745,678	745,678	745,678
Subtotal, vocational education	12,621,514	12,007,320	13,272,101	13,272,191	20,132,507
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,685,152	1,685,152	1,685,152	751,140	1,685,152
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,465,162	1,080,285	343,925	0	343,925
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	47,259	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,170,103			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	332,973			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	350,080	324,216	324,216	324,216	324,216
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,013,522	1,208,203	1,351,381	1,351,381	1,351,381
Special projects and teacher education	200,000			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	6,326,001	4,411,705	3,818,523	2,540,586	3,818,523
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	701,492	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,519,923
Teacher education and recruitment	693,612			0	0
Research and innovation	84,821			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	37,261			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,517,186	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,519,923
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	604,576	350,000		0	0
Vocational education	2,366,013	1,491,513	38,432	38,432	38,342
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training	203,731	11,433		0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	3,174,320	1,852,936	38,432	38,432	38,432
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	269,925			0	0
Civil rights education	70,820			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	369,365	369,365			
Student loan insurance fund	4,758,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	140,910,056	113,935,533	101,616,872	84,984,510	124,392,117

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$18,106,545	\$16,785,719	\$18,182,598	\$18,182,598	\$21,184,295
State administrative expenses	181,065	167,913	181,826	181,826	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,211,458	596,823	501,336	0	596,784
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,274,000	2,039,599	2,130,133	1,496,021	2,047,264
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	387,284	441,825	420,559	420,559	420,559
Grants for special projects				0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Elementary and secondary education—Continued					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	\$1,038,377	\$1,034,408	0	\$1,019,010
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	6,094	0	0
State administration.....	23,180	22,411	0	22,483
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	291,500	200,465	\$139,465	0	201,120
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	23,513,409	21,295,257	21,555,917	\$20,281,004	25,290,395
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874):	11,663,443	12,140,000	6,886,000	3,695,000	13,952,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815):	945,730	230,400	11,000	11,000	11,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	12,609,173	12,370,400	6,897,000	3,706,000	13,963,000
Education Professions Development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):	470,173	215,621	274,960	274,960	274,960
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D):	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	470,173	215,621	274,960	274,960	274,960
Teacher Corps.....	0	0	0
Higher Education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):	750,374	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones):	205,341	202,223	205,364	205,364	205,364
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A):	243,931	243,359	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103):	557,267	1,262,585	652,830	652,830	652,830
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104):	3,218,986	1,865,480	1,219,548	0	453,759
Graduate facilities (HEFA II):	553,153	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105):	106,602	92,405	92,405	92,405	92,405
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):	2,170,375	266,727	1,283,705	1,288,727	945,391
Direct loans (MDEA II):	3,456,196	3,325,376	2,641,299	2,641,299	3,785,314
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	13,910	166,372	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C):	2,161,525	2,264,220	2,372,040	2,372,529	2,372,529
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	40,000	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV):	946,300	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E):	25,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	14,448,960	9,688,747	8,467,191	7,253,154	8,507,592
Vocational Education:					
Basic grants.....	3,705,261	3,699,294	3,531,214	3,531,214	5,426,939
Innovation.....	230,683	230,683	0
Work-study.....	126,083	0	0	126,019
Cooperative education.....	243,033	243,033	243,033
Consumer and homemaking education.....	222,817	222,817	222,817
Subtotal, vocational education.....	3,831,344	3,699,294	4,227,747	4,027,747	6,018,808
Libraries and Community Services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I):	480,232	480,232	480,232	256,190	480,232
Construction of public libraries (LSCS II):	494,640	485,060	143,308	0	366,917
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCS III):	41,741	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A):	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B):	23,750	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179
College library resources (HEA II-A):	346,633	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B):	117,100	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I):	159,779	153,588	153,588	153,588	153,588
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	415,620	482,882	531,447	531,447	531,447
Special projects and teacher education.....	39,996	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,157,491	1,708,511	1,415,324	1,047,974	1,638,933
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI):	169,344	366,917	366,917	366,917	366,917
Teacher education and recruitment.....	339,429	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,989	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	510,762	366,917	366,917	366,917	366,917
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	0	0	0
General education.....	132,210	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Vocational education.....	0	0	0
Evaluations.....	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	0	0	0
Training.....	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	0	0	0
Construction.....	0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	132,210	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	506,748	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act):	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act):	96,258	96,258	0	0
Student loan insurance fund.....	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	58,326,528	49,541,005	43,270,056	37,022,756	56,125,605

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$8,417,750	\$8,094,552	\$8,243,687	\$8,243,687	\$9,133,814
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	998,243	485,416	407,753	0	501,940
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,911,000	1,723,476	1,797,312	1,267,496	1,709,568
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	332,551	392,527	382,604	382,604	382,604
Grants for special projects.....	30,000	0	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	745,215	745,867	0	0	739,672
Loans to non-profit private schools.....	11,645	0	0	0	0
State administration.....	19,157	18,609	0	0	18,340
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	240,909	166,454	115,803	0	164,054
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	12,844,825	11,788,546	11,097,159	10,043,787	12,649,992
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	2,430,000	2,535,000	1,453,000	791,000	3,076,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	2,430,000	2,535,000	1,453,000	791,000	3,076,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		194,038	242,301	242,301	242,301
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	2,123,269	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,123,269	193,038	242,301	242,301	242,301
Teachers Corps.....	359,678	276,091	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	142,845	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	192,040	188,978	192,058	192,058	192,058
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	189,903	198,461	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	1,020,884	972,067	502,615	502,615	502,615
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	2,571,233	1,641,185	1,072,916	0	403,333
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	1,859,065	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	104,015	84,837	84,837	84,837	84,837
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,901,170	206,165	992,230	992,230	730,733
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,529,398	2,570,323	2,041,571	2,031,571	2,925,829
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	16,034	111,571	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(0)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,420,605	1,451,453	1,520,570	1,520,884	1,520,884
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	70,000	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,745,800	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	50,000	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	15,812,992	7,425,040	6,406,797	5,324,195	6,360,289
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	2,500,861	2,503,962	2,410,600	2,410,600	3,704,727
Innovation.....	0	0	224,845	224,845	224,845
Work-study.....	100,578	0	0	0	100,527
Cooperative education.....	0	0	234,845	234,845	234,845
Consumer and homemaking education.....	0	0	152,108	152,108	152,108
Subtotal, vocational education.....	2,601,439	2,503,962	3,022,398	3,022,398	4,417,052
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	388,844	388,844	388,844	218,650	388,844
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	217,203	387,922	128,092	0	128,092
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,323	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	4,735	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	313,195	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	75,044	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	147,325	142,684	142,684	142,684	142,684
Adult basic-education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	203,568	225,639	241,935	241,935	241,935
Special projects and teacher education.....	151,391	0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,580,628	1,251,300	1,007,766	709,480	1,007,766
Education for the Handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	128,794	279,058	279,058	279,058	279,058
Teacher education and recruitment.....	694,331	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	429,454	363,867	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	4,699	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,257,278	642,925	279,058	279,058	279,058
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	1,543,500	1,690,000	0	0	0
Research and development centers.....	0	0	0	0	0
General education.....	907,859	64,723	0	0	0
Vocational education.....	281,229	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....	0	0	0	0	0
National achievement study.....	143,921	0	0	0	0
Dissemination.....	81,898	0	0	0	0
Training.....	0	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	0	0	0	0	0
Construction.....	21,825	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research, and training.....	2,980,232	1,804,723	15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	\$107,350			0	0
Civil rights education	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	73,613	73,613			
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)					
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	44,131,304	28,545,238	23,573,479	20,477,219	28,097,458

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$49,346,231	\$46,084,616	\$48,891,851	\$48,891,851	\$56,963,224
State administrative expenses	493,462	460,885	488,918	488,918	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	5,590,970	2,767,349	2,324,594	0	2,751,699
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	10,055,000	8,707,724	9,157,744	5,928,233	8,661,553
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,034,524	1,071,500	1,160,013	1,160,013	1,160,013
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):	4,036,478	3,992,360		0	3,923,184
Grants to States		197,971		0	0
Loans to nonprofit private schools	108,853	104,487		0	103,732
State administration	1,368,841	934,630	650,227	0	927,923
Guidance counseling and testing (NDEA V):					
Subtotal elementary and secondary education	72,034,359	64,321,522	62,673,347	56,469,015	74,451,328
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	8,556,000	8,953,000	5,365,000	856,000	10,184,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				0	0
Subtotal SAFA	8,556,000	8,953,000	5,365,000	856,000	10,184,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		636,109	911,256	911,256	911,256
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D)	1,806,545		0		0
Subtotal, education professions development	1,806,545	636,109	911,256	911,256	911,256
Teacher Corps	1,039,054	975,908		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	677,364		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	419,049	415,033	419,164	419,164	419,164
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	744,731	738,408		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	4,325,660	5,326,884	2,754,310	2,754,310	2,754,310
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104)	11,036,512	7,301,223	4,773,136	0	1,787,686
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	3,910,055	750,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105)	275,771	242,374	242,374	242,374	242,374
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,784,490	785,323	3,779,604	3,997,604	2,783,509
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,331,205	9,790,882	7,776,759	7,776,759	11,145,077
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	644,308	700,372		0	0
Interest payments	(1)		0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	5,882,082	7,462,074	7,817,411	7,819,022	7,819,022
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	92,192		0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	4,590,600		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)	85,900		0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	48,799,919	33,512,573	27,562,758	23,009,233	26,951,142
Vocational Education:					
Basic grants	13,502,873	13,607,721	13,347,672	13,347,672	20,513,341
Innovation			337,124	337,124	337,124
Work-study	552,457			0	522,175
Cooperative education			392,317	392,317	392,317
Consumer and homemaking education			842,231	842,231	842,231
Subtotal, vocational education	14,055,330	13,607,721	14,919,344	14,919,344	22,607,188
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,948,566	1,948,566	1,948,566	859,344	1,948,566
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,085,622	1,257,143	387,784	0	387,784
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,465	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,245,906		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	323,037		0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	382,852	350,978	350,977	350,977	350,977
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,467,036	1,758,365	1,967,553	1,967,553	1,967,553
Special projects and teacher education	425,000		0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities			0	0	0
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	6,988,234	5,530,454	4,770,282	3,293,276	4,770,282
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	771,722	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,672,090
Teacher education and recruitment	1,151,743		0	0	0
Research and innovation	198,350	74,956		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	24,762	32,000		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,146,577	1,779,046	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,672,090

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	\$2,089,240	\$2,700,000	0	0
Research and development centers.....	1,465,482	0	0
General education.....	492,481	43,934	0	0
Vocational education.....	897,690	319,539	\$43,408	\$43,408	\$43,408
Evaluations.....	205,768	0	0
National achievement study.....	505,927	0	0
Dissemination.....	171,118	0	0
Training.....	534,541	0	0
Statistical surveys.....	19,633	0	0
Construction.....	5,095	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	6,386,975	3,063,473	43,408	43,408	43,408
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	952,446	0	0
Civil rights education.....	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	437,176	437,176
Student loan insurance fund.....	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	11,862,000	0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	175,114,615	132,866,982	117,967,485	101,223,622	141,640,695
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$3,693,961	\$3,427,736	\$3,691,019	\$3,691,019	\$4,430,811
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	211,557
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	423,153	210,946	177,196	0	947,120
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	948,000	950,675	983,688	751,529
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	211,259	280,536	289,098	289,093	289,098
Grants for special projects.....	445,921	70,000	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	286,848	283,347	0	1,438,032
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	16,737	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	102,627	69,983	50,000	0	69,618
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	6,271,769	5,473,293	5,341,001	4,881,646	7,399,569
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	3,436,000	3,578,000	2,030,000	1,585,000	4,048,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	125,400	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	3,436,000	3,703,400	2,030,000	1,585,000	4,048,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	430,339	140,866	161,839	161,839	161,839
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	430,339	140,866	161,839	161,839	161,839
Teacher Corps.					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	124,410	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechan.c arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	170,429	167,458	170,438	170,438	170,438
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	77,739	75,611	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103).....	306,428	366,701	189,606	189,606	189,606
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104).....	1,048,887	626,354	409,476	0	158,643
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105).....	48,306	58,413	58,413	58,413	58,413
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	782,260	88,597	426,398	426,398	314,023
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,051,909	1,104,564	877,340	877,340	1,257,338
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	10,000	65,219	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	404,658	632,631	662,757	662,893	662,893
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talen. search.....	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,242,500	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	98,700	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	5,366,226	3,185,548	2,794,428	2,385,088	2,811,354
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	1,092,424	1,087,186	1,031,291	1,031,291	1,584,937
Innovation.....	210,590	210,590	210,590
Work-study.....	43,792	0	0	43,770
Cooperative education.....	214,852	214,852	214,852
Consumer and homemaking education.....	65,074	65,074	65,074
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,136,216	1,087,186	1,521,807	1,521,807	2,119,223
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	240,363	240,363	240,363	157,658	240,363
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	241,676	145,913	103,370	0	103,370
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,643	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066
College library resources (HEA II-B).....	210,264	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	121,758	119,427	119,427	119,427	119,427
University community service programs (HEA I).....	0	0	0
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	205,663	228,181	244,389	244,389	244,389
Special projects and teacher education.....	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,122,117	839,220	812,885	626,830	812,885

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	\$100,000	\$127,696	\$127,696	\$127,696	\$127,696
Teacher education and recruitment	134,799			0	0
Research and innovation				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf		2,853		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	237,652	127,696	127,696	127,696	127,696
Research and training:					
Research and development:				0	0
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	279,569			0	0
Vocational education	20,000	133,069	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	299,569	133,069	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	49,975			0	0
Civil rights education	72,563			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	37,901	37,901			
Student loan insurance fund	106,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	18,750,457	14,778,179	12,854,656	11,354,906	17,545,566

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$32,279,410	\$29,996,824	\$32,555,993	\$32,555,993	\$37,930,541
State administrative expenses	324,107	300,015	325,560	325,560	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,286,889	647,442	543,856	0	637,976
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,367,000	2,247,084	2,355,812	1,634,142	2,258,692
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	404,942	462,194	437,803	437,803	437,803
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,454,248	1,435,659		0	1,438,032
Loans to nonprofit private schools		5,414		0	0
State administration	27,970	26,798		0	26,879
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	351,727	239,707	166,765	0	240,441
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	38,496,293	35,361,137	36,385,789	34,953,498	42,970,364
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	7,899,000	8,446,000	5,432,000	3,589,000	9,872,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	7,787	1,583,100	559,000	559,000	559,000
Subtotal, SAFA	7,906,787	10,029,100	5,991,000	4,148,000	10,441,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		225,427	289,799	289,799	289,799
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D)	363,538		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	363,538	225,427	289,799	289,799	289,799
Teacher corps	227,411	202,032	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,198,329		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	206,632	203,508	206,636	206,656	206,656
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	153,439	145,939		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	2,436,631	1,467,164	758,609	758,609	758,609
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	1,657,006	1,428,479	933,861	0	346,685
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	50,300	84,457	84,457	84,457	84,457
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,340,940	148,015	712,366	712,336	524,625
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,582,590	1,845,348	1,465,734	1,465,734	2,100,582
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	159,325	205,254		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,099,985	2,761,976	2,893,499	2,894,096	2,894,096
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	33,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	492,700			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	10,410,877	8,290,140	7,055,182	6,121,888	6,915,710
Vocational Education:					
Basic grants	4,613,057	4,590,788	4,356,478	4,356,478	6,695,242
Innovation			238,015	238,015	238,015
Work-study	158,326			0	158,245
Cooperative education			253,315	253,315	253,315
Consumer and homemaking education			274,891	274,891	274,891
Subtotal, vocational education	4,771,383	4,590,788	5,122,699	5,122,699	7,619,708

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	\$489,102	\$489,102	\$489,102	\$259,833	\$489,102
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	606,269	267,614	144,785	0	144,785
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,782	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	376,277			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	166,270	156,011	156,011	156,011	156,011
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	790,803	938,021	1,056,856	1,056,859	1,056,859
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,532,253	1,957,549	1,953,558	1,579,504	1,953,558
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	207,146	448,822	448,822	448,822	448,822
Teacher education and recruitment.....	140,119			0	0
Research and innovation.....				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	8,828			p	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	356,093	448,822	448,822	448,822	448,822
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....				0	0
Vocational education.....				0	0
Evaluation.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....		80,200		0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	100,200	38,420	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....				0	0
Civil rights education.....	424,613			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	114,757	114,757			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....				0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	67,097,205	61,308,172	57,311,849	52,729,210	70,703,961

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$5,815,575	\$5,384,852	\$5,848,099	\$5,848,099	\$6,919,112
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	366,853	181,001	152,042	0	177,119
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	813,000	839,155	866,275	670,038	826,702
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	214,536	280,643	278,896	278,896	278,896
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	361,319	353,360		0	331,117
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		6,114		0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	91,063	61,480	50,000	0	59,949
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	7,822,346	7,269,938	7,345,312	6,947,033	8,606,228
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	3,445,000	3,587,600	2,039,000	2,697,000	4,216,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	15,130	593,100	24,000	24,000	24,000
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	3,460,130	4,180,700	2,063,000	2,721,000	4,240,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		135,065	153,061	153,061	153,061
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C, and D).....	278,562		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	278,562	135,065	153,061	153,061	153,061
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	274,375			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	166,175	163,222	166,182	166,182	166,182
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	71,127	70,545		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEA I, sec. 103).....	424,274	219,374	219,374	219,374	219,374
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	1,185,946	551,808	360,742	0	133,587
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	68,989	58,633	58,633	58,633	58,633
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	923,890	75,090	361,394	361,394	266,150
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	974,234	936,172	743,588	743,588	1,065,656
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....		44,682		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	703,731	721,956	756,335	756,335	756,335
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	30,748			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	255,100			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....	44,406			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	4,698,721	3,046,382	2,666,248	2,305,506	2,665,917

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	\$1,253,667	\$1,271,620	\$978,137	\$978,137	\$1,503,248
Innovation			208,961	208,961	208,961
Work-study	36,093			0	36,074
Cooperative education			212,567	212,567	212,567
Consumer and homemaking education			61,720	61,720	61,720
Subtotal, vocational education	1,289,760	1,271,620	1,461,385	1,461,385	2,022,570
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	211,135	211,135	211,135	145,651	211,135
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	79,126	264,362	98,504	0	97,197
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,509	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
College library resources (HEA II-A)	126,038			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	116,752	114,690	114,690	114,690	114,690
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	147,591	157,733	165,279	165,279	165,179
Special projects and teacher education				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	782,901	853,083	694,771	530,683	693,364
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	113,577	113,577	113,577	113,577
Teacher education and recruitment	106,906			0	0
Research and innovation				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	2,425			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	209,331	113,577	113,577	113,577	113,577
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education				0	0
Vocational education			15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations			0	0	0
National achievement study			0	0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training			15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world-affairs			0	0	0
Civil rights education			0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	42,940	42,940	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund			0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	716,000		0	0	0
Total, Office of Education	19,350,691	16,996,342	14,562,354	14,297,245	18,559,717

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$34,417,670	\$32,040,222	\$34,822,669	\$34,822,669	\$40,571,414
State administrative expenses	344,177	320,413	348,227	348,227	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,823,769	887,491	745,499	0	880,651
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,501,000	3,110,281	3,264,611	2,179,882	3,122,578
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	497,987	548,312	519,583	519,583	519,583
Grants for special projects			0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,912,391	1,880,219	0	0	1,829,702
Loans to nonprofit private schools	14,200	11,688	0	0	0
State administration	38,238	36,486	0	0	36,499
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	480,854	326,368	227,056	0	326,497
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	43,030,286	39,161,480	39,927,645	37,870,361	47,286,924
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	6,306,000	6,566,000	3,725,000	705,000	7,703,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		227,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	6,306,000	6,793,000	3,725,000	705,000	7,703,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	1,677,094	271,931	360,170	360,170	360,170
Subtotal, education professions development	1,677,094	271,931	360,170	360,170	360,170
Teachers Corps.	318,367	654,374	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,467,120		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	234,786	231,544	234,822	234,822	234,822
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	303,624	293,417	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,536,015	1,917,695	991,560	991,560	991,560
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	3,800,692	2,381,394	1,556,824	0	580,969
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	441,872		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	127,776	110,157	110,157	110,157	110,157

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$3,325,040	\$319,486	\$1,537,621	\$1,537,621	\$1,132,389
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,016,640	3,983,133	3,163,746	3,163,746	4,534,047
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	53,969	270,825	0	0	0
Interest payments	(1)	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,510,350	3,757,566	3,936,497	3,937,309	3,937,309
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	33,589	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,631,900	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPA, pt. E)	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	20,483,373	13,265,217	11,531,227	9,975,215	11,521,253
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	6,308,224	6,385,581	5,843,004	5,843,004	8,979,808
Innovation	204,525	250,098	250,098	250,098	204,420
Work study	0	0	0	0	0
Cooperative education	0	270,262	270,262	270,262	270,262
Consumer and homemaking education	0	368,691	368,691	368,691	368,691
Subtotal, vocational education	6,512,749	6,385,581	6,732,055	6,732,055	10,073,279
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	682,542	682,542	682,542	339,392	682,542
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	791,750	226,194	176,992	0	176,992
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,668	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275
College library resources (HEA II-A)	662,815	0	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	255,831	0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	194,015	183,638	183,638	183,638	182,638
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	934,037	1,111,779	1,243,389	1,234,389	1,243,389
Special projects and teacher education	0	0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	3,625,408	2,312,095	2,394,503	1,874,262	2,393,503
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	273,483	592,555	592,555	592,555	592,555
Teacher education and recruitment	708,656	0	0	0	0
Research and innovation	440,118	110,494	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	138,615	211,303	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,550,872	914,352	592,555	592,555	592,555
Research and Training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	0	0	0	0	0
Research and development centers	0	0	0	0	0
General education	266,633	43,947	19,002	19,002	19,002
Vocational education	158,530	0	0	0	0
Evaluations	0	0	0	0	0
National achievement study	0	0	0	0	0
Dissemination	0	0	0	0	0
Training	171,820	0	0	0	0
Statistical surveys	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, research, and training	596,983	42,947	19,002	19,002	19,002
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	150,955	0	0	0	0
Civil rights education	338,653	64,100	0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	159,386	159,386	0	0	0
Student loan insurance fund	0	0	0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	1,715,000	0	0	0	0
Total, Office of Education	86,515,126	70,075,463	65,332,157	58,178,620	79,999,623

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$73,883,619	\$73,314,190	\$74,534,785	\$74,534,785	\$81,072,087
State administrative expenses	771,220	734,549	745,348	745,348	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	5,322,514	2,723,308	2,287,600	0	2,739,956
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III):	9,581,000	8,478,187	8,916,081	5,817,974	8,498,616
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,175,595	1,214,477	1,145,009	1,145,009	1,145,009
Grants for special projects	167,801	88,900	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	5,073,092	5,083,507	0	0	5,081,022
Loans to nonprofit private schools	0	52,814	0	0	0
State administration	109,811	106,791	0	0	107,263
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):					
Grants to States	1,380,889	955,233	664,561	0	959,509
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	97,463,541	92,751,956	88,293,384	76,335,939	99,603,462
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	29,911,398	29,659,000	16,878,000	7,709,000	34,617,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	401,579	5,347,300	309,000	309,000	309,000
Subtotal, SAFA	30,312,977	35,006,300	17,187,000	8,018,000	34,926,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	\$2,540,739	\$627,577	\$898,345	\$898,345	\$898,345
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D)				0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	2,540,739	627,577	898,345	898,345	898,345
Teacher Corps	763,028	826,165		0	0
Higher Education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,871,346			0	0
College of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	377,698	373,856	377,795	377,795	377,795
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	815,281	818,531		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	3,827,937	4,418,353	2,284,545	2,284,545	2,284,545
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	12,209,445	7,073,695	4,624,391	0	1,792,795
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,186,862	2,800,000		0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	269,709	217,421	217,421	217,421	217,421
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	7,057,490	860,039	4,139,194	4,139,194	1,132,389
Direct loans (NDEA II)	7,327,310	8,541,379	8,516,635	8,516,635	12,205,414
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	611,754	705,733		0	0
Interest payments	(0)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	7,518,505	8,655,045	9,067,190	9,069,059	9,069,059
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search	161,375			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	3,018,200			0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	47,252,912	34,464,052	29,227,171	24,564,649	27,079,418
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	15,034,097	14,936,466	15,170,553	15,170,553	23,314,833
Innovation			337,125	337,125	337,125
Work-study	563,525		0	0	563,239
Cooperative education			392,317	392,217	392,217
Consumer and homemaking education			957,253	957,253	957,253
Subtotal, vocational education	15,597,622	14,936,466	16,857,248	16,857,148	25,564,667
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,664,458	1,664,458	1,664,458	742,639	1,664,458
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,389,404	1,622,353	340,480	0	340,480
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	47,164	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,474,050		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	456,118		0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	358,627	332,502	332,503	332,503	332,503
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	2,082,928	2,505,509	2,823,537	2,823,537	2,823,537
Special projects and teacher education	179,749		0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities					
Subtotal, libraries and community services	7,714,248	6,238,549	5,274,705	4,012,406	5,274,705
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	737,950	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,598,917
Teacher education and recruitment	1,154,437		0	0	0
Research and innovation	300,364	255,644		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	32,636	6,299		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,225,387	1,860,860	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,598,917
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	1,400,000	1,700,000		0	0
Research and development centers	1,190,419			0	0
General education	212,512	2,430		0	0
Vocational education	539,717		49,336	49,336	49,336
Evaluations			0	0	0
National achievement study	225,000		0	0	0
Dissemination					
Training	284,958	3,000		0	0
Statistical surveys			0	0	0
Construction	116,771		0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training	3,969,377	1,705,430	49,336	49,336	49,336
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	498,436		0	0	0
Civil rights education	798,496		0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	359,602	359,602		0	0
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund	11,440,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education	220,986,365	188,826,957	159,436,106	132,384,740	195,044,850

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$3,181,878	\$3,013,489	\$3,356,077	\$3,356,077	\$4,044,438
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	294,968
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	582,833	296,752	249,274	0	1,117,701
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,165,174	1,113,987	1,155,623	866,965	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	264,277	329,967	318,330	318,330	318,330
Grants for special projects	336,500		0	0	0

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Elementary and secondary education—Continued					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	\$560,955	\$562,511		0	\$581,548
Loans to nonprofit private schools	2,067			0	0
State administration	11,533	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	145,027	100,396	\$69,846	0	100,882
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	6,398,177	5,582,502	5,299,150	\$4,691,372	6,471,200
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	6,628,000	6,901,000	3,915,000	1,055,000	8,067,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,438,025	2,093,700	773,000	773,000	773,000
Subtotal, SAFA	8,066,025	8,994,700	4,688,000	1,828,000	8,480,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		157,489	186,994	186,994	186,994
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	890,057		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	890,057	157,489	186,994	186,994	186,994
Teacher Corps					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	45,000			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	171,169	168,195	171,178	171,178	171,178
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	159,410	189,561	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	32,901	650,607	313,134	313,134	313,134
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	2,428,883	1,213,583	793,374	0	264,246
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	445,563		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	57,435	64,949	64,949	64,949	64,949
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,228,410	188,084	905,211	905,211	666,647
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,123,561	1,221,118	1,862,525	1,862,515	2,669,234
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds		70,182	0	0	0
Interest payments	(1)		0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,475,446	1,022,006	1,070,673	1,070,894	1,070,894
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	38,750		0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,115,000		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)	142,000		0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	8,463,528	4,743,285	5,181,044	4,387,981	5,220,282
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	1,411,118	1,439,960	1,445,921	1,445,921	2,222,161
Innovation			213,577	213,577	213,577
Work-study	54,861		0	0	54,833
Cooperative education			219,041	219,041	219,041
Consumer and homemaking education			91,238	1,238	91,238
Subtotal, vocational education	1,465,979	1,439,960	1,969,777	1,969,777	2,800,850
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	245,448	245,448	245,448	159,746	245,448
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	307,796	243,914	104,217	0	104,217
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,666	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069
College library resources (HEA II-A)	132,181		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	124,273	121,786	121,786	121,786	121,786
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	138,059	146,169	152,742	152,742	152,742
Special projects and teacher education			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	1,050,173	862,683	729,559	539,640	729,559
Education for the Handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	165,614	165,614	165,614	165,614
Teacher education and recruitment	289,553		0	0	0
Research and innovation	9,291		0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	4,751		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	403,595	165,614	165,614	165,614	165,614
Research and Training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	88,896	24,466		0	0
Vocational education	65,463	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations			0	0	0
National achievement study			0	0	0
Dissemination			0	0	0
Training			0	0	0
Statistical surveys			0	0	0
Construction			0	0	0
Subtotal, research, and training	154,359	74,466	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	79,279		0	0	0
Civil rights education			0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	38,478	38,478			
Student loan insurance fund	1,300		0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund			0	0	0
Total, Office of Education	27,060,950	22,109,177	18,285,138	13,834,378	24,749,299

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and Secondary Education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$1,754,215	\$1,654,401	\$1,749,298	\$1,749,298	\$2,190,937
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	208,063	104,377	87,677	0	111,049
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	550,756	637,800	654,286	543,738	640,054
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	182,331	251,499	252,792	252,792	252,792
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	185,766	187,862	-----	0	179,379
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		5,611	-----	0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333	-----	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	50,591	50,000	50,000	0	50,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	3,091,722	3,054,883	2,944,053	2,695,818	3,437,542
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	114,000	119,000	67,000	4,000	138,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	114,000	119,000	67,000	4,000	138,000
Educational professions development:					
Preschool, elementary and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....			120,221	130,598	130,598
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	237,585	-----	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	237,585	120,221	130,598	130,598	130,598
Teacher Corps:					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....				0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	159,267	156,343	159,271	159,271	159,271
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	44,718	43,855	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	223,372	217,106	112,256	112,256	112,256
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	648,417	336,685	220,106	0	89,927
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....		800,000	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	61,298	54,115	54,115	54,115	54,115
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	526,980	49,560	238,524	238,524	175,662
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	638,789	617,884	490,776	490,776	703,344
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	25,000	27,932	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	()	-----	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	360,309	356,835	373,827	373,904	373,904
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	19,000	-----	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....		159,700	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E).....		0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	2,866,850	2,660,315	1,648,875	1,428,846	1,668,479
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	708,154	704,708	563,453	563,453	865,942
Innovation.....			205,159	205,159	205,159
Work-study.....	20,693	-----	0	0	20,683
Cooperative education.....			207,235	207,235	207,235
Consumer and homemaking education.....			35,554	35,554	35,554
Subtotal, vocational education.....	728,847	704,708	1,011,401	1,011,401	1,334,573
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	163,671	163,671	163,671	126,155	163,671
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	148,391	90,601	90,601	0	90,601
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,292	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	179,215	-----	0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....		0	0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	109,865	108,892	108,892	108,892	108,892
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	125,774	131,267	135,709	135,709	135,709
Special projects and teacher education.....		0	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....		0	0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	828,958	599,315	603,757	475,010	603,757
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	67,225	-----	0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	36,556	-----	0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	1,506	-----	0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	205,287	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....				0	0
Vocational education.....			15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....			15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	\$30,645			0	0
Civil rights education.....				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	33,318	33,318			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	615,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	8,802,212	7,441,760	6,570,684	5,910,673	7,477,946
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$28,985,185	\$27,068,572	\$29,616,047	\$29,616,047	\$34,505,250
State administrative expenses.....	291,460	270,742	296,160	296,160	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,076,258	1,057,993	888,722		1,070,540
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,136,000	3,581,329	3,760,540	2,498,188	3,592,947
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	518,142	604,339	577,670	577,670	577,670
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,974,056	1,960,992		0	1,927,258
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		20,808		0	0
State administration.....	44,292	42,701		0	42,696
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	556,981	381,962	265,733	0	381,934
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	38,582,374	34,989,438	35,404,872	32,988,065	42,098,295
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	32,880,000	34,531,000	21,328,000	7,442,000	39,352,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	32,753	4,709,700	635,000	635,000	
Subtotal, SAFA.....	32,912,753	39,240,700	21,963,000	8,077,000	40,187,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		304,962	410,153	410,153	410,153
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	960,195		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	960,195	304,962	410,153	410,153	410,153
Teacher Corps.....	106,134	295,747	0	0	0
Higher Education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	996,612		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	244,290	251,008	244,330	244,330	244,330
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	250,802	267,588	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	1,707,311	1,908,903	987,014	987,014	987,014
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	3,742,069	2,548,584	1,666,124	0	626,507
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	350,000		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	120,886	109,974	109,974	109,974	109,974
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,012,260	253,931	1,222,117	1,222,117	900,034
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,778,077	3,165,833	2,514,577	2,514,577	3,603,703
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	250,114	322,213	0	0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)		0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,349,248	3,373,306	3,533,940	3,534,668	3,534,668
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....			0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,447,700		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....			0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	15,249,369	12,191,340	10,278,076	8,612,680	10,006,233
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	6,724,762	6,700,866	6,456,132	6,456,132	9,922,095
Innovation.....			258,244	258,244	258,244
Work-study.....	243,023		0	0	242,899
Cooperative education.....			281,687	281,687	281,687
Consumer and homemaking education.....			407,378	407,378	407,378
Subtotal, vocational education.....	6,967,785	6,700,866	7,403,441	7,403,441	11,112,303
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	747,843	747,843	747,843	366,117	747,843
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	956,718	294,128	187,865	0	187,865
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,966	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	49,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	438,070		0	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			0	0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	207,934	196,597	196,597	196,597	196,597
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	951,508	1,132,973	1,272,206	1,272,206	1,272,206
Special projects and teacher education.....	456,550		0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	3,863,339	2,479,867	2,512,837	1,930,246	2,512,837
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	304,744	660,289	660,289	660,289	660,289
Teacher education and recruitment.....	411,611		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	22,034	13,675		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	738,389	673,964	660,289	660,289	660,289

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	\$90,824			0	0
Vocational education.....	18,862	\$23,272	\$20,996	\$20,996	\$20,996
Evaluations.....	50,250			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	177,872			0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	337,808	23,272	20,996	20,996	20,996
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	112,963			0	0
Civil rights education.....	366,131	20,795		0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	173,136	173,136			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....				0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	103,618,376	97,144,087	78,703,664	60,152,870	107,058,106
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$11,965,941	\$11,514,239	\$11,728,452	\$11,728,452	\$13,590,808
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,589,629	819,428	688,326	0	825,273
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	2,806,000	2,506,213	2,628,629	1,854,696	2,609,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	452,331	513,297	496,395	496,395	496,395
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,100,863	1,111,709		0	1,137,535
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		19,520		0	0
State administration.....	29,656	29,065		0	30,374
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	372,927	259,983	180,872	0	271,705
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	18,467,347	16,923,454	15,872,674	14,229,543	18,961,408
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	12,426,000	12,938,000	7,339,000	4,852,000	15,097,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....		2,508,500	425,000	425,000	425,000
Subtotal, SAFA.....	12,426,000	15,446,500	7,764,000	5,277,000	15,522,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....					
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	1,456,175	258,745	340,217	340,217	340,217
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,456,175	258,745	340,217	340,217	340,217
Teacher Corps.	4,295	273,459		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	206,044			0	
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	217,818	214,648	217,847	217,847	217,847
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	303,774	312,641		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	1,358,537	1,372,312	709,565	709,565	709,565
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	3,916,035	2,618,385	1,711,756	0	618,724
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 305).....	123,648	101,240	110,240	101,240	101,240
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,449,987	325,356	1,565,872	1,565,872	1,153,195
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,983,053	4,056,316	3,221,874	3,221,874	4,617,352
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	17,321	191,187		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	2,684,129	2,244,596	2,351,481	2,351,966	2,351,966
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	35,000			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,692,500			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	35,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	17,022,846	11,436,681	9,879,635	8,168,364	9,769,889
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	3,679,098	3,610,797	3,519,602	3,519,602	5,409,092
Innovation.....			239,372	239,372	239,372
Work-study.....	161,213			0	161,131
Cooperative education.....			255,219	255,219	255,219
Consumer and homemaking education.....			222,085	222,085	222,085
Subtotal, vocational education.....	3,840,311	3,610,797	4,236,278	4,236,278	6,286,899
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	565,959	565,959	565,959	291,404	565,959
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	867,052	323,350	157,581	0	157,581
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,134	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,220
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	375,632			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	164,471			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	172,599	165,768	165,768	165,768	165,768

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services—Continued					
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	\$269,799	\$305,985	\$333,131	\$333,131	\$333,131
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,519,396	1,468,317	1,329,694	897,558	1,329,694
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	208,605	451,985	451,985	451,985	451,985
Teacher education and recruitment.....	297,990		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....	112,516	128,907		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	4,990			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	624,101	580,892	451,985	451,985	451,985
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....			0	0	0
Research and development centers.....			0	0	0
General education.....	50,744		0	0	0
Vocational education.....	214,941		15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....			0	0	0
Dissemination.....			0	0	0
Training.....			0	0	0
Statistical surveys.....			0	0	0
Construction.....			0	0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	265,685		15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	385,911		0	0	0
Civil rights education.....	130,509		0	0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	113,306	113,306			
Student loan insurance fund.....	640		0	0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	3,769,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	61,075,522	50,162,151	39,939,483	33,665,945	52,727,092

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$17,457,612	\$16,156,273	\$18,819,284	\$18,819,284	\$21,926,089
State administrative expenses.....	174,644	161,563	188,193	188,193	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	858,758	420,151	352,930	0	406,702
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	1,759,000	1,615,011	1,683,117	1,186,348	1,589,655
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	316,091	374,730	360,730	360,370	360,370
Grants for special projects.....	30,000		0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	928,179	897,323		0	851,102
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		4,845		0	0
State administration.....	18,353	17,219		0	16,718
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	230,719	154,028	107,158	0	149,551
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	21,773,428	19,801,143	21,511,052	20,554,195	25,300,187
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	397,000	413,000	234,000	18,000	490,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	8,575		0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	405,575	413,000	234,000	18,000	490,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		181,395	223,169	223,169	223,169
Training programs (EPDA pts. C and D).....	464,504		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	464,504	181,395	223,169	223,169	223,169
Teacher Corps.....	391,132	191,882		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	857,592		0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	194,220	191,149	194,239	194,239	194,239
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	139,545	135,930		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	618,228	1,177,790	608,986	608,986	608,986
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	2,271,473	1,177,342	769,681	0	288,927
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....			0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	85,914	75,790	75,790	75,790	75,790
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,417,090	148,226	713,383	713,383	525,374
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,839,474	1,847,984	1,467,827	1,467,827	2,103,582
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	8,129	126,142		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	1,538,526	1,831,616	1,918,836	1,918,836	1,918,836
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search.....	63,878		0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	185,300		0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E).....	90,000		0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	9,309,369	6,711,969	5,748,742	4,979,043	5,715,734

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	\$2,974,705	\$3,010,158	\$2,836,702	\$2,836,702	\$4,359,578
Innovation.....			225,796	225,796	225,796
Work-study.....	103,465		0	0	103,413
Cooperative education.....			236,178	236,178	236,178
Consumer and homemaking education.....			178,995	178,995	178,995
Subtotal, vocational education.....	3,078,170	3,010,158	3,477,671	3,477,671	5,103,960
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	403,825	403,825	403,825	224,804	403,825
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	302,540	314,186	130,586	0	130,586
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,391	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	194,939			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	144,321	139,136	139,136	139,136	139,136
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	427,880	497,755	550,582	550,582	550,582
Special projects and teacher education.....			0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	1,576,646	1,461,202	1,330,428	1,020,821	1,330,428
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	144,955	314,074	314,074	314,074	314,074
Teacher education and recruitment.....	183,643		0	0	0
Research and innovation.....			0	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	2,314		0	0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	330,912	314,074	314,074	314,074	314,074
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	993,795	895,478		0	0
Research and development centers.....				0	0
General education.....	9,127			0	0
Vocational education.....	10,000	55,277	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations.....			0	0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....				0	0
Training.....				0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....				0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	1,012,922	950,755	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	13,920			0	0
Civil rights education.....	14,313			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	19,340	91,340			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....				0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	40,859,231	33,176,917	32,904,136	30,966,047	38,542,552

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$15,343,592	\$14,387,918	\$15,295,449	\$15,295,449	\$17,820,517
State administrative expenses.....	153,436	150,000	152,954	152,954	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,277,841	1,513,770	969,176	0	1,144,828
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	3,886,000	3,404,272	3,574,127	2,364,521	3,395,425
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	504,462	565,995	610,299	610,299	610,299
Grants for special projects.....	467,687			0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,729,885	1,730,053		0	1,707,176
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		89,251		0	0
State administration.....	42,300	41,056		0	40,967
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	351,987	297,500	255,495	0	366,463
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	24,757,190	21,819,815	20,857,500	18,423,223	25,085,675
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	1,537,000	1,600,000	1,278,000	571,000	2,660,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	313,950	99,700		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	1,850,950	1,699,700	1,278,000	571,000	2,660,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....		323,516	438,231	438,231	438,231
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	1,169,147		0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,169,147	323,516	438,231	438,231	438,231
Teacher Corps.....	96,235	71,142		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	209,061			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	243,929	240,649	243,969	243,969	243,969
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A).....	351,112	353,677		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—sec. 103).....	1,724,477	1,996,287	1,032,197	1,032,197	1,032,197
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	4,926,670	3,199,080	2,091,382	0	793,453
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	2,308,427		0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	158,763	127,798	127,798	127,798	127,798

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Higher education—Continued					
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$4,128,840	\$391,466	\$1,884,045	\$1,884,045	\$1,387,514
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	4,721,068	4,880,526	3,876,532	3,876,532	5,555,560
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds.....	381,317	251,701		0	0
Interest payments.....	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C).....	3,762,043	2,993,747	3,136,307	3,136,954	3,136,954
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search.....	82,926			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV).....	1,655,600			0	0
Training programs (DPEA, pt. E).....				0	0
Subtotal, higher education.....	24,654,233	14,434,931	12,392,230	10,301,495	12,277,445
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	5,501,195	5,447,743	4,890,133	4,890,133	7,515,390
Innovation.....			251,591	251,591	251,591
Work-study.....	207,893			0	207,787
Cooperative education.....			272,356	272,356	272,356
Consumer and homemaking education.....			308,566	308,566	308,566
Subtotal, vocational education.....	5,709,088	5,447,743	5,722,646	5,722,646	8,555,690
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	745,365	745,365	745,365	365,099	745,365
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	414,459	732,551	187,452	0	187,452
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	42,955	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	538,517			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	330,858			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	201,099	190,150	190,150	190,150	190,150
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	465,302	543,151	600,765	600,765	600,765
Special projects and teacher education.....				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	2,800,303	2,319,528	1,832,043	1,264,325	1,832,043
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	288,659	625,438	625,438	625,438	526,433
Teacher education and recruitment.....	564,354			0	0
Research and innovation.....	360,371	276,372		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	15,484	290		0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,228,868	902,100	625,438	625,438	625,438
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....				0	0
Research and development centers.....	1,687,880			0	0
General education.....	637,920	19,994		0	0
Vocational education.....	224,845	50,000	15,903	15,903	15,903
Evaluations.....	40,650			0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	276,916			0	0
Training.....	192,200	3,500		0	0
Statistical surveys.....				0	0
Construction.....	119,074			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	3,179,485	73,494	15,903	15,903	15,903
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	862,617			0	0
Civil rights education.....	53,840			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	162,247	162,247			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	18,750,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	85,324,203	47,304,216	43,211,991	37,412,261	51,540,425

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$1,601,175	\$1,363,918	\$1,383,315	\$1,383,315	\$1,597,595
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	174,290	87,394	73,412	0	86,211
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	494,231	580,075	593,510	501,223	577,243
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	181,253	249,634	247,006	247,006	247,006
Grants for special projects.....				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	150,938	145,138		0	145,029
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		1,334		0	0
State administration.....	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	50,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	2,811,887	2,640,824	2,497,243	2,231,544	2,716,417
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	1,537,000	1,600,000	908,000	1,275,000	1,910,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	39,780			0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	1,576,780	1,600,000	908,000	1,275,000	1,910,000

¹ Not available.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	\$135,082	\$116,931	\$125,620	\$125,620	\$125,620
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)					
Subtotal, education professions development	135,082	116,931	125,620	125,620	125,620
Teacher Corps					
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	45,000			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	157,845	154,927	157,849	157,849	157,849
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	26,936	28,359		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	145,951	169,890	87,843	87,843	87,843
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	465,602	247,470	161,782	0	62,265
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)				0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	45,412	45,214	45,214	45,214	45,214
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	382,740	33,374	160,621	160,621	118,291
Direct loans (NDEA II)	420,214	416,082	330,488	330,488	473,632
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds		25,000		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	415,503	257,934	270,216	270,272	270,272
Special programs for disadvantaged students:					
Talent search				0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	233,100			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)	22,500			0	0
Subtotal, higher education	2,360,803	1,378,250	1,214,013	1,052,287	1,215,366
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	569,245	590,814	416,792	416,792	640,547
Innovation			204,345	204,345	240,345
Work-study	17,324			0	17,316
Cooperative education			206,093	206,093	206,093
Consumer and homemaking education			26,299	26,299	26,299
Subtotal, vocational education	586,569	590,814	853,529	853,529	1,130,600
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	153,903	153,903	153,903	122,142	153,903
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	177,906	105,309	88,975	0	88,975
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,247	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025
College library resources (HEA II-A)	51,567			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)				0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	108,058	106,901	106,902	106,902	106,902
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	120,299	124,625	127,831	127,831	127,831
Special projects and teacher education	27,999			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	741,729	595,564	582,437	461,701	582,437
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	84,580			0	0
Research and innovation	5,625			0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	1,385			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	191,590	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education				0	0
Vocational education	68,865	34,049	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	68,865	34,049	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.					
Civil rights education				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	30,000			
Student loan insurance fund				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	8,553,305	7,136,432	6,345,842	6,214,681	7,845,440

* Not available.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 1:30 p.m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair).

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess will not extend beyond 2 o'clock p.m. today.

(At 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. THURMOND in the chair).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, Calendar No. 476.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the pending bill before the Senate, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, H.R. 13763, provides funding to support the activities and functions of the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, Botanic Garden, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office. The total of the bill is \$344,060,817. We will observe from the table on the first page of the report that this sum is \$59,536,760 over the bill as it passed the House of Representatives in September. Of the total recommendations of the Senate committee, \$59,631,260 represents Senate items, including the Senate Office Buildings, which were not considered by the House nor included in the House bill. In summary, exclusive of these Senate items, the bill is \$94,500 under the House version of the bill. This reduction was effected

due to the delay in processing this bill through Congress this year. The House had provided for funding of new positions on a 9-month basis, whereas the recommendations in this bill provide funding on an 8-month basis. A copy of the bill and report is before us. A comparative table showing, by line item, the appropriations for fiscal year 1969, the budget estimates for fiscal year 1970, the House allowances, and the amounts recommended by the Senate committee is printed at the conclusion of the report.

In my statement here today, it is my purpose to highlight the recommendations, calling attention to items of particular interest or of possible controversy following which I will attempt to answer questions any Senator may have as to details or other information elicited from the hearings or justifications.

Over a year ago, in July of 1968, the Committee on Appropriations directed that a study be made of senatorial allowances by the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. It was the intent of the committee, in making such a recommendation, that senatorial allowances be adjusted so that it would not be necessary for Senators to rely upon contributions for their official office expenses. These three groups, as a special committee, conducted this study and unanimously recommended the increased allowances I am about to describe, with the exception of trips home for Senators, which I will discuss later.

These recommendations are explained in some detail commencing on page 4 of the report but, briefly, they are as follows:

The committee recommends an increase in the clerk-hire allowance for each Senator in the amount of \$23,652. This will permit the employment of one additional person at a not-to-exceed rate of \$23,652, or for several additional employees at lower rates within this sum.

With respect to Senators' transportation, the special committee had recommended that the number of round trips to home States for Senators be increased from six to 12 trips per annum. In addition, and in order to simplify accounting procedures, it recommended that the cost of a round trip be calculated at 12 cents per mile from Washington to the residence city of the Senator in the State, and that the total of this sum, multiplied by 12, should be the ceiling per year for the 12 trips. This dollar allowance, thus arrived at, would have permitted the Senator to schedule travel to his home State, and within the State, up to the limit of this ceiling and to have been reimbursed for such travel on the basis of actual vouchers submitted. Also, by use of the dollar ceiling, it would have, in fact, allowed more than 12 trips per year if economy accommodations were utilized. But it would have relieved administrative difficulties which are increasing each year in the processing of reimbursement vouchers. However, the full Committee on Appropriations did not approve this recommendation and, consequently, the bill before the Senate amends existing travel language to per-

mit 12 round trips per year in lieu of the six authorized heretofore.

For employees' mileage, it is recommended that eight home State trips in offices of Senators from States with less than 10 million population, and 10 trips in offices of Senators from States with 10 million population or more, be allowed. The new authorization also permits the payment of mileage to Senators' employees traveling from the State to Washington and return—within this limitation, of course.

For office expenses in the home State, an increase of from \$300 to \$400 each quarter is recommended. Language has been inserted in the bill to provide reimbursement under this appropriation for newspaper, magazine, and periodical subscriptions, including the purchase of news clipping services. This provision applies to all Senators, whether offices are maintained in the home State or not. By way of further clarification, I should state that this permissive use to buy newspaper, magazine, and periodical subscriptions has to come out of the \$400 quarterly allowance and is therefore raising this particular reimbursement limitation.

With respect to additional long-distance telephone service, the committee has authorized the installation of a WATS line for each Senator's office, if so desired by him, and provided such Senator surrenders 50 percent of his existing long-distance allowance presently computed in calls and minutes. Complete details concerning the advantages and limitations of this system are discussed in the Senate hearings commencing at page 428. In connection with this phase of its study, the special committee agreed that no change would be proposed in the telegram allowances until after the installation of the WATS service, when it might be appropriate for the Committee on Rules and Administration to reevaluate this allowance.

It is recommended that the stationery allowance for each Senator be increased by \$600 per annum from the present \$3,000. The committee's decision to provide this increase was based on the requests of many Senators that continuous letterheads, manifold sets of carbon and tissue, and other carbon paper be provided through the paper allotment rather than as a charge against the stationery account. However, as there is no authority in existing law to accomplish this, the committee recommended the additional \$600 per annum for the purchase of any such authorized stationery supplies through this account. If any amount is unused in this account, of course, under the Williams amendment to a prior bill, the balance would revert to the Treasury.

As for increases in the paper allotments, the committee has been advised that the Joint Committee on Printing will review this matter in detail. Also, it is suggested in the report that the Committee on Rules and Administration study further the advisability of additional allowances for mechanical equipment, now charged against a Senator's clerk-hire allowance.

That concludes the summary of allowance recommendations provided in the

bill, Mr. President; and I will now proceed to a general discussion of other Senate items as well as appropriations for the Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office.

The committee has provided the sum of \$106,930 for the offices of the majority and minority leaders, which will finance one legislative assistant position at not to exceed \$28,908 per annum and one executive secretary at not to exceed \$15,111 per annum. In addition, two other positions already authorized have their titles changed—one, to an administrative assistant at not to exceed \$31,317 in place of a research assistant, and the other, a clerical assistant at not to exceed \$12,921 per annum, instead of a clerk at \$8,979 per annum, an increase in compensation.

For the offices of the majority and minority whips, language and funds have been included in the bill so as to fix the compensation of an administrative assistant at not to exceed \$30,003 per annum and an executive secretary at not to exceed \$15,111 per annum for each of the whips' offices. This proposal merely provides for a higher rate of pay for not to exceed two employees, already authorized.

At the request of a special bipartisan committee, appointed at the beginning of the 91st Congress, the committee has included language in the bill adjusting the compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate to approximately \$10,000 per annum, and has provided funds and authority for him to employ and fix the compensation of a secretary at not to exceed approximately \$8,500 per annum.

For the office of the Secretary, the committee has approved an appropriation of \$1,675,448. Three positions which have been carried on the administrative roll for several years have been transferred and made regular positions under the office of the Secretary. This does not increase the number of positions, nor does it increase the amount of appropriations.

The committee has created a new position of Comptroller of the Senate, with a salary of \$35,259 per annum. This action was taken by the committee in recognition of the superior service rendered to the Senate by Mr. Robert A. Brenkworth, who has held the position of financial clerk for many years. Mr. Brenkworth's duties have encompassed a great deal more than those of a financial clerk. As expenditures of the Senate have grown to in excess of \$50 million annually, it was the opinion of the committee that a fiscal operation was required which would embrace all disbursing activities and related responsibilities. In the report on page 7, the committee has requested the Secretary of the Senate to examine into the operations of the Senate which are fiscal in nature, with a view toward transferring to the new comptroller position such functions as should properly fall under the jurisdiction of such an officer.

Under the appropriation head, office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, a total of \$4,915,909 is recommended. Included in this sum are funds for five additional personnel to operate the new

computer equipment in the service department. In this connection, \$275,000 is included under miscellaneous items for annual rental on the new computerized equipment which had earlier been authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I understand this equipment already has been installed. Language and funds have also been included under the Sergeant at Arms to correct an inequity in the salaries of six plainclothesmen on the Capitol Police force assigned to the Senate, making available an additional \$438 per annum for each such officer.

Under the postage allowance, the committee has provided an increase of \$96 per annum in the allowance for Senators from States east of the Mississippi River and \$120 in the allowance for Senators from States west of the Mississippi River. This is necessitated by the 15-cent increase in special delivery stamps which went into effect July 14, 1969.

For the Joint Economic Committee, \$447,165 is recommended. This is \$36,000 above the House allowance and will provide for two additional professional positions at a salary of \$23,283 each, and certain personnel reclassifications which were effected during fiscal year 1969 and which were not reflected in the original budget estimate for fiscal year 1970. As stated in the report, these funds are provided for the 8 months remaining of the fiscal year.

The total appropriation for the responsibilities of the Architect of the Capitol, which also include the Senate Office Buildings maintenance and construction work, and Library maintenance, construction, and equipment purchases, is \$24,360,900. This is \$15,594,100 under the budget estimates, but \$4,793,600 over the House allowance. Of this increase, \$125,000 represents the amount required to permit the Architect to proceed with the installation of the speech reinforcement system in the Senate Chamber, which was authorized by the Senate in Senate Resolution 167, agreed to April 15, 1969. A description of this system is printed at page 282 of the Senate hearings. Subject to the availability of the Chamber for such work to be performed, it is estimated that the installation could be completed within 3 or 4 months after the components are delivered.

The next item in the report is the extension of the west central front of the Capitol. The committee recommends the sum of \$2 million, allowed by the House to enable the Architect to prepare detailed plans and specifications for extension of the west front of the Capitol Building. However, by language inserted in the bill, the committee directs that \$250,000 of this sum be transferred to the National Park Service for the purpose of making a feasibility study, including estimates of costs, with reference to restoration, only, of the existing west central front of the Capitol. The remainder of the funds, \$1,750,000, would be available as stated above, but with the proviso that in any agreements entered into, provision would be made for a progress payments procedure so that if the National Park Service report shows

that restoration is feasible the Architect will have retained authority to suspend the plans and specifications agreement.

Under Capitol Grounds, the committee recommends \$874,100, which is \$32,000 over the House allowance and which is to be used to improve the surfaces and lighting in the Senate parking lots. This latter estimate was not submitted to the House for consideration.

For the Senate Office Buildings, a total of \$3,310,000 is recommended. Of special interest will be the \$28,000 provided for installation of the legislative light signals in the Old and New Senate Office Buildings, and \$38,600 to commence a desk-replacement program in the Old Senate Office Building. Many of the original desks furnished when the building was new in 1909 are still in use, but are badly in need of replacement. This renewal program will extend over a 17-year period.

Also included in the appropriation is \$28,000 for the replacement of obsolete equipment in the New Senate Office Building cafeterias. The equipment in question has been in operation since January of 1959, and with a normal useful life of approximately 10 years, this particular equipment has reached the point where it is no longer economically feasible to maintain and operate. The larger items of replacement are a dish-washing system at \$18,500, a patty maker at \$1,600, six trucks for dish transportation at \$449 each, a proof cabinet for the bakery at \$1,600; and four coffee urns at \$650 each.

In addition, funds on an 8-month basis have been included for the employment of a full-time bricklayer—at an annual rate of about \$9,000—now employed on an hourly basis.

Another increase over the House allowance which the committee recommends is \$1,250,000 for the acquisition of all real property in the east half of square 725—land adjacent to the New Senate Office Building—with the exception of property on which the Belmont House is located. The language in the bill provides also for demolition and removal of the buildings or other structures to be acquired and, pending demolition, for immediate use by the Government or lease in lieu thereof. In view of rapidly rising land costs and the need for the site for future construction of an extension to the New Senate Office Building, the committee believes the property should be obtained as quickly as possible. Authorizing legislation for the extension of the Senate Office Building site passed the Senate on October 8 of this year.

The committee has also included funds for initial funding for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. The Library has reached the maximum capacity of its present buildings. Rental costs in leased space elsewhere in the area are estimated to approximate \$1.7 million for the fiscal year, and without a resolution of the space problem quickly, additional rental costs can be expected in future years.

The initial estimate for constructing the Madison Library Building was \$75

million in 1967. Costs have now escalated to the point where this estimate has been revised upward to \$90 million. A breakdown of these costs may be found on page 300 of the hearings, and on page 294 is a description of the building with space allocations designated. Legislation increasing the authorized cost of this building to \$90 million passed the Senate just last week—on October 15. The committee, therefore, has concurred with the action of the House of Representatives and has recommended \$2,800,000 of the amount requested for plans and specifications and related expenses.

For the operations and activities of the Library of Congress, the committee recommends a total appropriation of \$43,856,300, which is \$30,500 under the House allowance and \$821,500 under the budget estimate. Included in this amount are funds to finance 73 new positions, discounted on an 8-month basis due to the late enactment of the bill. Details on the individual appropriation items under the Library commence at page 18 of the report.

For the Government Printing Office, a total of \$39,950,000 is recommended. Of this, \$30,300,000 is to finance the cost of printing and binding for the Congress, based on an estimation of the fiscal year's requirements.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,650,000 for the Office of Superintendent of Documents, which is \$402,000 below the budget request, but \$1,472,000 over the 1969 appropriation—thus permitting a much-needed and fully justified expansion of the work forces. Specifically, the committee has provided funds to finance 112 full-time positions and the part-time equivalent of another 101 full-time positions. The sum recommended is \$100,000 below the House bill and represents 8-month funding of new positions rather than 9-month funding which was provided for in the House bill.

With respect to the revised request for \$3.6 million for selection of site and general plans and designs of the proposed new Government Printing Office building, the committee recommends disallowance of the funds at this time. The cost of the building was originally estimated at \$47 million some 5 years ago when the project was first authorized. More recently, the General Services Administration submitted revised estimates, projecting escalation of costs, as follows: \$62.5 million as of October 1969; \$68.2 million as of October 1970; and \$73.9 million as of October 1971. The committee recognizes the deficiencies of the present location and concedes the economies in operation to be attained in a new, modern, well-located printing plant. But the committee feels that the uncertainties surrounding the availability and desirability of the proposed new location and the escalation in construction costs from \$47 million to almost \$75 million warrant a more current evaluation and authorization. Therefore, the committee recommends disallowance of the funds in this bill. The committee has provided authority, however, for urgently required improvements in the electrical and air-condi-

tions systems in the present printing plant through the use of the revolving fund.

To fund the activities of the General Accounting Office, the committee recommends the sum of \$63 million, an increase of \$3,386,000 over the fiscal year 1969 appropriation. These increased funds will provide the additional 161 average positions justified to the committee as being essential to maintain currency in the increasing workload, along with associated travel and other mandatory costs.

That concludes my summary presentation, Mr. President. I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, insert: "SENATE"

On page 2, after line 1, insert:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE"

On page 2, after line 6, insert:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS"

"For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, \$4,685,530."

On page 2, after line 10, insert:

"MILEAGE OF PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND OF SENATORS"

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$58,370."

On page 2, after line 14, insert:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT, AND MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS"

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, \$3,000; in all, \$16,000."

On page 2, after line 19, insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES"

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:"

At the top of page 3, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT"

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, \$281,187."

On page 3, after line 2, insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS"

"For offices of the majority leader and the minority leader, \$106,930: *Provided*, That effective November 1, 1969, the respective leaders may each appoint and fix the compensation of an administrative assistant at not to exceed \$31,317 per annum, a legislative assistant at not to exceed \$28,908 per annum, an executive secretary at not to exceed \$15,111 per annum, and a clerical assistant at not to exceed \$12,921 per annum in lieu of the positions heretofore authorized by Senate Resolution 158, agreed to December 9, 1941, Public Law 86-30, approved May 20, 1959, and Senate Resolution 240, agreed to January 24, 1952."

On page 3, after line 14, insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS"

"For offices of the majority and minority whips, \$68,730: *Provided*, That effective November 1, 1969, the whips may each appoint and fix the compensation of an administrative assistant at not to exceed \$30,003 per annum, and an executive secretary at not to exceed \$15,111 per annum."

On page 3, after line 20, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN"

"For office of the Chaplain, \$17,185: *Provided*, That effective November 1, 1969, the compensation of the Chaplain shall be \$10,074 per annum and he shall be subject to election at the beginning of each Congress: *Provided further*, That the Chaplain may appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary at not to exceed \$8,541 per annum."

On page 4, after line 2, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY"

"For Office of the Secretary, \$1,675,448, including \$144,673 required for the purpose specified and authorized by section 74b of Title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That effective November 1, 1969, the Secretary may fix the compensation of the Assistant Secretary at not to exceed \$11,826 per annum, employ and fix the compensation of a Special Assistant at not to exceed \$10,293 per annum in lieu of an Assistant at \$8,760 per annum, employ and fix the compensation of an Editor, Digest at not to exceed \$21,024 per annum, an Assistant Editor, Digest at not to exceed \$18,396 per annum, and a Clerk, Digest at not to exceed \$8,541 per annum: *Provided further*, That, effective November 1, 1969, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a Comptroller of the Senate at a salary of \$35,250 per annum, and a Secretary to the Comptroller at a salary of not to exceed \$12,921 per annum, and the allowance for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is hereby made available for personnel at such titles and per annum rates as may be necessary, at no time exceeding an aggregate of \$249,660."

On page 4, after line 23, insert:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES"

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, \$4,017,014."

On page 5, after line 2, insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES"

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$115,619."

On page 5, after line 6, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$115,619."

On page 5, after line 9, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS"

"For administrative and clerical assistants to Senators, \$24,656,608: *Provided*, That the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Connecticut shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of three million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants: *Provided further*, That, effective November 1, 1969, paragraph (1) of section 105(d) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, as amended (2 U.S.C. 61-1 (d)), is amended by increasing each of the amounts in the table therein relating to Senators' clerk hire allowances by \$23,652, and paragraph (2)(i) of such section is amended to read as follows: '(i) the salary of two em-

ployees may be fixed at gross rates of not more than \$23,652 per annum.'."

At the top of page 6, insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$4,915,909: Provided, That effective November 1, 1969, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to employ the following additional employees: A Systems Programmer at \$15,987 per annum, a Production Manager at \$14,454 per annum, an Applications Programmer at \$13,797 per annum, an Operator at \$10,074 per annum, an Operator at \$9,417 per annum, and six plainclothesmen, Police Force, at \$8,760 per annum each in lieu of six Privates at \$8,322 per annum each."

On page 6, after line 11, insert:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY

"For the offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, \$196,612."

On page 6, after line 15, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

"For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$374,100."

On page 6, after line 18, insert:

"PAYMENT TO WIDOW OF DECEASED SENATOR

"For payment to Louella Dirksen, widow of Everett McKinley Dirksen, late a Senator from the State of Illinois, \$49,500."

At the top of page 7, insert:

**"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE
SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES**

"For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$236,720 for each such Committee; in all, \$473,440."

On page 7, after line 5, insert:

"AUTOMOBILES AND MAINTENANCE

"For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President Pro Tempore, one for the Majority Leader, and one for the Minority Leader, \$50,880."

On page 7, after line 10, insert:

"FURNITURE

"For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, \$31,190: Provided, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

On page 7, after line 15, insert:

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including \$431,775 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, \$6,646,755, of which amount \$6,000 is hereby made available for obligations incurred in fiscal year 1968."

At the top of page 8, insert:

"FOLDING DOCUMENTS

"For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding \$2.82 per hour per person, \$46,355."

On page 8, after line 4, insert:

"MAIL TRANSPORTATION

"For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$16,560."

On page 8, after line 8, insert:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For Miscellaneous Items, exclusive of labor, \$5,708,986 including \$497,000 for pay-

ment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with Section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961, and \$15,000 for expenses of the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Senate."

On page 8, after line 14, insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous Items, fiscal year 1969', \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries, officers and employees, Senate, fiscal year 1969'."

On page 8, after line 18, insert:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For postage stamps for the Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, \$240; and for air mail and special delivery stamps for the Office of the Secretary, \$350; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$215; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, \$119,328: Provided, That the maximum allowance per capita of \$960 is increased to \$1,056 for the fiscal year 1970 and thereafter: Provided further, That Senators from States partially or wholly west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$264 each fiscal year; in all, \$120,133."

On page 9, after line 3, insert:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$363,600; and for stationery for Committees and officers of the Senate, \$14,250; in all, \$377,850: Provided, That effective with the fiscal year 1970 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$3,600 per annum: Provided further, That section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1969, (Public Law 90-417, approved July 23, 1968) is hereby made applicable to the President of the Senate."

On page 9, after line 14, insert:

"COMMUNICATIONS

"For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for payment of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, in addition, to those otherwise authorized, \$15,150."

On page 9, after line 22, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Effective October 1, 1969, the third paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957, as amended (2 U.S.C. 53), is amended by striking out '\$300' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$400', and by inserting before the colon preceding the proviso therein a comma and the following: 'or incurred for subscriptions to newspapers, magazines, periodicals, or clipping or similar services'."

On page 10, after line 7, insert:

"Effective July 1, 1969, the third paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as amended (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by striking out the portion thereof relating to payments from the Contingent Fund of the Senate and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The Contingent Fund of the Senate is hereafter made available for reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred by Senators in traveling, on official business, by the nearest usual route, between Washington, District of Columbia, and any point in their home States, for not to exceed twelve round trips (or the equivalent thereof in one-way trips) in each fiscal year'."

On page 10, after line 21, insert:

"Section 6(c) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-603(c)), is amended by inserting after 'Senate and

House of Representatives' the words 'Comptroller of the Senate,'"

On page 11, after line 2, insert:

"Effective July 1, 1969, the first sentence in the second paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962, as amended (2 U.S.C. 127), is amended to read as follows: 'The contingent fund of the Senate shall be available for the payment of mileage, to be computed at 10 cents per mile by the nearest usual route, between Washington, District of Columbia, and a point in the home State of the Senator involved, for not to exceed eight round trips made by employees in each Senator's office in any fiscal year, such payment to be made only upon vouchers approved by the Senator containing a certification by such Senator that such travel was performed in line of official duty, but the mileage allowed for any such trip (1) shall not exceed the round trip mileage by the nearest usual route between Washington, District of Columbia, and the residence city of the Senator involved, or between Washington, District of Columbia, and any other place in such State at which the Senator maintains an office pursuant to the provisions of the second paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957, as amended (2 U.S.C. 52), whichever is greater, and (2) shall not include travel by an employee to his initial place of employment.'

On page 12, after line 3, insert:

"No part of any appropriation disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be available for payment of compensation to any person for any period for which such person is carried in a leave without pay status from a position in or under any department or agency of the Government."

On page 21, line 14, after the word "Committee", strike out "\$441,165" and insert "\$477,165".

One page 28, line 10, after "\$2,000,000", insert a comma and "of which \$250,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for 'Preservation of Historic Properties', National Park Service, Department of the Interior for the conduct of studies to determine the feasibility and cost of restoring the West Central Front of the Capitol without regard to any other Act".

On page 28, line 24, after the word "amended", strike out "\$842,100" and insert "\$874,100".

On page 28, after line 24, insert:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at \$1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$3,310,000, of which not to exceed \$35,000 shall be available for expenditure without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended."

On page 29, after line 12, insert:

"EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING SITE

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States, in addition to the real property heretofore acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United

States Senate under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028) and Public Law 85-591, approved August 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 495-496), by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, for purposes of extension of such site, all publicly or privately owned property contained in lots 863, 864, 892, 893, 894, and 905 in Square 725 in the District of Columbia, and all alleys or parts of alleys and streets contained within the curblines surrounding said square, as such square appears on the records in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia as of the date of the approval of this Act: *Provided*, That any proceeding for condemnation brought under this Act shall be conducted in accordance with the Act of December 23, 1963 (16 D.C. Code, secs. 1351-1368): *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States and any alleys or parts of alleys and streets contained within the curblines surrounding Square 725 shall, upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol, and any alleys or parts of alleys or streets contained within the curblines of said square shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, appointed pursuant to Part III of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of such Commission: *Provided further*, That, upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this Act, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized to provide for the demolition and/or removal of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to use the property for Government purposes or to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to incur any necessary expenses in connection therewith: *Provided further*, That the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this Act and such property shall become a part of the United States Capitol Grounds; and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$1,250,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 31, after line 14, insert:

"SENATE GARAGE

"For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, \$76,600."

On page 35, at the beginning of line 15, strike out "\$19,085,000" and insert "\$19,061,500".

On page 35, line 24, after the word "copyrights", strike out "\$3,128,000" and insert "\$3,124,000".

On page 37, line 18, after the word "amended", strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$6,997,000".

On page 41, line 12, after the word "libraries", strike out "\$9,750,000" and insert "\$9,650,000".

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a structural history of the Capitol prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which I think will put the whole matter in better perspective.

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

[From the Library of Congress, Government and General Research Division, Oct. 8, 1969]

STRUCTURAL AND/OR ARCHITECTURAL CHANGES MADE IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL, 1793 TO DATE

(Research by Helen Dalrymple)

The first cornerstone of the United States Capitol was laid by George Washington on September 18, 1793, but the building as we know it was not completed until 1800, when the Olmsted terraces were finished. During the 20th century, the roof over the original building was replaced, the House and Senate chambers were remodeled and provided with new roofs, and the east front of the Capitol was extended some 32 feet. Discussions of a proposed extension of the west central front of the Capitol began in 1964 and continue to the present time.

Construction of the Capitol, and proposed modifications of it, have engendered a good deal of discussion through the years, as might be expected with a building to which so much sentiment and tradition are attached. This memorandum will set out, in chronological order, the principal phases of construction of, or modifications to, the Capitol, along with a short description of any controversies that accompanied the proposed changes.

1792: George Washington and Thomas Jefferson decided to hold a competition for designs for the Capitol and the "President's House." James Hoban's design was accepted for the White House, but it was not until the following year that Dr. William Thornton's plans for the Capitol met with general approval.

1793: First cornerstone was laid September 18.

1793-1829: During this period the "old Capitol", consisting of the center section (but not the large dome which surmounts it today), and the north and south wings, or the old Supreme Court chamber and Statuary Hall, was constructed according to Dr. Thornton's basic design. James Hoban, Stephen Hallet, and George Hadfield, successively, were hired to supervise the execution of Thornton's plans for the Capitol, but disagreements with Thornton, who was made a Commissioner of the District of Columbia in 1794 and continued to exercise ultimate authority over the design of the building, led to the dismissal of Hallet and then Hadfield, after Hoban had been put in charge of construction of the White House.

In 1803 Benjamin Latrobe was given the job of superintending the construction of the Capitol. Like his predecessors, he too immediately wanted to modify Thornton's design but Thornton, with Jefferson's support, overruled him. Latrobe and Thornton continued to exchange charges and counter-charges, even after 1805 when Thornton had ceased to defend officially the integrity of his design. During the 15 years that Latrobe was associated with the Capitol, however, he had a considerable effect on its ultimate design. He tore out some of the work of his predecessors, partially necessitated by the burning of the Capitol in 1814 by the British, changed wood floor and partition construction to masonry, and designed the wing

west of the rotunda and the present East portico and steps. These steps changed the main entrance from the West, where Thornton had planned it, to the East. In addition Latrobe was responsible for the design of all the interiors of the central portion, and he completely changed Thornton's plan for the House and Senate chambers. Conflict between Latrobe and the new commissioner, appointed in 1816 to superintend the construction of the Capitol, led to Latrobe's resignation in 1817.

Charles Bulfinch, a prominent Boston architect, was appointed Architect of the Capitol in 1818 to fill the vacancy left by Latrobe's resignation. Realizing the difficulties of explaining architectural plans to members of Congress, one of the first tasks Bulfinch undertook was to have a wooden model of the Capitol prepared. It showed various alternative schemes designed by Thornton and Latrobe along with his suggestions for the central rotunda and dome, which had not yet been constructed. This apparently was a wise bit of strategy because appropriations allowing him to begin work on the central portion of the building were quickly approved. Although we could find no real controversy over the early construction of the building among members of Congress, there was a continuing concern over the cost of the building and the long period of time required for its completion. In addition, during these early years, some members felt that the Capital City would be removed from Washington at some point, and they were reluctant to see so much money being spent on the Capitol building in Washington.

Bulfinch completed the north and south wings, whose restoration after the 1814 fire had been begun by Latrobe, and designed and constructed the central portion of the Capitol with a wooden dome covered with copper. He stayed on as Architect of the Capitol until June of 1829, when he was officially notified that his office would be terminated that month (in accordance with a law passed by Congress the previous year abolishing the position of Architect of the Capitol).

Continuing acoustical problems with the restored House chamber were a matter of some concern to members of the House, as described by the following excerpt from I. T. Frary's "They Built the Capitol" (1940):

"The restored Hall of Representatives . . . was found to have perpetuated in it the echoes that had caused so much difficulty and criticism in the past. Committees were appointed to investigate the difficulty. Bulfinch was called upon for his opinion, as were William Strickland and Robert Mills, both of whom had formerly been assistants and associates of Latrobe.

"A variety of theories and suggestions were propounded and expounded, no two of which were in agreement, and none of which seemed to have much effect in remedying the poor acoustics. A canvas ceiling was stretched above the columns. This stopped the echoes, but also stopped the voice of the speaker, a consummation that would certainly not prove appealing to a legislative body all primed with pent up oratory. A wooden partition was built between the columns, but this came down ignominiously after a week's trial.

"Sunken panels were prescribed in place of the flat, painted ceiling. One expert wanted the floor raised; another contended that the ceiling should be lowered; a third proposed a rearrangement of the furnishings; and after all suggestions had been discussed or tried out, over a period of fifteen years or more, they apparently gave it up as a bad job. Today the room is used as a repository for statues of the great and near great, and the guides entertain visitors by demonstrating the freak echoes which enable them to hear whispers from certain remote positions on the floor."

Members continued to complain about the poor acoustics until 1857 when they moved into their new chamber in the just completed south wing. It is interesting to note that in 1902, when the roof of the old building was reconstructed, consideration was given to retention of the same old acoustical effects in Statuary Hall which had fascinated visitors for so many years.

Frary reports that the cost of the old building, including restoration after destruction by the British, was \$2,432,851.

1851-65: By 1850 it had been determined that an enlargement of the Capitol was necessary to accommodate the two legislative bodies. Robert Mills, Architect and Engineer for the Government (but not officially designated Architect of the Capitol) submitted plans to the Congress for the extension of the Capitol by the addition of two wings, to the north and south of the original building. The Senate, however, insisted that a competition be held for the design of the extension, with the additional proviso that the plans would become the property of the government so that the best features of each could be combined. Although the Senate instructed Mills to draw up final plans upon the completion of the competition, President Fillmore decided to appoint Thomas U. Walter as architect of the extension of the Capitol. Under Walter's guidance, the north and south wings and the greatly enlarged Capitol dome were constructed between 1851 and 1865.

The first appropriation, \$100,000, was approved by the Congress in 1850, and the cornerstone was laid on July 4, 1851 in the south wing. Construction began immediately, but was interrupted during the winter months of 1851-52 because the Congress couldn't agree on further appropriations. Allegations of fraud and poor construction methods were made (initiated apparently by the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds because the construction of the extension had been placed under the Department of the Interior, and by unsuccessful bidders on construction contracts) and committees were appointed in both the Senate and House to look into the matter. The committees reported that the foundations were sound, that they would support the weight of the buildings, and in April, 1852, a further appropriation of \$500,000 was approved.

In 1853, concern was expressed by some members of Congress that the Architect (Walter) had too much authority under the law, since he could draw funds from the Treasury on his own signature. President Franklin Pierce, newly elected, decided to give the War Department overall supervisory jurisdiction over the construction, and he appointed an Army Engineer, a Captain Meigs, to take charge of the work. Meigs and Walter got along fairly well, each respecting the other's ability, until 1857 when Meigs apparently tried to assert his authority over Walter. In 1859 Walter went directly to President Buchanan about Meigs, and Meigs was discharged.

It appears that the extension of the Capitol was a matter on which all members of Congress were agreed. Their old chambers were so unsatisfactory from the point of comfort, ventilation, and acoustics, that they felt that improved accommodations were mandatory. There was generally a discussion, however, each time additional appropriations were requested for the extension, because they were so far in excess of original estimates. Originally it was thought that the extension would cost between \$1.5 and \$2 million; in fact, the two wings came to a total cost of \$8,075,299, and this figure did not even include the cost of the new dome (\$1,047,291). After construction was well underway, though, it was acknowledged that the wisest course was to go ahead and complete the building. But this did not prevent certain members from taking the floor to complain about the excessive expense involved. In addition, the members seemed to occupy themselves with many of the details of the construction, ranging from the types of bricks to be used, the artistic decorations for the new wings, and of course, the seating arrangements for the new chambers. We quote below, from *Documentary History of the Construction and Development of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds*, to illustrate how some members of Congress felt about the Capitol extension.

[Senator Borland of Texas, April, 1852]: I am opposed to the extension of this Capitol, because I believe it is unnecessary. I do believe (and there are others who agree with me) that the room within the external walls of the present building is all-sufficient, if properly appropriated, for all our purposes, and will be for fifty years to come. . . .

But even if the extension were necessary, I am opposed to it on the plan proposed. It may be deemed presumption in one of my poor judgment, yet I do say, that, in my opinion, the proposed extension of the Capitol, with such wings as are spread out before us, and the proportion they sustain towards the rest of the building, will make a structure which I can call by no other name than *architectural monstrosity*, the like of which has never been seen in any civilized country on the face of the earth. . . . It will resemble, more nearly than anything which suggests a comparison, a mammoth brick-kiln, or some Mexican hacienda, which, as everyone knows, is the very burlesque of all architectural proportion. . . .

Consider also the inconvenience that will result from the proposed arrangement. The two Chambers of Congress will be about six hundred feet apart; and in conducting the intercourse of the two Houses, the distance to be traveled backwards and forwards will be something like a quarter of a mile!

Then, again, when these two wings are erected, and the two Chambers are established, one in each, what is to be done with the present building? It will be a series of great *lumber rooms*, making up an immense covered way from one Chamber to the other! Nothing more.

[Senator Houston of Texas, May, 1858]: . . . I have observed some of them [statues being prepared for placement in Capitol]; and the goddess of Liberty, I believe, is one. I am an admirer of statuary, but I cannot say that I am a critic, or even an amateur, in that department of art. It does seem to me that it is a figure which makes rather a queer display in the Capitol. In the first place, I object to its attitude. It appears to me to be in anguish—drawn back in the most ungraceful and ungainly attitude for a lady. [Laughter.] It appears to be in torment; and had it been physical, I should have imagined that it really had a boil under the arm. [Laughter.]

Although the original plans for the extension of the Capitol did not make provision for replacing the Bulfinch dome, it soon became apparent that the increased size of the Capitol completely dwarfed the old dome. Thomas Walter accordingly drew up plans for a new and much larger dome, to be constructed of cast iron, and in 1855 an appropriation of \$100,000 to replace the dome was made. The vote in the Committee of the Whole in the House was tied, but it was approved when the chairman voted for it. Two days later the appropriation was passed by the House with no opposition. Since the original appropriation was made before any real estimate of the ultimate cost was made, appropriations for the dome, too, met some opposition in the Congress because of the expense involved.

Construction of the Capitol extension was, of course, complicated by the commencement of the Civil War, but President Lincoln insisted that the work be carried on as a symbol of the permanency of the Union. The Statue of Freedom was bolted in place on the new dome in December, 1863, but there were still a number of interior details to be completed when Thomas Walter submitted his resignation (again because of a conflict with other governmental authorities with jurisdiction over the Capitol) in May, 1865. However, during his tenure in office, he had greatly modified the Capitol building and had given it a new dome which today is regarded as a symbol of the United States.

1874-92: Supervision for landscaping the grounds of the Capitol was placed in the hands of Frederick Law Olmsted, the most prominent landscape architect of his time. The broad plaza on the east was planned by Olmsted, as well as the marble terraces and the grand stairway on the west as we know them today. The work on the grounds, including grading, boundary walls, and other features of the plan, was done between 1875 and 1881, at which time Olmsted requested an appropriation for the marble stairway and terraces on the west; these had not been authorized in the original bill. Construction of the terraces, which included space beneath them for committee rooms, was begun in 1883 and completed in 1892. Since this work was purely architectural in nature, the work was carried out under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, and Olmsted resigned in 1885.

As with some of the earlier improvements to the Capitol, there did not appear to be any real opposition to the landscaping of the grounds, except for the inconveniences it caused and the amount of money it cost. (Frary put the total cost of the terraces and landscaping at \$3,626,579.) There was considerable discussion in the Senate in 1886 on an amendment proposed by Senator Hale of Maine to the appropriations bill for sundry civil expenses providing that the committee rooms constructed beneath the new terraces should have windows to the outside. The amendment was finally ruled out of order. Hale argued that the rooms should have natural light, while others insisted that to put windows in the terrace wall would completely destroy the intended architectural effect of a solid foundation supporting the Capitol.

The completion of the Olmsted terraces gave the West Front of the Capitol the aspect that is so familiar today.

1902: A gas explosion and fire occurred in the old Supreme Court Chamber in 1898, bringing the condition of the roof over the old Capitol building to the attention of the Congress. In 1902, therefore, the roofs of the central portion of the Capitol, including that over the old Supreme Court and Statuary Hall, were fireproofed and reconstructed. The outline of the new roof conformed generally to the old, but the two small domes were made somewhat lower. According to the report of Elliott Woods, Architect of the Capitol, this change was made "so that in case the Walter plan for the extension of the east front is carried out, the eastern front of the Capitol will conform to the perspective view as made by Mr. Walter." In Statuary Hall, as mentioned above, care was taken that the new ceiling conform largely to the contours of the old in order that the odd acoustics, or echoes, of the room be preserved. The total cost was approximately \$170,000.

1949-50: During this period the roofs of the House and Senate wings were reconstructed and the two chambers were remodeled. The roof over the House Chamber had been supported by temporary steel supports since 1940, when it had been determined the roof was unsafe. Reconstruction of the roofs was delayed, however, because of the war. Some objections were raised in the House to the proposed remodeling of the House Chamber because of the history associated with it, and to the plan for removing the State seals from the old ceiling. The comments of Representative Huber of Ohio are typical of those made by opponents of the proposed remodeling:

"Mr. Chairman, we are only the temporary custodians of this Chamber. It belongs to posterity and should be preserved. We have over here on the other side the old Senate Chamber. It is regarded as such a holy of holies that they have a fence around it and we are not even permitted to go in and walk around. Yet we would change the architecture of this Chamber overnight."

"My amendment [to the deficiency appropriation bill] will not interfere with the letting of this contract. They can go ahead and make the necessary repairs and do the remodeling of the House Chamber, but it will not be necessary to take out the skylights and change the basic architecture. It is very little consolation to think that the State seals overhead will be taken out and deposited in a certain place in your home State. We are spending a lot of money on other projects and I do not see any reason in the world why we cannot safeguard this historic Chamber and keep it so that generations to come may visit and see it in its historic state. There is no reason, in my opinion, why it should not be preserved."

Mr. Huber's amendment to retain the existing architecture and skylights of the House Chamber was defeated, and the proposed remodeling of both chambers, incorporating design features from sources of Federal architecture used by Thornton and Latrobe in other sections of the Capitol, was begun. During the construction period, the House met in the caucus room of the Longworth Building, and the Senate met in the old Supreme Court Chamber. Both bodies were able to move into their newly refurbished quarters in January, 1951. The cost of the roof reconstruction and the remodeling of the two chambers amounted to \$5,102,000.

1958-62: Extension of the East Front of the Capitol had first been proposed by Thomas Walter, the architect responsible for building the north and south wings and the enlarged dome on the Capitol in the 1850's. In 1904 Congress had established a joint commission to study the extension proposal, and they proposed two different schemes, A and B, for such an extension. Scheme A recommended an extension of 12 feet 10 inches, while Scheme B recommended an extension of 32½ feet. David Lynn, an assistant to the Architect of the Capitol and later Architect of the Capitol himself, made certain modifications in Scheme B, which were accepted by the commission.

In 1955 Congress approved appropriations for the extension of the East Front, with a provision that it be "in substantial accordance with Scheme B of the architectural plan submitted by a joint commission of Congress and reported to Congress on March 3, 1905." Opposition to the extension began to develop in 1957, and hearings were held in early 1958 on a bill which would have eliminated the requirement that the extension be carried out in accord with Scheme B. The bill was reported to the Senate, but it failed to pass by a vote of 32 to 47.

Opponents of the East Front extension argued that it would destroy the authenticity and integrity of the Capitol, that it would sacrifice historic values to the ever-growing need of legislators for more space, and that its execution was to be carried out in accordance with a plan prepared some fifty years earlier when the needs of the Nation were vastly different.

Proponents of the plan argued that the extension was a completion of Walter's original plan for the Capitol, which was not carried out because of the Civil War, that the existing overhang of the skirt of the dome over the East Portico was a serious architectural defect, and that the original sandstone wall of the East Front was in a serious state of deterioration.

Despite the objections of many members of Congress, the American Institute of Architects, and others, when S. 2883 failed to pass the Senate, the way for construction was, for all intents and purposes, cleared. Construction began in 1958 and was completed in 1962. The cost of the extension, including repairs to the dome, furnishings for the new areas, and improved lighting throughout the building, was \$24 million.

1969: This brings us to the present time, when discussions of a proposed extension of the West Front are underway. We will not

go into this dispute, since it is really beyond the intended scope of this memorandum, except to say that, as in 1958, there are strong feelings both for and against the proposal. There is no question that the sandstone West Front is deteriorating; supports have been put in place to insure safety. Opponents argue that the one remaining original wall of the Capitol should be restored instead of covered up, while proponents feel that the extension of the West Front would be a better solution. The issue has yet to be resolved.

In addition to this memorandum, we are enclosing copies of pictures of the Capitol at different stages of construction, which we thought would be helpful in illustrating the many different phases in the development of the Capitol. We hope you will find this information helpful, and that you will feel free to call on us again in the future if we can be of some further assistance.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I shall be pleased to answer any questions any Member may have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I noticed in the report, as well as in the bill, that \$800,000 is being added for the WATS system. I understood from the chairman of the committee that any Senator who desires to install this system in his office will have to contribute at least 50 percent of the money now allowed to him for telephone service. Is that correct?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does that \$800,000 cover?

Mr. MONTOYA. That covers the estimated expense, assuming that all Senators would subscribe to the WATS line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Assuming that each Senator does surrender 50 percent of his telephone allowance, will that cover the entire cost of the WATS system?

Mr. MONTOYA. The total telephone allowance used last year amounted to \$720,000. Assuming that one-half is surrendered, that would amount to \$360,000. I do not want to deceive the Senator from Louisiana, or the Senate. We have no accurate figures except this possible projection which might indicate a more definite figure. Thus, that is about all I can say.

I should like to relate to the Senator my own personal experience. I have an FTS line in New Mexico which I pay for out of my own personal resources. I feel that I need it to service the needs of my constituents and to promote the efficiency of my office. That is why I have it. I am not shedding any tears over the expense. The point I want to make is that since I have been using the FTS line, for which I pay close to \$300, my telephone expense has gone down in actual use to 40 percent of my allowance. I have the figures here from the Sergeant of Arms, which I obtained a few minutes ago. This line can be used only from New Mexico to Washington. Thus, on the basis of my own experience, if I were to have a WATS line from Washington to New Mexico, I would probably use less than 40 percent. Therefore, from my own experience, I feel that this saving will exceed \$360,000 and amortize the expense of the FTS line or the WATS line quicker than we can anticipate from available figures now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator use the line that he has just described for personal business at all?

Mr. MONTOYA. No, I do not.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is strictly for business then?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I go back to my earlier question: If each Senator were to install a WATS line as provided in the bill, the reimbursement from the telephone allowance would amount to what percentage of the cost of the WATS system?

Mr. MONTOYA. I would say perhaps between 30 and 40 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, it would cost the Government from 40 to 50 percent more than the current telephone expense.

Mr. MONTOYA. I would say that, in round figures. May I also point out to the Senator from Louisiana that if a Senator has a WATS line in his office—

Mr. ELLENDER. I have an FTS.

Mr. MONTOYA. This is similar, except an FTS is a Government line and the WATS line is a leased line. But if a Senator has a WATS line in his office and he has processed a matter for a constituent of his, and it is an urgent matter—or perhaps it is not urgent—if one of the staff members uses that telephone to call the constituent, he saves the time consumed in writing a letter. My experience in the field has been that I have saved much on clerk hire by virtue of the FTS line which I have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because the Senator can answer a constituent immediately.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is right. I cannot estimate what that means in efficiency and clerk hire. About a month ago I had the financial clerk get a compilation of what I had returned in salary hire since I have been in Congress. I do not have the exact figures before me, but I had turned back approximately \$300,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that partly due to the fact that the Senator has a WATS line?

Mr. MONTOYA. No; I was turning that money back before the use of the FTS, but I recognize that the use of the WATS line, which creates better efficiency, obviates the necessity of more correspondence in the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, the FTS line can be used by a Senator only from 5 p.m. to 9 a.m. next morning.

Mr. MONTOYA. The one that we have now, yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And on holidays and Sundays.

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the cost of that is only \$30. Why should the WATS cost more? Is it because it can be used continuously, at any time of the day?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes, obviously.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason for it?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 4 of the bill the committee has suggested a Comptroller of the Senate be provided, at a certain salary, and that an assistant be appointed, and that the entire amount for clerical assistance shall not be more than \$249,660. Is that sum in addition to what it costs for the present financial clerk and staff?

October 21, 1969

Mr. MONTOYA. The committee contemplates that in addition to the financial clerk, we would have a Comptroller. We are providing for additional funds only for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not an addition? I thought it was an addition to the force he now has.

Mr. MONTOYA. Two new positions are created—Comptroller and secretary to the Comptroller.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, this is not in addition to what the Senate pays to the financial clerk and all of his employees?

Mr. MONTOYA. This is an additional allowance for two employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the \$249,660, which would be for additional clerk hire? Would he not be permitted to also add clerk hire in addition to the two positions the Senator mentioned?

Mr. MONTOYA. No; he will not be allowed any funds in addition to that previously authorized for the financial clerk and disbursing office staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me put the question this way: How much more will it cost to operate the financial clerk's office with this provision in the bill than it now costs us? I am not opposing it; I want to clarify it.

Mr. MONTOYA. It will not cost any more except for the salary provided for the two new positions, Comptroller and a secretary for the Comptroller.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the financial clerk spend now? Does the Senator mean to say it is included in the \$249,660?

Mr. MONTOYA. The present disbursing office allowance is \$249,660, excluding the salary of the financial clerk.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, all the committee has added to the present amount to be spent by the financial clerk is the salary of the Comptroller, which is fixed at \$35,259, and then a secretary to the Comptroller? Is that all the committee has added?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the stationary allowance, the Senator has added \$600 a year. What is the need for that?

Mr. MONTOYA. Many Senators have been facing additional paper requirements to pay for the new machinery they have installed in their offices. This is the only fund they can utilize for the purchase of the paper. We have not had an adjustment in this recently.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought we increased it considerably in the last couple of years.

Mr. MONTOYA. As I stated before in my statement, I met with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of the Ethics Committee, and we discussed recommendations made by the staffs of the three committees. We also sent out a questionnaire, under the name of Senator Hayden, before the first of the year, before his term expired, to each Senator asking specific questions about specific allowances Senators had had theretofore.

When I became chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I followed up with an inquiry letter to each of the Senators who had not responded to the Hayden letter. We received the responses which

we tabulated. Of the responses we received on specific categories, such as travel allowance and additional stationery allowance, every Senator was in accord that they should be increased.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means every Senator who answered it, because I did not.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is what I said; every Senator who answered. It was the unanimous recommendation of the staffs of the three committees and the subcommittee, and was agreed to by the chairman of the Ethics Committee and by the chairman of the Rules Committee, that we should increase the allowance \$600.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be \$3,600 for Senators.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is right; from \$3,000 to \$3,600.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much does each Member of the House of Representatives receive, does the Senator know?

Mr. MONTOYA. \$3,000. I wish to state also to the Senator from Louisiana—I know he is aware of it, but I should like for the RECORD to show it—that if any Senator does not use all his allowance, the remainder reverts, not to the Senator, but to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was an amendment originally adopted last year.

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it applies only to the Senate, and not to the House of Representatives, as I understand.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason I did not answer the questionnaire the Senator sent to me was that, as I recall, last year I returned half of what was allotted to me, or about \$1,500, and I am just wondering what the stationery account is being used for.

Mr. President, I have other questions that will come up when I offer certain amendments; and if there is anything I say that is not in accord with the record, I request that the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. MONTOYA. I shall be more than happy to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because, as the Senator knows, this was put on my desk only yesterday—as a matter of fact, I believe it was printed last night—and I did not have the opportunity to go through all of the record of the hearings, and for that reason I am not as well acquainted with the contents of the bill, the hearings record, and the report as I should be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment, I wish to say I am impressed by the way in which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, has handled this bill. This is one of the most difficult appropriation bills to handle, because it hits Senators where they live—and I mean literally where they live: It affects our allowances, and it affects the amount of space we have. It is a complicated bill, and one that affects Senators' sensibilities. The Senator from New Mexico has handled it with great tact and sensitivity, and, while I may disagree with him on a few points, I think he has done an excellent job.

AMENDMENT NO. 251

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 251, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 28, strike out lines 8 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof:

"WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

"For the conduct of studies to determine the feasibility and cost of restoring the west-central front of the capitol, without regard to any other act, \$250,000, which shall be transferred to the appropriation for 'Preservation of Historic Properties', National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, this amendment is the same amendment that I proposed to the committee when the bill was considered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed; this is the amendment that the Senator from Louisiana proposed in the committee, where it lost by a tie vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. A tie vote, 6 to 6.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join the Senator in sponsoring his amendment. I noticed this morning he was offering the amendment I offered in committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor. Already the Senators from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE and Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) are shown as co-sponsoring the amendment; and, in addition, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would strike \$1,750,000 from the bill. These funds are currently earmarked for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications, and for associated expenses in connection with the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

The bill as it passed the House contained \$2,000,000 for extension planning. However, I am happy to say that the Senate Appropriations Committee felt that a restoration study should be made and thus reduced funds for extension planning by \$250,000, channeling this money into a restoration study.

But this action still leaves us in somewhat of a dilemma. We appear to be proceeding along two mutually exclusive courses. On the one hand we are giving the Architect of the Capitol the green light to proceed with detailed plans for extension of the west front. On the other hand we are commissioning a study which could well form the basis for a

congressional decision to restore the west front—thus preserving the last exterior portion of the original Capitol and also preserving a great deal of money as well. If we decide to restore on the basis of the study a great deal of the \$1,750,000, if not all of it, will have been spent to no good purpose.

Mr. President, this morning's New York Times commented on this issue directly and, I thought, with great persuasiveness. I should like to read the short editorial from the New York Times dealing with this subject matter. The title of the editorial is "Affront to the Capitol," and it reads as follows:

The Senate, in an excess of diplomatic zeal, is doing its best to have it both ways on the West Front of the Capitol. According to the Appropriations bill due on the Senate floor, \$1.75 million of the \$2 million already appropriated by the House would be voted to start work on the extravagantly unnecessary expansion scheme favored by Mr. Stewart, the nonarchitect of the Capitol. At the same time \$250,000 would be appropriated for a study by the National Park Service on the feasibility of restoring the West Front.

That is certainly a glorious contradiction in terms and a superb double-headed political ploy—\$250,000 for preservation and \$1.75 million for destruction—take your choice. The \$1.75 million would just be the push to get the ball rolling on a grotesque \$45-million rebuilding scheme that could rise to \$70 million without even trying. It is a proposal to which the professional world of architects, historians and environmentalists and a large number of thinking and feeling citizens are violently opposed. It enjoys favor with few except the architect of the Capitol and his architects who will do the job.

The Senate could demonstrate a fine sense of economy and art by eliminating the \$1.75 million and voting only the \$250,000 to the Park Service for an immediate preservation study. This is one case where the issue is clear: Spare Mr. Stewart's feelings or spare the Capitol.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say, in the first place, that I have received a communication from the architects of Florida, through their organization, the Florida Association of Architects, supporting the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin and others, and stating that under no circumstances do they want to see destroyed this original west front of the Capitol, which has so much historic value, with which point I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will be dealing in his speech.

In the second place, I wish to say that I took this same position in committee, and that I related there the fact that, as members of the Committee on Public Works at the time of the restoration of the White House, we were faced with much the same problem: Whether to destroy the outside appearance of the White House and reconstruct it, and perhaps destroy the whole White House as it had previously existed, or, instead, to preserve all the historic values there, outside and inside, most of them dating back to the restoration after the British fire, by reenforcement work within the

walls and under the foundations of the White House.

We decided, after making a personal visit and after discussion of the matter with President Truman, who at the time was our President, that we should conserve those historic values by strengthening the interior of those walls, and strengthening the foundation.

That was done; and I may say that in spite of a little furor which was raised at the time, I have never heard since that time anything except compliments addressed to the fact that that course was followed, and that this historic value in connection with the retention of the appearance and the historically interesting things about the exterior of the White House, and many of the historic things within the White House, was well worth preserving, and that Congress preserved something of great historic interest and value to our country.

I believe that much the same thing applies in the instant case, perhaps to even a little greater degree, because now the west front is all that remains of the original sandstone structure of the Capitol, at least as I have been informed.

I think that, not only for its appearance, but for its historic interest, dating back as it does to the sandstone quarries of nearby Virginia and to the plans made by our Founding Fathers who participated at that time in planning the original Capitol, we should preserve those historic values, and I strongly support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and his associates.

I think that I made this position perfectly clear in the committee. I should like to make it equally clear in the Record at this time. I think we shall be neglecting very important historic values if we move to extend the west front of the Capitol, and thus really exterminate all possible historic values still remaining in the ancient west front of the Capitol.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator will be agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

I think that the eloquent and persuasive argument the Senator has made with reference to the preservation of the last part of the original Capitol Building, the only part that has not already been altered, is even more important than the very large amount of money involved.

I think that the Senator's comparison of this matter with the action taken with respect to the White House is excellent and should serve as a guide.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the testimony in the committee did deal with the very point he developed so well. The difference was that in the restoration and the maintenance of the west wall, it was not possible to evacuate the Capitol and do all the inner structure work that is necessary and that was possible in the day when President Truman moved to the Blair House.

As I recall the testimony from the office of the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the consideration of restoration, the fact that this building would remain a working building was one of the considerations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is exactly why I think we need a study of feasibility as well as the cost of restoring the west front.

The American Institute of Architects has told us—and I have a letter to that effect—that there would be no more inconvenience and no greater area eliminated from use with restoration than with extension. They may be right, or they may be wrong. However, until we get a study from the Park Service, it is hard to determine whether the American Institute of Architects or the Capitol Architect is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with respect to the comments made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kansas, I am sure that he has correctly reported what happened in the committee. However, I lived through the extension of the other front of the Capitol. And anyone who could say that we were not greatly disturbed in a large part of the Capitol while that extension was taking place did not survive that particular effort.

I cannot see how any more disturbance could be accomplished with reference to the restoration of the west front of the Capitol than was accomplished at that time in extending the east front of the Capitol.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the part of the Capitol in which we hold our sessions and the part of the Capitol in which the House of Representatives holds their sessions will not be disturbed in any way. This effort applies to the middle portion of the Capitol. And if some tourists are disturbed by either one of these programs, I do not think it would matter greatly. The essential business of our Government could continue. As a matter of fact, much of the business of the Government takes place in the committee rooms and in the offices of Senators and Representatives and in other portions of the establishment such as the Library of Congress.

As far as I am concerned, I do not believe there will be any material difference in the inconvenience that would be experienced.

I do think that in this country which is growing so rapidly we are forgetting many of our historic facts. It is well worthwhile to preserve this last historic vestige of the original Capitol planned by so many of our Founding Fathers.

I have never forgotten a time before I came to the Senate when I heard one of the guides talking to a group of youngsters at the corner of the House wing of the Capitol.

He explained how the site for the Capitol was chosen. He pictured it very graphically. He explained how the father of our country, President Washington, rode here on his horse with various other persons whose names I do not now recall. One was a French engineer, and there were others, including, as I

October 21, 1969

recall, Mr. Jefferson who later was President.

There was some talk of a disturbance between Jefferson and Hamilton as to where the Capitol should be and where the District of Columbia should be.

The guide pictured this notable group of our great Founding Fathers and others riding up to the spot at the top of the hill, looking over the Potomac at the Virginia hills on the one side, looking at Virginia and at Maryland, and saying, "Here will be the Capital of the United States," and then pursuing that with the construction of the original Capitol, which was a tremendous venture for that young Government and for that young and poor Nation.

I think we should preserve this part of the Capitol. I think we need to preserve the historic values in this country. And I think one of the things we need above everything else at this time is to have our people, and particularly our young people, realize what has gone on before, during the founding of this great Nation and the Capitol which in many respects has become the Capital of the free world.

Here is the last vestige of that original Capitol which is proposed to be destroyed in this well-intentioned extension which we do not need. As a matter of fact, a great many of us have rooms in the other extension that are hardly used at all. I have told the committee that if anyone wants my extra room there, he is welcome to it.

We are not using all the rooms in the other extension of the Capitol. I do not think we should talk about this tremendous extension with three dining rooms and all the other things that are mentioned and at the same time forget the value of the historic west front and destroy it completely.

It is for that reason that I shall strongly support the effort now being made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his very persuasive and eloquent appeal.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A MEMBER OF THE FRENCH SENATE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to introduce to the Senators a very distinguished visitor to our country, Senator Andre Monteil.

Senator Monteil is chairman of the Foreign Affairs and Armed Forces Committee of the French Senate. I could not help wondering if it would not be a solution to some of our problems if we were to combine the chairmanship of those two particular committees.

Senator Monteil is a former professor of literature, which likewise lends an aura of distinction to his role. He was first elected to the French Assembly in 1945. So, he has acquired a great deal of seniority. He has been State Secretary for the Navy twice, in 1950 and 1954. He was Minister of Public Health in 1954 in the government headed by Premier Mendes-France. He was first elected to the Senate in 1959 and was then re-elected in 1962.

Senator Monteil was active in the French resistance movement. He holds the Medaille de la Resistance, the Croix de Guerre, and the Bronze Star Medal of the United States. He is a member of the Legion of Honour.

One of the Senator's five sons is married, I am happy to say, to an American.

I am sure I speak for all Members of the Senate in welcoming to the Senate our most distinguished French colleague. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes so that Senators may have the privilege of meeting Senator Monteil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 3:02 p.m.

During the recess, Senator Monteil was greeted by Members of the Senate.

On expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELL-MON).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2276) to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. CARTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12982) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. CABELL, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. HOGAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Kansas, I should like to read into the RECORD a response I received from the American Institute of Architects. This is a response that came from Francis D. Lethbridge, of the AIA, who was asked by the president of the AIA to look into this matter and to answer our questions. I will read the question, which is brief, and the answer. The question is as follows:

Question. Another point made by Mr. Campioli, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, is that restoration would involve considerable inconvenience to visitors and occupants alike. He explained that the entire West Front, including Statuary Hall, would have to be vacated for 5 to 10 years. Furthermore, he stated that if the extension were approved the rooms and corridors along the West Front would remain in commission. Will you give your expert opinion of these assertions?

This is what the AIA replied:

Answer. Restoration, like Extension, will involve some inconvenience. Inconvenience to visitors, however, should be negligible in either case. Campioli's statement that the entire West Front, including Statuary Hall, would have to be vacated for 5 to 10 years, is ridiculous. There is no reason to believe that Statuary Hall would have to be vacated at all, and no reason to believe that all of the rooms on the West Front would have to be vacated for any such period of time. If the work were to proceed slowly it would not be necessary to vacate more than that portion of the offices affected and if it were to be carried out more quickly, the spaces would have to be vacated for only a fraction of the time claimed.

I might say, once again, that however one would decide on this matter, whether he would accept the word of the Architect of the Capitol or of the AIA, the answer is going to be forthcoming, I would hope, in the study that we are requesting instead of by expending this large amount of money.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I do not want to make a great point out of this particular discussion, but I think it would be helpful just to show the conflict, if nothing more, between the people who advise the committee. I have reference to page 610 of the hearings. Mr. Campioli made some reference to the complexity of the restoration work. He said and testified to the committee:

It would not be a simple restoration. It would be a most complex restoration, probably the most complex which has ever been done or would be done in this country. It could only be done safely if we were permitted to do the work like the White House was done in relatively recent years. In other words, gut most of the entire interior of the old part of the Capitol by taking the floors and arches down so that they would no longer be exerting any lateral pressure against the outside wall and vacating the west central side of the Capitol for a long period.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, so that I will not be quoting out of context that the paragraph entitled "Complexity of restoration work," found on pages 610 and 611 of the hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMPLEXITY OF RESTORATION WORK

Mr. CAMPOLI. It would not be a simple restoration. It would be a most complex restoration, probably the most complex which has ever been done or would be done in the country. It could only be done safely if we were permitted to do the work like the White House was done in relatively recent years. In other words, gut most of the entire interior of the old part of the Capitol by taking the floors and arches down so that they would no longer be exerting any lateral pressure against the outside wall and vacating the west central side of the Capitol for a long period. If the procedure followed at the

White House were possible at the Capitol, then you could proceed to restore that wall.

You could then build in expansion joints, and you would reconstruct all the interiors under modern construction methods, using masonry-bearing walls, reinforced concrete floor slabs and the arches would be put back, by use of hung ceiling construction.

To do it any other way would be very risky. I have a drawing here that I think will explain our problem. This drawing is a typical section of an arch in the building. We have two types of arches. We have a barrel arch, which is this type (see p. 663) and then we have groined arches (see p. 664), which cross each other and are much flatter in curvature. The exterior of the wall is built of sandstone, as you see here [pointing]. Some of these stones are quite large.

If any of the stones which have deteriorated, have to be removed, they would have to be removed by first removing some of the stones above and then putting them back into place after the deteriorated stone is replaced. The interior of the House side of this wall is of granite rubble stone, laid in lime mortar. The inner face of the Senate side wall is of brick, laid in lime mortar.

The core of the wall is a mass of loose material, stones dumped into place with some lime mortar and many, many voids. A hundred percent of the corings that were made of this wall in 1964 showed voids behind the sandstone.

Now the thickness of this west wall acts as a counteraction against the thrust of this arch. Any substantial removal of this sandstone would cause the interior core to fall out, and the remaining thin wall, this interior rubble, would not be sufficient to support the thrust of these arches. In addition to which these arches are superimposed with a sandfill which supports the finished floor material on the floor above.

These arches are set in lime. If this west wall were to be subjected to any substantial amount of restoration, such as the removal of any cracked stone, deteriorated stone or spalled stone, all of these arches on the west central front of the Capitol would have to be completely shored from the basement up to the roof. By such shoring we would relieve these arches from the compression that they are now subjected to; in other words, they would become dormant arches carrying no loads, as the shoring and the centering would then carry the load.

In order to install the shoring, all of the plaster would have to be removed so that the centering could be placed against the bricks. The jarring that would follow in removing these stones might very well cause the lime mortar between the bricks, which are not set with full beds, to allow the sandfill to filter through the openings in the joints.

We had that experience in the channelling operation when we installed the new electric wiring in recent years. We cut about an inch square chase into the brick arches. The resultant pounding would cause the sand to come through. Mr. Stewart experienced some of that in his own office. These are some of the basic problems of restoration.

SENATOR PEARSON. What would you do on the extension? How would your procedure differ there?

MR. CAMPOLI. On the extension we would add a structure that would act as a buttress, as shown in this dark area here [pointing].

SENATOR PEARSON. You would build against it?

MR. CAMPOLI. We would build against it. That new work would act as a buttress to keep the west wall from moving farther downhill.

SENATOR PEARSON. Thank you.

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Kansas and I disagree. Neither of us is an architect, and we are not pretending to make a

judgment on this. The point is that there is a difference of opinion. How is that difference of opinion to be resolved? We resolve it by having the Park Service, which everybody agrees is competent to make the study, go ahead and make the study—a study which I will show, in a few minutes, has not been made in anything like an adequate way.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin says, that none of us here is an architect, is true. That is also true, as the Senator knows, of J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol. He is not an architect, but was appointed Architect of the Capitol by President Eisenhower. He continues to hold that position at the pleasure of the President.

Throughout the Johnson administration, the senior Senator from Ohio hoped, and now has been hoping throughout the short period that President Nixon has been in office, that it would be the pleasure of our President to remove J. George Stewart and appoint in his place a man who is really a qualified architect, instead of one who is a former Republican Congressman from the State of Delaware and who has done a good job for the Republican National Committee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me. As my colleague knows, I am very happy to be a cosponsor of his amendment to strike out \$1,750,000 included in this bill for the purpose of implementing J. George Stewart's scheme to deface the west front of the Capitol.

Most of us assumed that this boondoggle, which was first unveiled in 1966, had been abandoned by Mr. Stewart and his backers. Now, at a time when the President of the United States has ordered a major cutback in Federal construction, when Congress is trying to hold down appropriations, when the budgetary and inflationary situations are even more critical than they were in 1966, when there are innumerable domestic crises for which adequate funds are not available, the bumbling non-Architect of the Capitol urges that taxpayers' money be spent for this unconscionable boondoggle.

I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has taken hold of this proposal and is so violently expressing his opposition to it.

Mr. Stewart says that it will cost \$45 million to do what he proposes to do; but if his earlier pet projects are any guide, this would eventually wind up costing taxpayers at least \$90 million.

It may be that something must be done to the west wall to keep it from crumbling away. However, it is incredible, but it is true, that to date no study has been made to determine how much it cost to repair it rather than to expand and alter it.

I commend my colleagues on Committee on Appropriations for recommending that \$250,000 be appropriated for a study of the feasibility and of the cost of restoring the west front of the Capitol, a study which the so-called Architect of the Capitol has never undertaken.

Qualified engineers and architects

have reported that the walls of the west front can be braced and strengthened without damage to the historical building. The Fine Arts Commission has charged that Stewart's proposal would be a national tragedy, and stated that the old walls can be repaired in their present location. It would be virtual sacrilege to destroy the noble west front of the Capitol with its classic walls and its cascading staircases without the most compelling reasons for doing so. Americans can be thankful to date this proposed senseless vandalism on a national monument has been rejected.

The fact is that the walls of the west front are not nearly in such a state of deterioration as J. George Stewart would lead us to believe. Every study made by a task force independent of the so-called Architect of the Capitol differs greatly with his conclusion that the Capitol has been in a state of near collapse since the 1950's.

In 1957 an engineering study was conducted by experts of the National Bureau of Standards. They made core samples and examined the west wall in detail. They found that much of the exterior sandstone of the Capitol was weathered but to depths no greater than one-half inch. Their report stated:

If this depth is removed by means of suitable tooling, the sandstone should be serviceable for many more years. . . .

In addition to the report of the National Bureau of Standards, a report prepared for the Architect in 1964 by the firm of Thompson & Lichtenber, engineering consultants, stated:

The structure, except for the exterior walls, has not been subjected to weathering and is not in a hazardous condition.

Furthermore, the American Institute of Architects, which represents over two-thirds of the licensed architects in the country—and I mean certified architects and not political architects such as J. George Stewart—has continually maintained that the walls are architecturally sound.

Mr. President, if the statement attributed to Benjamin Franklin, "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other," has any meaning, then it would be sheer folly to follow this most recent of J. George Stewart's recommendations. I have carefully watched the manner in which the so-called Architect of the Capitol has managed his office throughout the years I have been in the Senate. I have witnessed an unbroken series of boondoggles, of stumbling and fumbling and an unbelievable waste of taxpayers' money. Now, J. George Stewart proposes to deface the Capitol of our country.

Before any further funds are appropriated for actual work on the west front, Representatives and Senators should have available full and accurate information regarding the alternatives. A member of my staff recently asked the executive assistant in the Architect's Office for information as to the costs involved in restoration of the west front. Amazing as it may seem, he replied:

We have no breakdown of the estimates of the cost of restoration, neither the Congress nor the Commission having ordered or provided funds for that purpose. Furthermore,

our experts feel that such an estimate would be meaningless and would bear no resemblance to the final cost of restoration should that course be followed.

His latter statement is undoubtedly true if we consider how previous cost estimates of the Architect's Office usually represented half of the actual cost of completion. This is just another example of the disgraceful manner in which the Office of the Architect of the Capitol is conducted.

Over the years I have spoken out in the Senate on the shameful mismanagement of that Office. The Comptroller General has reported the lack of proper management procedures which makes it impossible for him to ascertain actual costs on various projects under the direction of the Architect.

Mr. President, if we accept the argument that more space is needed made by those favoring Stewart's proposal, why not extend the Capitol underground into the plaza on the east side. Knowledgeable architects report to me that this would be a relatively easy task. Also, that it would cost only one quarter of the proposed west front extension, requiring some 270,000 square feet of space at a cost of \$40 per square foot, or \$11 million, as opposed to \$167 per square foot, or \$45 million, for the proposed extension of the west front. There would be a savings of \$34 million of taxpayers' money. Part of this could be used for restoring the west front.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the adoption of the pending amendment. I express earnest hope that we will not permit the Architect of the Capitol to proceed with his plans to deface the west front of the Capitol. The \$1.75 million requested to prepare plans for the project would be not only an economic extravagance but senseless vandalism on a national monument.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who has been a very consistent and effective critic of the Architect of the Capitol, and he has fought long and hard against this proposal.

Mr. President, for make no mistake about it, once we have taken the first step down the extension path it will be harder to turn back. Regardless of what a restoration study shows, and I am convinced such a study will show that restoration is both feasible and far less expensive, next year the proponents of extension will point to the funds already spent on planning and talk of what a colossal waste it would be to change our course.

There are a number of reasons why we should not provide funding for planning an extension of the west front. But perhaps the most compelling is the fact that we have never had a study worthy of the name of the feasibility and cost of restoring rather than extending the west front. The Architect of the Capitol has been on record for a number of years in support of the extension of the west front. As far back as August of 1957 in a report to Speaker of the House Rayburn the Architect recommended "the adoption of scheme C, embracing all improve-

ments proposed for both the east and west sides of the Capitol." On Wednesday, June 5, 1963—6 years ago—the Architect of the Capitol told the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

I am on record with the Commission as advocating extension and reconstruction of the west front at an early date.

In view of this predisposition on the part of the Capitol Architect, should it really surprise us that the only "study" on the issue of whether to extend or restore recommended extension? This so-called study was commissioned by the Architect himself. Its total cost was \$33,500, according to a release from the Capitol Architect's Office dated March 21, 1967. It concerned itself principally with the existing condition of the Capitol—studying the stones and joints and buttresses in great detail. It gives no convincing reasons why extension is preferable to restoration. It devotes one paragraph to each of these alternatives. Yet, this is the study that the Capitol Architect, the man who commissioned the study, mind you, uses as his basis for declaring restoration infeasible. To accept this study as the completely unbiased, objective last word on the subject makes about as much sense as to let the catcher, not the umpire, call the balls and strikes.

In contract to this \$33,500 study which the Capitol Architect points to as the last word on the subject of restoration versus extension, it is noteworthy that as of that March 21, 1967 date, \$240,000 had been spent on the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of the west front extension. In this bill we propose to spend an equivalent amount on a restoration study. In this way we can know exactly what we are talking about when we discuss restoration. We will not have to accept the estimate of Mr. Campioli, the Assistant Architect, that restoration costs will be between \$10 million and \$50 million—an estimate that no logical mind could accept as the best obtainable. The Congress will be armed with the information essential to a reasoned decision.

Let us look at the cost factor. The American Institute of Architects in a letter to me dated October 1 states:

It is the considered opinion of those experts consulted by the A.I.A. that the cost of repair and restoration would probably not exceed \$10 million and that it is inconceivable that it could exceed \$20 million.

Now when the Architect of the Capitol first estimated the cost of extending the west front back in 1957 it compared favorably with this \$20 million ceiling. The estimated cost in 1957 was \$17 million. This went up to a modest, relatively, \$20 million as late as June of 1963. The estimate had ballooned to \$34 million by 1966 and we are now told that the cost will be \$45 million. In other words, the cost went up by \$3 million in the first 6 years following the extension proposal and by \$25 million in the next 6 years. If we continued to see such cost escalation and it takes another 6 years to complete an extension, the total cost will be \$70 million. The Capitol Architect's slide rule has never been so ac-

curate as to inspire us with confidence that such a further increase will not take place.

How about cost per square foot? The Rayburn Building, hardly a fine example of cost conscious construction, cost \$34.26 per square foot. The west front, assuming no cost escalation, will cost a whopping \$166.95 per square foot. Even a top-flight hospital, fully equipped with all the latest equipment only costs about \$100 a square foot or two-thirds as much as the west front extension. Does it make sense to begin a project almost five times as expensive per square foot as the Rayburn Building at a time when inflationary pressures are draining the purses of most American families and when restoration would be cheaper by far? I hardly think so.

Unfortunately, when we start to get down to brass tacks and discover just how expensive a west front extension would be and how little we know about the costs and feasibility of restoration the alarmists cry, "But the Capitol will collapse if we don't start extension." This charge is just so much poppycock. The Architect himself has never seriously claimed that the Capitol dome will come crashing to the earth if we do not extend now. In fact, even were we to provide extension funds immediately, it would take 12 to 18 months for the planning work to be completed before a hand would be laid on the west wall to begin actual construction. Mr. Campioli, the Assistant Architect, told me during hearings on the legislative appropriations bill that he would not be in a position to request funds for early phases of the construction work until next year when we consider the legislative appropriations bill for fiscal 1971. Of course it would take additional time after the bill was signed into law to let the bids for this work.

Certainly we could follow the same timetable for restoration. If a 6-month study showed that restoration was both feasible and desirable we could proceed to fund the beginning steps in the shoring up process in next year's legislative appropriations bill. What we cannot afford to do is fail to start the restoration study now. By biding our time we are merely playing into the hands of those who would let the west front crumble, neglecting to fill up cracks which are worsened by winter ice accumulations, refusing to scrape off countless layers of paint, and assuming that things will eventually get so bad Congress will have no choice but to extend.

We are told that the proposed west front extension will add a great deal of much needed space for both Members of Congress and visitors. To be specific it will provide 115 offices, 38 bathrooms, two dining rooms, two cafeterias, two auditoriums, two escalators, and eight elevators to the Capitol. But these auditoriums and dining rooms will simply be duplicating similar visitors' facilities that are planned for Union Station, barely two blocks away. I submit that it would be highly irresponsible for Congress to commit itself to such wasteful duplication at a time when the race for the construction dollar has pushed interest rates to astronomical levels—so high that homeownership is becoming a

privilege rather than an accepted norm of American life.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I yield.

Mr. COOK. How many offices did the Senator say this would provide?

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Ninety-eight.

Mr. COOK. Well, as a freshman Senator, I hope that I am not stepping on anyone's toes, but it seems to be happening more frequently that when I am invited to the Capitol I am invited to someone's—I hesitate to use the word "hideout"—to someone's office where he will have absolute privacy. I do not know how long one has to be here to get one of them, but I am wondering whether the 98 offices which will be built in that section will be an extension of that particular kind of privilege.

I can only say to the Senator that I very much support his amendment because the space, really, is not needed in this building. It is needed, so far as we are concerned, across the street. When we talk about the creation of 98 new offices and 38 bathroom facilities, I have a notion that these facilities are not going to be available to committees or subcommittees. Apparently, they will be available either to senior Members of the House or, conceivably, to senior Members of the Senate. I must confess that I think the sum of from \$45 to \$70 million could be better utilized, that we should utilize our money and our space a little more prudently.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I want to thank the Senator from Kentucky. I think he makes a point that cannot be rebutted.

As I am going to point out in a minute, the bill provides for more space adjacent to the New Senate Office Building. We have the money for that in this bill; thus we are duplicating it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey, who is a cosponsor of the amendment and has been working hard in its direction.

Mr. CASE. As a cosponsor, I want to say how happy I am to find the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook) back in the right area. He is a good man. I said earlier, at one time, that he was one of the bright stars in the new firmament around here and I am glad to have this reestablished to my own satisfaction in this good cause.

Mr. COOK. I must confess that I have had an offer from him that I might have his cubbyhole. Let me say, in all honesty, that I wish to thank him very much.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, furthermore, there has been no survey of congressional space requirements worthy of the name in connection with this planned extension. There is no comprehensive plan for the future development of Capitol Hill to meet projected space requirements. We have no way of knowing what is needed and we have no comprehensive plan for meeting present and future needs. In the absence of this information, how can we say that space should be provided through an addition to the Capitol Building rather than through the extension of the New Senate Office Building, or some other ex-

pansion project? How can we even know how large a new building or an addition should be? The answers are very simple. We cannot know. We would be going into an extension project blindfolded.

Mr. President, the very bill we are considering today provides \$1,250,000 for the acquisition of land destined for the extension of the New Senate Office Building. Those who cite space needs in urging extension of the Capitol overlook the fact, as stated in the committee report, that once this land is acquired—and it will be acquired quickly—by building an enclosed bridge between the new Senate Office Building and the Capitol Hill Apartments, at a cost of approximately \$27,000, additional space would be made available immediately at very little expense.

Of course, once the New Senate Office Building has been extended, additional space will be available. A great deal of additional space. Has this added space been taken into account by those who advocate west front extension? I seriously doubt it.

I understand that it was developed during the House debate on this project that the interior division of the proposed extension was not immutable—that any number of changes could be made. Thus we are faced with the specter of a haphazard development of the interior of the proposed extension of the west front. We are confronted with the possibility that space will be divided up on the basis of political muscle rather than esthetic and utilitarian design considerations. A new kind of happening, with every man his own architect, may well be the result. The very uncertain nature of the extension planning as it now stands is simply one more reason not to proceed with extension.

I could dwell at some length on the historic significance of the west front of the Capitol, but I think the distinguished Senator from Florida has already done that. So I will conclude by saying we should remind ourselves that we owe it to the American people to spend their dollars as wisely as we know how at a time when inflation waters down the incomes of countless American families. Can we in good conscience embark on a multimillion dollar expansion project, largely for our own convenience, at a time when we are asking State and local governments to hold the line on construction spending—at a time when the President is cutting back on Federal public works spending by 75 percent—at a time when a tight money policy has made it next to impossible for countless numbers of American families to own their own homes? Who would go back to his constituents having voted for a \$45 million extension of the Capitol on the basis of inadequate evidence and tell them that they must wait for more Federal aid for education—they must wait for adequate Federal assistance for sewage works construction—they must wait for tax relief, and they must not spend their own savings because it is inflationary?

If we are to apply the same standard to ourselves that we seem to be applying to the American economy as a whole, then we should not approve the first step in a project to extend the west front of

the Capitol which will cost a minimum of \$45 million—particularly when we have no real knowledge of the cost and feasibility of restoration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have listened to the Senator's remarks with great interest, as well as those of the Senator from Florida, who feels so strongly about the historic attributes of this situation.

The Senator was present at the markup of the bill in committee, as was the senior Senator from Colorado. As I understand the situation, it is the contention of those who want the west front restored that it should be restored in the same stone of which it is now built. Is that correct? Perhaps the chairman of the committee could answer that question. I am not sure.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I think that is correct, but let me say to the Senator from Colorado that it is my understanding that that would be a part of the study of feasibility to be made by the Park Service. If that recommendation were to be that it should be built of granite or marble, and that it would be feasible and last much longer, that recommendation should be followed; but it is my understanding that we assume it would be replaced with sandstone.

Mr. ALLOTT. No one should be in the position of second guessing the Founding Fathers of our country, who did this, but the fact is that they constructed the Capitol using materials which were then available.

I do not know whether the Senator had occasion to go into the situation with respect to the restoration of east front. I believe it is a fact, and I do not think anyone can contradict it, that as long as we have a sandstone structure we are going to have deterioration of the sandstone underpinnings, and we are going to have deterioration of any sandstone that is exposed to the elements.

As I remember my physics, when water freezes, it exerts a pressure of approximately 1 ton per square inch. So if we have sandstone which is exposed to the elements, no matter how we try to seal it, water will get in it. When it freezes, there will be subsequent flaking off of that sandstone.

I think it becomes important, no matter how wedded we may be to the historic aspects of the situation, to be practical. To me it is not practical to carry our worship of history so far as to demand restoration with the same materials, when time itself will bring us to the same place we are now.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Colorado. I would not be wedded to the fact that, because our forefathers chose sandstone which came from a certain part of the country, we should do precisely the same. I agree that the material should be modern, up to date, on the best advice that the best architects can give us. Since the architects believe the Park Service is capable of doing it and having the appropriate architects make recommendations on the material, as well as the design, it seems to me this study should give us that kind of answer.

October 21, 1969

Mr. ALLOTT. I made my comments after hearing the remarks of the Senator from Florida, for whom I have great respect; but I think we can carry the worship of history a little too far. It would be foolish, in my opinion, to reconstruct and to restore the west front in that way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, the Senator is right. We would not have the same sandstone, anyway. It would have to be new. So whether it were new sandstone or granite or marble, the best way to proceed would be in terms of economy but also in terms of durability.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have another question to ask the Senator. I was told that 1 day last summer 30,000 or 35,000 visitors went through the Capitol. I heard the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee make a remark to that effect during the markup of the bill in committee. May I inquire of him how many visitors a year go through the Capitol?

Mr. MONTOYA. Between 5 and 7 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. Therefore, I would like to propound this question, if I may, to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I know he has given this matter much thought: 30,000 or 35,000 people went through the Capitol in 1 day. Between 5 million and 7 million go through the Capitol in the course of a year. The prospects are that even more of our citizens will in the future be able to visit the capital of their country and look at its historic aspects.

Does the Senator think we can continue to accommodate those visitors with such facilities as restrooms and restaurants? They bring their children. We hear children in the hallways saying to their mothers and fathers, "I want to eat." We have seen and heard that a thousand times since we have been here. How does the Senator think we can hope to accommodate the visitors of the future, as well as present visitors, with a mere restoration?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer, of course, is that there is a plan, which we expect to be implemented, for a visitors center at Union Station.

The Union Station, as the Senator knows, is convenient. It is only two or three blocks away, and the Visitor Center there would provide the auditorium space, the restaurants, and all the facilities which would be duplicated here if we extended the west front, and at a far lower cost—perhaps not quite the same way, but at a lower cost.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not wish to be facetious, but two or three blocks for a little boy who has to go is a long way to go.

I think there is some truth in what the Senator says. This is the thing that concerns me about the two proposals.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One weakness in American life is the failure of people to take enough exercise, walk enough, and develop the standard of health they should. One thing they could do which would help them, it seems to me, would be to show a willingness to walk a distance such as that from the Union Station and back.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us not put that burden on everyone.

I am concerned about this aspect of the matter. I am also concerned about another aspect which the Senator mentioned, regarding the lack of any firm figures on the reconstruction of the present west front. This concern has been voiced by me as well as by the Senator from Wisconsin and other members of the committee; I thought it was particularly significant in the light of the apparent legislative history that it was planned to reconstruct the west front from the very soft stone of which it was originally constructed. The question of how we were going to provide for visitors in the future seemed to me to be another vital point.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I rise in favor of our amendment, which would bar funds for planning the extension of the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

Under the amendment, offered by Senators PROXMIRE, KENNEDY, myself and others, the \$1.7 million earmarked by the Appropriations Committee for prebid planning of the proposed extension would be stricken from legislative appropriation bill.

The amendment would, however, leave untouched \$250,000 which the committee directed be used for carrying out a study of restoring the west front of the Capitol. Under the committee's language, the study will be performed by historic preservation experts in the Department of the Interior.

It is our conviction that the Congress should not embark upon the Architect's plans for extending the Capitol until the restoration study has been made and fully considered. If the study shows that restoration is not feasible, the Congress can then proceed with the extension.

There is no dispute that the west front is deteriorating. Emergency repairs have been made and I am confident the Congress will provide such funds as may be needed for further shoring of the west wall.

There is, however, a continuing dispute over the permanent work that should be undertaken. The controversy boils down to extension versus restoration of the deteriorated west wall of our Nation's most important shrine.

The Architect of the Capitol has recommended a large extension of the west front.

Under his plan, the middle section with the columns would come forward about 44 feet. The adjoining segments would be extended 88 feet; the sections connecting the central port of the Capitol to the House and Senate wings, 56 feet.

By comparison, the east front, whose extension I and others vigorously opposed, was extended 32½ feet.

The proposed extension of the west front is no small undertaking. Four and one-half acres of floor space will be added to the Capitol under the Architect's plan. This will include two dining rooms; two cafeterias, two auditoriums, 38 rest rooms, eight elevators, two escalators and a total of 98 offices.

Do we need all or any of this to keep the west wall of the Capitol from falling down?

The cost of this proposal has been calculated at about \$45 million. But judging from the escalation of costs in building the Rayburn Building, the final price tag on the west front is likely to be far higher.

I do not know about the House, but the Senate certainly needs more working space. But is the only way to get it to dismember the west front and add some acres of unneeded facilities?

No detailed study has been made of restoring the west front as opposed to extending it.

The Architect does tell us that by his calculations, restoration would cost between \$10 million and \$50 million. To me this big spread in his estimate is an admission that he really has no idea as to what the cost will be.

On the other hand, the American Institute of Architects believes the spread would be no more than \$10 to \$20 million. The AIA further believes that a long-lasting restoration job can be accomplished, and should be undertaken.

Why restoration?

In testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Francis Lethbridge, vice president of the AIA, urged avoidance of west front extension:

"Which will erase the last externally visible work of the great pioneers of Federal architecture, William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe, and Charles Bulfinch;

"Which will alter the noble terraces planned by Frederick Law Olmstead, the dean of American landscape architecture; and

"Which will obscure a significant chapter of this country's cultural history, burying forever the last remaining walls of the Capitol that date back to the founding of the republic."

Mr. President, today as never before, the public is rightly concerned about its environment. Around us air and water are fouled; noise proliferates; parks and open space are swallowed up.

The tangible evidence of our history is as much a part of our environment as all the rest. Our lives are enriched by visits to the places that recall for us the names, events, and ideas which shaped the growth of our Nation.

To alter or destroy an historical structure is as much a desecration of the environment as to fill in a marsh or run a freeway through an established neighborhood.

I predict that if the Congress grants the Architect the planning funds he has requested, this will be a downpayment on the extension of our Capitol. There will be no turning back.

Extending the west front of the Capitol must be held off until we know whether restoration is a possibility. I urge the adoption of our amendment for this purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I believe it to be apropos and, indeed, essential for me to state here that the funding provided, and the conditions placed on the funding, do not necessarily place the Senate, or even Congress, on record as approving or giving the green light for extension of the Capitol. I want that clearly understood. The Appropriations Committee certainly wants to continue to look at this picture. That is why we have outlined the specific procedure to travel two roads. Some people may call that impractical. Others may call it impotent. But in view of the background and the exigencies of the situation, and the uncontested evidence that is in the record, I feel that the Appropriations Committee is traveling a very safe route in making this recommendation.

First of all, the restructuring or extension of the central part of the west front of the Capitol was authorized by Congress a number of years ago. Many studies have been made, and pursuant to a mandate from Congress and the proper funding to carry out that mandate, the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol entered into a contract with one of the fine engineering firms of this country, Thompson, Lichtner, & Co., of Massachusetts, and that company was instructed to look at the makeup of the west front and to make a determination as to whether or not we should proceed along the route of restoration, or proceed with extension.

The firm of Thompson, Lichtner & Co. proceeded to do what had to be done to make the determination. They filled five volumes with reports of scientific findings resulting from core borings of the walls, taking out samples of the sandstone and the material that was behind the sandstone, and then the rubble wall in the interior, and, based upon the findings, they came to the conclusion that restoration was not feasible, and extension was recommended.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I am not standing here defending extension, nor am I standing here saying that restoration is feasible. What I am saying is that we have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars. We have entrusted a very capable Commission with the task of informing us as to what we should do. That Commission has unanimously stated to us that extension is the proper route.

I should mention the members who approved it. I refer to Speaker McCORMACK, Vice President AGNEW, the late Senator Dirksen, Representative FORD, and the Architect of the Capitol. These are the members of the Capitol Extension Commission.

They have directed that the Commission ask for an initial appropriation of \$2 million for the purpose of drawing up plans and specifications to proceed with the extension of this work. That is what we had pending in the subcommittee when we began the consideration of this problem.

We examined many witnesses along these lines. We went into the matter in depth. The witnesses who based their information and conclusions upon actual probing of the structure testified that

restoration was not feasible. They recommended that we proceed with extension.

They also stated that we could not get the sandstone that is presently in the exterior of the west front since the quarries are extinct. They said, however, that we might possibly get some limestone. However, that was not conclusive, either.

It was pointed out that that would not cure the sagging of that west wall and would not prevent the necessity of propping up the west side of the Capitol. The only feasible way of propping up the west side of the Capitol was through an extension which would be strong enough to hold the Capitol in place and keep it from sagging any further.

It was testified that the Capitol was sagging at the rate of one-fourth of an inch a year based on last year's study, that it would prove dangerous to people eventually and that the present makeup of the wall had suffered from so much moisture and so much decadence that even shoring it up would not insure against further cracking and that this type of decadence would cause that side of the Capitol to collapse.

I am just relating what we had to contend with. So, in a spirit of trying to exact all the information and trying to give the so-called restorationists a chance, I ordered a hearing so that those who espoused restoration could come in and testify. We invited the different schools of thought who had been in touch with us. We asked the AIA to come in. And they came in with a committee of architects.

The sum and substance of their testimony was that they had looked at the findings as well as the report furnished and compiled by the Thompson, Lichtner & Co. On the basis of this report they felt that there should be a study with respect to the feasibility of restoration.

I then suggested during the course of my cross-examination that perhaps an independent agency could launch this separate study since they felt that Thompson, Lichtner & Co., being under the dominion or instruction or domination, as they said, of the architect, would not have findings that would conclusively prove that they were not prejudiced.

They suggested upon further questioning the National Park Service. It was pointed out that they had the capability to conduct this study.

It was then, in order to please the so-called restorationists and to bring justice to this situation and to provide for a complete study by both sides—those who wanted extension and those who now without foundation and study plead for restoration—that we evolved the idea of going on these two roads—namely, not to delay the plans and specifications route, but to take enough money out of that initial request to provide for a study to be conducted by the National Park Service or under its direction by someone else with respect to the feasibility of restoration. That is how we arrived at this solution.

We have not in our report or in our pronouncement stated that we endorse the extension of the west front. I personally want to reserve my judgment on

further funding for extension pending the study on restoration.

I think that every Senator who supports the appropriation in its dual role or with its dual thrust feels the same way.

We are not endorsing extension of the Capitol. Surely I think all of us want the initial structure preserved if it can be done. I do, and I think I have voted in the past to preserve the west side of the Capitol. However, the decision we have to make is not whether we want to vent our patriotism for this sacred seat of government. The decision we have to make is whether we want to be practical in view of the exigencies of the occasion.

That is why I think it is apropos to say that throughout the history of the Capitol there has been controversy over every extension and the innovation of every structural change. From the beginning up to the present date, the Capitol has not been free from controversy.

The only remaining part of the initial structure or facade of the initial structure is the west front. It is in disharmony at the present time with the construction of the Senate and the House wings. It is out of scale. And certainly the pediment under the dome is out of harmony with the dome and with the rest of the structure.

These things have to be done. Whether they should be done now, I do not know. Whether extension versus restoration is now in order, I cannot say. All I can say is that we authorized extension and entrusted the Capitol Extension Commission with authority to make the initial steps in that direction. And we are now in effect saying, "You can plan on a suggested basis, but be sure to provide in your contract for plans and specifications that if restoration is found to be feasible and Congress decides that restoration is the route that we should take, then you, the Commission, be prepared to say, 'We suspend the contract for plans and specifications at this point, and now we will take a look at restoration and go back to the committee, back to Congress, for a new determination.'"

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I do not know anyone who has worked harder or has made a greater contribution to try to throw some light on a situation that is filled with confusion and conflict of testimony and doubt than the chairman of this subcommittee.

At the time of our conference, the subcommittee's conference, I think it was the chairman's proposal, to satisfy those who felt that the proper study for restoration had not been made, that there was a middle way, a center ground, and that was to proceed with, as it turned out, \$1,750,000 for plans and specifications for the extension, pursuant to the authorization, but then to set aside \$250,000 for a study and plans for the restoration.

At that time I raised some objection. It seemed to me that the two-road course was not the most feasible thing to do. To have \$1,750,000 expended during the next fiscal year for plans and specifications in one direction and to go with

\$250,000 in another direction seemed to cause great doubt and disturbance on my part. The subcommittee reported an authorization for extension and sent it to the full committee. Even greater responsibilities on my part at that time prevented me from remaining in the full committee that morning; and I found, by the report and by my conversations with the chairman, that the dual-road concept had been accepted. I still find it extremely difficult to accept—to go both ways at the same time.

If the \$250,000 study turns out to be correct, the \$1,750,000 is wasted. If the original authorization of \$1,750,000 turns out to be the correct way to go, we have wasted \$250,000. Frankly, I think there is still doubt in the subcommittee and in the Appropriations Committee to accept the dual-road concept and that we had better halt here and find some way to find the single road to joy and to find a route of more rationality.

I dislike to differ with my chairman on this. My respect is unlimited for his understanding and for the effort he has made. It just seems to me that this particular procedure is not in the best interests of proceeding on this project.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I suppose the popular way would be to argue, for sentimental reasons, to restore the wall no matter what the cost. I listened to the testimony, and there was no indication whether it would cost \$10 million or \$50 million. If it would cost \$5, \$10, or \$15 million, and that was all, I think I would prefer the restoration. But, so long as we are going into a large sum of money, we do need additional facilities, particularly restaurants and restrooms, for the millions of visitors who have a right to visit the Capitol.

We went through exactly the same arguments with respect to the east extension of the Capitol. There is nothing new about this. The Building Commission has been working on this for more than 5 years. As the chairman has pointed out, they selected Thompson, Lichtenner & Co. to investigate this. Dr. Clair, one of their top architects, after studying and evaluating the condition of the west central front for the past 5 years, recommended extension, not restoration, as a proper remedial measure to be taken.

It is difficult to perceive how only a 6-month study by other consultants at this time, as proposed by the AIA, could yield results of comparable reliability, judgment, and dependability as those attained by Dr. Clair after 5 years study and vigilance.

Dr. Clair's findings and recommendations have been reviewed and concurred in by Speaker McCormack, Vice President Agnew, the late Senator Dirksen, Representative Ford, and the Architect of the Capitol as members of the Capitol Extension Commission; by four architects retained at the direction of the Commission to prepare plans for the extension—two are Fellows and two members of the American Institute of Architects; by two architects—both Fel-

lows of the AIA—and one landscape architect retained at the direction of the Commission to act as advisory architects for the project; by the Assistant Architect of the Capitol who is an authority on restoration and served for 8 years as director of architecture at Williamsburg, during which time he was responsible for all architectural and engineering work required for the Williamsburg restoration project and directed the work of 52 architects, engineers, and research staff. Dr. Clair's recommendations have also been endorsed by the American Society of Registered Architects.

Mr. President, this is really nothing new. It is something we have been studying for 5 years, and we have the recommendations of the leaders of both the House and the Senate and of responsible engineers, and I think the time has come when we should take some action.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment deleting the \$1.75 million appropriation for plans to extend the west front of the Capitol. I find it rather shocking that such a project, leading eventually to an unnecessary expenditure of over \$44 million, is even being considered by Congress.

To embark on this costly project at a time when inflation is ever increasing and when the President himself has ordered a 75-percent cutback in Federal construction new starts is both unnecessary and unwise.

I am completely opposed to it.

Across the country the effectiveness and, indeed, the very legitimacy of our institutions of government are being criticized and questioned by young and old alike. To appropriate these planning funds, to approve the first step of a massive boondoggle—and the expenditure of \$44 million on the west front extension is nothing less—would only confirm their suspicions that Congress acts wholly irresponsibly.

Instead of going ahead with the extension plans, we should first thoroughly study the alternative of restoring the Capitol's west front. This is the course of action recommended by the American Institute of Architects. It would adequately cover the repair work that the front admittedly needs and is by far the commonsense approach.

Through neglect and age the west front is now in a state of disrepair. As the AIA report on conditions of the west front of the Capitol states:

Numerous cracks are in evidence on the exterior of the building. Some window lintels and keystones have cracked and slipped. Several of the architrave stones have sagged. The foundations, at some points, are not far enough below the finish grade to escape frost damage. However, none of the defects appear to indicate that danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is impracticable.

The report clearly indicates that a massive rebuilding effort to extend the Capitol westward is, architecturally speaking, not required. What is required is to restore the condition of the west front so that its structural weaknesses

are corrected and its facade preserved. Modern technology now permits us to do this, and at considerably less expense than the proposed extension.

The amendment we are now considering leaves in the \$250,000 provided by the bill for a restoration study to be carried out by the National Park Service. This would give us an idea of exactly what needs to be done to restore the west front and at what cost. It is the only sensible way to proceed.

Should this study reveal that restoration is, in fact, not possible, we can then consider other approaches to repairing the west front. But to leap forward now on a massive extension effort without first even exploring the feasibility of restoration is, quite frankly, irresponsible.

As a matter of public policy, I am strongly opposed to extending the Capitol's west front without first attempting to restore it to its original condition. There are three basic reasons why I favor such restoration and oppose extending the west front.

First. The cost of this extension will be approximately \$44 million. The AIA estimates that restoration will run about \$10 million. The difference of \$34 million would be better spent on housing, conservation, mass transit, or other more worthwhile projects.

Extending the west front will cost \$166 per square foot of floor space. This is five times what the Rayburn Building cost and that is the most expensive public building ever. It is three times what a modern office building costs and almost twice the cost of a well-equipped modern hospital.

To spend \$44 million on this project at the present time simply makes no sense.

It borders on sheer lunacy when you consider that the extension will probably cost more than \$44 million. The Architect of the Capitol, who seeks the west front's extension and provided us with the \$44 million estimate, underestimated the cost of the Rayburn Building by \$35 million. It is not a good precedent.

Evidently the Defense Department is not the only Government body troubled by cost overruns.

Second. Extending the west front will remove from sight the last remaining wall of the original Capitol Building. It will destroy a wall built in the time of Adams and Madison. The Capitol is more than just a roof over the heads of Federal legislators. It is a symbol of our commitment to democracy and a reminder of our proud heritage. The west front has significant historical value and must not be tampered with, unless it is absolutely necessary. Such necessity has yet to be shown.

Third. The simple fact is that the extension is not required. Do we truly need the cafeterias, restrooms, auditoriums, and additional office space that extending the west front will bring? The answer is definitely "No," particularly in view of the Visitor's Center now being constructed at Union Station within walking distance of the Capitol. And even if the answer were "Yes," should such facilities be provided in the Capitol? Here again the answer is "No." The primary purpose of the Capitol is to provide space for floor consideration of legislation and di-

rectly related activities. It is not to provide for omnibus activities only indirectly concerned with this legislation. Again, even if the answer to this second question were "Yes," should such facilities be constructed now when the President has called for fiscal restraint to curb inflation? The answer is "No," and for obvious reasons.

The legislative branch of Government has directed the executive branch to restrain its spending. To be truly equal, it should practice such restraint itself, and I can think of no better project on which to curb spending than this one.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and oppose the appropriation of \$1.75 million for planning the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed in the RECORD: "Afron to the Capitol," appearing in the New York Times on October 21; "Capitol Crime," appearing in the New York Times on October 6; and "Can the West Front Be Restored?" appearing in the Washington Post on September 17.

There being no objections, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1969]
AFFRONT TO THE CAPITOL

The Senate, in an excess of diplomatic zeal, is doing its best to have it both ways on the West Front of the Capitol. According to the Appropriations bill due on the Senate floor, \$1.75 million of the \$2 million already appropriated by the House would be voted to start work on the extravagantly unnecessary expansion scheme favored by Mr. Stewart, the nonarchitect of the Capitol. At the same time \$250,000 would be appropriated for a study by the National Park Service on the feasibility of restoring the West Front.

That is certainly a glorious contradiction in terms and a superb double-headed political ploy—\$250,000 for preservation and \$1.75 million for destruction—take your choice. The \$1.75 million would just be the push to get the ball rolling on a grotesque \$45-million rebuilding scheme that could rise to \$70 million without even trying. It is a proposal to which the professional world of architects, historians and environmentalists and a large number of thinking and feeling citizens are violently opposed. It enjoys favor with few except the architect of the Capitol and his architects who will do the job.

The Senate could demonstrate a fine sense of economy and art by eliminating the \$1.75 million and voting only the \$250,000 to the Park Service for an immediate preservation study. This is one case where the issue is clear: Spare Mr. Stewart's feelings or spare the Capitol.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post
Sept. 17, 1969]

CAN THE WEST FRONT BE RESTORED?

It was hardly surprising that the House Appropriations Committee voted \$2 million for the preparation of plans for an extension of the West Front of the Capitol. It is hard for members of the House to turn down an urgent plea from their Speaker. But it will be a sad day—for the House, for history, and for common sense—if the appropriation is approved as it now stands when it comes before the full House this week.

Speaker McCormack may well be right when he says that something must be done about the deterioration in the Capitol's west wall. Certainly the wooden braces and the evidence of surface decay indicates that some sort of action is needed. But that some-

thing is not necessarily an addition to the building that would cost at least \$45 million, would alter the handsome terraces planned by Frederick Law Olmsted, and would wipe out the last remaining walls of a building that withstood the efforts of the British to destroy it a century and a half ago. Before taking such a step, Congress ought to be sure that no other solution to the problem of deterioration is feasible. It would ask no less from a government agency that sought to expand any of the historically important buildings under its control.

The proper steps for Congress to take this year are to appropriate funds to have a study made of the possibilities for restoration and to establish a commission of prominent architects, historians and others to work out a long-range development program for the Capitol grounds. The American Institute of Architects, whose members know far more about the problems of restoration and construction than do any of the members of the existing Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, is arguing that restoration can be done with sandstone from the same quarry from which the original walls were built. Although that group concedes it does not have the money to make a thorough study on its own, surely its recommendations are entitled to more weight than the *ipse dixit* of the Capitol's non-architect, J. George Stewart, that restoration is too difficult and too expensive to undertake. Only a careful study by experts—and these are not likely to be found on Capitol Hill—can settle the question of whether restoration is feasible. Without knowing the answer to that question, Congress can vote for an extension of the West Front only if it ignores both history and common sense.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1969]
CAPITOL CRIME

The so-called Architect of the Capitol, backed by an unthinking House, proposes to keep the nation's prime historic monument from falling down by erecting a \$45-million extension for the most ludicrously expensive restaurant, cafeteria and hideaway office space in the world—and all of it behind a new and preposterous false front.

It must be made clear—since it is being deliberately muddled in Congressional minds—that there are other, more sensible, appropriate and less costly ways to hold up the walls, and more responsible ways to get that space. The dome will not come tumbling down around legislators' ears as the only alternative to the present plan. The West Front obviously needs strengthening and restoration immediately. But that is all it needs, and all it should have, in the interest of historical and esthetic integrity.

Professionals have shouted themselves hoarse in the face of the elaborate schemes and reports from the office of the non-Architect of the Capitol, whose ossified imperial style and dogged amateur taste must be giving his distinguished predecessors, Bulfinch and Latrobe, sepulchral fits. But the amateurs on Capitol Hill go right ahead.

The House has already voted \$2 million to start the \$45 million attack. That \$2 million is exactly the sum of the first year's authorization of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The \$32 million authorized by the Preservation Act for a three-year period is less for the whole country's heritage than the cost of the Capitol mutilation alone.

In the light of this Congressional delinquency toward historic preservation, Congressional generosity toward historic destruction is even more appalling. It is doubly appalling after the murder and embalming of the East Front, under the same auspices. The Senate can take corrective action now by backing the most direct kind of restoration. This would cost about \$10 million, according to the American Institute of Architects, or less than one quarter the cost of the extension.

The Capitol is a public building, not a private club. It belongs to the nation. It will not be served by the profligate distortion of history and art.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that the cost of the extension could ultimately be many millions of dollars more than the restoration?

Mr. MONTOYA. On the cost of restoration the AIA estimated—

Mr. TYDINGS. For the RECORD, what is the AIA?

Mr. MONTOYA. The American Institute of Architects, who appeared before the committee. They testified that the cost of restoration could be between \$10 and \$20 million.

Mr. TYDINGS. \$10 to \$20 million?

Mr. MONTOYA. The people from the Capitol Architect's Office testified that the cost of restoration could range from \$10 to \$50 million. The other figure was \$10 to \$20 million.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Office of the Architect of the Capitol?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. Mr. Campioli testified to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the American Institute of Architects testified that it could cost as much as \$10 million, but in no circumstances over \$20 million. Is that not their testimony?

Mr. MONTOYA. I think that is correct.

May I say something else, too, along those lines. It was agreed by both sides that if we decided to go the route of restoration, no contractor would take it in a bid basis, that it would have to be on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. Who decided that?

Mr. MONTOYA. The witnesses on both sides. I posed that question. And that restoration would have to go on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. My first question to the Senator from New Mexico is this: Is it not a fact that the extension of the west front could cost the taxpayers of the United States many millions of dollars more than the restoration?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a fact.

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. I agree with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that every time the Architect of the Capitol has revised his figures on the cost of the extension, he has increased it by as much as \$3 or \$6 million, until today, although the original estimate was in the \$17 million range, it is now up in the \$40 million range?

Mr. MONTOYA. It is now \$45 million.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the Architect's original estimate of the cost of the Rayburn Building?

Mr. MONTOYA. We developed that in the hearings, too.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was that not the same—

Mr. MONTOYA. I might state in all fairness that the reason for the increase has been that the cost of construction has escalated at the compounded rate of 7 percent per year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Correct.

Mr. MONTOYA. The \$45 million figure is an escalated compounded figure up to the time of concluding the construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Correct. Yet how much is that \$45 million going to escalate before the extension is finished? Is it going to escalate like the figure of the Architect of the Capitol on the Rayburn Building?

Mr. MONTOYA. Under today's inflated prices—and I do not mean to be partisan—the cost of public construction is escalating at the rate of 1 percent per month.

Mr. TYDINGS. So when the Senator asks the Senate today to embark upon a program of spending \$44 million of the taxpayers' funds for an extension of the west front rather than on restoration, the Senator is saying that in addition to that \$44 million the taxpayers are going to have to pay in addition an amount equivalent to 1 percent per month depending on how long it takes to build it.

Mr. MONTOYA. I do not think the Senator fully understands what I said. I said the \$45 million as of today took into consideration a 7-percent annual increase during the course of construction and up to the time of concluding construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. So it is the Senator's feeling that this \$44 million figure is a top figure.

Mr. MONTOYA. As of today.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the Senator is relying on the Architect of the Capitol. Is that right? Is that who the Senator is relying on?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes, but I am relying on all the witnesses who testified to that figure.

Mr. TYDINGS. For the record, what was the top figure of the Architect of the Capitol when the Congress passed the appropriation for the plans, the working plans, for the Rayburn Building?

Mr. MONTOYA. I do not have those figures offhand, but I want to say that the cost of the east front—

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to refresh the Senator's recollection. Would the Senator agree it was \$34 million under the final cost?

Mr. MONTOYA. But the cost of the east front of the Capitol was estimated at \$10 million and the final cost came to \$11.5 million or thereabouts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Now, let us discuss the so-called survey or study which the Architect of the Capitol had made which resulted in the testimony that we go ahead with extension rather than restoration. Is it not a fact that the Architect of the Capitol picked that firm himself without any consultation whatever with the American Institute of Architects?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Commission on Extension of the Capitol picked this firm.

Mr. TYDINGS. But as a practical matter, was it not the Architect of the Capitol himself who picked that firm?

Mr. MONTOYA. I could not answer that with any degree of authority.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that that firm knew what they were supposed to come back with the day they were picked? There was never any question in the mind of the Architect of the Capitol but that that firm would come back with a recommendation to go ahead with extension rather than restoration, was there?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is asking me to become an expert witness.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator presided over the hearings. The Senator was there.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is asking me to give an opinion which is not based on any facts that were before the committee.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator take the word of one firm, which was paid \$33,000 by the Architect of the Capitol, who had already stated publicly what he wanted, against the weight of authority of the AIA with respect to what was feasible?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am sorry the Senator missed my allusion to this point in my presentation a few minutes ago. I stated that because certain parties felt aggrieved that this report might have a taint of prejudice, we thought it proper to commission or direct the commissioning of a separate agency to conduct this survey, and that is the very thrust of our alternate plan here today.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to point out that although I am in sympathy with some of the positions developed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, there might not be anything evil or deceptive in the hiring of a firm wherein the inference was that they were to go out and come back with some study relative to extension. The truth is that Congress authorized this extension in 1955.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the point I was trying to make. They were ordered to do what they did.

Mr. PEARSON. I am not sure they were ordered to do what they did.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was the question I was trying to develop. The firm was given a job to do and they did it. I say they knew what they were supposed to do.

Mr. PEARSON. The matter I am directing attention to is that it might not be deception.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not deception.

Mr. PEARSON. It might be in relation to what Congress already authorized.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know about Congress, but it was directly in relationship to what the Commission told them to do, and that is what I was trying to develop.

Mr. MONTOYA. I want to say in fairness to the Commission that it is my belief the Commission did not tell this firm, "Go out and get us a report for extension of the Capitol." If that is what the Senator is trying to get me to admit, I will not admit it. I think this is a prestigious commission. I think the testimony will show that this firm went out to probe into the structure of the Capitol and it was to come back with a comprehensive report showing whether or not restoration was feasible; and they did come back with a comprehensive report on that point, which has not been rebutted except for opinion evidence on the part of the AIA.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to follow along

the lines of the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Kansas because I think he went to the heart of the matter. I did not want to give the impression that I felt the firm was doing anything devious.

I was asking the Senator if they were not given a job to do, namely, to come back in favor of extension rather than restoration.

Mr. MONTOYA. Before the Senator goes further, I wish to read from the report of Thompson & Lichtner.

Mr. TYDINGS. What page is that on?

Mr. MONTOYA. Page 558 of the hearing record.

In dispatching the five volumes entitled "Report on the Structural Condition of the West Central Portion of the United States Capitol" they stated:

Upon completion of examinations, analyses, and studies, together with recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary, including recommendations as to (1) whether the existing wall, if found deficient, can be repaired in its present condition, (2) whether the existing wall can be refaced with marble in its present condition, (3) whether remedial action requires extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble, or (4) whether any other means of preservation are deemed feasible and advisable.

I think that should indicate that this firm had been instructed to probe into every facet of feasibility with regard to the west front.

Mr. TYDINGS. How does the Senator account for the fact that already, as of March 21, 1967, \$240,000 had been spent on the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates for the west front extension?

Does the Senator mean to tell me that he thinks the Architect of the Capitol did not tell this firm he wanted to go ahead with the extension already having spent almost a quarter of a million dollars on preliminary plans for an extension? It does not make sense. Preliminary plans and specs imply construction and approval of a project.

One final question to the Senator from New Mexico. How can the Senator justify, in a period of time like this, with so much inflation, going ahead with an extension which admittedly, by the testimony in the Senator's own hearings, can cost as much as \$20 million more than restoration? How does the Senator justify it?

Mr. MONTOYA. In the first place, I have stated here that neither I nor any member of the Appropriations Committee, in voting for the alternative procedure, went on record as favoring extension. I so state that to the Senator from Maryland. I so stated that in my preliminary remarks.

We are trying to find out what course we should take in the future.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from New Mexico so stated during the markup of the bill in the Appropriations Committee. He made that very clear.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. How does it follow,

when in 1967 we first appropriated \$240,000 for preliminary plans for the extension, that now we ask for \$1.75 million for continuation of these plans? I just do not see how we can say we are still—we have not made a decision to go ahead with construction. I think we should study the feasibility of restoration rather than proceed with the second step, the \$240,000 I mentioned being the first, of construction which this planning money represents.

Mr. MONTOYA. Let me answer the Senator from Maryland. The House provided for that appropriation in 1967.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senate struck it out.

Mr. TYDINGS. The \$240,000?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was \$240,000 which they went ahead and spent, relating to preliminary plans for an extension.

Mr. MONTOYA. That was stricken out by the Senate. It then went back to conference.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was passed and spent.

Mr. MONTOYA. Right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Here we are again on the next step, spending almost \$2 million on it. What difference does it make? We are nibbling away at it. It is difficult for me to justify the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of funds for extension of the west front in view of the present inflation and the heavy taxes the people of this country are already paying today.

Mr. MONTOYA. There is no money in here for construction, I want the Senator to know.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know, but we have already spent \$240,000. Now we come back with \$1.75 million, and each time we nibble away a little more, it is another victory for the Architect of the Capitol, and another step closer to the ultimate expenditure of what the Capitol Architect says will be \$44 million. Planning is part and parcel of construction and by approving planning money we are, in effect, approving construction. I do not believe for 1 minute that the architect is right with his estimate. He is not going to be any more accurate on the extension of the west front than he was on the Rayburn Building.

I think the Senator will recall this, that if it goes through, it will cost substantially more than \$45 million, even though this is more than \$20 million over the cost of restoration. I do not see how we can keep going forward with it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not listened to all of the debate this afternoon, but I heard it during the markup in the Appropriation Committee, and it is my understanding that it is the Senator's position that he is not advocating extension of the west front.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. He is not advocating restoration.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. He is not advocating either in preference to the other. He is simply advocating that we appropriate some money for the survey, and then make our decision on the basis of the result of that survey. In the meantime, money for planning an extension would be in the bill in the event the survey so recommends.

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have the greatest respect for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia but when we appropriate money to go ahead and build, money which goes toward building the west front, whether we are for it or against it, when we vote "yea" for the appropriation, we are taking a step in that direction.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. He is not doing that. The bill does not appropriate money for the building of—

Mr. TYDINGS. We are appropriating money relating to the preparation of plans for the extension of the Capitol. Any way we cut it, we are spending money. It may not be for actual construction, but it is money that has to be spent to extend the west front of the Capitol. We can say we have not taken a position but when we vote "yea" to spend that money, but we are taking a position so far as the taxpayers are concerned.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I intend to vote, as the Senator will, for the Proxmire amendment, but I do not want the position of the Senator from New Mexico to be misunderstood here.

Mr. TYDINGS. I asked the distinguished Senator from New Mexico before whether he was for or against the amendment, because I was not certain. It is difficult to determine. If we vote aye for the expenditure of money on a project that we are not in favor of—

Mr. MONTOYA. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that while part of this money is to be used for plans and specifications, it will be used for any restoration that is found to be in order also.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, many of the points I had intended to make already have been presented to the Senate during this debate.

I can well recall during the 80th Congress, when Congress provided for the construction of the New Senate Office Building, that I fought the program for about 9 years. I proposed at the time that we extend the east front of the Capitol and thereby provide enough space so that Senators who were really in need of space could obtain it. I felt we could more or less kill two birds with one stone, and effect a saving for the taxpayers. I also suggested that in order to take care of Senators who needed space, we should use every available spot in the Old Senate Office Building so as to provide it.

My idea was to use the old Senate Office Building and the extension of the east front to provide the needed space. But we ended up in doing all three of the actions that were proposed. We have used every available space in the Old Senate Office Building, we extended the eastern front of the Capitol where 50-

some offices were provided, and we built a new Senate Office Building.

Today, 10 years later, we are being asked to extend the west front of the Capitol and provide not 98 offices, as my good friend from Wisconsin stated, but 115 offices, according to the committee hearings. It has been my observation here, since I came to Capitol Hill, that more space begets more employees. That can easily be demonstrated. As a matter of fact, I will do it through an amendment which I shall propose in a few minutes, after we vote.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that the \$1.75 million the committee has provided in the bill is not only to study the feasibility of an extension, but to provide specifications for the construction of an addition to the west side of the Capitol. We are staring down the exhaust pipes of the bulldozers.

I think it would be a shame for us to provide for an extension of the Capitol because, as was said by my good friend from New Mexico, some of the architects believe that it is necessary for us to do so in order to hold the walls where they now are. That is the position taken by some of the architects. Others take a different position.

It seems to me that, with the knowledge we have already gathered from various reports made by famous engineers, the restoration of the Capitol is feasible, and that we should proceed in that direction. At least we should not rush hurriedly along the opposite path.

One of the arguments made for extending the Capitol is to provide more room to take care of the visitors at the Capitol and to provide them with more restaurants. When the extension of the eastern part of the Capitol was suggested, I tried to provide for restaurants to be built in the basement of the new extension, so that the cost to the taxpayers for operating the restaurants could be reduced. The idea I had in mind was for Representatives and Senators to use the same space.

There is no doubt in my own mind that if it were possible to have one restaurant for all Senators and all Representatives, and have it large enough to accommodate visitors, we could save a lot of money. Why do I say that? As Senators know, we have restaurants in the New Senate Office Building, in the Old Senate Office Building, and in the Capitol; It costs the taxpayers of this Nation an annual subsidy of \$497,000 to operate those restaurants. Add another restaurant or two, and the subsidy might be increased to \$700,000 or \$800,000. There seems to be no end to it.

As far as I am concerned, I shall support the pending amendment. It is the same amendment I submitted to the committee before the bill was reported to the Senate. I joined my good friend from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) as a cosponsor, and I hope the amendment passes.

Just as surely as the Senate votes to provide \$1.75 million to prepare plans and specifications for the expansion of the west side of the Capitol, that is the course which will be taken. I would much prefer that we proceed to spend \$250,000,

or even more if necessary, to study plans, not to extend, but to restore the present structure. In that way we can save millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

I doubt that the cost of restoring the west side of the Capitol would be more than \$20 million to \$30 million, as compared with perhaps \$75 million or \$100 million for an extension.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the offices and storerooms, and what have you, that will be provided for if the restoration is made. That data is included on pages 522 and 523 of the hearings. It will indicate the 115 offices I spoke about earlier.

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

<i>Detail of rooms, areas, and facilities by floors</i>		
Subbasement:		
Visitors' auditorium (400 seats each)-----	2	Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Information and exhibition lobby-----	1	Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.
Storage areas-----	6	Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator not agree that if we carry out the expansion program and create all the additional rooms and facilities it will be only a matter of time before we have a request for added personnel and staffs to fill the space?
Service docks-----	2	Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I said before. More office space begets more people. There is no doubt about it.
Public lobby-----	1	As was pointed out awhile ago, if Senators will look at page 16 of the committees report, they will find we are providing money to purchase more land to construct a third new Senate office building.
Mechanical equipment rooms-----	2	This expansion has been going on for quite some time, without good reason. I propose to show that in a few minutes, after we take the vote on the pending amendment. It is my hope to offer an amendment to cut some of the funds that were provided by the committee for additional employees for each Senator.
Service elevators-----	4	Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I agree with him fully. I know each year he has been waging quite a fight, and I have joined him in it, in trying to cut back the number of subcommittees. We add more and more of them over the years. It seems there is nothing more permanent here than a temporary subcommittee or committee of any kind.
Stairs-----	7	In my 23 years' experience, I have never yet seen one of them disbanded, but instead we create new ones, over and over. I think if we could cut back on some of the subcommittees, we could have a more efficient operation. If we could reduce the size of the staffs, in addition to the cost that would be saved, the Government could operate more efficiently.
Escalator-----	1	Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has mentioned additional employees. When Congress passed the Reorganization Act of 1946, that act provided for 15 standing committees, and each standing committee was to have six clerical and four specialist employees, making a total of 150 employees for the committees.
Basement:		
Cafeterias (300 seats each)-----	2	But today the number of such employees has increased from the 150 to 685, and if we provide the additional \$24,000 for each Senator, we will add to the total number in the Senate from 100 to as
Foyers-----	2	many as 150 new employees, employed by the Senators, which will make necessary the construction of a new Senate office building. I do not think that is necessary.
Dining rooms (270 seats each side)-----	2	Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator.
Kitchens (with pantry)-----	2	Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make just one observation about the matter of extending the west front. In my opinion, it is unfair to stand on the floor of the Senate and state that the Architect of the Capitol does this, that, or the other thing just on his own initiative, because that is not a fact. We have a West Front Building Commission, which is composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the Senate—who was, of course, Mr. Dirksen at the time the Commission considered the latest proposal.
Storage rooms-----	2	Those are people with some responsibility, and they are responsible citizens. I am certain they did not permit the Architect to go out and hire anybody without reason, and that there was no one hired without their knowing about it and concurring in it. I think that should be made clear, when it is said that George Stewart went out and did this or that, and spent so much money. Though I am not a member of the Commission, I know that is not the fact.
Offices-----	10	Within the last month or two, the Commission has been enlarged to include the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, making it a seven-member Commission. The two additional members did not have anything to do with the proposal for expansion now under consideration, as it came up before they were added; but that is now the Building Commission on the west front of the Capitol.
Mechanical equipment rooms-----	2	I felt that ought to be made plain.
Women's toilets-----	2	Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Senators CASE, PROXMIRE, and KENNEDY to strike out the \$1.75 million included in the legislative appropriations bill for the extension of the west front of the Capitol. The amendment would not affect funds for a study regarding restoration. I sincerely feel this is the proper approach to this problem since we are all mindful of the present condition of the west front of the Capitol.
Men's toilets-----	2	Only with adequate information can we intelligently act upon the alternatives. I believe it is incumbent upon this body to proceed on the expenditure of any public funds only when we have all the facts before us. The proposed amendment would permit us to consider the alternatives on a factual basis as opposed to a speculative basis.
Passenger elevators-----	2	The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 251) of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.
Service elevators-----	4	The bill clerk called the roll.
Stairs-----	2	Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator
Private dining rooms-----	2	
First floor:		
Committee room-----	1	
Conference room-----	1	
Offices-----	25	
Stairs-----	2	
Storage rooms-----	6	
Women's toilets-----	2	
Men's toilets-----	7	
Private toilets-----	4	
Passenger elevators-----	4	
Service elevators-----	2	
Principal floor:		
Subcommittee room-----	1	
Offices-----	27	
Storage room-----	1	
Women's toilets-----	1	
Men's toilets-----	2	
Private toilets-----	2	
Passenger elevators-----	2	
Service elevators-----	2	
Gallery floor:		
Subcommittee room-----	4	
Joint conference room-----	2	
Offices-----	27	
Women's toilets-----	1	
Men's toilets-----	2	
Private toilets-----	2	
Passenger elevators-----	2	
Service elevators-----	2	
Stairs-----	4	
Document room-----	2	
Attic floor:		
Document room-----	2	
Offices-----	26	
Mechanical equipment rooms-----	3	
Women's toilets-----	2	
Men's toilets-----	2	
Storage rooms-----	2	
Passenger elevators-----	2	
Service elevators-----	2	
Stairs-----	2	
Electrical machine rooms-----	2	

Mr. ELLENDER. As was stated during the debate, we are soon going to spend from \$20 to \$40 million to restore Union Station, just a few blocks from here. Many facilities will be provided that will be attractive to tourists who come to see the Capitol. In that structure we will be able to provide for large restaurant space. I daresay that the restaurant space will be used in such manner that the Government will not have to subsidize any part of it.

Mr. President, I repeat, if we build this structure, as will be done if we provide money for the drawing of plans and specifications, the subsidy now being paid to operate restaurants in the New and Old Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol will be increased by \$250,000 to \$300,000, added to the \$497,000 subsidy we are now providing to maintain those restaurants.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator not agree that if we carry out the expansion program and create all the additional rooms and facilities it will be only a matter of time before we have a request for added personnel and staffs to fill the space?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I said before. More office space begets more people. There is no doubt about it.

As was pointed out awhile ago, if Senators will look at page 16 of the committees report, they will find we are providing money to purchase more land to construct a third new Senate office building.

This expansion has been going on for quite some time, without good reason. I propose to show that in a few minutes, after we take the vote on the pending amendment. It is my hope to offer an amendment to cut some of the funds that were provided by the committee for additional employees for each Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I agree with him fully. I know each year he has been waging quite a fight, and I have joined him in it, in trying to cut back the number of subcommittees. We add more and more of them over the years. It seems there is nothing more permanent here than a temporary subcommittee or committee of any kind.

In my 23 years' experience, I have never yet seen one of them disbanded, but instead we create new ones, over and over. I think if we could cut back on some of the subcommittees, we could have a more efficient operation. If we could reduce the size of the staffs, in addition to the cost that would be saved, the Government could operate more efficiently.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has mentioned additional employees. When Congress passed the Reorganization Act of 1946, that act provided for 15 standing committees, and each standing committee was to have six clerical and four specialist employees, making a total of 150 employees for the committees.

But today the number of such employees has increased from the 150 to 685, and if we provide the additional \$24,000 for each Senator, we will add to the total number in the Senate from 100 to as

many as 150 new employees, employed by the Senators, which will make necessary the construction of a new Senate office building. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make just one observation about the matter of extending the west front. In my opinion, it is unfair to stand on the floor of the Senate and state that the Architect of the Capitol does this, that, or the other thing just on his own initiative, because that is not a fact. We have a West Front Building Commission, which is composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the Senate—who was, of course, Mr. Dirksen at the time the Commission considered the latest proposal.

Those are people with some responsibility, and they are responsible citizens. I am certain they did not permit the Architect to go out and hire anybody without reason, and that there was no one hired without their knowing about it and concurring in it. I think that should be made clear, when it is said that George Stewart went out and did this or that, and spent so much money. Though I am not a member of the Commission, I know that is not the fact.

Within the last month or two, the Commission has been enlarged to include the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, making it a seven-member Commission. The two additional members did not have anything to do with the proposal for expansion now under consideration, as it came up before they were added; but that is now the Building Commission on the west front of the Capitol.

I felt that ought to be made plain. Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Senators CASE, PROXMIRE, and KENNEDY to strike out the \$1.75 million included in the legislative appropriations bill for the extension of the west front of the Capitol. The amendment would not affect funds for a study regarding restoration. I sincerely feel this is the proper approach to this problem since we are all mindful of the present condition of the west front of the Capitol.

Only with adequate information can we intelligently act upon the alternatives. I believe it is incumbent upon this body to proceed on the expenditure of any public funds only when we have all the facts before us. The proposed amendment would permit us to consider the alternatives on a factual basis as opposed to a speculative basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 251) of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator

from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SONG), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SONG), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) is paired with the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND). If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Allen	Hartke	Packwood
Anderson	Holland	Pastore
Burdick	Hollings	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Saxbe
Cook	Mansfield	Schweiker
Cranston	Mathias	Scott
Dodd	McGee	Smith, Ill.
Dole	McGovern	Symington
Dominick	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ellender	Metcalfe	Tydings
Fannin	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Murphy	Yarborough
Griffin	Muskie	Young, Ohio
Hart	Nelson	

NAYS—24

Aiken	Fong	McClellan
Allott	Goodell	Montoya
Baker	Gore	Prouty
Bellmon	Hansen	Russell
Bennett	Hatfield	Smith, Maine
Boggs	Hruska	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Curtis	Long	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—23

Bayh	Gravel	Mundt
Bible	Gurney	Pell
Brooke	Harris	Sparkman
Cannon	Hughes	Spong
Cooper	Javits	Stevens
Eagleton	Kennedy	Thurmond
Eastland	McCarthy	Percy
Ervin	Moss	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 251) was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, at the beginning of line 13, strike out "\$24,656,608" and in lieu thereof insert "\$23,266,792"; and, in line 17, after the word "inhabitants", strike out the colon and the following language:

"Provided further, That, effective November 1, 1969, paragraph (1) of section 105(d) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, as amended (2 U.S.C. 61-1(d)), is amended by increasing each of the amounts in the table therein relating to Senators' clerk hire allowances by \$23,652, and paragraph (2)(1) of such section is amended to read as follows: '(1) the salary of two employees may be fixed at gross rates of not more than \$23,652 per annum.'"

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that it will not take very long to explain this amendment, and I hope we can get a vote within the next 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there have been three recent increases in senatorial clerk hire allowances, which does not include the one we are now considering.

In fiscal year 1965, the Legislative Appropriations Act provided States with population in excess of 17 million an increase in the annual clerk-hire funds of \$6,000 basic or \$15,190 gross. These States were California and New York. States in excess of 10 million were given an annual increase of \$3,000 basic or \$7,595 gross.

In fiscal year 1967, the Legislative Appropriations Act provided States with population in excess of 10 million an additional annual clerk-hire allowance of \$6,000 on the basic scale. This \$6,000 basic amounted to \$17,950 gross per annum by fiscal 1967. In the same act, States with more than 3 million but less than 10 million in population were given a \$4,020 basic increase which amounted to \$12,020 gross. States with a population of less than 3 million were provided an increase of \$2,040 basic or \$6,100 gross.

In fiscal year 1968, the Legislative Appropriations Act was amended on the Senate floor to grant each Senator an increase in annual clerk-hire funds of \$23,400 gross. The so-called basic rate was done away with between fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968. As a result of the Tydings

amendment and the most recent pay raise, each Senator is currently authorized to employ the following employees in the category "top paid personnel": One at not to exceed \$31,317; two at \$30,003; one at \$28,689; one at \$23,652; and remainder at \$17,520.

A Senator from a State with less than 3 million population, after the July 1, 1969, pay raise is currently authorized to spend \$239,805 in personnel staff allowance. This amount increases with the population scale. States with more than 10 million but less than 11 million population, for instance, have an allowance of \$324,120. At the top, those States with more than 17 million have a fund of \$401,865.

The legislative appropriations bill now before the Senate contains a committee amendment increasing the clerk-hire allowance of each Senator by \$23,652.

The argument is now being made that some of the larger States need more additional help. Under existing law, more help is given to Senators with large constituencies. In the pending bill we have provided Senators from a few States that have large populations with more assistance. As I indicated earlier, 52 Senators receive \$239,805 if the population of their States is under 3 million. Sixteen Senators from States whose population is above 3 million receive \$255,185 per year to operate their offices. I am not going to recite all the amounts that are given to Senators from larger States; but Senators from four States with a population in excess of 17 million obtain \$401,863 per year to operate their offices.

I mentioned these figures previously, and I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the computation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Section 2. The table contained in section 105(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1968, as amended, shall be deemed on and after July 1, 1969, to read as follows:

Number of participating Senators	
\$239,805 if the population of his State is less than 3,000,000	52
\$255,135 if such population is 3,000,-000 but less than 4,000,000	16
\$268,275 if such population is 4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000	8
\$280,320 if such population is 5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000	8
\$293,460 if such population is 7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000	4
\$308,790 if such population is 9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000	0
\$324,120 if such population is 10,000,-000 but less than 11,000,000	2
\$339,450 if such population is 11,000,-000 but less than 12,000,000	6
\$354,780 if such population is 12,000,-000 but less than 13,000,000	0
\$370,110 if such population is 13,000,-000 but less than 15,000,000	0
\$385,440 if such population is 15,000,-000 but less than 17,000,000	0
\$401,865 if such population is 17,000,-000 or more	4

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senate votes in favor of the pending bill, it will mean that each Senator will be able to employ an additional employee whose salary will be \$23,000 and some

odd. He can also use the same fund, if he wishes, to provide two or three employees instead of one.

So that if this amendment is not adopted, I venture to say that the 100 more employees provided for may be multiplied by a factor of two or three.

There is a provision in the pending bill for the construction of a new Senate office building or an extension of one we now have. There is a provision to purchase more land in case we need more space for housing the additional clerks and assistants to each Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt beginning on page 15 of the committee report be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

**EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE
BUILDING SITE**

The estimate of \$1,250,000, submitted at the direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, provides funds for the acquisition of all real property in the east half of square 725, with the exception of property on which the Belmont House, now classified as a national historic building, is located. A total of 44,644 square feet is to be acquired, either by purchase, condemnation, or in the case of the alleys, totaling 13,000 square feet, by transfer without reimbursement from the jurisdiction of the District government to the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol. The language also provides for demolition and removal of the buildings or other structures to be acquired and, pending demolition, for immediate use by the Government or lease in lieu thereof. In view of rapidly rising land costs in the area and the urgent need for the site for future construction of an extension to the New Senate Office Building, the committee believes the property should be obtained as expeditiously as possible.

There is a desperate need for additional workspace for senatorial offices and committee staffs. In a survey by the Public Works Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, 72 Senators and 24 committees and subcommittees attested to this need. Although construction plans for new quarters are not provided in this appropriation, it is estimated that by building an enclosed bridge between the New Senate Office Building and the Capitol Hill apartments, at a cost of approximately \$27,000, additional space would be made available immediately at very little expense. Several subcommittees have indicated interest in the prospect.

It is the recommendation of the committee, therefore, that the sum of \$1,250,000 be provided for the purpose of acquiring the land at this time.

Authorizing legislation for the extension of the Senate Office Building site passed the Senate October 8, 1969.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in addition to the \$23,652 provided for each Senator, we have additional assistants and clerks for the minority leader, the majority leader, and various other departments or offices, such as the Sergeant at Arms.

To give an idea of what we have been doing since 1961, the entire number of Senate employees in 1961 was 2,692. Seven years later, we have provided for the employment of 3,624 people. That means an addition of over 1,000 employees in the last 7 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I have prepared, showing the increase in the number of

Senate employees since 1961 be included in the RECORD at this point. It should be borne in mind that these are all legislative employees, and do not include increases in the force of such offices as the Architect of the Capitol.

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

Average monthly employment by calendar year, U.S. Senate, 1961-68

Year:	Number
1961	2,692
1962	2,806
1963	2,937
1964	3,029
1965	3,144
1966	3,251
1967	3,504
1968	3,624

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my belief that if we continue to provide the money in order to get more assistants, to get more employees on Capitol Hill, we will obviously soon need additional space. I hope Senators will not provide for this additional number.

As I pointed out some time ago, I think that the largest States are amply provided for as to the other States, in the last 3 or 4 years we have provided for more and more assistance for Senators. It is my belief that the amount we are now providing is simply out of order, particularly when we are trying to save a few dollars for taxpayers.

If this provision in the bill is agreed to it will add in excess of \$2.3 million to the payroll of the Senate. I am very hopeful that the Senate will agree to the pending amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the remarks of my good friend from Louisiana on this particular point.

I must say to the entire Senate that perhaps the bill is a very difficult bill to present to this body. However, I have to discharge my responsibility as the chairman of the subcommittee and I gladly do so.

Every dollar in the bill has been placed in the bill after conscientious study, through exhaustive hearings, and after giving proper consideration to all the evidence that was adduced and all the justifications presented.

It is nice to make a speech about economy, but it is also realistic to face reality. By reality I mean to face what other Senators need in order to conduct their offices efficiently as Senators of the United States.

We came to the conclusion to add \$23,652 for clerk hire for each Senator, not because of a perfunctory consideration but after considerable study and probing. Senator Hayden started this study before he left office. He wrote a letter to each Senator asking different pointed questions with respect to clerk hire, stationery allowances, air mail, employees' mileage, transportation of Senators, office rent in the State, office expense in the State, telephone calls outside of Washington, long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, communication reimbursement, mechanical equipment, rules and regulations pertaining thereto, and paper allotment.

When I became chairman of the subcommittee after Senator Hayden had

left, I directed a letter to those Senators who had not responded to Senator Hayden's letter because I wanted a tabulation of what Senators felt in this regard. Then, after we tabulated the responses in the different categories I called a meeting with the chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. After the meeting began we brought in the staff members of the three committees. The staff members of the three committees had collaborated in trying to evaluate the different requests by Senators and had conducted an independent study of what Senators actually needed. So the staff made certain recommendations to us when we met.

It was at that point that we disallowed some of the staff recommendations and allowed others. This was one. This request carried a unanimous recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and myself as chairman of the subcommittee.

In all fairness, I might add there were 40 responses and out of the 40 responses only two responded that they had a sufficient staff.

There is also one other thing I must bring up by way of sustaining my position. Many Senators do not use all of their clerk hire allowance and this money reverts to the Treasury. I stated before that I had had a compilation or computation of the dollars that I had turned back on clerk hire allowance since I have been in Congress and it approximated \$300,000. I am sure other Senators do likewise.

The point at issue is that many Senators need this clerk allowance in order to conduct their offices efficiently.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to point out that in the State of California we now have 20 million people.

I think there are some States where, if one were to compute and prorate the amount of money spent for clerk hire for service to the States—and I can think of one State that shall remain nameless—we actually get one-tenth of what they get.

The State of California has grown tremendously in the few years that I have been a Member of this body. There are other States where the population has not expanded at the same rate.

I assure my distinguished colleagues that I not only could use one more employee but I could find a full day's work for five more. However, I could not accommodate them because the offices I occupy were allocated on the basis of perhaps 12 million people and the workload is tremendous. I am sure the same is true of my colleague from California.

I know it is difficult for the committee to say that every Senator should have more help or to find a formula under which those who need more employees get them, but I would like to say to Senators that as far as my State is concerned, this provision is badly needed. I am quite certain that the extra amount of money

suggested by the committee will be put to excellent work not in lightening the load of those now on the staff but in making it possible for my colleague, Mr. CRANSTON, and me to provide more service, a fuller service, and actually to do the job that we would do. It is unbelievable. I heard that President Nixon said to ex-President Johnson, "No one can explain being President until you have been President." I should like to say that no one can really explain being a Senator from California until you have been a Senator from California and realize what happens, the demands, and the problems. Every problem that exists in the entire country exists in California. This will be most welcome. I think my distinguished colleague realizes that I am not one that is used to spending money unnecessarily. If there is anyone in this body that has a greater appreciation for the value of the taxpayer's dollar, I would tip my hat to him. It is my chief concern. But in this particular matter, with regard to my State, it will be of great help and is badly needed.

It pains me to disagree with my dear friend from Louisiana but in California we really need it and we can put it to good use.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out awhile ago, the smaller States, 26 of them, get better than \$200,000 in order to operate each senatorial office, whereas the Senator from California gets \$401,000. Those figures have been fixed by law. If the Senator from California needs more assistance, let the amount be based on population and not passed on to the smaller States or to other States that do not have a similar need. I think that the method devised by Congress has worked very well and, as will be shown by the table I introduced for the RECORD awhile ago. We start with the States with 3 million or under, and those Senators are provided an allowance of \$240,000. Then we go on to the next population category, and they get more money, and so on down the line.

When it comes to California, with more than 17 million population, we have provided, as I have said, almost double what the smaller States obtain.

Since Congress has gone on record as providing more funds for larger States, I think that would be the best way to continue. Increases should not be passed on to every State. This will mean an expenditure, as I pointed out awhile ago, of \$2.25 million per year, to satisfy a few large States.

It is argued that it is up to the Senator to use the money, if he wants it or not, but I think that is a bad way to proceed. There is temptation there from constituents who say, "You have got all that money. Why don't you put me on your payroll?" I have been approached that way in the past, and I have resisted the temptation.

In another area, I know that each summer here quite a few students are put on the payroll at Government expense. With all the money made available to each Senator, it is my belief that the method we now have of providing more funds for the larger States is the better one. There is no good reason to

provide for the larger States the added sum of \$23,400 and then make it apply to all States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah wants the floor. Does the Senator from New Mexico hold the floor?

Mr. MONTOYA. I relinquished the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my good friend from Mississippi. What I am about to say was prepared with the thought that this might have come up yesterday, in the absence of the Senator from Mississippi, who is the chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and I am its vice chairman.

I had time to prepare this statement. The Senator from Mississippi just got in this afternoon and did not have that time and, thus, I am speaking on his behalf and for the other members of the committee.

I am pleased to declare our support for the increases in senatorial allowances that are included in the bill.

As the report on the bill indicates, our committee participated in the study and review of the suggested allowances and of the various suggestions for changes. The final recommendations for adjustments in the allowances impressed us as quite reasonable and received our unanimous agreement.

Mr. President, a sizable number of Senators made a persuasive argument of their need for increased allowances for the effective operation of their offices. Although not all of us suffer because of insufficient office allowances, we are sympathetic to their plight. But our committee supports the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee for an additional reason. It has been our hope that the day would come, and soon, when the Senate will provide the funding for all of the functions which any Senator must carry out. Under those conditions, we believe that it then will not be necessary for a Senator to accept any contributions from outside sources for any purposes other than the financing of his own campaign for reelection to the Senate.

We hope that the proposed increases in allowances will go a long way to achieve this goal. It will be incumbent upon our committee, if these adjustments in allowances are approved, to reexamine the provisions of Senate Rule 42 which permit a Senator to accept a contribution to defray the excessive expenses of his office.

Mr. President, a system of funding a Senate office by outside contributions is obviously fraught with danger. The Committee on Standards and Conduct commends the Appropriations Committee for beginning to move to place such funding where it belongs—upon the Government of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, a number of our colleagues, even within the past year, have indicated that the allowances they receive as Senators are not adequate to enable them to carry out their responsibilities and have accepted contributions. Under pressure from news media and other sources, they have retreated from that position and are presumably back

to the responsibility of carrying the costs out of their own pockets. In some cases this may be very difficult and may make service in the Senate very arduous.

Thus, the point of view of those of us on the Committee on Standards and Conduct is that we support a reasonable, effective arrangement, or proposal, to increase allowances to the point, if not immediately, then some time in the future, when every Member of this body can serve their constituents without having to dip into their own pockets or having to go to their friends and ask for help for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I want to express appreciation to the committee, to the chairman, and to the ranking minority member for a very sound, wise, and courageous position that they have announced.

I opposed the fund—whatever it is called in the rules—when it was set up, although I recognized the need for some way of taking care of it. This is the right way to do it. I am so glad that the committee is lending its great prestige to the effort which the legislative subcommittee has made in this direction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate except for a very few minutes, but I want to reiterate what the Senator from Utah has said. I do not want to go over the debate again, and I am not alluding to any individual, but we brought in a proposed rule which, even though it permitted contributions, spelled out that a Senator may use the contributions only to influence his nomination for election or his election. It stated, further, that he shall not use, directly or indirectly, any part of any contribution for any other purpose.

That was thought to have been so severe that many exceptions were added on the floor. I do not complain about that; I just state it as a fact.

Nevertheless, it stated that:

Nothing in this rule shall preclude the use of contributions—

That means money somebody else gave, not a direct campaign contribution, but put in his hands—

to defray expenses for travel to and from each Senator's home State; for printing and other expenses in connection with the mailing of speeches, newsletters, and reports to a Senator's constituents; for expenses of radio, television, and news media methods of reporting to a Senator's constituents; for telephone, telegraph, postage, and stationery expenses in excess of allowance; and for newspaper subscriptions from his home State.

Our committee recommended these changes in a Senator's allowance as a prelude for asking the Senate to repeal this part of the rule that was put in on the floor. I am not complaining, but we still think it ought to be that anything that is put in the hands of a Senator in the way of money can be used only for those purposes, and that the cost of running an office ought to be something the Government pays for, and that no kind of reason can be given along that line as an excuse for taking money.

I hope the whole package can prevail. I am not going to suffer as a result of

this clerk allowance. Most of the time I have less than my allowance. I state this as something that does happen to a Senator: Since I became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I have been running short, frankly, because of the increased volume of work. I know other Senators have had the same experience. My State is in the lower classification of population. I will get along. There will not be any contributions, at least. I know I have had to add two telephone lines to my office already. Many times when the phone rings, they are all busy.

I am not talking about myself. I will get along. A Senator must have an office in his State now. If one Senator from a State has an office, the other Senator had better have one. That is expensive. I have two good employees, and they are busy all the time, in Jackson, Miss. Senator EASTLAND has the same.

No two States have the same kind of constituent demands. I am willing to take the word of the chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator in everything he has said about this whole problem. One thing that bothers me is that we are struggling with our overall obligations in the Government, and the budgetary situation, and the tax situation. This troubles me a great deal. I know there are other States which are larger than mine, and perhaps there are greater pressures from within those States than from within mine. However, I am very hesitant to vote for this increase at this time solely because of the feeling of pressure on me and the whole Congress to try to cut down on expenditures.

I read in the newspapers—and this is in the area of the armed services—that the Defense Department is making a very strenuous effort to cut down its budget, in an effort to help the President balance the budget, and in order to achieve a decrease in the inflationary pressures. It is the symbol of our attitude that bothers me more than the actual clerk hire. It bothers me very much.

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) has been a leader in this field. I feel that I would be remiss in not at least making this small gesture of foregoing this matter until we get over the inflationary pressures, and I hope the war, and reestablish a balance in our economy.

Mr. STENNIS. It is the people's business we are taking care of, not our own business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has not the work of the Senator from Mississippi increased because he is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and has not the work of the Senator from Arkansas increased because he has been holding hearings? That generates publicity, and is bound to make more work. I do not question that. But the subcommittees are well provided with funds to take care of their official business. It strikes me

that when a Senator is head of a committee or subcommittee, he hears more from the public because of the action taken by him or the subcommittee. That is one of the reasons why in the past I have opposed the creation of so many subcommittees. I know any time a Senator makes a speech on a certain proposal, his correspondence increases overnight, and then it will slack off.

From my own experience of almost 33 years, my mail increases depending on something that is brought out by some of the subcommittees on which I serve. I am sure that is true of others.

It strikes me that with all the subcommittees we have now, the 500 additional clerks who serve on the subcommittees could certainly be used by the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the Senator from Arkansas to provide help in answering such mail as may be sent to them because of the hearings held by the various committees.

Mr. STENNIS. I have done all I can to get the mail sent out. I do not use my staff members to do my work. My people in Mississippi will not be brushed off when they write me or call me and want things done. I am up against it, but I will get by.

Mr. ELLENDER. But many letters come from outside the State of Mississippi. I know that is the Senator's experience.

Mr. STENNIS. Constituents from the various States vary greatly about the things they want a Member of Congress to do. I have a pile of papers right now that were given to me as I left a speaking engagement at Jackson, Miss. They are going to get attention one way or another.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wanted to say that, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, any mail from outside of Louisiana I get pertaining to agriculture I send to the committee.

I have a staff of only seven clerks, but they attend to all of that for me. I believe that Senators who have subcommittees could easily do the same thing, and do away with a lot of office work that arises because of the fact that they serve on the subcommittees.

Mr. STENNIS. We are all busy at my office until 6 or 7 o'clock. Four of the girls stay there.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I do not intend to take more than a minute of the Senate's time, because it is getting late. I simply wish to make this statement: I met with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), who is chairman of the Ethics Committee, and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the staff, to go over the answers they received to letters and questions they sent out asking about the needs of Senators. The reason I came into the picture was because I am chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I receive a lot of calls asking for additional space, and so on.

I realize that some Senators do not use

all their appropriations. I do not use mine, and I do not use any of the members of the Rules Committee staff on my staff, either. My own staff does the work I am supposed to do in my office.

However, I know there are a good many Senators whose staffs simply cannot turn out the work they have to do. For that reason, I support the bill in the form in which it was reported, because, as I think the Senator from Mississippi brought out very forcefully, the needs of the Ethics Committee in accomplishing the work they have in mind, illustrate needs we have right now, and therefore I support the bill as reported.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which reported this bill. I merely wish to make this observation: I am not using all of my allowance now. I think it very unlikely that I would use this additional allowance. But if Senators do not use the money, the people do not have to pay it.

Senators who represent populous States and need the additional help in order to do their work should have it. No Member of the Senate is compelled to spend one single cent on his staff that he does not feel is necessary. I happen to have enough confidence in the integrity of the Members of this body that I do not believe any Senator will use money that he does not need, simply because he has access to it.

Furthermore, if any Senator's conscience bothers him too much about the allowance that Senators have to do their work, I would suggest that he take a little journey downtown, and travel through the executive offices. I am not talking about the offices of the members of the Cabinet, but the Assistant Secretaries, the Deputy Assistant Secretaries, the Assistants to the Deputy Secretaries, and so on down the line. As you go through their offices, walking on carpets that come up to your ankles, you can see the staffs they have, which are almost unlimited in size. Perhaps they need them; I am not criticizing them.

But I have never been too patient with people on the Hill who are so alarmed about Senators having, if they need it, sufficient funds to do their work. Those who do not need it do not have to take it, and the people will not have to pay it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator

from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARNSMAN), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SONG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE). If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Allen	Fulbright	Prouty
Allott	Goldwater	Proxmire
Burdick	Gore	Smith, Maine
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Smith, Ill.
Church	Holland	Talmadge
Cook	Hruska	Tower
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Pastore	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Hart	Nelson
Anderson	Hatfield	Packwood
Baker	Hollings	Pearson
Bellmon	Inouye	Randolph
Bennett	Jackson	Ribicoff
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Saxbe
Case	Long	Schweiker
Cotton	Magnuson	Scott
Cranston	Mansfield	Stennis
Dodd	Mathias	Symington
Dole	McGee	Tydings
Dominick	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Goodell	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Montoya	
Hansen	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—25

Bayh	Gurney	Muskie
Bible	Harris	Pell
Brooke	Hughes	Percy
Cannon	Javits	Sparkman
Cooper	Kennedy	Spong
Eagleton	McCarthy	Stevens
Eastland	Metcalf	Thurmond
Ervin	Moss	
Gravel	Mundt	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11 strike out lines 3 through 23 and on page 12 strike out lines 1 through 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The first sentence of the second paragraph under

the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962, as amended (2 U.S.C. 127), is amended to read as follows:

"The contingent fund of the Senate is hereafter made available for reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred in traveling by the nearest usual route between Washington, District of Columbia and any point in the home State of the Senator involved, for not to exceed eight round trips made by employees in each Senator's office in any fiscal year, such payment to be made only upon vouchers approved by the Senator containing a certification by such Senator that such travel was performed in line of official duty." This provision shall take effect with respect to round trips commencing on or after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I join the Senator in the sponsorship of the amendment. The Senator and I have discussed the amendment. I have in turn discussed it with members of the committee, and we are agreeable to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am glad to have the Senator's name added as a co-sponsor.

I will take just a moment to explain the purpose of the amendment. The bill as drafted would provide reimbursement for a staff member going to the home State on eight trips at the rate of 10 cents a mile, regardless of what the cost of the trip might be.

The purpose of the amendment is merely to spell out that they could be reimbursed only for actual transportation expenditures incurred. This does not deal with the number of trips allowed but merely limits the payment to actual costs of transportation.

Without the amendment, it would be possible for a staff member going back home to actually make money on the trip over and beyond the actual expenditures incurred, because the transportation costs are less than the 10 cents per mile. This amendment would merely spell out that they must submit the voucher for the trip and be reimbursed in turn for the voucher covering the expenditures as made.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. I might add, further, that the reason why the provision is in the bill is that the employee trips have been reimbursed on the basis of mileage heretofore. This would put their reimbursement equivalent to what applies to the individual Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate very long.

The amendment I proposed a short time ago was defeated and I had other amendments prepared to reduce the amounts that have been provided by the

committee for various other purposes in the bill. The amount for the offices of the minority leader and of the majority leader have been raised, although I understand there is no intention on the part of the majority leader to use the amount provided. We are doubling the amount for the minority whip of the Senate so as to be able to pay one of his assistants \$30,003 and the other \$15,000, although the amount provided now by law is a little less than half of that.

In January, when the Senate convened, I said that I felt that to pay our Chaplain as much as \$17,500 was entirely too much, and I felt that the amount should be reduced. I am glad to say that the committee did see fit to reduce the figure from \$17,500 to \$10,000. But what the committee did was to turn around and add authority for the employment of a secretary at the rate of \$8,000 annually. So that we end up providing the Chaplain more than he is now receiving.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. The reason why the committee made the provision for a secretary is that the previous Chaplain had an allowance for a secretary, not through direct appropriation but out of the administrative roll of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was Reverend Harris.

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Reverend Harris had a great deal of outside work. As I recall, he wrote articles for various newspapers, and Senator Hayden made that allowance for him.

As I have said, I am not going to press this amendment, but it strikes me that we are entirely too liberal with the taxpayers' money. We have added quite a few jobs. As I pointed out earlier, we have increased the jobs in the Senate by over a thousand between 1961 and 1968, and that trend seems to continue. I sometimes wonder how we ever got along.

I am not going to press it any further, but it strikes me that the Senate ought to consider the times in which we are living, and we ought to try to set an example. Earlier, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) stated that the offices downtown are getting a lot of employees whom we are providing, and that we ought to do the same thing for ourselves. I disagree with that. It strikes me that Congress ought to lead the way toward economy in Government and this would be a good place to set an example.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. I ask for third reading, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 13763) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I move

to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the entire Senate to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) for the splendid manner in which this important funding measure was handled. His clear and convincing presentation, his strong advocacy, his careful preparation as well as his overwhelming acceptance by the Senate. This was only characteristic. Senator MONTOYA has distinguished his entire public career with his outstanding legislative skill and ability.

The same may be said of the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the ranking minority member of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. He cooperated to make certain that this measure received the full yet efficient consideration of the Senate. We are grateful.

We are grateful also for the views of others who joined the discussion adding their own sincere and helpful comments. Noteworthy was the outstanding contribution of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). The success of his amendment was based in large measure on his able and effective advocacy. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) also is to be commended. His views are always most welcome as are those of the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Finally, the Senate may be pleased today with its action in disposing of another of the all important funding measures. There are others to be considered and I would hope that the entire appropriations process will be completed at the earliest possible time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT EXPANSION AND REGULATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 329, S. 2696. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2696) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation and expansion of exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield, so that I may inquire as to the future business for this week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that it is with a great deal of personal reluctance that I call up S. 2696 at this time. However, because of the bareness of the calendar, I really do not have much choice, and I never want this Congress to be accused of being a foot-dragging Congress.

After we dispose of this bill, which may well go into Thursday, it is the intention to take up the veterans education bill, which was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare today.

That is about as much as I can say at the moment.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will yield further, aside from commenting—I do not know of any three words I have ever used that got so much action, and I am very pleased that the Senate is engaged in a considerable flurry of activity—the distinguished majority leader knows that I inquired of him as to whether or not some other bill could be substituted for this, simply because there are Senators on both sides who may not find it possible to be here tomorrow. But I understand that the reason for laying down this bill is that there does not appear to be another bill which could be substituted, and we had this discussion so that this might be brought out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader almost broke my right arm, the distinguished assistant minority leader almost broke my left arm, various Senators from Utah, Texas, and other places almost broke my back, but I do not have much choice.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the junior Senator from Maine is also absent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He had his arm around my neck, as well as the Senator from Minnesota and a few others.

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on last Tuesday a situation occurred in the Senate that confused some of my colleagues, amazed others, startled me, may I say, and I rise at this point to try to put the RECORD straight and eliminate confusion as far as I am able to do so. I also wish to thank some of my colleagues for their defense of me and my position after I had left the Chamber.

Mr. President, you may recall that last Tuesday S. 3061 was suddenly and unexpectedly laid before the Senate as the order of business. I had suggested that the bill be put over to give me and other

Senators on the minority side the time to properly prepare some amendments. However, for some reason the bill was laid before the Senate very quickly and at the moment I was not prepared. We did the best we could to accommodate the acting majority leader in his determination to bring the bill before the Senate.

I had pointed out that I had long standing commitments in California that I just could not break, and which made it impossible for me to remain in the Chamber through the full session on Tuesday. I explained that as well as I could, and I explained that I had tried to have prepared two amendments that I wanted to introduce that had not been completed because we had not had the warning time. I do not think the situation was healthy, proper, or sound.

One amendment had to do with the legal service program in the bill, S. 3061. I thought I had explained it carefully. I understood the legal service program to mean actually what the term implies, that is, to provide a lawyer and legal services for a poor man who could not afford them. I said that somewhere along the line the provision for legal services had become legal reform and that all sorts of things were going on not only in my State but also in many other States, and that my amendment would have permitted two things. It would have restored the Governors' veto over this particular function without the OEO Director's override. Also, it would have provided the Governors with permission to veto line items. In the past there has been a habit of jumping the entire OEO program together and although one may object to only one or two items, the entire program would have to be vetoed. This did not seem to be practical and did not seem to be producing the desired results. So my amendment was introduced to accomplish two things.

I would like the RECORD to show that in the beginning, when the OEO program was first started, the Governors of the separate States had an unencumbered right to veto; and, then, in the second year, 1965, the right of the Governors to veto was significantly weakened, because the Director was given the power to override the Governor's veto. This has caused problems.

During committee hearings I said on several occasions that I would attempt to introduce an amendment that would clarify the original intent of the legal service program, which was simply to provide a lawyer for some poor guy who did not have enough money to hire a lawyer, and that if it was the feeling of the committee that taxpayers' money should be used for the purpose of legal reform, we should hold hearings and come to a decision, and perhaps bring it before this body. Certainly, in my opinion and in my judgment it was not proper to substitute legal reform for what started out to be legal services.

Tuesday my amendment was brought up. There was a rollcall vote and my amendment was agreed to by a vote of 45 to 40. At that point I was forced to leave the Chamber to keep my appointments in my State of California.

After I left the Chamber there was a

discussion, and another amendment was brought up which would amend or emasculate it, really, by placing the power to override the Governor's veto in the hands of the President.

I was amazed that this amendment should be brought up at a time when I was out of the Chamber. Second, I thought it unusual that, having had a rollcall vote and the will and the desire of the Senate having been recorded, that this matter should be taken up again. Certainly, I would think that propriety would have made restraint applicable so that consideration might be at a time when it would be possible for me to be in the Chamber.

I notice from the RECORD that my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. JAVITS) said on three or four occasions that he was embarrassed by the procedure. I do not want him to be embarrassed. I appreciate his thoughtfulness in my behalf, but I do not think he should have been embarrassed.

Then, one of my other colleagues said that 10 days had passed since we voted to report the bill to the Senate and that it was not as though the Senator from California was not a member of the committee.

My distinguished colleague knew I was not only a member of the committee, but that I was an active member. I worked quite conscientiously, as I have ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, on the legal services program, a program designed to help the poor.

I have never disagreed with its objectives but I have often disagreed with the manner and the implementation. I believe one of my first efforts in this body was to try to get the politics out of the program for the poor and to see that the taxpayers' money went directly to the poor people who needed help.

At that point, Mr. President, I particularly want to thank three of my colleagues. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), who is now presiding in the Senate, and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) for speaking in my behalf when I was not here.

Later the statement was made that I had answered at one point that I was unclear with regard to the amendment in relation to the existing law. That was true. I was. At the time I was speaking, the amendment had just been written and submitted. I am not a lawyer. It had just been put in proper language, to be made part of the bill, and in form to be properly presented to the Senate for consideration. I say it was considered. It did pass. I thought that that would be the end of it. There is good reason for the amendment. We find that the legal services, in my State, and in several other States that I know about, set out on a program of legal reform and, in many cases, such reform in this manner is not popular with the majority of my constituents. But they have to pay. They have to pay the cost of bringing the action and then, if they want to object to it, they are asked to pay for the defense, too.

It seems to be, really, an unheard of situation. That was the purpose of my

amendment. I said several times during the presentation of the amendment that I was perfectly willing to have hearings if we want to set up an institution and program of legal reform, hold the hearings, and then bring the matter before this body and let it stand or fall on its merits.

As I say, I am most thankful to my colleagues, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) for protecting my rights and being most helpful and thoughtful of my purpose and my desire along with the stated desire of the Senate which had passed the amendment by a vote of 45 to 40.

I should like to clear up whatever confusion there may be because, as I understand it, there was finally an agreement reached by the proponents of the amendment that would have completely emasculated my amendment. As I understand, the agreement was that I would be a member of the conference and if I objected to the amendment, it would be withdrawn and my amendment left in its original form.

Technically, from the standpoint of parliamentary procedure, I do not know exactly how one does this, but I will accept the offer and I should like the RECORD to show now that I will object. As a conferee I will ask that it be withdrawn, leaving my original amendment which was presented to the Senate and which was voted on by a rollcall vote.

There is another confusion in the hurry of all this. I read the printed copy of S. 3016 carefully today, particularly the second amendment which I am discussing.

On page 14, line 12, it says:

Nothing in subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to deny the President the nondelegable authority to reconsider the plan disapproved by the governor if the President finds the plan to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purpose of this article.

Well now, Mr. President, I submit that again is a unique situation because, as I read section 242 of the existing law, there is no subsection (a). So I leave this question to the staff.

I would like to thank sincerely those Senators for the courtesy which they extended me by saying that if I objected to the second amendment, they would withdraw it at the time of conference by whatever proper parliamentary rules there are for such an action. I appreciate their thoughtfulness and I consider it very kindly of them. I want the RECORD to show now that as a conferee I will object.

THE RECENT VIETNAM MORATORIUM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there has been great discussion lately about the problems of the Vietnam war. Some confusion has evolved from it.

I am sure that many of the young people who marched in the so-called recent moratorium did so without a full understanding or knowledge of the conditions of the historic background of how we got into the war, what happened,

and what were the circumstances that brought about this dilemma in which we find ourselves.

I was fortunate to have been given a letter by a man who served in high capacity in two administrations, both in the administration of President Eisenhower and in the administration of President Kennedy. I have his permission to read parts of the letter which are from a letter he wrote to the present President of the United States, Mr. Nixon.

I read from the second paragraph of the letter:

Having lived at close range with the decisions of South Vietnam from 1961 onward—and disagreed with many of them—I naturally feel a deeper personal concern than most men in private life, and hence I feel compelled to express my concern to you on two points.

First, I believe the public must always be made aware of the facts concerning our involvement in South Vietnam. On January 20, 1961, when President Eisenhower and you—

That was then Vice President Nixon—left the South Vietnam problem to others, we had 800 military advisors and an equal number of foreign aid personnel located in and about Saigon. Eight years later, when you picked the problem up again, we had 550,000 men and countless civilian personnel engaged in a major military effort and doing all sorts of other things as well.

The first major decision came in the fall of 1961 when President Kennedy accepted the recommendations of General Taylor and Walter Rostow and, as a result, our military presence in South Vietnam was almost immediately increased to 15,000 "advisors". This was a step President Eisenhower refused to take as it was a contradiction of the 1954 Geneva Accord—defendable only because our intelligence told us (through means we could not disclose) that the North Vietnamese were violating the Accord by infiltration of cadres and material).

As I said to you when you visited me in our home some two years ago, "President Kennedy put the prestige of the United States on the line and we have been trying to redeem it ever since."

The successive steps in the escalation of our involvement in South Vietnam are all too familiar to you and I will not recount them now. However, I believe the public and the Congress must always be told just how the escalation took place and who was responsible. In short, Vietnam must never become "President Nixon's war". You are struggling to extricate the United States from a bad situation resulting from bad judgment and faulty decisions by President Kennedy and President Johnson and their principal advisors. Understandably, you say, "Let's not quibble over how we got into Vietnam. Let's work to get out of it." This position is commendable but it seems to me, Mr. President, that too many on the Hill are trying to put Vietnam on your doorstep and hence, I believe you are justified in reminding the public both directly and indirectly just how the situation came about.

I agree that we must withdraw and this should be done as rapidly as possible. I concur in your "hope" (not a commitment) that Clifford's timetable should be anticipated. However, I am very concerned over the concept of withdrawing combat forces and leaving our air and logistic resources behind to be protected by a revitalized South Vietnam army. We went through this once and the ARVN failed us. Air fields and depots were seriously damaged by enemy bombardment, infiltration and sabotage. Therefore, 50,000 Marines were put on "static defense" and when this failed, they and hundreds of

thousands more U.S. military personnel were put on the offensive.

Withdrawing combat forces might very possibly cause a repetition of late 1964. With this apprehension in mind and strong doubts concerning the effectiveness of a revitalized South Vietnam military establishment, I suggest as an alternative that units of all types be withdrawn concurrently in a phased withdrawal so that our own combat units will be available to protect our own air and logistic resources at all times. This is a suggestion I offer to you based on my experience and observations of the disappointments of the past.

Mr. President, I shall refrain from reading the rest of the letter, because it is personal. It does not bear on the subject.

I wanted to read the letter into the RECORD at this point so that the confusion that exists about this entire dismal, discouraging situation could be brought clearly to the attention of all citizens and many of our colleagues who may have forgotten the basis of the beginning, and many of those who marched, unfortunately, not being certain as to what they would accomplish.

As I have said many times, those who marched in the moratorium, who said they marched to stop the killing, have not the slightest idea of the amount of killings and atrocities and bloodshed they will turn loose if we ever accede to the demands of the moratorium committee and pull out of there immediately. There will be a slaughter the like of which has not been seen in the world since the Madman of Berlin tried to exterminate an entire people.

And so, Mr. President, I have put this particular piece of factual history into the RECORD at this point because the man who wrote this letter has served with great honor and great distinction in public service to his Nation for many years. He is a man of complete trust and honesty and dedication.

I asked his permission to put this letter into the RECORD in the hope that my colleagues may read it and may go back over the elements of this case carefully and cautiously, and make certain that we do not permit the fires of emotion to overcome the bright light of good wisdom and knowledge in trying to make the decisions which we are trying to make with regard to Vietnam.

I know, Mr. President—and I am sure that all my colleagues will agree—that no one has the complete knowledge that is available to the President of the United States. And there is no one, I am sure, even in this Chamber, or the entire Congress, who would question for one instant the design and desire of the President to bring this unfortunate episode in history to an honorable conclusion.

So I hope that possibly this addition to the RECORD printed by the Congress may in some way keep clear and in sharp focus the actual facts, conditions, and desires of the President to bring about peace. I hope that people will not be influenced by emotional behavior led by people whose names are not generally known, whose identities are obscure, whose background and characteristics are known only to some of us who have

taken the trouble, perhaps, to research their backgrounds and their reasoning, in order to find the why and the wherefore of their particular interest at the present time. It is in the hope that we will not be carried away and suggest that the President of the United States turn over these all-important decisions to some mob of people who have marched. I am sure motivated by the finest impulses, in the hope of bringing about peace and stopping the killing. And I know of one one who disagrees with that desire.

But they may do it with understanding. They may do it with full regard for the fact that this is the obligation of the elected President of the United States, and ours is to advise him in performing these obligations. It is our duty to advise and consent as he goes along, and to please not impede the progress that he is attempting to make, and that he is making, so that, at the soonest possible moment, we will come, not to a makeshift withdrawal, not to what would amount to an absolute and abject surrender of the principles and the guarantees laid down by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and adhered to by President Nixon, but that we may bring this entire situation to a proper conclusion—one with honor, and one, I would hope, that would encompass the suggestion of my esteemed colleague the majority leader yesterday, when he said he would hope to see a convocation of all interested free nations to guarantee the freedom of peace and the freedom of being for the nations of all of Southeast Asia, not just the unfortunate South Vietnamese who have suffered so long.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his courteous attention, and I yield the floor.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969— AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 252

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 13270, the House-passed tax reform bill and ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, printed, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD in accordance with the Senator's request.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 252

Beginning on page 273, strike line 7 and all thereafter down through line 17 on page 276, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) Plowback Requirement.—Section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Plowback Requirement.—

"(1) To the extent that percentage depletion (determined under subsection (b)) exceeds the sum of cost depletion for such minerals plus qualified plowback expenditures (as defined in paragraph 3) made by the taxpayer (or by members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return) during the current taxable year and the two succeeding taxable years, such excess percent-

age depletion shall be restored to taxable income in the second succeeding taxable year to the extent of the difference between the amount of such excess percentage depletion (computed according to the rate in subsection (b)) and the amount that would have been computed by substituting the following rates for those provided in the designated subparagraphs of subsection (b):

- "(1)—20 percent
- "(2)—17 percent
- "(3)—11 percent
- "(4)—7 percent
- "(5)—5 percent
- "(6)—4 percent
- "(7)—11 percent

To the extent that qualified plowback expenditures during the two succeeding taxable years are taken into account in computing (or eliminating) excess percentage depletion with respect to the current taxable year, they shall not be taken into account in computing (or eliminating) excess percentage depletion with respect to any other taxable year. Where qualified plowback expenditures, applied under the above rules, are greater than the amount needed to eliminate excess percentage depletion, such excess qualified plowback expenditures may be carried over for two years and applied in the same manner as the net operating loss deduction provided for under section 172.

"(2) The amounts to be restored to income under paragraph (1) shall be determined for all mines, wells, and other mineral deposits located within the United States and its continental shelf separately from those located without the United States and its continental shelf. For mines, wells, and other mineral deposits located without the United States and its continental shelf, the amounts to be restored to income shall be determined for all such mines, wells, and other mineral deposits located within each separate foreign country or in all foreign countries, at the election of the taxpayer (or members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return).

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "qualified plowback expenditures" means all costs, including fees, wages, and salaries, incurred by the taxpayer (or members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return) in connection with exploration, acquisition, and development of mineral properties of a like or geologically-related kind to that for which the percentage depletion has been allowed, including intangible drilling and development costs, plants and facilities for drilling, mining, and producing such minerals to a readily marketable state, and research and development on methods of discovery and recovery of such minerals.

"(2) The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1970."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with percentage depletion in the extractive industries. For many years, the tax law has granted owners of mineral interests a deduction against income from those interests—the deduction being known as "percentage depletion." The percentages vary according to the mineral, varying from 27½ percent in the case of oil and gas wells to 5 percent for pipe clay and gravel.

The percentage depletion is different from "cost depletion." In the case of cost depletion, the taxpayer is allowed to take deductions, based upon the rate of production from his mineral property. But when the cost is used up, that is the end of the deductions. With percentage depletion, the deductions continue on as long as there is production from the property and notwithstanding that the

taxpayer's cost has long since been recovered through these deductions.

Two major reasons are behind permitting percentage depletion to go on beyond the time when the taxpayer's cost has been recouped: The first is that it is in the nature of a "reward" to the taxpayer for risking his capital in trying to develop mineral resources. It is a high-risk type venture, and without the reward it is generally conceded that we would not have had resource development which has brought an abundance of minerals and their products to consumers at relatively low cost. The second reason is that percentage depletion is calculated to provide an incentive for the taxpayer to keep going in finding and developing resources for the ultimate benefit of the consumers and, in the case of overseas activities, our balance-of-payments position.

With this background, let me point to what the House-passed tax reform bill proposes to do. It would cut the percentage depletion rates by approximately 25 percent. I refer to this as a "meat ax" approach to the problem of abuses which have been occurring. Take two corporations, A and B. Each is in the oil business and each has \$100,000 in percentage depletion deductions for a particular year. Corporation A "plows back" its \$100,000 into continued exploration, drilling and development—all calculated to increase—or at least replace—oil resources for the ultimate benefit of consumers. Corporation B does not plow back anything, but takes the \$100,000 and uses it for dividends to stockholders. Under the House-passed bill, both would be treated alike. I find this treatment both arbitrary and unfair, and it would certainly seem to be contrary to our national interest.

My amendment would center on the abuse and not treat both of these corporations the same way. In the case of corporation A, which plows back all of its percentage depletion, the present depletion rates would continue to apply. In the case of corporation B, which does not plow back anything, the new, reduced rates in the House-passed bill would apply. In the case of corporation A, the 27½ percent rate would continue. In the case of corporation B, the reduced rate of 20 percent would apply.

If corporation B plowed back only a portion of its percentage depletion, then it would be allowed a rate falling between the House rate of 20 percent and the present rate of 27½ percent, depending on the proportion that was plowed back.

My amendment also provides that if the plowback is less than the amount of the percentage depletion deduction for the current taxable year, the taxpayer will have the two succeeding years within which to make the plowback expenditures required to preserve the present higher percentage depletion rate. It also provides that if the plowback expenditures exceed the percentage depletion deduction, they may be carried over for the 2 succeeding years to be used in preserving the higher percentage depletion rate for those years.

Actually, my amendment represents a compromise between the two theories underlying the percentage depletion deduction. The reduced House rates would represent the reward theory. The additional amount, represented by the present rates, would represent the theory that percentage depletion is calculated to be an incentive for the taxpayer to continue to find and develop mineral resources. My amendment is directed at the area of abuse where the second theory is not being satisfied.

We have received testimony from representatives of the Treasury Department that the wholesale reduction in rates represented by the House-passed bill would result in increased costs to consumers. At a time when everyone is deeply affected by inflation, this would be a terribly inappropriate time to aggravate the situation. Let no one be lulled into thinking that the House-passed bill, if enacted, would not result in an increase in the cost of auto gas, home heating fuel, tractor fuel, construction materials, and the various products represented by the petrochemical industry. Such a result would not obtain if we center on abuses, as my amendment does, and leave those individuals and corporations, which are plowing back their percentage depletion, alone.

My amendment makes it clear that the plowback expenditures must relate to the mineral against which the percentage depletion has been allowed. The phrase "like or geologically related kind" would mean, for example, that percentage depletion on oil production could be plowed back in finding and developing natural gas, and vice versa. In the mining industry, some deposits contain several different kinds of minerals. These are geologically related, and percentage depletion as to any of them could be plowed back as to any or all of them.

My amendment provides that percentage depletion and plowback are to be separately considered for activities within the United States and its continental shelf and activities abroad. This is designed to continue the separate consideration of taxation of foreign income.

The definition of expenditures which will qualify as plowback expenditures for the purpose of enabling a taxpayer to retain the present rates of percentage depletion is, in my judgment, both liberal and realistic. The costs of exploration to find mineral properties, including typical geological and geophysical exploration expenditures, would qualify. So would the costs of acquisition of mineral properties—bonuses paid to owners, the purchase price paid for a mineral property, and commissions. Delay rentals are not intended to be covered, because by their very nature, they "delay" development of a mineral resource for the benefit of consumers. Also qualifying would be costs of development, which would include intangible drilling and development costs, the cost of plants, well pipe, and facilities required for drilling, mining, and producing minerals to a readily marketable state. Thus, defining fa-

cilities would not qualify in the petroleum industry, because crude oil is "readily marketable." Construction of a pipeline incidental to moving crude oil to a storage tank on the cost of the storage tank would qualify. So would the cost of transporting minerals from a mine to the point at which they must be processed to a readily marketable state. Finally, expenditures for research and development of methods of discovery and recovery would qualify, because these are calculated to enable minerals to more efficiently be found and produced for the benefit of consumers. Fees, wages, and salaries incurred in connection with any of these qualifying activities also qualify, and if an employee's services are partly in connection with a qualifying activity and partly in connection with a non-qualifying activity, his salary should be appropriately allocated.

I recognize that a taxpayer would be allowed to currently deduct many of these qualifying expenditures; and in other cases he would capitalize them and be permitted to deduct depreciation. That is not relevant to the plowback approach. What counts is that the taxpayer makes expenditures during the current taxable year and the 2 succeeding years which are equal in amounts to its percentage depletion deduction for the current taxable year, and that these expenditures are of a nature which can be reasonably expected to bring more and better quality minerals to the consuming public. In the case of overseas operations, such expenditures would have a twofold effect: First, in some cases at least they would bring more and better quality minerals to the consuming public in the United States; and second, they would enable our taxpayers having foreign operations to more effectively compete in overseas markets, thus improving our balance-of-payments position through long-established policies of repatriating substantial profits to the United States and also providing a growing market for our own export trade.

Mr. President, the time is past due to reform our tax law to see to it that the very technical provisions of the Internal Revenue Code affecting the extractive industries conform to national policy. The House-passed bill does not do this. My amendment does.

RAISE THE ANNUAL EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during the transaction of morning business today I introduced a bill to raise the annual earnings limitation of social security recipients from \$1,680 to \$2,400—an increase that I feel is necessary for many retired Americans to maintain an adequate standard of living.

I have already introduced legislation to grant across-the-board increases in social security benefits, which now average just \$99.86 a month. It is a logical step, then, to also raise the limitation currently placed on the amount a social security recipient can earn without losing a portion of his benefits. Both the

benefits and the earnings limitation should reflect the spiraling cost of living.

The President has proposed to increase the earnings limitation from \$1,680 to \$1,800 a year—undoubtedly a step in the right direction. However, there has been a precipitous rise in the cost of living since the last social security increase was enacted in the fall of 1967.

My proposal would not only offset the recent rise in the consumer price index; but it would also make up for past instances when cost of living increases were not matched by increases in the earnings limitation—and it would effectively cover some of the additional cost of living increases that will likely be visited upon these fixed-income Americans before the Social Security Act is again amended in the future.

Mr. President, we must realize that people now reaching age 65 have usually had the advantage of better health care than prior generations of social security recipients—a fact that is contributing to a longer life span and the ability of people to continue with some kind of work after retirement. This generation of social security recipients is also likely to have acquired more skills during their working years than did the last generation. We need to preserve those skills, and to encourage people to work, rather than to penalize them for working.

We must also realize that, since the minimum wage has risen, the social security recipient now reaches the earnings limitation in less time than ever before. Thus, at a time when he needs most to work to supplement inadequate benefits,

he is severely penalized and limited in doing so.

Ideally, Mr. President, the earnings limitation—or retirement test, as it is sometimes called—should be repealed. But I am advised that this is not economically feasible, as it would cost several billions of dollars.

The ceiling of \$2,400 which I propose would, I believe, exempt most of the earnings for those people who must work to supplement their social security benefits. At the same time, of course, it would be less expensive than abolishing the limitation. Under my proposal, the annual cost would be an estimated \$1.3 billion.

I hope that Congress will decide to go beyond the President's recommendation and set the earnings limitation at \$2,400 a year. It seems clear to me that such a change would more realistically meet the needs of so many Americans.

We cannot justify asking a great many of our social security recipients—people who played a large part in building America into the world's most affluent society—to subsist below the norm.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 22, 1969, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 21, 1969:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for terms expiring May 11, 1972:

R. Derge, of Indiana, vice Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, term expired.

Jewel LaFontant, of Illinois, vice Dr. Pauline Tompkins, term expired.

William C. Turner, of Arizona, vice Dr. Walter Adams, term expired.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William C. Lee, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years vice Alfred W. Moellering.

U.S. MARSHAL

Andrew J. F. Peebles, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Florida for the term of 4 years vice John E. Maguire, Sr.

Anthony E. Rozman of Michigan to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years vice Orville H. Trotter, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 21, 1969:

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

William O. Baker, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years from August 3, 1969.

Jack Malcolm Layton, of Arizona, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1973.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 21, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ronald W. Carter, Riverlawn Christian Church, Wichita, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Father, I come to You today to ask Your blessing upon this meeting. I know, Father, that You know each of these men, that You know their names, that You know their addresses, that You know their families, that You know all about them; so, Father, help each man, no matter what his duty here today, to remember that he is an American; an American with a heritage to be proud of; an American with a present to be concerned about, and an American with a future to prepare for. So bless each man, Father, and give him wisdom, courage, national pride, and perhaps, even tears, that he might do everything to keep America always a land of the free and the home of the brave. In Jesus' name I ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9946. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C.; and

H.R. 11702. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1181. An act to provide for potato and tomato promotion programs;

S. 2264. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control and vaccination assistance; and

S. 2452. An act to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services.

REV. RONALD W. CARTER

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to associate myself with the invocation of Rev. Ronald

W. Carter, the young man who offered the invocation in our Chambers this morning.

Reverend Carter is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Winston Carter of Carthage, Mo., whom it is my pleasure to represent in the Congress.

Reverend Carter is a graduate of the Ozark Bible College in Joplin, Mo., which is also located in the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri.

He was named third honor student, as well as class orator of his 1968 graduating class.

At the present time, Reverend Carter is minister of the Riverlawn Christian Church of Wichita, Kans. His equally young and most attractive lady is from Indiana.

I commend this young man on accepting the call to Christian service; I also commend his father and mother—seated in the gallery today—for obviously creating a Christian home which has helped prepare him for duty in the church.

In the words of Luke:

A good man brings good out of the treasure of good things in his heart. For a man's mouth speaks what his heart is full of.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer today was offered by Rev.