

I did at Saranac . . . because I am one of those Christians who believes completely and literally in God's promise to restore Israel to its ancient home. I rejoice that this is happening in my day. I am filled with admiration for the valor and sacrifice of the small population of Israel which has successfully withstood the attacks of its more numerous enemies in the very hour of its birth. I am proud that the United States through the United Nations had a part in establishing this new sister nation, and I feel privileged as an American to assist in a small way in this work."

A MILLION COPIES

The contents of this letter eventually came to the attention of the Israel Bond organization. The impassioned defense of Israel, the deep commitment of a Christian to world Jewry so impressed those who saw it that requests for copies began coming in. In response to a request from the Israel Bond people, McKeldin agreed to have the letter reproduced and distributed. Eventually, a million copies of the letter were made and sent throughout the world.

The letter also led Israel Bonds to ask McKeldin to speak at various Bond raising functions. McKeldin agreed, and since then has spoken throughout the country for Israel Bonds, including giving the first speech for Israel Bonds in Dallas, Texas. He has helped sell hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of bonds, as well as buying thousands of dollars worth himself.

His work for Jewish causes has not been confined to Israel Bonds. He has helped raise money for local organizations like the Talmudical Academy and for national groups like the United Jewish Appeal and the Jewish National Fund. In fact, as Mayor he raised hundreds of dollars for the JNF by keeping a blue JNF pushka box on his mayor's desk and requesting contributions from his visitors. He always said that whatever his guests gave he would match. During the Six-Day War, a reporter, noting this oft-said statement, put a \$100 bill in the pushka McKeldin quickly called the Baltimore JNF office and told them he had a \$200 contribution for the JNF's land reclamation efforts.

TRIPS TO ISRAEL

McKeldin's interest in and open identification with the Jewish religion are apparent in many ways. He has traveled to Israel five times—in 1952, 1955, 1958, 1962 and again in 1968. He carries every day in his pocket a black and gold yarmulke of crocheted wool which he got in Kfar Batya in Israel, and many times I have seen him don the yarmulke when receiving rabbis or speaking at Jewish functions. He wears almost every day a watch with a Hebrew lettered face. And he openly greets Jews—and many time Gentiles—with "Shalom." Inscribing his book about Baltimore entitled "No Mean City," he will many times include in actual Hebrew the phrase Shalom Urvacha, meaning "Peace and blessing." His yiddish includes another greeting: Kim gazunt un gay gazunt ("Come in health and go in health.")

What explains this rarity of humanitarianism expressed in the life and thinking of this man? Why this obvious love for the Jewish people? Why this identification and interest in Judaism that far exceeds any personal or political reasons?

First, I believe Theodore McKeldin had been attracted to the Jews because of his overall commitment to helping minority groups and fighting injustice. Throughout his forty years in public life, he consistently championed racial and religious justice, long before it became politically palatable.

"I hate injustice—all forms of injustice," he once told me. "I've dedicated my entire life to fighting injustice."

PERSONALLY INVOLVED

As a poor boy from South Baltimore, he grew up identifying with the downtrodden. He was therefore personally involved with the plight of any group battered by prejudice, and when he greeted Negroes with, "Hi, my brother" or referred to Jews as "lantsmen" he was speaking openly from his soul.

But the second and most important reason for his development of a strong bond with Jewry is the fact that Theodore McKeldin is a deeply religious person.

Believing firmly in prayer, McKeldin is

drawn to the people who introduced prayer to One Supreme Being. He knows both the Old and the New Testament better than any other layman I know. He probably would have been a minister, as he told me on numerous occasions, if he had had the money to go through the long schooling necessary ("If I had been a Catholic, I would have been a priest, but the Protestants and the Jews do little to help those who feel a calling."). Thus, his sense of righteousness and his belief in the beauty of the religious way of life quite possibly find an illuminating example in the Jews. Viewing a photo of Israeli troops praying at the Western Wall following the Six-Day War, he said to me, "What other army captures a city with a prayer book and a prayer shawl?"

BIBLICAL KINSMEN

Dr. Leon Sachs, a close McKeldin friend over many years, summed it up best when he said of him, "He is a sincere Christian who views the Jews as a biblical kinsmen. He undoubtedly feels because of his religious nature that Judaism, the mother of Christianity, is something special and that the Jewish people themselves do have a mission in this world. He therefore feels a strong affinity for the Jewish people."

In the mayoralty campaign of 1963, McKeldin watched the election returns come in on a television set in his campaign hotel room. As the votes were counted from five of the six city districts, he saw Philip Goodman, the first Jewish mayor of Baltimore, leading him by 400 votes. With votes yet to be counted in the Fifth District, the city's predominately Jewish district, McKeldin turned to his wife and said, "It's all over. I'll never beat Phil Goodman in his own district." He started to leave the room as his daughter called out, "The figures are changing." McKeldin said he knew, visualizing the crushing defeat. But his daughter persisted, saying he was now pulling ahead. Amazed, McKeldin returned to the TV set and watched dumbfounded as the Jews of Baltimore gave him a 4,000 vote majority and his second term as Mayor.

The love affair between McKeldin and the Jews was obviously mutual!

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 6, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them along the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light.—Exodus 13: 21.

O God, our Father, in generation after generation men have sought Thee and have found that Thy faithfulness never fails, Thy love never falters, and Thy strength never fades. Our fathers walked by the guidance of Thy spirit and rested in Thy mercy, so to us, their children, be Thou a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night to give us light upon our way, strength to walk along it, and peace in our hearts.

Remove the veil from every heart and unite us into one people as we walk together toward the promised land where free men shall dwell together in peace and good will.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE CRIMINAL LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1002, Public Law 90-226, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Revision of the Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Dowdy and Mr. HOGAN.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. FISH.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624,

84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. STEED, Mr. COHELAN, and Mr. KYL.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 202(b), Public Law 90-259, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. PETTIS.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. CAHILL.

RESTRAINT ON MIDEAST—WARNING AGAINST IMPOSED SETTLEMENT

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I read with dismay the reports that the United States has agreed to enter preliminary discussions with the Governments of France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union on the Middle East situation. I urge the United States to approach such talks with both restraint and caution. The consultations which would presumably take place at the United Nations between the permanent representatives of the so-called Big Four would attempt to find ways and means of solving the Middle East crisis.

The United States must, however, avoid any suggestions which would either diminish the position of Israel or which would seem to impose any conditions. Solution to the situation in the Middle East can only be arrived at through direct negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis. While the announced purposes of such informal discussions would appear to give added prestige and support to the Jarring efforts to find some area of agreement between the antagonists, there is always the possibility that such talks could eventually lead to efforts by some to impose a settlement in the area.

If the Soviet Union and France can use their influence upon the Arab States to negotiate honestly and sincerely within a framework of explicit recognition of Israel sovereignty and a permanent end to hostilities, then the U.N. talks may make a worthwhile contribution to a peaceful Middle East.

For this reason any proposals which might result from these talks at the United Nations can only be the basis for negotiations between the Arab and Israeli Governments.

Any solution to the Middle East crisis should embody the five principles enunciated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in statements on June 19, 1967, and September 10, 1968. The five principles were: Recognition of the right of every nation to live in peace and have this right respected by its neighbors; freedom of innocent maritime passage in international waterways; limitation of the arms race; respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all countries; and progress in solving the refugee problem. The fifth principle—progress in solving the refugee problem—would have to take into consideration the entire history of the refugees in the Middle East.

Efforts to impose a peace settlement have failed in the past and they will fail again unless these principles are adhered to. Peace can come only if both sides respect the right of each to exist. This cannot be imposed; it must come from a realization that there is no alternative.

I, therefore, hope that President Nixon will not accept any agreement to impose a peace in the area, and that he will use all of the prestige of the Office of President of the United States to urge the

Arabs and Israelis to reach agreement with each other.

RESTORATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the atrocious spectacle occasioned by the public execution of 14 Iraqi citizens, nine of whom were Jews, raises once again the specter of extinction of a minority group only because of their religious beliefs.

The persecution of the Jews in Iraq has been well documented over the years. Economic sanctions and travel restrictions have made it impossible for the pitifully few Jews remaining in Iraq to either sustain themselves properly or to emigrate from Iraq. Now the process of persecution and discrimination has taken a macabre turn with the recent hangings. And we are told by the Iraqi Government that the trials and presumably the executions will continue, although the executions will not again be public. But, Mr. Speaker, it does not make one bit of difference if a wrongful act is committed in public or private. The unfortunate victims of the recent hangings would be no less dead had the act been committed within the closed confines of the prison walls.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a place in this world to which civilized nations can turn in a collective effort to put a stop to barbarous treatment of human beings. The only body is the United Nations. For it is only by condemnation of such governments as Iraq by the entire world community is there a possibility of putting a stop to the genocidal acts.

Today it is the Jews, tomorrow it may be the Catholics, maybe even the Moslems. We must persevere in our efforts to preserve the right of people to worship as they see fit. For this reason, I am introducing this resolution condemning the Government of Iraq for perpetrating this violent act of murder, and further to express the sense of Congress that the President instruct the permanent representative to the United Nations to ask for a special meeting of the Security Council in an effort to find a way to put an end to these senseless murders before even more are committed.

Mr. Speaker, these violations of human rights and lack of human decency must be investigated thoroughly—and now.

Following is text of resolution and a list of the sponsors:

H. RES. 226

Whereas the Government of Iraq has violated all of the principles of common decency by making a public spectacle of the execution of fourteen Iraqi citizens of whom nine were Jews;

Whereas all vestiges of civilized behavior were lost when the bodies of the victims were publicly displayed at the gates to the city; and

Whereas the Government of Iraq appears to be oblivious to the condemnation which this atrocious act, signifying their return to the age of barbarity, has aroused throughout the world;

Whereas more secret trials followed by public executions can only inflame emotions and decrease the opportunity for peace and stability in the Middle East;

Whereas the Government of Iraq has by its actions violated the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to respect the principle of equal rights, the dignity of the individual and the equal rights of all people regardless of race, color or creed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the secret trial and public execution of Iraqi citizens be condemned and that the House of Representatives respectfully request the President of the United States to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request a special meeting of the United Nations Security Council to seek ways and means of preserving the human rights of the people of Iraq.

LIST OF SPONSORS

Hon. Joseph Addabbo, Democrat of New York.
 Hon. Glenn Anderson, Democrat, of California.
 Hon. Frank Annunzio, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Hon. William A. Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Mario Biaggi, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Edward P. Boland, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 Hon. John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana.
 Hon. Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Philip Burton, Democrat, of California.
 Hon. James Byrne, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Don H. Clausen, Republican, of California.
 Hon. R. Laurence Coughlin, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. John Conyers, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.
 Hon. Glenn Cunningham, Republican, of Nebraska.
 Hon. Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat, of Connecticut.
 Hon. James J. Delaney, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.
 Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, Republican, of New Jersey.
 Hon. Joshua Ellberg, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Leonard Farbstein, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Dante Fascell, Democrat, of Florida.
 Hon. O. C. Fisher, Democrat, of Texas.
 Hon. James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Gilbert Gude, Republican, of Maryland.
 Hon. Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.
 Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat, of California.
 Hon. Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.
 Hon. Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California.
 Hon. Ray J. Madden, Democrat, of Indiana.
 Hon. Joseph G. Minish, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Hon. Robert H. Mollohan, Democrat, of West Virginia.
 Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida.

Hon. Otis Pike, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Bertram Podell, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. Melvin Price, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Hon. Thomas M. Rees, Democrat, of California.
 Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Hon. Benjamin Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. William F. Ryan, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York.
 Hon. William St. Onge, Democrat, of Connecticut.
 Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
 Hon. Charles W. Sandman, Republican, of New Jersey.
 Hon. Charles A. Vanik, Democrat, of Ohio.
 Hon. Joseph P. Vigorito, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Jerome R. Waldie, Democrat, of California.
 Hon. Lawrence Williams, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 Hon. Gus Yatron, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

CONDEMNATION OF IRAQ

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the House resolution introduced today by 48 Members of this Chamber condemning the Government of Iraq for its action of January 27 in which the peace of the Middle East was further threatened by the public execution of 14 persons, nine of them members of the Jewish faith.

This atrocity is a barbaric action belonging to the Dark Ages. Executions such as this following secret trials are a complete violation of the principles of the United Nations. Iraq's attitude toward the State of Israel raises the suspicion, which cannot be dispelled, that nine men were hung for their religious beliefs rather than their alleged crimes.

Despite the outcry which her action has caused among men of good will throughout the world, it is reported that Iraq is starting a new series of secret, mass spy trials involving 35 people, including 13 Jews. It is reported that several dozen more persons have been held for months on charges of espionage and sabotage.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that these executions have deeply shocked the greater Cleveland community which I represent. On Monday night, February 3, a mass rally was held to protest the action of the government of Iraq. That night and since then, over 2,200 Clevelanders have signed petitions deploring the atrocity.

It is my hope that the whole House will support the resolution we are introducing today to condemn these acts and request our permanent representative to the United Nations to call a special meeting of the U.N. Security Council to seek ways and means of preserving the human rights of the people of Iraq.

Only if the human rights of minorities

are preserved in each country of the Middle East will peace ever be possible in that troubled area. We cannot condone, we must condemn the actions of the Baghdad regime which ignores the rights of individuals and the safety of millions.

SALARY RAISES—A VICTORY FOR WHOM?

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the Rules Committee has tabled any possibility of bringing the Federal salary increase to the floor for approval or disapproval by the full membership, we hear the rumor—"This is a victory." Apparently the pay raise is now automatic on February 14, 1969, and there can be no vote—no chance to show our constituents opposition to this increase of 41 percent on our own salary.

"A victory for whom?" may haunt us. For we, the recipients of a salary increase, were not even permitted an opportunity to express by record vote the wishes of our people.

A strange victory when we consider that the action of a few must have assumed the attitude that the full membership could not be entrusted with our own decision as to whether or not we approve of this increase. The inference is that gag action was necessary to keep the bill from the membership because—had the pay bill been discharged the Members would have voted to kill it.

Will we benefit by a pay raise, when we can anticipate the increase will be immediately offset by additional inflationary increases in other areas of the economy. Can we not expect that the private and public sector will immediately follow suit—and justify their increases on our leadership?

Labor will demand appropriate increases, the farmers will feel justified in seeking higher prices or larger supports—business executives will feel free to upgrade their salaries to induce capable men into the ranks of free enterprise. Caution against inflation has been scattered to the winds. In short, the entire producing economy of our country will overnight be dissatisfied. We have but opened a Pandora's box to a renewal of revolutionary inflation.

Many among the citizenry already feel themselves aggrieved—our retired citizens, pensioners, salaried people, and welfare recipients can be expected to see in our indiscretion the need for reaction so they, too, can offset the spiraling losses in the purchasing price of our dollar.

And what of our young men in the military forces? In Vietnam under combat conditions a private receives \$186.40 per month, a captain receives \$621.80 per month. These are men who face death at any moment. Can we refuse to grant them a 41-percent military pay raise?

Salaries and costs have already all but priced us out of competition on the world

market. Where will there be victory on the world exchange from such action?

Consider also the precedent now established—that is, that a committee can circumvent the wishes of the full membership of the House. Can we distinguish such action from taxation without representation?

Can we allay, as unfounded, the growing uneasiness of our people that a committee may be established to raise taxes without any vote or the opportunity of the constituents to express disapproval. Government which denies its people a voice is not representative government. Rather, it is called government by committees—soviets.

The pay raise may be considered a victory by some, but I fear it will be a short-lived victory which can only usher in further chaos and disorder among our concerned people.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS SURVEY—PART II

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material and tables.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the tabulations of the questionnaire which was sent to over 20,000 school superintendents is continuing. The basic purpose of this questionnaire is to draw upon the personal experience of school superintendents so as to assist the committee in making objective judgments with regard to the future direction of Federal education legislation. The responses have been most helpful in gaining an insight into the feelings of the superintendents who implement the programs established through this legislation.

Since the committee has already begun hearings on extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, this would be a most propitious time to share with my colleagues some of the responses to the question—"In general, have the recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education been of great, substantial, moderate or little value?" Our analysis of the responses to this question indicate that, indeed, the majority of superintendents are convinced that recent Federal education programs have been of concrete assistance. Of those responding, 74.2 percent indicated that recent enactments have been of great, substantial, or moderate value. As I stated last week, approximately 70 percent of the responding school superintendents stated that ESEA is underfunded in their school district. Principally because of limited funds, uncertainty as to the amount of funds to be received, and actual reductions in levels of support, a certain number, however only about 12 percent, indicated that recent enactments have been of less than moderate value. In contrast to this, 18 percent of the superintendents who responded were most enthusiastic about recent enactments, feeling strongly enough about these programs to state that Federal assistance has been of "great" value as is evidenced in the following table:

PERCENT OF RESPONSES INDICATING RECENT ENACTMENTS OF CONGRESS FURNISHING SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION HAVE BEEN OF "GREAT" VALUE

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England.....	11.4	14.2	8.3	19.4	0	
Connecticut.....	8.8	20.0	0	22.2		
Maine.....	6.2	20.0	4.2	0		
Massachusetts.....	8.4	6.6	7.5	13.3	0	
New Hampshire.....	13.6	50.0	12.5	0		
Rhode Island.....	25.0	0	16.6	60.0		
Vermont.....	23.5	33.3	21.4			
Mideast.....	12.6	11.8	11.6	14.4	66.6	0
Delaware.....	0	0	0	0		
Maryland.....	11.1		50.0			
New Jersey.....	11.8	10.5	11.4	15.8		
New York.....	13.0	14.0	9.7	18.0	50.0	0
Pennsylvania.....	13.2	10.5	13.0	13.2	100.0	
Great Lakes.....	12.0	2.4	13.1	13.4	66.6	20.0
Illinois.....	11.4	9.0	14.1	12.5		0
Indiana.....	10.4	0	12.5	8.3	0	0
Michigan.....	11.6	3.6	13.2	12.0		100.0
Ohio.....	16.0	9.1	15.8	16.6	100.0	0
Wisconsin.....	9.6	9.6	8.6	16.6		0
Plains.....	15.6	14.8	16.6	18.0	0	100.0
Iowa.....	13.6	12.4	11.8	33.3	0	
Kansas.....	16.0	16.2	13.5	33.3	0	
Minnesota.....	11.8	12.4	10.0	16.6	0	
Missouri.....	14.6	11.1	20.8	0	0	100.0
Nebraska.....	18.0	19.1	16.6	0		
North Dakota.....	16.9	14.6	22.2	50.0		
South Dakota.....	26.6	22.8	41.2	0		
Southeast.....	31.8	27.2	32.6	36.0	13.3	0
Alabama.....	59.0	50.0	57.1	80.0	50.0	
Arkansas.....	32.6	28.6	39.0	28.6		

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
Southeast—Continued						
Florida.....	37.5	50.0	12.5	66.6		
Georgia.....	20.0	0	21.6	16.6	33.3	
Kentucky.....	36.2	33.3	38.8	38.4	0	
Louisiana.....	29.4		0	41.6	0	
Mississippi.....	34.1		33.3	35.7		
North Carolina.....	34.0		27.7	39.2	0	
South Carolina.....	30.0		36.3	25.0	0	
Tennessee.....	28.8	12.5	41.6	18.1	0	0
Virginia.....	23.5		14.8	38.0	0	0
West Virginia.....	15.0		33.3	0	0	
Southwest.....	33.8	36.4	30.0	17.1	50.0	0
Arizona.....	31.1	33.3	31.6	25.0	0	
New Mexico.....	22.9	18.8	31.2	0		
Oklahoma.....	49.1	47.1	57.6	25.0		
Texas.....	28.8	32.4	25.9	16.6	66.6	0
Rocky Mountain.....	12.8	10.9	33.8	15.8	33.3	
Colorado.....	9.5	8.1	10.0	25.0	0	
Idaho.....	25.0	25.0	33.3	0		
Montana.....	9.7	8.7	8.3	33.3		
Utah.....	23.0		16.6	16.6	100.0	
Wyoming.....	6.6	5.2	11.1	0		
Far West.....	15.4	14.0	18.1	12.6	21.4	0
Alaska.....	12.5	0	0		100.0	
California.....	16.6	12.9	21.9	14.1	18.2	0
Nevada.....	22.2	50.0	0	100.0		
Oregon.....	4.8	3.2	6.8	0		
Washington.....	18.6	23.8	20.6	0	0	
United States.....	18.4	17.5	18.3	20.1	25.0	18.2

Many of those who said that Federal assistance has been "great" were quite enthusiastic about programs which were made possible through Federal assistance. Others cited the progress that has been made in their schools because of the Federal enactment. The number in parentheses following the city is the enrollment figure:

Dayton, Ohio (58,500): "Recent enactments, of course, for elementary and secondary education have been of great value in promoting new programs, creating innovations and allowing for expansion of services to the educationally deprived youth and adults."

New Orleans, Louisiana (109,684): "In my judgment, the recent enactments of Congress which have provided support for elementary and secondary education have been of great value. The value of such legislation lies not only in the improved quality of education which has been made possible but also in the increase in aspiration levels of millions of disadvantaged youth. Hope has been promised for a better educational world where previously there was no hope. Moreover, I am firmly convinced that aid for the disadvantaged has resulted in improvement in the education of children in areas which are not classified as disadvantaged. Certain provisions such as Title II of ESEA and the use of Title I funds for special education classes have had across the board beneficial results.

Leavenworth, Kansas (66,048): "Recent enactments of Congress for support of elementary-secondary education have provided locally: greatly improved libraries and library service, summer reading improvement programs; travel allowance to college girls from local college to public schools to become individual tutors for junior high students; teacher aides to provide clerical and supervisory assistance to teachers with large class loads; medical and dental care to individual students from low income."

Brookings, South Dakota (2,794): "Recent Federal support for elementary and second-

ary education has been of great value, not only in the educational funds that it has provided but I believe that it has had a great effect on calling the attention of situations to be of urgent nature and of the problems of education in this country."

Tuscumbia, Alabama (2,421): "The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has added great impetus for change and improvement. It has played a significant role in upgrading education in the south and other parts of the nation."

Naco, Arizona (321): "We are a small Mexican border school with very inadequate funding, a bilingual program, and provincial attitudes; the support has been of very great value to us."

Richmond, California (43,779): "Recent support to schools by the Congress has been of great value. There still is much progress and work to be accomplished in this difficult task."

Akron, Ohio (59,000): "Of great value: (a) they have changed attitudes; (b) bought equipment and materials; (c) permitted experiment; and (d) inspired innovative thinking."

Pauls Valley, Oklahoma (2,027): "Categorical aid has been of great value indeed. I shudder to think what our Oklahoma public school system would be like today if there had been no Federal assistance."

Numerous superintendents, in their evaluation of Federal education programs, made specific mention of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I of ESEA received a high evaluation from a substantial number. The following are examples of this type of response:

Mount Pleasant, Texas (2,825): "We feel that recent enactments of Congress in regard to education have been of great value to the local educational agency in providing educational opportunities to all youth regardless of economic, ethnic or educable background. Within our own district we are able to validate the increase of the learning level of

seventy percent (70%) of our economically and educably deprived at least one grade level since the implementation of our remedial programs which are available to us under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, the vocational programs available under the Vocational Act of 1963 are of tremendous value to all youth of our district."

Donna, Texas (3,850): "In the past, this district, which has a high concentration of disadvantaged youth, could not effect substantial educational change because of inadequate finances. A condition of lethargy existed among the professional personnel who could see no possibility for improvement. All of this has now been changed with the influence of Federal legislation. Through ESEA, special programs now exist and an atmosphere of anticipated improvement exists among both faculty and students."

Coulee City, Washington (204): "ESEA funds have greatly improved the educational program of our school system."

Lee County, South Carolina (6,200): "ESEA has and continues to have a great impact on the quality of the educational process in this state. All of the other Acts—NDEA, Vocational etc., have also been highly effective, if somewhat restrictive. There must be more if we are to even reach the goal of providing educational opportunities that will permit children to achieve to the maximum of their potential."

Banks County, Georgia (1,347): "ESEA has helped our school district tremendously since enactment of law by Congress. Our school district is located in the Ninth Congressional District in North Georgia. ESEA has enabled our district to purchase equipment, reduce teacher pupil rate, help with lunches, clothing, reading (remedial) and many other projects. Without Title I ESEA it would have taken our district 10 years to reach the present level that we now have. In my opinion, ESEA has done more to improve education in my area than all the other federal projects combined."

Sandersville, Georgia (5,300): "Through our Title I PL 89-10 money, we have increased our attendance to 97%, overall an increase in attendance over three years ago of 19%. Through our Title III PL 89-10 project, we have raised the reading levels of all our children and experimenting with a public kindergarten and a program for multiple handicapped children—the programs have been of great value."

Strathmore, California (372): "The ESEA Title I is a good program and has really been of great value in this particular school. I am positive it has improved education as a whole."

Frederick, Maryland (18,356): "Federal aid for support of elementary and secondary education has been of substantial value to this school system. Title I particularly has enabled us to help many children in many ways that we could not do without use of these funds."

Juneau, Alaska (Department of Education) (70,000): "ESEA has been of great value as 'seed' money. Over 50% of the schools in the state have made modifications in their locally supported school systems based upon evaluation of their Title I ESEA programs."

Kansas City, Missouri (75,000): "Congressional legislation has had a substantial effect in our school system, especially ESEA Title I, Vocational Education, PL 874, and the Cafeteria Subsidy. Title III projects may be promising, as may be EPDA."

Montpelier, Vermont (2,100): "Truly, the ESEA, especially its first three Titles have been of value to this school system—consistent with the funds provided. Title III has been particularly meaningful here."

Superintendents who indicated that Federal enactments have been of substantial value frequently were most complimentary about the programs in their additional comments. The following comments are illustrative:

Hamden, Connecticut (9,600): "The provisions of ESEA and NDEA have had a real impact upon our schools. The former in allowing us to provide programs for children we never would have financed, and to innovate and try to move frontiers into new areas. The latter has done more for teacher improvement and supplying us with classroom materials than anything the state or local community has done. It has worked toward closing the gap between technology and practice."

Warminster, Pennsylvania (11,859): "After 30 years in school work, 25 of which have been in administration, I believe that the Federal Government has done more for schools than ever before and has been of great value despite the reductions. Never in my experience have I had so much equipment, so much staff or so much opportunity. I realize that these things can be done at the local level, but it must be pointed out that since they were not done here at the state level, the Federal Government's contribution has been of substantial value."

Long Beach, California (71,334): "Recent enactments of Congress have been of substantial value. Without the aid provided, many worthwhile programs could not have been supported. Local and state resources are being severely pressed to provide the basic educational needs for the average pupil."

Others, such as the superintendent of schools for the Dixie School District in San Rafael, Calif., with an enrollment of 4,923, suggested that we must do much more:

The answer to your question five must be that the recent enactments of Congress for furnishing support for elementary and secondary education have been of substantial value. However, we have only begun to improve our educational system and much more is needed if our young are to be properly prepared to meet the demands of the last 20th century and early 21st century.

Many of the superintendents felt that they would consider the programs of great value had they been fully funded or funded far enough in advance to allow administrative planning for the funds made available. A statement by the Superintendent of the San Diego city schools and reiterated by many other superintendents reflects this view:

Recent federal programs have been of substantial assistance. The tasks facing the large urban school districts, however, call for extraordinary assistance.

The following responses are typical of the many superintendents who share the same opinion:

Parkersburg, West Virginia (19,800): "Help has been moderate, simply because funds have been moderate. We must increase federal participation fourfold at least if the impact is to be substantial."

Boswell, Ohio (1,600): "Moderate—after the war—suggest that more money be directed to education."

Bellaire, Michigan (520): "I believe that the recent enactments of Congress supporting education for the public schools have been of substantial value. But, they have stopped just short of being 'great'. This I realize would take more money but I believe this would be the best investment government can make today."

Greenwood, Mississippi (6,068): "Recent enactments of Congress give substantial support to our school district. We have made the best progress ever experienced in the district. We could not operate an adequate program without the ESEA funds. We can solve our problems with enough money and enough time."

The tables which follow contain the percent responses indicating that Federal assistance has been of "substantial" and "moderate" value:

PERCENT OF RESPONSES INDICATING RECENT ENACTMENTS OF CONGRESS FURNISHING SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION HAVE BEEN OF "SUBSTANTIAL" VALUE

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England	19.8	20.0	17.5	27.7	0	
Connecticut	17.6	20.0	15.0	22.2		
Maine	25.0	20.0	29.2	0		
Massachusetts	16.9	20.0	12.5	26.6	0	
New Hampshire	27.2	50.0	18.8	50.0		
Rhode Island	18.8	0	16.6	40.0		
Vermont	17.6	33.3	14.2			
Mideast	21.7	14.8	23.2	22.8	33.3	100.0
Delaware	36.4	0	66.6	0		
Maryland	66.6		50.0	71.4		
New Jersey	15.2	2.6	21.3	21.0		
New York	21.6	23.2	19.4	22.0	50.0	100.0
Pennsylvania	22.8	21.0	24.6	18.0	0	
Great Lakes	21.2	16.4	23.3	21.6	33.3	40.0
Illinois	16.2	14.8	17.1	16.6		100.0
Indiana	24.0	0	25.0	33.3	100.0	0
Michigan	25.5	25.0	28.9	16.0		0
Ohio	25.2	27.2	24.8	29.1	0	0
Wisconsin	18.5	14.5	21.0	16.6		100.0
Plains	22.0	21.3	25.0	12.0	40.0	0
Iowa	26.7	28.8	27.4	8.3	0	
Kansas	22.4	17.5	32.4	16.6	50.0	
Minnesota	19.8	19.4	21.6	16.6	0	
Missouri	23.2	25.9	22.4	7.1	100.0	0
Nebraska	27.0	25.0	33.3	33.3		
North Dakota	11.8	10.4	22.2	0		
South Dakota	16.0	15.8	17.6	0		
Southeast	33.0	29.8	31.9	34.1	53.3	50.0
Alabama	22.7	50.0	28.6	13.3	50.0	
Arkansas	29.8	30.3	24.4	57.1		
Florida	18.8	0	12.5	33.3		
Georgia	30.9	33.3	29.7	33.3	33.3	
Kentucky	34.4	16.6	33.3	30.8	100.0	
Louisiana	52.9		100.0	33.3	100.0	
Mississippi	39.0		40.7	35.7		
North Carolina	36.2		50.0	28.6	0	
South Carolina	25.0		27.2	25.0	0	
Tennessee	35.5	37.5	20.8	54.5	100.0	100.0
Virginia	35.2		33.3	42.8	0	0
West Virginia	45.0		33.3	50.0	100.0	
Southwest	26.2	22.8	33.0	22.8	0	0
Arizona	22.2	14.2	31.6	25.0	0	
New Mexico	37.1	31.2	50.0	0		
Oklahoma	25.8	26.4	24.2	25.0		
Texas	25.7	20.9	33.3	25.0	0	0
Rocky Mountain	33.0	34.3	33.8	26.3	0	
Colorado	34.9	37.8	35.0	25.0	0	
Idaho	37.5	29.1	50.0	50.0		
Montana	23.6	22.8	33.3	0		
Utah	15.4		16.6	16.6	0	
Wyoming	20.0	15.7	22.0	50.0		
Far West	25.8	19.7	25.1	36.8	28.6	100.0
Alaska	25.0	25.0	33.3	0		
California	26.0	20.4	22.8	35.8	27.2	100.0
Nevada	22.2	0	40.0	0		
Oregon	22.6	22.5	24.1	0		
Washington	27.9	16.6	31.0	50.0	100.0	
United States	24.6	21.7	25.8	27.3	33.3	45.4

PERCENT OF RESPONSES INDICATING RECENT ENACTMENTS OF CONGRESS FURNISHING SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION HAVE BEEN OF "MODERATE" VALUE

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England	40.6	37.1	41.6	38.8	100.0	
Connecticut	29.4	0	35.0	33.3		
Maine	50.0	40.0	45.8	100.0		
Massachusetts	50.7	40.0	52.5	53.3	100.0	
New Hampshire	40.9	50.0	50.0	0		
Rhode Island	31.2	60.0	33.3	0		
Vermont	11.8	33.3	7.1			
Mideast	39.2	46.5	39.0	34.7	0	0
Delaware	36.4	0	33.3	50.0		
Maryland	11.1		0	14.2		
New Jersey	43.2	52.6	39.3	36.8		
New York	41.7	44.2	46.6	32.0	0	0
Pennsylvania	35.6	42.1	33.8	39.4	0	
Great Lakes	33.1	35.6	30.6	42.2	0	40.0
Illinois	31.7	30.3	33.3	33.3		0
Indiana	34.4	70.0	27.8	41.6	0	100.0
Michigan	28.4	35.7	20.4	48.0		0
Ohio	36.0	31.8	35.2	45.8	0	100.0
Wisconsin	36.5	41.9	32.0	41.6		0
Plains	35.6	35.2	34.7	44.0	40.0	0
Iowa	39.1	38.1	43.1	33.3	0	
Kansas	29.6	32.5	24.3	16.6	50.0	
Minnesota	41.9	41.6	38.3	58.3	100.0	
Missouri	35.4	33.3	35.8	50.0	0	0
Nebraska	30.3	29.4	33.3	33.3		
North Dakota	35.6	35.4	33.3	50.0		
South Dakota	29.3	31.6	17.6	100.0		

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
Southeast	20.4	23.4	19.4	19.8	26.6	50.0
Alabama	13.6	0	14.2	20.0	0	
Arkansas	21.1	19.6	24.4	14.2		
Florida	31.2	50.0	50.0	0		
Georgia	30.9	33.3	29.7	33.3	33.3	
Kentucky	18.0	33.3	16.6	23.0	0	
Louisiana	11.8		0	16.6	0	
Mississippi	9.8		11.1	7.1		
North Carolina	14.8		11.1	14.2	100.0	
South Carolina	30.0		18.1	50.0	0	
Tennessee	22.2	25.0	25.0	18.1	0	0
Virginia	21.5		14.8	14.2	100.0	100.0
West Virginia	25.0		0	50.0	0	
Southwest	19.2	18.7	17.0	28.6	50.0	100.0
Arizona	17.7	9.5	15.8	50.0	100.0	
New Mexico	11.4	12.5	12.5	0		
Oklahoma	11.2	13.8	6.0	0		
Texas	23.9	23.6	21.2	33.3	33.3	100.0
Rocky Mountain	28.8	26.2	32.2	15.8	33.3	
Colorado	33.3	35.1	35.0	0	50.0	
Idaho	15.0	16.6	8.3	25.0		
Montana	27.8	31.6	16.6	0		
Utah	53.8		66.6	50.0	0	
Wyoming	30.0	21.0	55.5	0		
Far West	30.0	32.0	29.8	25.2	35.7	0
Alaska	50.0	75.0	33.3	0		
California	28.4	31.1	29.5	21.8	36.4	0
Nevada	55.6	50.0	60.0	0	100.0	
Oregon	30.6	25.8	31.0	100.0		
Washington	30.2	33.3	24.1	35.7	0	
United States	31.2	30.9	30.3	30.7	31.2	36.4

The problem most frequently discussed by superintendents who responded "substantial" or "moderate" is that of funding. Many of the responses indicated that the funds were too limited to allow for an adequate program. Others felt that the uncertainty of the amount was a major obstacle to an effective program. Typical responses are as follows:

Myrtle Point, Oregon (1,463): "The recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education have been of substantial help, particularly in the starting of new programs and in the giving of extra teacher time and materials to students of low and exceptional ability. The difficulty has been in trying to maintain a program when the funds vary from year to year. Our little district received approximately \$20,000 the first year to operate from January to September and we are now receiving approximately \$16,000 to operate the entire school year. The programs started the first year were successful and received parent and teacher approval to such an extent that the reduction in federal monies has been made up by local funds, which puts an increased burden on our already overburdened local property taxpayers."

Bothell, Washington (9,107): "Substan-

tial. However, the uncertainty of the amount and length of time of funding have caused much concern in conjunction with long range planning."

Markham, Illinois (3,532): "I feel that recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for education have been of substantial value to this school district and ones in the surrounding area. I feel that Title II of the ESEA has been very influential and important inasmuch as it attempts to supplement an area that has not always been given the attention by school officials as required. I feel this particular title is important, also, since it requires that the local effort be sustained or increased in order to qualify the following year for funds. School districts are required to invest these funds in books and materials rather than personnel which I feel is very important. It is my personal preference that funds be increased for this title on the highest priority."

Alexis, Illinois (660): "Federal support of elementary and secondary education has been of very moderate value, due to the meager funds appropriated."

Lockport, Illinois (385): "Extremely moderate value. Our allotment for Title II (ESEA) will not go far. We are making the best effort possible, but our library still rates 'below Class IV' which is lower than the lowest classification."

Willimantic, Connecticut (1,300): "I believe that the recent enactments of Congress to furnish support for elementary and secondary education are of moderate value mainly because the amount of money has been small."

Cumberland, Maryland (16,456): "Enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education have been of substantial value in Allegany County; however, much more is needed and any reductions would be extremely painful."

Roseville, California (2,518): "I would say that Congressional support for education lies somewhere between substantial and moderate. Certainly, with the present trend, it is rapidly approaching the latter. I firmly believe that if the Federal Government had maintained or would maintain its original level of support under ESEA that the effect on education, both at the elementary and secondary level, would have been much greater."

A very small percentage of the superintendents feel that Federal assistance has been of little value. As indicated in the table which follows, this was a response primarily from smaller school districts:

PERCENT OF RESPONSES INDICATING RECENT ENACTMENTS OF CONGRESS FURNISHING SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION HAVE BEEN OF "LITTLE" VALUE

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England	13.5	17.1	16.6	0	0	
Connecticut	14.7	0	25.0	0		
Maine	15.6	20.0	16.6	0		
Massachusetts	14.0	20.0	17.5	0	0	
New Hampshire	4.5	0	6.2	0		
Rhode Island	18.8	40.0	16.6	0		
Vermont	11.8	0	14.2			

States by region	Total percentage	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
Mideast	13.0	10.8	13.9	12.7	0	0
Delaware	9.1	0	8	25.0		
Maryland	0		0	0		
New Jersey	15.2	18.4	16.4	5.2		
New York	12.0	7.0	14.6	12.0	0	0
Pennsylvania	13.2	5.2	13.0	18.4	0	

PERCENT OF RESPONSES INDICATING RECENT ENACTMENTS OF CONGRESS FURNISHING SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION HAVE BEEN OF "LITTLE" VALUE—Continued

States by region	Total percent-age	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
Great Lakes	14.2	9.0	14.8	8.2	0	
Illinois	11.0	3.2	18.2	20.8	0	0
Indiana	12.5	10.0	15.2	0	0	0
Michigan	12.4	10.7	14.4	8.0	0	0
Ohio	13.9	22.7	15.2	0	0	0
Wisconsin	11.5	14.5	9.8	8.3	0	0
Plains	12.8	14.0	10.0	16.0	0	0
Iowa	6.2	7.2	3.9	8.3	0	0
Kansas	13.6	17.5	8.1	0	0	0
Minnesota	14.0	15.5	13.3	0	0	0
Missouri	20.7	20.9	16.4	42.8	0	0
Nebraska	11.2	13.2	0	33.3	0	0
North Dakota	10.2	12.5	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	9.3	8.7	11.8	0	0	0
Southeast	4.8	7.7	6.0	1.8	0	0
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	2.8	5.4	0	0	0	0
Florida	6.2	0	12.5	0	0	0
Georgia	3.6	0	5.4	0	0	0
Kentucky	6.8	16.6	8.3	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	9.8	0	11.1	7.1	0	0
North Carolina	4.2	0	0	7.1	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0

States by region	Total percent-age	School enrollment				
		Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
Southeast—Continued						
Tennessee	6.6	25.0	4.2	0	0	0
Virginia	9.8	0	18.5	0	0	0
West Virginia	5.0	0	11.1	0	0	0
Southwest	10.0	10.6	9.0	11.4	0	0
Arizona	15.6	23.8	10.5	0	0	0
New Mexico	17.1	31.2	6.2	0	0	0
Oklahoma	6.4	33.3	6.0	0	0	0
Texas	9.8	8.8	10.1	16.6	0	0
Rocky Mountain	16.0	17.5	10.2	21.0	33.3	0
Colorado	9.5	8.1	10.0	0	50.0	0
Idaho	10.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	0	0
Montana	25.0	22.8	25.0	66.6	0	0
Utah	7.6	0	0	16.6	0	0
Wyoming	20.0	31.6	0	0	0	0
Far West	15.0	16.2	14.6	14.7	7.1	0
Alaska	12.5	0	33.3	0	0	0
California	12.8	14.0	10.4	15.4	9.1	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	24.2	22.6	27.6	0	0	0
Washington	17.4	19.0	17.2	14.2	0	0
United States	12.2	13.8	12.1	9.2	4.2	0

The majority of the superintendents giving this response indicated that the problem was one of limited funds. Most felt they received very limited assistance because of the small size of their school districts, and many others initially received such assistance, proceeded with a program and then the following year, received no funds. Typical of the feeling expressed by superintendent who responded "little value," is the response from McDonald, Pa.—2,299:

I feel that the recent enactments of Congress for school districts at first were substantial, now I believe little because of the cuts in the programs financially.

Some additional responses along this line follow:

Burlington, Washington (2,605): "In general, recent enactments have been of moderate to little value because the allocation to the districts of our size do not allow for an extensive enough program development. For example, approximately six percent of our student body is Mexican-American. Our allocation for providing help in Cultural Deprivation of these students amounts to \$10,500. It helps, we are doing a better job than we used to, but it is a long way from solving the problem."

Lakewood, Colorado (6,000): "At this point I feel it is of little value because of the amount of money involved. I personally feel that the money for library materials has been of great value. All the other programs under ESEA have been so minor that they have little effect."

East Whittier, California (12,000): "For the East Whittier District in particular, recent Federal enactments have been from moderate to little value for the simple reason there hasn't been enough money available for us to really do the job. We are most appreciative of NDEA funds and hope that this will not be cut back. Hopefully, there could be a massive increase also in EPDA funds."

Wakeeney, Kansas (1,000): "Moderate to little. We just don't receive enough funds to have any appreciable effect on our program."

Nazareth, Pennsylvania (3,400): "Limited funds provide moderate to little value."

Hamilton, North Dakota (50): "Little value since we are small."

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that in response to this question, superintendents freely commented, frequently at length, about the strengths and the weaknesses of recent Federal legislation designed to benefit elementary and secondary education. Clearly, many expressed concern about certain problems such as late funding, curtailment in funds, and uncertainty with respect to the amount of money they would receive. The responses I have included here today indicate some of these problems. But when one views all of the responses, it is clear that the benefits derived from the programs clearly outweigh the problems which we are experiencing in these early years of program implementation.

The superintendent of Charleston County School District in South Carolina, a district which serves 60,000 students, responded to question 5 of the questionnaire as follows:

In our school district, when one compares the benefits gained from federal funding with the problems encountered from federal funding, we find that the benefits greatly outweigh the problems.

I think Superintendent Garrett's statement reflects not only the situation in his district, but also represents quite well a widespread feeling with respect to these programs. Our committee survey indicates too that superintendents agree with Superintendent Garrett's closing statement:

It is my opinion that our school system and many other school systems in the United States would be in severe trouble without such Federal funding.

AMEND MEAT INSPECTION LAW

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, since the

passage late in 1967 of the Wholesome Meat Act, the Department of Agriculture has had its hands full trying to reach agreements with the various States regarding the sanitation standards to be enforced, and to recruit enough Federal inspectors to do the expanded job imposed on the Department by the law.

The intent of Congress in passing the legislation was to assure consumers of safe and sanitary meat supplies. It was not the intention of Congress to drive out of business many small slaughtering and packing firms which have long been doing business, and which follow good sanitary practices. Yet I have received complaints that some of the technical requirements facing small packing plants may be impractical and unrealistic, and while not actually improving sanitation conditions, impose such a financial burden upon the plant operators that their continued existence is threatened.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have drafted and introduce a bill which would amend the present law by giving the Secretary of Agriculture the discretionary authority to exempt certain plants from the statutes provided they are only in intrastate commerce. It is the same authority which he now has in regard to territories of the United States.

I voted against the 1967 act, and we now know that measure was ill advised.

ACTION OF YESTERDAY BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WITH REFERENCE TO CIGARETTE ADVERTISING ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

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

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the action taken yesterday by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to cigarette advertising on radio

and television is simply one more instance of arbitrary and capricious action by a regulatory agency.

Once again the Federal Communications Commission has brazenly reached out to appropriate unto itself new jurisdiction, beyond that which Congress has delegated to it.

In making its pronouncement on a matter it knows Congress will be considering this year, the FCC is attempting to intimidate the free exercise of congressional will and to usurp congressional authority.

I resent this effort deeply and condemn it. I urge all Members of this body to do likewise.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our President, Richard Nixon, is confronted with grave problems in the United States and throughout the world. The Vietnam war still plagues the world, with another Vietnam Communist offensive threatening. The Near East is at the boiling point. The Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia exposes the Berlin corridor to more pressure and possible harassment. Turmoil is seething in the Caribbean. Here at home, we are faced with explosive situations on our campuses, crime on the increase, and violence in the urban areas. To solve these problems, the President needs unity and the President needs our support. The American people should unite behind the Commander in Chief. This is no time for partisanship or special interests. The President has an awesome responsibility. He cannot bear these colossal burdens alone. The President needs our help here in the Congress and that of the American people. President Nixon is well equipped to lead our Nation during these times of crises. He is experienced, having served in our Armed Forces, here in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and as Vice President of the United States. Those who lambast the President and tear down the Office of the Presidency are pulling the house down upon themselves. We must have confidence in our leaders and support the President in the national interests. I call upon my colleagues here in the Congress, of both political parties, to support our President so that he might lead America into the greatest era in the history of the world. Through unity, we can win the peace and preserve freedom for all time to come. The destiny of free peoples everywhere hangs in the balance. The percentage is about 50-50 between freedom and slavery throughout the world. Let us not be the ones to tip the scales against us. Let us support our President and respect the dignity of that high and exalted office. Henry Grady, the late, great editor of the Atlanta Constitution once said:

Back of the President and above him stand the American people. What the people are—that, and nothing else—will the President be.

YESTERDAY'S U.S. DISTRICT COURT DECISION OPENS THE DOORS OF COLLEGE CAMPUSES OF AMERICA TO WHOEVER MIGHT WISH TO SPEAK ON ANY SUBJECT

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Montgomery, Ala., Judge Frank M. Johnson, of the U.S. district court handed down a decision, the effect of which opens the doors of college campuses of America to whoever might wish to speak on any subject he pleases and takes away longstanding and recognized prerogatives of college university presidents and their advisers over campus affairs.

The speaker in question at my own Auburn University, Auburn, Ala., is the recognized advocate of counseling young men across the country to evade the draft—One Rev. William Sloan Coffin, chaplain of Yale. Reverend Coffin along with Dr. Benjamin Spock have prided themselves in collecting draft cards and presenting them en masse, to the selective service boards as a protest movement against this country's commitment in Southeast Asia.

Auburn president, Dr. Harry Philpott had correctly ruled against his speaking on the Auburn campus because of Reverend Coffin's previous conviction in a U.S. district court in Boston on a charge of conspiracy in aiding and abetting of young men to resist the draft. President Philpott further said that speakers who advocate disobedience to Federal law or who violate Federal law should not be allowed to speak on the Auburn campus, in that one of the fundamental aspects of education is to instill in our American citizenry respect for the laws of this country.

The court's decision is all the more objectionable, in that the court order stipulates that a suitable auditorium must be provided by Auburn University and that school funds must be provided in defraying travel expenses and paying honorarium to this convicted felon who goes about this country preaching disobedience to laws and counseling the campus youth of this country to follow the "Hell no, I won't go" doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, I view this decision as just another case in which the Federal courts of this country, through their liberal interpretations of the laws of the land, are making contributions to the cause of those who would destroy that which has traditionally and inherently made our country great.

I would like to place in the RECORD a brief résumé of Reverend Coffin's activities which might shed some light on his philosophy and his goals:

REV. WILLIAM SLOANE COFFIN, JR., CHAPLAIN, YALE UNIVERSITY

Reverend Coffin was convicted for conspiracy to aid, abet and counsel violations of the Selective Service law and was sentenced on July 10, 1968 to a prison term of two years and was fined \$5,000.

He was listed among co-plaintiffs with the

W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America in a suit filed in Federal Court in April 1966 against the U.S. Attorney General and the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB), to restrain all further proceedings before the SACB in the case of the Attorney General v. W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America on the grounds that the Internal Security Act of 1950 is unconstitutional. The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America is the youth front of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Reverend Coffin was listed among the sponsors of The DuBois Centennial Celebration which was held at Carnegie Hall, New York, on February 23, 1968. This affair was sponsored by a quarterly Negro journal called Freedomways, a publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

He has been an official of the National Conference for New Politics (NCNP), a leftist organization which has been highly infiltrated by identified members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other subversives. In 1966, Reverend Coffin was listed as a member of the NCNP's National Council, and in 1967 was reported to be a member of this group's Executive Board of the National Council.

Reverend Coffin spoke at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., on October 21, 1967, at a mass demonstration sponsored by the National Committee to End the War in Vietnam, a Communist-dominated organization.

He also addressed another anti-war rally held in New York City on April 27, 1968. This event was under the auspices of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, which has a mixed group of identified Communists, notorious fellow travelers, and pacifists in its leadership.

According to *The New York Times* of May 26, 1961, Reverend Coffin was arrested in Montgomery, Alabama, on charges of disorderly conduct in connection with his participation in the Freedom Rides and integrated sit-ins.

He has participated in the activities of the Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, an agitational anti-war organization. Reverend Coffin has served as a member of this organization and has also spoken at rallies in its behalf during 1967 and 1968.

Reverend Coffin was listed as an initial signer of "A Call to Resist" which urged civil disobedience regarding the Selective Service law. This Call was sponsored by the Committee for Draft Resistance, San Francisco, and was distributed during 1967. According to the *Guardian* of March 16, 1968, Coffin and another individual, led some 5,000 demonstrators through New Haven, Connecticut, to the Armed Forces induction center on March 2, 1968 chanting "Resist, don't enlist."

He was listed among consultants on the preparation of "National Vietnam Examination" which was utilized in a classroom at Florida State University during the fall of 1966. The "National Vietnam Examination" was a project of the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). SDS is an anarchist organization which is led nationally by self-admitted communist revolutionaries.

OPPOSITION TO SALARY INCREASES

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my opposition to the major new salary increases proposed for the Congress, the judicial branch and the top echelon of the executive branch.

The increases—40 percent for Congressmen, 50 percent for Federal judges, 35 to 70 percent for high-ranking administration officials—now appear certain to go into effect on the scheduled date of February 14. The Senate voted this week to reject a resolution that would have vetoed the pay raises.

I feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we in the House of Representatives should at least have a chance to debate and vote on a package of pay raises that will cost the taxpayers almost \$25 million yearly.

I realize, of course, that Congressmen and other Government officials frankly deserve a significant increase in salary. Faced with mounting responsibilities, forced to pay many extraneous yet necessary expenses out of their own pockets, they have become more and more financially pressed over the past several years.

But—plainly, Mr. Speaker—this is not the time for salary increases of the magnitude proposed by President Johnson and his Commission on Governmental Salaries. Inflation is still a major problem in the United States, driving up prices at a rate virtually unprecedented in recent American history.

Taxpayers are being forced to dig deeper and deeper into their pocketbooks each year. The taxpayers in my congressional district, for example, face steep new increases in State taxes as well as a possible extension of the 10-percent Federal surtax.

How, in good conscience, can we ask the American taxpayer to pay higher rates when the Congress itself contributes to the economy's inflationary spiral by sanctioning \$25 million in new salary increases?

How, for that matter, can we ask labor and industry to exercise restraint in wage rates and consumer prices?

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the time is not right for major governmental salary increases.

PERMISSION FOR JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO HAVE UNTIL APRIL 1, 1969, TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1969, to April 1, 1969, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President as required by section 5(b) (3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it has been necessary for the Joint Economic Committee to defer its hearings until the latter part of February and early March in order to give the new administration an opportunity to consider the issues and prepare their testimony. Consequently, it is necessary to have a later filing date.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that this has been cleared by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), in the House, and by Senator JAVITS in the Senate, and by the vice chairman, Senator PROXMIRE, and by the chairman of the committee.

CXV—190—Part 3

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

"WASHINGTON WELCOMES CRIME PLAN"

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I have ever appeared before the House and have had an opportunity to quote with approval the writings of Mr. Drew Pearson, but his letter to his grandson, which was published this morning was called to my attention by a friend. I consider that in this letter the author did give a very fine and fair analysis of the crime situation in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere. I especially commend the suggestion that every able-bodied individual should be required to work for all the aid which is extended to him.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in work for all who will work, help for all who cannot work, and hell for all who will not work. I, therefore, include as a part of my remarks the article by Mr. Drew Pearson:

WASHINGTON WELCOMES CRIME PLAN

(NOTE.—Drew Pearson's column today takes the form of a letter to his grandson, Joseph P. Arnold.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 5, 1969.

DEAR JOE: President Nixon last week scored a big hit with people in the Nation's Capital by announcing a program to combat crime. It scored an especially big hit with Negro residents, because the great majority of Negroes are honest and law-abiding and they are the chief sufferers from robberies, and holdups by their own people.

Margaret Brown has been so worried about the many holdups in her neighborhood that she has been frightened to go home at night even though we send her by taxi. Negroes would have even been glad if the President had declared martial law in the District of Columbia.

Actually there wasn't anything really new in Nixon's crime remedies. They were very similar to the earlier recommendations of the D.C. Crime Commission which Attorney General Ramsey Clark had been trying to put through a budget-pruning Congress for months.

But the fact that a new President got behind these proposals and made them his own is important, because a new broom sweeps clean and Congress will now almost certainly have to appropriate the money even if it does go over the budget ceiling to pay for 10 more judges, 40 more prosecutors, 1000 more policemen, various court functionaries, etc.

All of these are important, and President Nixon was wise enough to call the editors of the local Washington newspapers into his office to announce the anticrime program, which gave it added emphasis.

THE FAMILY

But Nixon's anticrime proposals were chiefly protective, rather than preventive, and there were two very important preventive proposals which he did not touch upon. One of them was something no President can do much about—the broken family. The other was something no President has dared do anything about—crime and violence on television. No President so far has admonished the all-powerful TV networks regarding the

shameful manner in which they are inspiring crime and violence among the Nation's children.

Both of these things—the family and television—are probably the most important factors in generating crime.

As you know, your grandfather has been chairman of Big Brothers in the national Capital area for about ten years, and it's our job to try to supply Big Brother advisers for fatherless boys. We find, and all the experts find, that if a boy or girl has a good family, they usually stay out of trouble.

The Lower East Side of New York used to be one of the slums of the Nation where lived Jewish immigrants who could hardly speak English. But they understood the importance of family love and discipline and their children have now become some of the outstanding citizens of New York and the Nation.

As I said, President Nixon can't do much about families. But the rest of us can, first within our own families, second by helping other youngsters on the verge of trouble.

Especially the law-abiding Negro families need to help the thousands of fatherless, illegitimate Negro children born in Washington and every big Northern city. This is because Negro women come up from the South and find themselves in Northern cities without family ties, without church influence or the stabilizing contacts of their former community. So they fall back on the easiest way to make a living and increase the population with "welfare babies" who grow up, many of them, to make a living through muggings and robbery.

They sit in front of television all day watching the number of shootings on the top-rated programs, and the TV commercials which tell you that you don't have to pay for a vacation trip to Florida—you can go now and pay later. So these fatherless boys and girls figure they can take a shortcut to joining the affluent society by using the crime and violence techniques they see on television.

There are two remedies for this. One easy one is to regulate TV programs exactly as they are regulated in France, England and Germany.

The other remedy is to revive the old Civilian Conservation Corps of Franklin Roosevelt's day in order to get teen-agers off the streets.

This will not be easy and it will cost money. But it's better than having thousands of idle teen-agers cluttering up the pool halls and making the streets unsafe after dark. No matter how many police we hire or how many jails we build, they cannot solve the problem. While President Nixon has made a good start toward decreasing crime and he should be congratulated, we have to go one long step further from community protection to crime prevention.

Love,

YOUR GRANDFATHER.

SANTA BARBARA OIL DISASTER DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR FEDERAL LAWS

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the oil ruining the beaches of California and killing the birds and marine life, while unexpected in its severity, cannot be said to be something we could never have anticipated.

The French Riviera, San Juan, P.R.,

the *Torrey Canyon*, Rehoboth Beach, Del., and the problems in the Canal Zone and the St. Lawrence Seaway, have been sufficient to put reasonable men on notice that precautionary steps should be taken to prevent further disasters or at least ease their impact.

I was, therefore, surprised to have it brought to my attention that the Department of the Interior has done little to develop expertise in the area of oil emulsifiers, the chemicals used either to disperse or collect floating oil.

The Department maintains that it lacks authority to certify emulsifiers and we are left with the situation that the oil companies are free to select any oil emulsifier whatsoever, using the broadest possible guidelines.

This means that the future of the marine ecology is left in the hands of persons perhaps totally unfamiliar with what the effects of the emulsifier they select will be on the future of wildlife in the area treated. The consideration of the company executive will be to reduce the civil liability of the company rather than to preserve the environment. This is the type of conflict the Government is established to resolve.

The Federal Government certifies herbicides and pesticides for use rather than permitting self-regulation. Pollution of our air and water have become a concern of government because business considerations too often overrode public policy. If the Department of the Interior lacks the authority to regulate the use of oil emulsifiers to establish standards to be met, to test and certify, then it is a serious omission in our body of laws. It is an omission I intend to rectify.

I will be introducing legislation shortly to give the Department of the Interior the authority to establish a program that will meet the problems associated with oil spillage and leakage.

It does not mean that I believe such disasters are a necessary part of our technology. I have already introduced legislation to create a commission to establish priorities, and to make recommendations for future use of our natural resources. However, we must be prepared for future occurrences while we are also working on the means to prevent or limit them.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that it seems to me that this regulation of the use of oil emulsifiers is long overdue, and I cannot understand why the Department has not taken action long before they allowed the drilling to take place off the coast of California.

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

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the distinguished gentleman from California will check he will find that approximately 2 years ago the Sun Oil Co. did turn over what I believe is a very efficient emulsifier of crude oil to the Government.

I believe this product was demonstrated in the Delaware River and was

turned over, I believe, to the Department of the Interior. The gentleman might check on that.

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes, but the Department has no authority to certify it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At least I know that you have a useful product and it has been determined to be efficient.

FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM RAMSEY CLARK

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to a great American; to a man who, history will certainly show, has done more for the cause of decent law enforcement in the United States than any Attorney General within memory; to a man whose devotion to "law" has never allowed him to forget that the law is a bulwark against tyranny as well as the means for convicting and incarcerating wrongdoers. I speak of former Attorney General William Ramsey Clark.

During the recent presidential campaign, much was said about the need to deal effectively with the national crisis in law enforcement. Although our country has always recognized the primacy of local responsibility for law enforcement, we heard calls for massive Federal efforts to guarantee "law and order." But Ramsey Clark recognized that law enforcement must remain essentially a local responsibility. As Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has pointed out, Ramsey Clark did more during his relatively short time as Attorney General in support of local law enforcement—to aid and assist those really responsible for law and order—than any man who preceded him in the job.

All Americans were shocked and saddened during 1967 and 1968 by the terrible outbreaks of violence and destruction which occurred in the populous urban areas of this Nation. But Ramsey Clark was more than shocked and saddened. He worked diligently and successfully to develop the kind of restrained and effective techniques for dealing with massive civil disorder recommended by the Kerner Commission. However, Ramsey Clark's approach to massive civil disorder never attempted, as did some participants in the recent campaigns, to find simplified answers to the enormous complex problems of civil disturbances—never did he endorse the shortcuts or the quick solutions. He realized that the only long-term solution to the unrest which infects our cities is to remedy the underlying causes of such unrest, that symptomatic treatment of crime—hanging judges and stiffer criminal penalties—is no more a curative, much less a preventive, than is symptomatic treatment of our bodily ills.

Attorney General Clark refused—in my opinion wisely—to use the wiretapping and eavesdropping authority which

the Federal Government was granted in title III of last year's Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. This refusal, some would have us believe, showed a lack of zeal in pursuing the sinister participants in organized crime. But in reality, Ramsey Clark's decisions not to use the broad—some of us would say overly broad—wiretapping and eavesdropping authorizations resulted from a profound commitment to the elemental values of privacy, freedom of communication and freedom from the fear of omnipresent government surveillance. Only in cases where the national security was clearly jeopardized, Ramsey Clark believed, was there sufficient justification to contravene the traditional freedoms which Americans regard as fundamental. In this decision Ramsey Clark distinguished himself, to use Justice Brandeis' apt phrase, not only as a man of zeal, but as a man of understanding as well.

Some observers have said, Mr. Speaker, that because of the near-hysterical atmosphere which developed in some quarters on the subject of "law and order," that Ramsey Clark as Attorney General will never receive the evaluation he deserves. I would argue the reverse. To me Ramsey Clark was eminently the right man, in the right place at the right time, and history will so show.

He was the right man because he came from a distinguished family of jurists. An 18-century ancestor served as British solicitor in Ireland before settling in America. His paternal grandfather, William H. Clark, was a noted Dallas trial lawyer and president of the Texas Bar Association; his maternal grandfather, W. F. Ramsey, was a Texas Supreme Court justice. His father, of course, retired from the U.S. Supreme Court to open the way for his son's appointment as Attorney General on March 10, 1967. But Ramsey Clark was the right man for more reasons than his family's distinguished service at the bar. After obtaining both M.A. and J.D. degrees from the University of Chicago, in 1950, Ramsey Clark entered a successful Dallas law practice and later was appointed by President John F. Kennedy to head the Lands Division in the Justice Department. In that post he won the admiration and respect of all by the same quiet competence which later impressed the Nation when he was Attorney General. In February 1965, Ramsey Clark was sworn in as Deputy Attorney General, and in 1966 as Acting Attorney General when Nicholas Katzenbach transferred to the Department of State.

Ramsey Clark was also in the right place. He was in the right place because the Department of Justice carried, in the year following the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a major share of the responsibility for enforcement of this landmark civil rights legislation. There are many examples of Ramsey Clark's dedication to full rights for all Americans. The story I like best is the answer which he gave to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina,

Senator Ervin, during his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Senator had asked how many more pounds and pages of civil rights bills—beyond the 1,212 pages and 15 pounds he already had—would be submitted by the Department of Justice. Ramsey Clark answered simply:

As many pounds and pages as we need to ensure the rights of all Americans.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Ramsey Clark was Attorney General at the right time. For it was during his tenure in office that the debate on law and order and the means to achieve them reached its most fevered pitch. In the midst of the harsh remonstrance and the frenzied calls for Federal action, Ramsey Clark's cool, reasoned, and restrained approach helped to steady a nation which was on the verge of hysteria. What the times required was exactly what Ramsey Clark could give: an approach to law enforcement which dealt with problems as they are, not as we might imagine them; which saw that solutions ultimately depend on long, quiet, devoted work, not on rhetorical appeals to emotion and sometimes to prejudice. Thus, Ramsey Clark was most assuredly the right man for the times.

Of all the many accomplishments of Ramsey Clark, and of the Justice Department under his direction—enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, passage of new Federal legislation to aid local law enforcement authorities, development of reasonable and restrained techniques for control of massive civil disorder, prosecution of the Federal drive against organized crime, fostering of a new and more enlightened approach toward juvenile delinquency and its control and prevention—of all these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one thing will stand out about Ramsey Clark in the memory of his fellow citizens. That is Ramsey Clark's unstinting devotion to the idea that decent law enforcement is possible without impairing our traditional safeguards against tyranny, and that ultimately the worth of our society will be reckoned by history not in terms of how many criminals we convict, jail, or execute, but rather by the extent to which we have preserved and extended the freedom of that society.

RETIREMENT OF FRANK H. WEITZEL

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a great public servant and good friend, Frank H. Weitzel, completed his 15-year term as Assistant Comptroller General on January 17, 1969. He leaves that post after a long and distinguished career, and he will carry with him the best wishes and the grateful appreciation of a host of friends, associates and others in Government, academic, and business life who have come to know, respect, and admire Frank Weitzel.

His career is almost a classic one, the messenger boy who started in the General Accounting Office in 1923 at the age of 16 at a salary of \$14 a week. He went back to finish high school and then studied law at the George Washington University Law School evenings after work. He continued his association with the General Accounting Office in a legal and administrative capacity for a period of 45 years, 42 of them in unbroken service.

It is hard to think of the General Accounting Office without Frank Weitzel. Through his long and dedicated service in the General Accounting Office, he became an institution in himself. Probably he knows more about that organization than any other living man, and his knowledge of the Government is exceedingly vast, for the General Accounting Office is an agency which concerns itself with all the operations of Government.

I have known Frank Weitzel for most of my congressional years of service, which commenced in 1942. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, our committee, the Government Operations Committee, on which you served for many years, has a close working relationship with the General Accounting Office. We receive and examine its reports and are assisted in many ways in our investigations by GAO staff and facilities. On many, many occasions Frank Weitzel has counseled with us, has advised us, has argued and sometimes differed with us, but he has always been wise and patient and hard working and a true servant of the Congress without regard to partisan considerations.

After all these years Frank Weitzel deserves a well-earned rest, but I do not like to think of him as retiring from public service and the affairs of Government. His wealth of experience, his intimate knowledge of the workings of Government, his sharp legal mind which has been honed on many problems requiring Comptroller General rulings, his excellent relationships with the Congress—all these should be brought to bear in a continuing productive career. Frank Weitzel is a seasoned veteran in Government, but you could not tell it from his youthful countenance and his cheerful disposition. He has much to offer, and we all hope that he will be around for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAWSON), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) be allowed to have their remarks on this subject matter follow my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations has legislative jurisdiction over the General Accounting Office. We receive and act upon its reports to Congress, we utilize

its services extensively, and we keep a careful eye on its operations.

As chairman of the committee, and as a member of the committee before that, I have known, worked with and relied on Frank H. Weitzel for many years. His wise counsel and advice, his unstinting assistance and his devotion to Congress and to the citizens of the United States have been unsurpassed in my experience and observation. His outstanding ability and his uncommon integrity have been widely acclaimed.

Frank Weitzel's career and his service to his country have been truly remarkable. The details are well-known and I will not discuss them at length here.

What I want to do is express the gratitude of myself and the members of the Committee on Government Operations to Frank Weitzel and to state publicly that we, the Congress, and the Nation will sorely miss his wisdom and his work. I frankly regret the circumstances which make it impossible for him to continue as Assistant Comptroller General. And finally, with the utmost sincerity, all of us wish him well in any venture he may now undertake, and we wish for him and his family the happiness and contentment they so richly deserve.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those who have paid such well-deserved tribute to Frank Weitzel.

Very few men have equaled the many years of service Frank Weitzel has given to the Nation. Even fewer can approach the almost unparalleled contribution he has made to the promotion of efficiency and economy in the operation of the Federal Government.

During the 14 years in which I have been privileged to serve as chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, there have been many occasions on which Frank Weitzel has personally made substantial contributions to the effectiveness of the subcommittee's work.

I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to Frank Weitzel. Knowing Frank Weitzel, I am confident that his retirement from the General Accounting Office will not mean the end of his dedication to the public interest and that he will continue to advance that cause for many years to come.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1969, Frank Harvey Weitzel completed his 15-year tenure of office as the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States and closed the doors on a career with the U.S. General Accounting Office that spanned more than 45 years. The brilliant career of this extraordinary native of the District of Columbia is, perhaps, unparalleled in the history of any other Government agency.

His remarkable success story with the General Accounting Office started in 1923 at the age of 16 while attending Western High School in the District of Columbia. He started as a part-time messenger; the equivalent of a GS-1. During the next 30 years, prior to his ap-

pointment as the Assistant Comptroller General, Mr. Weitzel performed numerous jobs and held a variety of important positions in the GAO. He was instrumental in developing legislation which established policies and procedures for fiscal controls in Government operations. It has been stated by his friends and associates that there was not a job in GAO that Frank could not do—and better than the incumbent.

An exceptionally high IQ, combined with an extraordinary capacity for hard work, accounted for his unusual professional and scholastic accomplishments. He was graduated from Western High School in 1926 with honors and won a scholarship to George Washington University. Employed by the GAO during the day, he attended George Washington University at night and received his bachelor of arts degree in 1931, graduating with "highest distinction" and his bachelor of laws degree from the same university in 1935, graduating with "distinction." In 1956, he received a special award as George Washington University's outstanding alumni of the year. Perhaps the caption under his picture in the high school yearbook best summarizes his scholastic achievements—"The type who gets 100 percent on the Latin test that everyone else flunks."

On October 7, 1953, he was selected by President Eisenhower to be the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. The selection came as no surprise to his friends and associates and it was heartily applauded in the Halls of Congress.

On October 12, 1953, he took the oath of office, an oath which for the past 15 years he has upheld with incomparable distinction. He is a member of the bar of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States, a member of the Phi Sigma Kappa fraternity, the Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, and the Order of the Coif Legal Honor Society; a founder and member of the Federal Government Accountants Association, a trustee of the District of Columbia Division of the American Cancer Society, a trustee of the William A. Jump Memorial Foundation, an alumni trustee of George Washington University, the recipient of the Federal Government Accountants Association's award in June 1965 for distinguished leadership in improving financial management in the Government the recipient of the Federal Government Accountants Association's annual author's contest award of merit in June 1965, a renowned public speaker, an elder of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church and a collector of old and rare books and antiques.

I can think of no more appropriate words to summarize the ability, character, integrity and ideals of this extraordinary gentleman than those expressed by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren in commenting on his appointment, for the words have proven throughout our close association during the past 15 years to be as true today as they were then:

In ability, character and integrity Frank Weitzel is the peer of any man I know. He is a man of lofty character, great integrity, outstanding ability and high ideals. He is fair, patient, steadfast and unafraid. There is no finer example of the career public servant which he has so brilliantly typified. His appointment has thrilled not only the General Accounting Office but the Government as a whole.

Frank Weitzel's dedicated and inspiring service to his country and this community will not be forgotten.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a personal and official tribute to a recent retiree who served the United States with distinction for almost a half century. The Honorable Frank H. Weitzel, retiring as the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States brought great dedication to that office. His guidance and leadership in that enormously important office proved invaluable. For more than 45 years he served with the General Accounting Office, starting in at the ground floor level as a messenger, and rising to the top.

The General Accounting Office, familiarly characterized as the "watchdog" agency, annually audits and supervises the expenditures and receipts of billions of dollars by the executive branch of the Federal Government. More than that, as an arm of the Congress it provides meaningful assistance to the legislative branch's task of overseeing the multitudinous operations of Federal agencies, with a view to maximizing their economy and efficiency.

The Committee on Government Operations, the House's oversight committee, has been particularly fortunate in having Frank Weitzel to call on for assistance over a wide span of years. He could always be counted on to provide it with accurate data, analysis and the benefit of recommendations based upon his vast experience and his capacity for digging into the heart of problem areas.

As chairman of that committee's Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee I want publicly to record and to thank him for the many occasions on which the subcommittee has been the beneficiary of his thorough and conscientious efforts.

When Frank Weitzel was appointed Assistant Comptroller General in 1953, then Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren applauded President Eisenhower for his selection, saying that the President would "never make a better appointment." That judgment has stood the test of time, for he made that prediction come true by his devotion to duty and effectiveness.

It is with both regret and my best wishes that I note his retirement from the GAO and from public service. The Congress, and we Members, shall miss him.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the General Accounting Office and Frank Weitzel grew up together. That is not quite true: The GAO was 2 years old and Frank Weitzel was 16 when he began to work there.

Now, 45 years later, we salute him as he retires from Government service and

from his position as Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

As a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have on many occasions worked closely with Frank Weitzel on matters of mutual concern. The high regard which I have for him comes from personal knowledge of his great abilities and dedication to the public interest.

The word "integrity" is used so often that there is always a danger it will sound platitudinous. Yet, I can think of no other word to describe this quality in Frank Weitzel. "Integrity" is a way of life with him. He is a man of unwavering character and real substance.

He has indeed had a distinguished career—starting with his first position as a messenger in the GAO's Claims Division and culminating with his service for 15 years as the Assistant U.S. Comptroller General.

There has to be a reason for this, and I would like to share with you the remark recently made to me by a GAO staff man who has worked with him. "Frank is one of the most pleasant people you would ever want to meet," this gentleman said. "Even when he criticizes a proposed report or letter it is always constructive criticism." And that, to me, tells a great deal about Frank Weitzel and his effectiveness in the GAO.

These exceptional talents have been widely recognized. In 1965, he received the Federal Government Accountants Association's Award for distinguished leadership in improving financial management in the Government. Last year, Comptroller General Staats conferred on him the Comptroller General's Award for "an exemplary career of service to the General Accounting Office, the Congress and the Nation."

Frank Weitzel has been the personification of diligence in his work. He has worked closely with the Comptrollers General and others in improving the quality and efficiency of the GAO's work. Today, the GAO prepares and issues, annually, over 900 audit reports; over 4,000 Comptroller General decisions; and over 700 legislative and legal reports to the Congress. That is a prodigious output—an output that in fiscal year 1968 netted the Government \$232.8 million and additional unmeasurable savings resulting from improved Government operations.

It is with a profound sense of gratitude that I say to Frank Weitzel: "Thank you for a job well done; you have served your country honorably, and above and beyond the call of duty."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my word of tribute to those being expressed for Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. I have known him for many years and have been impressed by his dedication to service in the General Accounting Office. He has always given prompt responses to inquiries and requests that we have made of him and we have been aided in many ways.

Frank Weitzel has been a pillar of strength in ferreting out waste and in-

efficiencies in the vast structure of the Federal Government and bringing these to the attention of the House and Senate. Our Government and the country as a whole have benefited by his great work. He will long be remembered.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be included in the laudatory remarks of the gentleman in connection with the retirement of Frank H. Weitzel.

I concur wholeheartedly in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join in tribute to one of our very finest career public servants, the Honorable Frank H. Weitzel, who, after some 43 years of continuous Federal service, has retired as Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. I have known something of the man and the high quality of his service to the Congress and in the public interest generally. I regard both highly.

Of unquestioned ability, Frank has served with great energy and fidelity and with high distinction. From a \$14 a week messenger back in the 1920's, he rose to become the right-hand man of the Comptroller General.

Frank Weitzel, through his own shining efforts, joined that relatively small but highly select company of men and women who have long served the Nation by serving their Government. He understood Congress and its problems and needs. He knew much about Government generally. He held a deep and abiding respect for Congress as an institution.

Frank Weitzel epitomized excellence in the public service. In the words of the Prophet Isaiah, he lifted up a standard for others—a standard of excellence in public service. One of his shining characteristics is his unimpeachable integrity; it stands out like a red thread in the linen of his life. Of fair and open mind, willing always to listen, he sought to do what was right.

He has been a great force for good in the management and administration of the laws, especially in those relating to fiscal affairs. He had a heavy hand in drafting some of our milestone fiscal legislation.

The General Accounting Office is an agency of the legislative branch. I say without qualification that not only the legislative branch but the entire Government is losing one of its finest officers and advisers in Frank Weitzel. He was our good and always helpful friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased to join with other Members of the House in paying tribute to Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General, who is completing his 15-year term of office. Of course, Mr. Weitzel's

association with the General Accounting Office goes back many years. He started as a messenger boy in 1923 in the Claims Division. Since 1927 he served in the General Accounting Office without a break until the present time.

In his several capacities, Mr. Weitzel has dealt with legal, organizational, and procedural matters in the Federal Government and has been an expert adviser to the Congress on many legislative problems.

It is heartening to know that in our American democracy men can rise from humble beginnings to places of honor and distinction in the Government of the United States. Frank Weitzel certainly is one of those who, by hard work and dedicated service and willingness to learn and apply himself, has risen to high rank in the public service. He deserves acclaim because the job he has done so long and so well is one which only persons of dedication and integrity can do. He has strived constantly to improve the workings of our democracy, to make Government ever more efficient and honest and able to cope with the great problems of contemporary life.

The General Accounting Office is a unique institution in the annals of American Government. I will not say that Frank Weitzel is a unique individual in the GAO because there are many devoted public servants there. But Mr. Weitzel has practically grown up with the GAO, and when the first half century of its history is written, certainly his part will be set down as a prominent one.

We extend to Mr. Weitzel our best wishes for a long, healthy, and happy life, and know that he will continue to contribute to the welfare of his community, Government, and the Nation.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to include my own words of recognition and appreciation for Frank Weitzel's distinguished public service as Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

In establishing the positions of Comptroller General and Assistant Comptroller General in 1921, the Congress assigned to each a term of 15 years. On January 17 of this year, Frank Weitzel completed his statutory term of office and is retiring after nearly 45 years with the General Accounting Office.

As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I have special awareness of the scope and effectiveness of GAO's assistance to the Congress. I have found this assistance characterized by the high standard of excellence long traditional with the GAO. Frank Weitzel has made a tremendous contribution to the continuity of this tradition.

He has been widely recognized as one of the outstanding Government officials of our time. His brilliant mind has been matched by diligence and devotion. Attending George Washington University at night, he won, with distinction, both A.B. and law degrees. In 1953, his qualities evoked the recommendation of the then Comptroller General, Lindsay Warren, that he be considered for Assistant Comptroller General. In 1954, the Presi-

dent submitted the nomination and the Senate confirmed it.

Besides acting in the absence or incapacity of the Comptroller General, the Assistant Comptroller General performs such duties as the Comptroller General may assign to him. In carrying out these duties and sharing the enormous workload of the Comptroller General, Frank Weitzel has fully reflected and justified the high confidence which the Comptroller General has reposed in him. Beyond that, his career has been graced by the deep personal regard and esteem in which he is held throughout the GAO. This has come not only from his able service but from the warmth and kindness he showed to officials and employees at every level.

Frank Weitzel, who probably knows as much about the inner workings of our Government as any man, will be sorely missed. From the superb example of dedicated professionalism which his career represents, we can all take inspiration. For it, I am glad to express my gratitude to Frank Weitzel and my good wishes for him in the years to come.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the retirement of Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing gratitude and appreciation for the services of this remarkably competent public servant.

To carry out the duties of a position such as his requires a special combination of abilities and attributes not often enough understood. Indeed, Frank H. Weitzel has consistently throughout his long and useful career demonstrated a striking combination of competence, perseverance, and integrity.

His facility to master the plethora of facts, figures, and policy proposals is indicative of a high degree of managerial competence.

Mr. Weitzel has testified many times before a subcommittee on which I serve—the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Offices. In each case I was impressed with his obvious ability, his command of facts and figures relevant to his testimony, his straightforward manner, his efforts to protect the interests of the American taxpayers and the American Government.

His long years of service, furthermore, are in themselves proof of a determination to see a job through despite the inevitable frustrations and distractions which any worthwhile service can expect to encounter in the process of its successful conclusion.

And finally, and most outstandingly, the integrity of Frank H. Weitzel serves to underscore his ability as a public administrator. His unstinted efforts on behalf of the William A. Jump Memorial Foundation, his association with the Hahnemann Hospital, and his service as trustee of the District of Columbia division of the American Cancer Society testify to his sense of human and civic responsibilities.

A fitting tribute to Frank H. Weitzel is that of former Comptroller General

Lindsay C. Warren upon Mr. Weitzel's appointment as Assistant Comptroller General:

In ability, character and integrity, Frank Weitzel is the peer of any man I know. His selection will be most pleasing to the Congress and to the Government at large. I am grateful to the President. He will never make a better appointment.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has made this request, I would also ask unanimous consent that any Member of Congress who knows and appreciates the work that Frank Weitzel has done as a servant of the Congress be allowed also to extend their remarks on his retirement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES, PRECISE ACTION IS NEEDED

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a small agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be created to prevent any people in America from starving to death.

Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation which I believe will cut through the governmental redtape and bureaucracy which permits children to starve in America.

My bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to meet the responsibility and challenge of death from hunger in America. It is not designed to meet the total undernourishment problem in the United States as I feel any such broad, new legislation would not pass at this time and probably should not in view of the other pressing priorities on the taxpayers now.

I was deeply shocked and distressed to learn for the first time from the CBS program on hunger last year that some people do, in fact, die of hunger in our affluent and beloved country. There is simply no excuse for this. It happens despite the expenditure of many billions of dollars each year for the relief of poverty. It was at that time I introduced a bill to get at the people who starve to death in America.

It must be because of redtape and lack of precise concentration on the areas of greatest need, for we all know that not everyone on relief in our country lives on anywhere near such a distressing level of existence.

The Government now spends over \$1 billion on food programs, including the food stamp program reaching 2.4 million; the family food assistance program to 6.1 million, and the free and partly paid school lunch program going to almost 20 million children.

My legislation puts the responsibility of meeting the hunger problem specifi-

cally on the shoulders of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with great flexibility and discretion in his hands so that this horrible situation can be eliminated.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would create a Commission on Hunger within his department, composed of 10 staff members from the Department. He would be authorized to utilize the facilities and staffs of the health and welfare departments in the States to carry out his duties. He would also provide information and facilities requested and required by persons in low-income families to assist in meeting the problems of overpopulation.

I was pleased to see that former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Wilbur Cohen supported my suggestion in his January 10, 1969 statement before the Senate Nutrition Committee, proposing a similar office in the Department. I am hopeful for favorable departmental reports and hearings on my bill.

HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced with the support of a number of my colleagues from New York, a bill incorporating six brief amendments to existing housing legislation which are of vital importance to thousands of low- and middle-income residents of New York City and other major metropolitan areas.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the Congress last year significantly broadened the provisions for Federal Government participation in the construction of rental and cooperative housing for families of low and moderate income. The new section 236 added to the National Housing Act, together with the continuing program under section 221(d)(3), seemed to make possible a much-needed acceleration of housing starts in these critical categories. In practice, however, these provisions have not worked as effectively as we might have hoped, particularly in such high-cost urban areas as New York. It might be helpful, Mr. Speaker, if I were to review the amendments which I have today proposed and note how each would contribute to eliminating the obstacles which now beset the 221(d)(3) and 236 programs.

The first two sections of my proposed bill both deal with the problem posed by spiraling construction costs. Section 1 would raise the maximum size of the mortgage which may be insured under these two programs from the present limit of \$12,500,000 to \$30,000,000. Under the existing limitation, any project planned in New York with more than about 500 apartments must be divided into sections and separately mortgaged, with each mortgage separately meeting the terms and criteria established by the Federal Housing Administration. The resulting administrative tangles are

monumental. How do you divide structures which provide commercial rent? Which half of the project bears the cost of garages or unusual site work? Other FHA programs provide for much higher limits, ranging from \$20,000,000 to \$50,000,000, and New York City presently has designated sponsors in several urban renewal areas for projects in excess of 500 units. Thus, it is essential that the mortgage limit for the 221(d)(3) and 236 programs be revised upward to a more realistic level of \$30,000,000, so that rising costs need not be accommodated by shrinking apartments nor critically needed housing be delayed by procedural difficulties.

The second section of the draft bill would take further account of soaring costs by raising the statutory limit on per-unit costs in housing insured under the 221(d)(3) and 236 programs. At present, the law provides that the stated maximum per-unit costs may be exceeded by 45 percent in high-cost areas so designated by the FHA. In New York, where construction costs have been rising an estimated 7 percent annually, these limits have become unrealistic for high-rise fireproof construction. They permit, in effect, only six-story, semifireproof, non-union buildings without parking. In most areas of the city, however, we are dealing with reconstruction of densely populated urban renewal areas whose residents wish to see as many apartments replaced as are demolished. Thus, upward revision of the statutory limit on per-unit costs is necessary if the program is not to be choked off in the higher cost urban areas.

The next three sections of the measure I have proposed deal more directly with the people who live in section 236 projects—or who would likely to if the program could be made more appealing. The range of available tenants under existing statutes proved to be unduly narrow. Maximum incomes for prospective tenants are rigidly fixed in the law, and only a small percentage of these tenants may have incomes exceeding public housing maximums even by 35 percent. Since the minimum income is, in effect, whatever is required to sustain the carrying charges, the minimum has gone up along with rising costs and is now far too close to the statutory maximum to permit ready marketing of apartments in section 236 projects. This has been true particularly for the larger units, since families with three or four children cannot pay 25 percent of their income for housing as the law requires. I have thus proposed, in section 3 of my draft bill, to institute a sliding scale which would reduce the percentage of income which larger families must pay for apartments in projects insured under section 236.

I have also proposed, in the fourth section of the bill, to remove from section 236 its present rigid specifications as to maximum income limits. Instead, authority would be given to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set these limits by administrative action, according preference, as at present, to families with incomes within the lowest

practicable limits. And in section 5 of the bill, I have proposed to eliminate the present limit of 20 percent on the number of units in a section 236 project for which rent supplements may be paid. The existing limitation, embodied in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, has had both economic and social effects. By eliminating poorer people from the housing, it has further narrowed the range of potential tenants. At the same time, it has prevented many of the poorer residents of urban renewal sites from participating in the housing developments which displace them. Thus, this restriction has proved both unwise and unjust, and should now be dropped.

Mr. Speaker, these three amendments, in combination, would provide the section 236 program with needed flexibility to attract a wider range of potential tenants and thus greatly increase the marketability and overall value of the program.

My final proposal, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the extension of the special assistance program under section 305 of the National Housing Act which has been so important in maintaining the impetus of the 221(d)(3) program. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized a 1-year extension of this special assistance program, largely in order to give the new section 236 program time to begin functioning properly. Our experience thus far suggests, however, that the 221(d)(3) and 236 programs are quite distinct. Most community groups in New York, for example, who are advised of both programs and in fact have a choice of housing reject the 236 program as infeasible in its present form. While the other amendments I have proposed would relax some of the rigid requirements of the 236 program which now limit its appeal, I believe it is essential that special assistance remain available to the 221(d)(3) program for at least another year while evaluation of the 236 program continues. Thus, section 6 of my bill would authorize a further 1-year extension of the special assistance program under section 305 at the same level as has already been authorized for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive the urgent and sympathetic consideration of my colleagues in the House. The housing needs of urban America are indeed desperate, and only if existing programs are made to work with maximum effectiveness can we hope to meet responsibilities in this area.

HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Act, and in particular sections 221(d)(3) and 236, while intended to provide dramatic assistance in the creation of new housing, has proven to be of the least help to the major urban areas where in fact the need is greatest.

The programs under these sections, because of built-in restrictions, have had

very little impact on the city of New York, where there are now over 800,000 substandard housing units out of approximately 2½ million units. Those nonprofit organizations and churches which have sought to build housing in Manhattan have been frustrated. To meet the particular needs of Manhattan and the city of New York, and so as to interest these nonprofit groups once again to enter the housing field, I have joined with nine urban Congressmen from the city of New York to introduce amendments to the Housing Act. Those amendments which would affect the city of New York most particularly are:

First, to raise the mortgage limits of projects to more realistic levels and provide for higher per unit apartment costs; and

Second, broaden the range of eligible tenants, in particular making eligible the larger families, by reducing the maximum income limits and the percentage of income required to be paid as rent, and having these requirements made a matter of administrative regulation rather than fixed by law.

Shelter is a basic need which clearly has not and apparently cannot be met by private enterprise alone. There must be assistance on every governmental level to deal with the high cost of housing and limit the ever-spiraling rent increases which are taking place in the city of New York. If these amendments are enacted into law, they should have some impact on this horrendous problem.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would repeal the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

This Commission, established by Public Law 90-206 which was approved December 16, 1967, is required to make recommendations to the President, at 4-year intervals, on the rates of pay for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, Cabinet officers and other agency heads, and certain other officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

This basic purpose of the Commission is, Mr. Speaker, perhaps necessary and I would give the benefit of the doubt to the need for such a body to make such recommendations.

However, I take serious issue with the procedure by which such recommendations of the Commission become law.

The law requires that the President, in his budget following receipt of the Commission report, set forth his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay he deems advisable for those offices and positions covered by the law.

The President's recommendations become effective 30 days following transmittal of the budget, unless in the meantime other rates have been enacted by

law or at least one House of Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves of all or part of the recommendations.

I challenge the wisdom of this procedure, and, indeed, joined with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and eight others in the introduction of resolutions to disagree to the recommendation of the Commission as submitted by the President.

As we have seen, this resolution was not reported by the Committee on Rules, and I think that it is unfortunate that the American people whom we represent and who pay our salaries could not be accorded the simple respect of a roll-call vote on this important matter as was done in the Senate.

Therefore, I am also introducing a resolution today which would amend rule XXI of the rules of the House to provide that no bill or resolution making an appropriation shall be passed without a yeas-and-nays vote.

I introduced a similar resolution in the 90th Congress, and I am hopeful that my colleagues will recognize the wisdom and propriety in the adoption of such a resolution.

I might remind my colleagues that clause 1, section 6, article I of the U.S. Constitution provides as follows:

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether the Founding Fathers envisioned that the definition of "law" in that section of the Constitution would include a commission to recommend salaries and that the recommendation of the Commission, through the President, would become fact without a vote in both Houses of Congress.

MEETING THE PROBLEM OF OIL POLLUTION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with my distinguished colleague from Maryland, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (Mr. GARMATZ), in the introduction of legislation to meet the menace of oil pollution which at this very hour is destroying fish and wildlife off the coast of California, and is damaging the beach of the Santa Barbara area.

This legislation, the Oil Pollution Act of 1969, is desperately needed to prevent the disasters which have become all too frequent in recent years. There was the *Torrey Canyon* disaster in March of 1967 which, although not in American waters, brought the seriousness of this matter to the world's attention. Then, in March of 1968, the *Ocean Eagle* broke up in the entrance to San Juan Harbor causing extensive damage to the beaches there.

This legislation would amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to require anyone who wishes to drill or otherwise prospect for, or mine, extract, or dispose

of, any oil or gas which is located beneath any navigable water of the United States to obtain, and have at all times, a valid permit for such operation from the Secretary of the Interior.

This permit would be issued after notice and public hearing in order to determine that the proposed operation will not result in any damage to or loss of any wildlife or in the pollution of any navigable water of the United States.

HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today two bills comprising the higher education bill of rights which implement many of the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, chaired by Dr. Clark Kerr. These bills are being cosponsored by my able colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMANS).

The report and this legislation rest on the principle that the improvement of higher education is a national goal, deserving of the highest priority on the national agenda. We conceive of our universities serving the needs of the Nation as we move forward, with both the academic community and the country as a whole committed to an involved society, pledged to seek peace abroad and lasting solutions to our domestic crises.

None of our deepest national problems can be solved without the human resources and knowledge made available by higher education—

Noted the report of the Association of American Universities entitled "The Federal Financing of Higher Education"—

The importance to a nation of our kind of a broad, diversified, vigorous, and growing system of higher education is fundamental.

The purpose of our bills is to provide equal access to the education of their choice for all qualified Americans while maintaining a high standard of academic excellence.

This legislation seeks to place before the Congress some of the essential elements of a cohesive and farsighted policy for American higher education. During this session of the Congress, the Education and Labor Committee in the House and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate will be holding hearings on various aspects of higher education. I hope that our bills will serve as possible benchmarks in a thoughtful dialogue among the universities, the Congress, and the executive branch.

The first year of operation for programs established under this legislation is 1971. This is lead time provided for planning, not procrastination. We cannot afford to wait until the war in Vietnam is over to begin planning to meet the needs of higher education. We must provide adequate resources now and more substantial funds later for these crucial programs.

Also, a related item of serious concern

is our existing draft policy. Pending enactment of legislation reforming the draft and limiting exposure to 1 year, action by Executive order is essential to change the unfair and inconsistent regulations presently governing the Selective Service System; otherwise we will have few young men in a position to benefit from the college and graduate programs this legislation proposes.

While the Kerr report concentrates on the next 5 years when higher education will face urgent and immediate problems, former President Johnson called for a "long-range plan for the support of higher education in America" in his 1968 state of the Union message.

John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, established an advisory committee, chaired by Dr. Alice Rivlin, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, pursuant to that request. The Rivlin report, though differing in emphasis and certain particulars from the Carnegie report, also stresses the need for a coherent national design expanding Federal support of higher education.

What is the plight of the universities that requires a Federal commitment of a new order of magnitude? Their financial difficulties stem from two factors: increasing enrollment and rising costs. Together, the pressures of rising student enrollments and greater expenditures are beginning to outpace our ability to provide education of excellence to all students.

A century ago, enrollment in institutions of higher learning in our Nation was only about 50,000 students. Today's enrollment is almost 6 million students on a full-time equivalent basis. More than half of this growth took place in the period from 1958 to 1967. Two percent of young Americans entered college 100 years ago. Today, the figure is over 40 percent.

Estimates indicate that by 1976, if we are to make a higher education possible for all Americans, the Nation's colleges and universities and those responsible for their financial support must provide new facilities for 3 million additional students—or a total of 8 to 9 million students by 1976.

These figures, however impressive, are deceptive. In education, as in many aspects of increasing American affluence, the gap between the poor and the majority of the American people is not being narrowed. For example, only 7 percent of those now attending college come from families in the Nation's lowest family income quartile. Almost half of the undergraduate college students today are from families with incomes in the highest quartile. Statistics indicate that in the highest socioeconomic quartile, 19 out of 20 students in the top fifth ability grouping attend college within 5 years after high school graduation. Yet only 10 out of 20 students of equal ability from the lowest socioeconomic quartile make it to college.

Financial problems, however, are by no means limited to lower income families. Students from families in the \$15,000 to \$20,000 range frequently encounter insurmountable obstacles in seeking loans

and are generally very limited in their eligibility for scholarships. Yet if they have one or several brothers or sisters in colleges, or if their parents face large medical bills or other accumulated debts, these students may often find it impossible to go to college. Regardless of the family income, financial circumstances often result in no higher education for their children. In my judgment, legislation must deal meaningfully with the problems facing middle-income families.

In terms of rising costs, total institutional expenditures for higher education climbed from \$5.2 billion in 1957-58 to about \$17.2 billion in 1967-68, an increase of 231 percent. It is estimated that expenditures of higher education institutions will total about \$41 billion in 1976-77 for a projected enrollment of 9 million students. New construction of \$2 billion annually for the next 10 years is needed. New technologies, new areas of study, new and expanded interdisciplinary programs all cost appreciably more than the traditional forms of instruction.

In addition, the larger number of disadvantaged students entering college will mean that special facilities and instruction must be made available to assist in their adjustment to college training and to insure their success. These added expenditures increase the total instructional cost per student and widen the gap between tuition payments and what the college must actually spend to educate a student.

Our present Federal student aid programs—NDEA and guaranteed loans, work-study and educational opportunity grants—provide financial assistance for only 1.8 million undergraduates this fiscal year, and our graduate fellowship program in all Government agencies reached only 94,000 students. For aid to students and institutions, the Federal Government is spending only \$4 billion in the current fiscal year, a sum less in the aggregate than that spent for the highway program and that spent for farm price supports.

The Rivlin report indicates that all institutions, both public and private, obtain about one-fifth of their income from tuition and fees, one-fifth from the Federal Government, and one-fifth from State governments. Endowment income and private giving account for about 7½ percent. In private institutions alone, 34 percent of income comes from tuition and fees, 24 percent from the Federal Government, 1½ percent from State governments, and 14½ percent from endowment and private philanthropy.

To raise fees further may mean that these colleges will gradually cease to be accessible to students of ability regardless of their family income. Public universities, similarly, wish to preserve the tradition of quality education at a very low cost to the student. Greater support from alumni, business and others in the private sector is essential both to the financial stability of colleges and to the maintenance of a sound relationship based on our private enterprise system, but it is not expected to change substantially as a percentage of university income.

Therefore, it is clear that rising expenditures mean that the Federal Government's contribution of 20 to 25 percent of income must increase to one-third of university income if institutions of higher learning are to maintain quality and serve larger student bodies. To meet the needs of some 3 million additional students in the next 5 to 6 years will require a national commitment of a wholly new order. The Carnegie Commission estimates that Federal expenditures for education will have to rise by about \$10 billion initially and ultimately by about \$70 billion. This represents about one-seventh of the projected additional Federal revenues over the next several years.

The major bill that we are introducing would reach some 3.6 million students in fiscal 1971, growing to 5.8 million in 1977. This would be at an initial cost, including institutional assistance and funds for added construction and for new urban colleges, of \$5.1 billion in 1971 and \$9.2 billion in 1977. In addition, 8,000 to 11,000 medical students would be offered increased scholarship assistance through one aspect of the second bill, which totals \$443 million in 1971 and \$471 million in 1977. Further, 20 new medical schools would be established to graduate 2,000 additional doctors annually, starting in 1978.

The first table compares present expenditures and students aided with proposals contained in our bill and gives an overall cost summary of the proposals, and the second table summarizes the medical school provisions:

SUMMARY OF COST AND STUDENTS ASSISTED
[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Existing fiscal year 1969		Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973	
	Expenditure	Number of students	Expenditure	Number of students	Expenditure	Number of students	Expenditure	Number of students
Educational opportunity grants.....	\$133.6	258,200	\$1,300	2,192,000	\$1,400	2,316,000	\$1,500	2,583,000
Work-study.....	146.0	375,000	689	1,378,000	727	1,454,000	816	1,632,000
Supplementary matching.....	(¹)	(¹)	200	(²)	250	(²)	300	(²)
Scholarship grants to institutions.....	(¹)	(¹)	130	(²)	140	(²)	150	(²)
Cost of education supplements.....	(¹)	(¹)	1,700	(²)	1,900	(²)	2,100	(²)
Graduate fellowships.....	70.0	15,000	112	14,000	232	29,000	360	45,000
NDEA loans.....	(267.1)	(450,000)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Guaranteed loans.....	(641.2)	(750,000)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Research override.....	(¹)	(¹)	182	(²)	209	(²)	238	(²)
Improvement of undergraduate instruction.....	(¹)	(¹)	50	(²)	50	(²)	50	(²)
Academic construction loans.....	400.0	(¹)	530	(²)	690	(²)	830	(²)
Startup grants for junior plus urban colleges.....	(¹)	(¹)	200	(²)	200	(²)	200	(²)
Total.....	749.6	648,200	5,093	3,584,000	5,798	3,799,000	6,544	4,260,000

	Fiscal year 1974		Fiscal year 1975		Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year 1977	
	Expenditure	Number of students						
Educational opportunity grants.....	\$1,600	2,886,000	\$1,700	3,184,000	\$1,800	3,456,000	\$1,900	3,588,000
Work-study.....	906	1,812,000	990	1,880,000	1,073	2,146,000	1,101	2,202,000
Supplementary matching.....	350	(²)	400	(²)	450	(²)	500	(²)
Scholarship grants to institutions.....	160	(²)	170	(²)	180	(²)	190	(²)
Cost of education supplements.....	2,700	(²)	3,000	(²)	3,400	(²)	3,900	(²)
Graduate fellowships.....	448	56,000	528	66,000	560	70,000	584	73,000
NDEA loans.....	(³)	(³)						
Guaranteed loans.....	(³)	(³)						
Research override.....	269	(²)	302	(²)	335	(²)	368	(²)
Improvement of undergraduate instruction.....	50	(²)						
Academic construction loans.....	880	(²)	890	(²)	910	(²)	610	(²)
Startup grants for junior and urban colleges.....	100	(²)	100	(²)	100	(²)	(²)	(²)
Total.....	7,463	4,754,000	8,130	5,130,000	8,858	5,672,000	9,203	5,863,000

¹ Does not presently exist.
² Same as EOG.
³ At discretion of colleges.

⁴ Title IV NDEA.
⁵ Not included in total.
⁶ No projections available; depends on budgetary situation.

MEDICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE
[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973		Fiscal year 1974		Fiscal year 1975		Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year 1977	
	Authorized	Number of students												
Scholarships.....	\$29	8,200	\$31	8,800	\$32	9,100	\$34	9,700	\$36	10,200	\$38	10,800	\$40	11,100
Institutional payments.....	232	(¹)	247	(¹)	264	(¹)	282	(¹)	301	(¹)	323	(¹)	345	(¹)
100 percent Federal share of construction.....	142	(¹)	144	(¹)	148	(¹)	152	(¹)	156	(¹)	80	(¹)	86	(¹)
Startup grants for 20 new medical schools.....	40	(¹)	40	(¹)	40	(¹)	40	1,400	40	1,800	0	1,200	0	1,600
Total.....	443	(¹)	462	(¹)	484	(¹)	508	(¹)	533	(¹)	441	(¹)	471	(¹)

¹ New doctors; a total of 2,000 annually starting in 1978.

Our principal bill contains the following elements:

First. The educational opportunity grant program of title IV-A of the Higher Education Act would be expanded to provide assistance to "qualified individuals who need financial assistance to obtain" the benefits of higher education, instead of the present "exceptional financial need" requirement. It is estimated that about 2.2 million grants would be made in 1971 and 3.6 million in 1977, in contrast to the 258,000 available in the current fiscal year. For the first time, Federal scholarships would be available to students from middle-income families as the program is expected to reach about the lower three-fifths of the income range.

Grants would also be extended to students for 2 years of graduate work. Stipends would depend on need, with up-

per limits established for students in each stage of their course of study. The operation of the program would be changed to provide direct applications for these grants by the student to the Commissioner of Education who would determine the amount to which the student is entitled.

This procedure would in no way interfere with the student's choice of college and would, in fact, make his selection less dependent on the financial aid that a particular college could offer him.

Second. A new program of Federal scholarship grants to institutions is proposed under which each institution would receive an amount equal to 10 percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants held by students at that institution. Colleges could use these funds to award scholarships to any student in need, according to their own

criteria. Again, it is intended that these funds will enable the college to make scholarship aid available to students from middle-income families.

Third. A new program of supplementary matching grants would be established to match any non-Federal grants received by a recipient of an EOG. No student would receive more than one-half the amount of his original EOG. These incentive awards will have the beneficial effect of encouraging more private scholarship contributions.

Fourth. The work-study program is amended by increasing the authorizations, as indicated on the chart, so that three and a half times the present number of students can participate.

Fifth. Cost of education supplements are provided for each institution attended by a recipient of an EOG, in varying amounts starting in 1971 with \$525 for a

lower division undergraduate, \$700 for an upper division undergraduate, and \$1,050 for a first- or second-year graduate student. These amounts would increase in stages to \$700, \$900, and \$1,500, respectively, by 1976-77.

There is considerable feeling among educators and educational administrators—including those at land-grant and private universities—that institutional grants should be made by the Federal Government on a broader basis, beyond being tied to the number of recipients of other forms of aid. I believe in the main that this is a sound idea and one that may prove to be a very important element in any package of proposals that seeks to rescue postsecondary education from its financial difficulties. This is especially necessary on the university level, where graduate departments, often with expensive equipment and technologies, consume a large amount of academic budgets. The problem is that agreement is yet to be reached on the formula for making such grants; several have been proposed and I hope that this subject will be given closer study in the very near future.

Sixth. Title IV of the NDEA is amended to establish an expanded graduate fellowship program. Instead of the present 7,500 first-year fellowships, 14,000 would be awarded in 1971; 15,000 in 1972; 16,000 in 1973; 18,000 in 1974; and 20,000 in each of 1975, 1976, and 1977. The total number of students supported in each year would, of course, be considerably larger as the program would enable a student to receive a fellowship for up to 5 years—the 3 years presently in the law plus 2 additional years recommended by the Kerr report for work on a dissertation. Payments made to the institution would be raised from \$3,500 to \$5,000 per fellowship student.

Half of the fellowships would be awarded by national competition, on the basis of ability rather than financial need, and the other half would be awarded to universities for deserving graduate programs.

In particular, the bill requires that special emphasis be given to encouraging study of the humanities and social sciences. Decisions of the past decade have frequently not reflected the values and sense of judgment that knowledge of the humanities can provide. Ample voices are raised on behalf of the military-industrial complex, yet the character and quality of our judgment in Government may well depend on giving increased emphasis to the humanities in the coming years. Indeed it is abundantly clear that thoughtful, far-reaching decisions in Government would benefit from a more solid foundation in the humanities.

One effect of this method of allocating fellowships would be to strengthen particular graduate departments at particular institutions. I believe that this is important in light of the fact that the 42 members of the Association of American Universities award 52 percent of the graduate and professional degrees and 75 percent of the Ph. D. degrees granted in the United States each year.

Prof. John Perry Miller, dean of the Yale Graduate School, has commented that—

Title IV has suffered in comparison with N.S.F. and N.I.H. by not having a national competition in which departments and universities are judged publicly by the potential students' choice of schools, and the undergraduate colleges judged by the success of their students in winning in the national competition. This is an important innovation—one way of rewarding excellence.

Seventh. Authorizations for loans for academic construction will be increased from the present \$400 to \$530 million in fiscal year 1971 and \$890 million in fiscal 1975.

Eighth. A new program of startup grants for new public community colleges and 4-year colleges located in urban areas would be established by our bills. The Commissioner would be authorized to make grants for up to 80 percent of the planning and non-construction costs of these new institutions, but not to exceed \$10 million per institution. It is expected that the grants will more likely average \$1 million per institution. These funds will help meet the much greater costs of, among other things, land acquisition, site clearance, renovation of buildings, that pertain in major metropolitan areas, and, in so doing, recognize the importance of institutions of higher learning located in the very inner city communities whose residents they will serve. It is estimated that 500 community colleges and 50 urban 4-year colleges should be established by 1976.

Ninth. Both the Carnegie and Rivlin reports recommend a research override or sustaining grant, amounting to 10 percent of total Federal research grants to each university. Our bill provides that institutions may use these funds for unrestricted research or teaching purposes. It is expected that this provision will make it easier to obtain funding for smaller projects and planning projects, as well as for research by younger faculty members.

Federal support for university research has fallen off sharply since 1962, following a 25-percent annual increase for the preceding 6 years. The Carnegie Commission feels that it is important that the pace once again be stepped up, from the \$1.5 billion in Federal support in 1968 to \$2 billion in 1971 and \$4.05 billion in 1976. This, however, presents a practical problem inasmuch as Federal research grants are spread over more than 40 different pieces of legislation and agencies. While this may be a satisfactory method of review and determination of proposals, careful study is needed to ascertain the best way of raising the level of support in this complex of programs. I would hope that such a study will be undertaken both in the Congress and in the executive without further delay.

Tenth. Pursuant to a recommendation in the Rivlin report, a new project-grant program to support experiments to improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and to devise new instructional programs is established. It is hoped that applications for these grants will be reviewed at the Federal level by experts in the field as well as selected student representatives. The projects contemplated include strengthening undergraduate faculties, addition of new programs

to curriculums, acquisition of materials and equipment needed for particular instructional projects, and cooperation with other institutions. Ideally, this new program should concentrate on fields not now covered by other Federal agencies or on fields that cut across disciplinary lines, such as the humanities.

Eleventh. The Commissioner is directed to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing and implementing a plan for a self-sustaining national student loan bank. This study will include consideration of the various alternative proposals made in this connection and will, hopefully, result in a plan that would make the availability of loans less dependent on the commercial money market and less of an economic burden to the borrower once his education is completed. It is well to remember that there is a certain reluctance among families to take on additional debts even if there is a possibility of forgiveness.

Both the Carnegie and Rivlin reports base much of their student assistance plans on relatively easy access to loans in order to enable a student to attend the college of his choice, rather than the least expensive or the one at which he can obtain the greatest scholarship support.

Twelfth. Pursuant to a recommendation in the Rivlin report, the Commissioner is also directed to make a study of the desirability of legislation consolidating various categorical programs of support for higher education. The intention of this provision is to provide greater flexibility to institutions to meet their most critical needs.

The second bill makes four changes in programs affecting medical education:

First. In addition to scholarship programs existing under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965, our bill proposes 4-year stipends of \$3,500 annually to medical students, based on need. It is expected that at least 8,200 students in medical schools will be assisted by this provision in the first year and at least 11,000 in the last. This is between a fourth and a fifth of expected enrollment.

Second. Beyond the institutional grants available to medical schools under the Health Manpower Act of 1968, my bill would establish additional institutional payments to schools of medicine based on a formula which includes \$4,000 for each student working toward the M.D., \$2,000 for each student above the 1966 enrollment, and \$2,250 for each resident and intern.

Third. The construction grant program of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 would be amended so that the Federal Government would pay 100 percent of the costs incurred by medical schools under this program, instead of the present 66 2/3 percent.

Fourth. In order to encourage the establishment of four new medical schools in each of the next 5 years, my bill authorizes start-up grants to meet the initial nonconstruction costs of, for example, planning and land acquisition. Such grants could not exceed \$10 million per institution.

The 20 new medical schools called for in this bill contrast sharply with the 12 new institutions opened between 1964 and 1968. Some 2,000 doctors a year are expected to be graduated from these 20 schools starting in 1978.

Medical education is the only discipline singled out by the Carnegie report for special consideration. The reasons are several. First, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that we need 52,000 more physicians right now and that by 1976 we will still need 41,000. Even if our medical schools will be turning out 10,000 graduates a year by 1976, this is slow progress, considering the need. Second, this branch of higher education has financial problems that distinguish it from other graduate programs. Medical schools face extremely high costs in terms of more expensive equipment and facilities. In this respect, they are a severe drain on the resources of the universities with which they are associated.

Finally, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the names of the members of these two distinguished panels of educators and leading public figures who have made these farsighted recommendations for higher education. The Carnegie Commission consists of Ralph M. Besse, chairman of the board, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.; Joseph P. Cosand, president, the Junior College District of St. Louis; William Friday, president of the University of North Carolina; David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame; Carl Kaysen, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton; Katharine E. McBride, president of Bryn Mawr College; James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University; Clifton W. Phalen, chairman of the executive committee, Marine Midland Banks; Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University; David Riesman, professor of social sciences at Harvard; the Honorable William Scranton; and Norton Simon, president of Hunt Food and Industries, Inc.

The advisory committee preparing the report to the President, "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education," included Lynn M. Bartlett, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education; William Carey, Assistant Director, Human Resources, Bureau of the Budget; Leland J. Haworth, Director, National Science Foundation; Donald F. Hornig, special assistant to the President for science and technology; Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education; Barnaby C. Keeney, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities; Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health and Scientific Affairs; and Robert Q. Mars-ton, Director, National Institutes of Health.

In summary, it is imperative that we in the Congress begin to meet the higher education goals of this Nation now. To delay, we have learned, means either that we do not act at all or that we act when our chance of effectiveness is diminished. The quality of our civilization to come will depend on this Congress recognizing

its responsibilities. Enactment of a program for higher education is one of these obligations and we must fulfill it.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) in introducing the higher education bill of rights, which authorizes a 7-year program designed to meet the burgeoning needs of American colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) has noted in his statement to the House, this legislation reflects the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, headed by Dr. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California. The commission's report, "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education," issued last November, is a balanced and informed effort to define a national policy for higher education. The report provides the basis for most of the provisions contained in the measures we have introduced.

WIDE SPECTRUM OF VIEWS IN CARNEGIE REPORT

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in shaping its recommendations, the Carnegie Commission has drawn upon the widest possible spectrum of advice and opinions. The commission has sought the views of scholars, students, college administrators, trustees, and alumni, as well as leaders in business, government, and educational organizations.

Moreover, the commission itself, made up of 15 distinguished Americans, includes representatives of all types of institutions of higher education—public, private, land-grant, and junior colleges. One member, I should like to note, hails from my own congressional district in Indiana, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame and one of the most distinguished leaders in American life.

QUALITY AND EQUALITY

The Carnegie Commission report and the legislation we now propose focus on two essential goals for American higher education in the years just ahead: quality of result and equality of access. In the words of the Carnegie report:

Our colleges and universities must maintain and strengthen academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary society. At the same time, the nation's campuses must act energetically and even aggressively to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

To achieve these aims, it is clear that the Federal Government is going to have to assume an increasing level of responsibility for supporting higher education.

The Federal Government, of course, already makes significant contributions to financing higher education in our country. Indeed, in the past 10 years we have witnessed a remarkable growth

in both the amount and kinds of Federal aid to colleges and universities. Since the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the last five Congresses have voted funds for research, preparation of teachers, construction of facilities, student aid, community service, and adult education.

The total Federal investment in higher education has expanded from a little over \$1.1 billion in 1958 to an estimated \$94.5 billion in the current fiscal year—or about 23 percent of all support for higher education.

FINANCIAL STRAIN ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In spite of this substantial Federal investment, however, there are indications from many quarters today that the financial strain on colleges and universities is increasing at an unprecedented rate. Mounting enrollment pressures; an expanded volume of research activity; a widening commitment to public service functions outside the university; the sharp rise in graduate and professional education as well as many other new demands on the colleges and universities have contributed to steep increases in expenditures. Income from endowments and gifts, income from tuition and fees, and income from State and local government sources are simply not providing adequate resources to meet these needs.

College and university administrators by necessity, therefore, are looking to the Federal Government to shoulder a greater share of the financial burden of higher education. Last year, for example, the American Association of Universities, representing 42 major universities, declared that the Nation's system of higher learning faces "a severe and worsening fiscal crisis, and whether it can in fact do what is needed will depend on increased financial assistance from all available sources, but especially and particularly from the Federal Government." The association appealed for Federal support for all types of institutions, warning that without such support the widening gap between institutional income and expenditures would pose a "threat to the nature and vitality of American higher education."

THE NECESSARY FEDERAL COMMITMENT

The proposed higher education bill of rights seeks to provide the Federal financial commitment to higher education that will be necessary in the coming decade. It authorizes programs for both underwriting student costs through greatly expanded grant assistance and providing supplemental support to institutions. In addition, a separate bill authorizes expanded assistance for medical education.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York has discussed in detail the specific provisions of the bills, and I shall not repeat this analysis here. I should like only to say that I hope all Members will give close consideration to these proposed measures in the months ahead.

I hope, moreover, that the legislation we introduce today will serve as the starting point for a wide discussion, both in and out of Government, on the ele-

ments of a broad-gaged, coordinated, national policy for higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the Carnegie Commission report, "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education":

QUALITY AND EQUALITY: NEW LEVELS OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
(A special report and recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, December 1968)

(We should like to emphasize that the proposals made in this Report are specifically intended for the short-run period ahead, when higher education and the nation face urgent and immediate problems. The Carnegie Commission has sought to build upon the best features of existing programs and to recommend forms of aid which can be revised or replaced at any time, with the minimum of disruption to long-range planning, as better solutions are evolved through experience and research. Longer-run answers may ultimately be found in different kinds of support programs, and through innovations in educational structure, curriculum, and technology. But we cannot afford to defer the meeting of important national needs for academic quality and the extension of equality of opportunity while we continue our search for the long-run answers.)

FOREWORD

In early 1967 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created a 15-member Commission on Higher Education to examine and make recommendations regarding the many vital issues facing higher education in the United States as we approach the year 2000. The Carnegie Foundation made clear to the Commission that it was not being asked to speak for higher education but rather about higher education and its needs and contributions in relation to the nation's social concerns and purposes.

The Commission then mapped out these major areas of higher education for study and investigation: structure, function, and governance; innovation and change; demand, resources, and expenditures; and efficiency in the use of resources. Research projects have already been initiated in several of these areas, and studies being conducted elsewhere are under review. The Commission will issue a final report containing its findings and recommendations at the conclusion of its activities several years from now.

Because of the urgency of some problems in the sphere of higher education and the need for early action, the Commission has decided to issue special reports on such topics as soon as data are available to indicate desirable short-run measures and the Commission has had the opportunity to clarify its views and to develop specific recommendations.

This Report, *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, is the first in the series. The Commission hopes that it will prove useful and persuasive to those members of the 1969 Congress of the United States and of the executive branch who have key responsibilities in the area of higher education.

The recommendations in this Report are supported by all the present members of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Although individual members differed occasionally on details and wording, there was surprising unanimity on the need for, and the general levels of, federal aid and on the broad directions of implementation.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc., and an original member of the Commission, found it necessary to resign in mid-1968 because of the pressure of other commitments. We wish to record here our deep appreciation of his valuable contribu-

tions to the early planning sessions of the Commission and to our initial considerations of the topic of federal aid to higher education.

We wish also to express our gratitude for the many helpful suggestions of those consulted during the development of our proposals.

Finally, we wish to thank the members of our staff, and particularly Miss Virginia Smith, for their assistance in the preparation of this Report.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

Ralph M. Besse, Chairman of the Board, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company.

Joseph P. Cosand, President, The Junior College District of St. Louis.

William Friday, President, University of North Carolina.

David D. Henry, President, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

Carl Kaysen, Director, Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Katharine E. McBride, President, Bryn Mawr College.

James A. Perkins, President, Cornell University.

Clifton W. Phalen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Marine Midland Banks.

Nathan M. Pusey, President, Harvard University.

David Riesman, Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University.

The Honorable William W. Scranton.

Norton Simon, Hunt Food and Industries, Inc.

Clark Kerr, Chairman.

1. THE NATION'S NEEDS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

From the beginnings of the Republic, education at various levels has played a vital role in the building of a strong democratic society. At earlier stages in the nation's development, this role was chiefly the responsibility of the primary and secondary institutions. Now, as education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has increased, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex and exacting, the responsibility has shifted increasingly to America's colleges and universities.

Today, the nation looks to our institutions of higher learning to meet many of our most important needs:

More and more Americans, with aspirations for a better life, assume the necessity of a college education.

Equality of opportunity through education, including higher education, is beginning to appear as a realistic goal for the less privileged young members of our society.

The economy is dependent upon basic research and advancing technology, and upon the higher skills needed to make that technology effective, to assure national economic growth and well-being.

More managers, teachers, and professionals of all sorts are required to serve our complex society. More health personnel are essential to staff the fastest-growing segment of the national endeavor.

The cultural contributions of higher education take on wider dimensions as rising levels of education and growing affluence and leisure make possible greater concern with the quality of life in the United States.

Above all, the nation and the world depend crucially upon rigorous and creative ideas for the solution to profoundly complex issues.

What the American nation needs and expects from higher education in the critical years just ahead can be summed up in two phrases: quality of result and equality of access. Our colleges and universities must maintain and strengthen academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary society. At

the same time, the nation's campuses must act energetically and even aggressively to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

2. HIGHER EDUCATION'S POTENTIAL TO MEET THE NEEDS

Does American higher education have the necessary resources to meet at the same time the nation's expectations for protection of academic quality and for expansion of equality of educational opportunity? Can our colleges and universities find ways to encourage and accommodate growing numbers of students, many of whom will need special financial and academic assistance, while preserving essential margins of academic excellence?

In January, 1968, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges had this to say about the response of public institutions to the shortage of resources:

"To maintain quality, they have raised student charges substantially, turned away qualified students, limited enrollment, and refused requests for urgently needed public service."

Three months later the Association of American Universities issued this statement:

"American higher education is experiencing critical and widespread financial pressures. Virtually every type of college and university faces a widening gap between annual income and the level of expenditures required to undertake needed expansion and improvement—or even, in many cases, to sustain normal operation."

To evaluate the present and potential financial strength of higher education, it is necessary to examine four essential factors: growth in size, growth in functions, rising costs, and sources of funds.

Growth in size

Higher education is currently encountering pressures created in large part by its own record of accomplishments. A century ago, enrollment in higher education in the United States was only about 50,000 students. Today's enrollment is almost 6 million students on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis. More than half of this growth took place in the decade from 1958 to 1967. Estimates indicate that enrollment will pass 8 million by 1976, and this figure may well rise to 9 million if Carnegie Commission or other proposals are adopted to remove financial barriers for students from low-income families.

These enrollment data reflect not only the growing population of the United States and the growing share of that population in the younger age brackets, but also the rapidly increasing proportions of young people who seek higher education. A century ago, 2 percent of young Americans entered college. Now the figure is over 40 percent and is still rising.

Parental expectations or hopes of children's college attendance are now widespread. A Gallup poll shows that 97 percent of all parents questioned want their children to enter college. The national trend appears to be toward extending universal education beyond high school and through at least some years of higher education.

It should be noted, however, that the proportions of young people enrolled in higher education vary considerably from one part of the country to another. Percentages are more than twice as high for the Western states of Arizona, Utah, and California, as those for the Southern States of Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama.

It is apparent that the nation's colleges and universities and those responsible for their financial support must provide new facilities for 3 million additional students by 1976-77. To fall short of this goal would be to limit the movement toward greater equality of access to higher education.

Enrollment will continue to rise after 1976-77 for about another decade, but at a

slower rate, and will then level off until the year 2000. The heaviest costs of further expansion will be met in the period ending about 1980.

Growth in functions

Sheer numbers of students do not, of course, tell the entire story of institutional growth. Colleges and universities in the United States have also grown steadily in the number and complexity of functions they have assumed in response to both the expansion of knowledge and the needs of society.

Instruction has increased in total duration, in curricular range, and in specialization. Research has burgeoned. Graduate and professional programs have multiplied. Colleges and universities are performing a wide variety of important public services directed toward meeting civic and social problems.

This trend will continue in the future as higher education responds to new public needs. Today our institutions are being asked to extend their research efforts on the problems of the cities. They are expected to train additional doctors and medical support personnel to meet the nation's expanding activities in the important field of health care. There is a growing obligation to provide postdoctoral training and continuing education in a variety of fast-developing fields.

These expanding functions have brought our institutions of higher education to a central role in the well-being of our society. But they have also added greatly to the pressures of rising numbers of students and rising costs.

Rising costs

The continuing expansion of our higher education facilities will be expensive in any case. But the financial problems are made more severe by the fact that higher education costs per student are rising rapidly. Total institutional expenditures for higher education climbed from \$5.2 billion in 1957-58 to about \$17.2 billion in 1967-68, an increase of 231 percent as compared with a 119 percent increase in enrollments for the same period. It is estimated that expenditures of higher education institutions will total about \$41 billion in 1976-77 for a projected FTE enrollment of 9 million students.

Institutional expenditures are the major costs but not the total costs of higher education. Certain government and private expenditures for higher education purposes are not reflected fully or at all in institutional spending data. Federal administrative costs for various higher education programs are not, of course, passed on to the institution. Federal student aid under the GI Bill and Social Security Act and some forms of state student aid go directly to the student, and only a portion of that aid enters the institutional revenue-expenditure data via tuition and institutional room-and-board payments. Expenditures of GIs and other students for books, supplies, differential living expenses, and other associated higher education costs which are incurred outside the institution also do not appear in the institutional data.

Unfortunately, the determination of the total cost of higher education is difficult and, inevitably, somewhat arbitrary, and no reliable estimates of the total cost are currently available. This Report, therefore, will rely primarily on use of the fairly well-established data on institutional expenditures for higher education. It is the institutional expenditure total that the Commission estimates will rise to \$41 billion in 1976-77.

In terms of the gross national product (GNP), expenditures by higher education institutions rose from approximately 1 percent in 1957, when the GNP was \$432 billion, to slightly more than 2 percent in 1967, when the GNP was \$763 billion. Institutional expenditures will need to be about 3 percent by 1976-77, at which time the GNP will be about \$1,400 billion.

Many factors aside from the general level of inflation have contributed to rising costs per student. Faculty salaries, which had lagged for some years, have been rising faster than the general level of wages and salaries. Graduate work has increased in importance, and it is more expensive. More sophisticated and costly research and teaching tools are required.

For many other activities of society, rising costs are offset in substantial part by accompanying rises in productivity. Unfortunately, higher education has not and perhaps cannot offset its rising costs in this manner. Despite improvements in college management and experiments in programmed learning and other new techniques, no major ways are likely to be found in the short run which will make it possible to educate more students at the same level of expenditures without lowering academic quality. The search for techniques to improve educational productivity without endangering quality should be actively pressed forward; as was indicated in the Foreword to this Report, efficiency in the use of resources is one of the major areas of higher education mapped out for study by the Carnegie Commission. In the meantime, it is inevitable that costs per student will continue to rise.

Sources of funds

Higher education has long received some federal assistance, but the chief financing burden has been borne by state and local governments and the private sector. It is a striking testimonial to their faith in higher education that they have financed the enormous expansion to date, and that they are grudging to do still more in the future. But there are limits.

Many state and local governments whose expenditures for higher education are already large would experience great difficulties in providing the additional support needed, both because of tax base limits and because

of the other essential needs for public funds. Some states whose past expenditures for higher education have lagged should, of course, provide additional funds in substantial amounts. State support, however, has been a falling share, and it is realistic to expect it to fall still more.

Private resources, initially the major support for all higher education in this country, have provided about half of the institutional funds required for higher education in recent years. With expectations of rising per capita income, and with a relatively high income elasticity for educational expenses, private resources should continue to provide half of the expanded financial support for higher education—a heavy increase in absolute dollar amounts. It would be unrealistic to assume, however, that the private share can be increased in percentage terms over the next few years. This continued heavy reliance on private sources of support for higher education will be helpful to the preservation of autonomy and diversity in American higher education.

The federal government, with revenue available from the graduated income tax, is the major source now realistically able to raise its general revenues faster than the gross national product and thus able to offset the decline in the share borne by the states.

State, local, and private sources combined now pay about four-fifths of total higher education institutional expenditures, and the federal government pays one-fifth. While the absolute amounts paid by all sectors must continue to rise substantially, federal support levels in dollar terms will need to triple in the immediate future. The federal government's proportionate share of institutional support will need to rise from about one-fifth at present (almost \$4 billion) to about one-third (over \$13 billion) of the new total by 1976-77.

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1957-58		1967-68		1976-77	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
State and local.....	\$1.7	33	\$4.7	27	\$7	17
Private.....	2.8	54	9.0	52	21	51
Federal.....	.7	13	3.5	21	13	32
Total.....	5.2	100	17.2	100	41	100

Further federal support necessary to achieve goals of quality and equality

The Carnegie Commission believes a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need is so crucial for our best ideas and intellectual skills and for the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

The severity of the problem is not uniform throughout higher education. Some institutional levels, some geographical areas, some kinds of institutions face more critical financial needs than others. Overall data may disguise the serious nature of the problems for many institutions and students. Capacity not fully utilized in some areas is nevertheless inaccessible to students being turned away from overcrowded local facilities if those students lack the financial means to travel to and live in other areas. Available financial resources at one institution or system of institutions are not transferable to others. Improved resource planning on one campus does not help solve financial shortages at another whose resources are already being inventively utilized to the maximum.

Although the financial impacts have differed, most institutions have by now had to absorb so many of these pressures that formerly available margins in facilities and resources have been depleted. These institu-

tions are now being forced to choose among the alternatives of limiting enrollments, raising tuition fees, postponing expansion and new programs, or allowing quality to deteriorate. These alternatives are already being employed in varying degrees throughout higher education.

The adverse effects upon national needs are all too clear. Enrollment limitations and higher tuition fees (unless offset by grants and loans to those with low incomes) penalize first the very group of students for whom the goal of greater equality of opportunity is intended. Postponing expansions and new programs means deferring activities that may be among the most urgently needed at the present, such as the training of additional health science personnel or research on urban problems. Sacrificing general quality weakens the vital intellectual resources of the nation.

We believe that national needs in the areas of academic quality and equality of opportunity require new levels of federal support for higher education.

3. THE FEDERAL CONCERN WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

The well-being of higher education in the United States is a concern which the federal government shares with state and local governments and private individuals and organizations charged with primary responsibility

for our colleges and universities. Higher education fulfills purposes which are national as well as regional and local, and public as well as private, in their scope and impacts. College graduates and holders of advanced and professional degrees are highly mobile geographically; they are participants in what is essentially a continental market. And it is precisely this broad market which has been an important factor in the prosperity of the nation as a whole. Thus it is appropriate that federal as well as state and local support be given to the nation's institutions of higher education.

The federal government has, in fact, helped to support higher education over the years, with such federal actions as the land-grant movement of post-Civil War days, National Youth Administration programs for needy students during the Depression of the 1930s, aid for science programs during and after World War II, student aid to returning veterans through the GI Bill, and in recent years a growing range of measures to assist various aspects of higher education.

By 1967-68, federal aid given directly to institutions of higher education and to various student aid programs (not including veterans' and social security education benefits) had reached a total of almost \$4 billion and was being channeled through a variety of programs to some 2,100 colleges and universities and several hundred thousand students throughout the United States.

	Billions
Research and development.....	\$1.45
Construction57
Student aid.....	.62
Institutional support.....	.44
Other37
Total	3.45

But the nation's needs for higher education, and thus the needs of higher education for more resources, continue to climb. In the next few years, federal support levels should be tripled if the federal government is to assist state and local governments and the private sector in expanding higher education as an essential investment in the nation's future.

In urging these support levels, the Carnegie Commission is not unmindful of the other and pressing national needs for which federal funds must be allocated. In the broad area of education alone, there are urgent calls for aid at primary and secondary levels and for vocational training. Institutions involved in these levels of education face an array of array of urgent problems, and we warmly support higher levels of aid, including more federal assistance, for these other segments of education. Our focus in this Special Report, however, is the financial problems of our colleges and universities. We believe that federal aid to higher education warrants a high priority among other federal programs, both because of the importance of the specific national needs which higher education serves and because intellectual resources are indispensable to the resolution of so many other high-priority national issues.

The proposed net increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education by 1976-77 is approximately \$10 billion over current federal support levels. Projected growth of federal revenue would indicate that the net increment to federal revenue (over "work load" increases in costs) will reach about \$70 billion by 1976-77. Thus the proposed increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education would require one-seventh of the expected additions to available federal revenues over the next few years for new programs. The Commission is convinced that the federal government can meet this new level of responsibility for higher education without penalty to other urgent national priorities.

4. FORMS OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

The Carnegie Commission believes that federal support of higher education should be based upon the related concerns of contributions to the national welfare and to the vitality and effectiveness of the institutions of higher education themselves.

The forms of federal aid employed should satisfy the following requirements:

Draw forth to the extent possible, rather than merely replace, state and private support.

Provide for flexibility and periodic reevaluation to determine whether changing national needs warrant reallocations.

Assist both public and private institutions—the latter, of course, for nonsectarian purposes only.

Improve equality of educational opportunity for all able young people.

Rely heavily upon market processes through free student choice of institution and field of study.

Preserve institutional autonomy and integrity.

Encourage diversity.

Provide an incentive for innovation.

Maintain among distinguished institutions of learning a margin of excellence, a premium for quality.

Use competitive principles in the support of academic quality, through nationwide competition for graduate fellowships and for institutional proposals in various special program fields.

It is the Carnegie Commission's judgment that the best immediate means of federal aid to higher education are:

Grants and loans to individual students to move toward the nation's goal of equal educational opportunity.

Support to institutions to meet increased costs of expanding enrollment and to strengthen areas of particular national concern.

Extension of support for research, for construction, and for special programs.

Two other widely discussed approaches are considered by the Commission as far less desirable than extension of existing programs. One such approach, tax credits to parents of children in college, would not aid low-income families where the need is greatest. Another, general subsidies to the several states, would fail to provide the coordination and perspective necessary to assure expansion of programs of primary national concern.

5. FEDERAL AID PROPOSALS

The following proposals are those which the Carnegie Commission believes will best meet the most urgent financing problems associated with higher education through 1976-77. While most of the recommendations would result in expansion or augmentation of existing programs, new programs suitable for use in a short-run period are also proposed. No attempt is made here to incorporate or comment upon all existing federal aid activities relating to higher education.

Student aid and related institutional grants

The Carnegie Commission believes that one of the most urgent national priorities for higher education between now and 1976-77 is the removal of financial barriers for all youth who enroll in our diverse colleges and universities, whether in academic or occupational programs. A second important priority is support for talented graduate students who can meet the nation's needs for a wide variety of professionals, technical specialists, researchers, and college teachers.

The federal government presently provides limited amounts of student aid under a number of separate programs, some restricted to one or another major subject field, some based on need, some on ability, some channeled through the GI Bill. Today's graduat-

ing high school student often has difficulty in determining what student aid is available to him. Each program has separate requirements and applications. Often he must enroll in a college or university and then see if that institution still has funds available under particular programs. To replace these separate and limited programs (though not, of course, the GI Bill), the Commission proposes a substantially expanded program consisting of educational opportunity grants based on need, a work-study program, student loans, a counseling and information program, a graduate talent search and development program, and doctoral fellowships based on ability.

The Commission's program of student aid is based upon these premises:

1. Student aid must be adequate to remove effectively the financial barriers which now prevent many qualified students from entering or continuing higher education.

2. Basic grants supplemented by work-study payments should be scaled to differing educational expenses in the lower division, upper division, and graduate years. With the growth of the community college movement and urban facilities, most students will be able to attend low-cost institutions near home for at least the first two years.

3. The grant program should be augmented by a loan program making possible greater flexibility in choice of college to the needy student and providing a readily available source of college financing with repayment deferred for all students regardless of need.

4. Maximum flexibility and fullest utilization of aid funds will be accomplished if the major portion of these funds is kept in one national reservoir and granted to individual students who exercise free choice of institution and disciplinary fields. If funds are allocated by institution or region or field, problems of over- and under-use will inevitably arise and require time-consuming and costly transfer procedures. The "national reservoir" approach has worked very successfully under the GI Bill. For administrative purposes, however, grant payments would be made to students by their selected institutions rather than directly by the government.

Educational opportunity grants

Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access to education. And we have not yet achieved equality of access to education; financial barriers and racial barriers block the way for many potentially able young Americans. Almost half of the undergraduate college students in the United States now come from the country's highest family income quartile; only 7 percent come from the lowest income quartile.

Complete figures are not available for socioeconomic distribution of graduate enrollment, but fragmentary figures suggest that an even lower proportion of graduate students comes from the two lowest quartiles.

The proportion of Negroes in the American college population is less than half the proportion of Negroes in the population as a whole, and half the Negroes in colleges attend predominantly Negro colleges.

Financial barriers to higher education result in a demonstrable loss of national talent. In the highest socioeconomic quartile, 19 out of 20 students ranking in the top ability group (the highest 20 percent) enter college within five years after high school graduation; in the lowest socioeconomic quartile, only 10 out of 20 in the highest ability group enter college.

Although the federal government, in the past, has provided financial aid to college students through the GI Bill, loans, and student work programs in the Depression, it was not until the Higher Education Act of 1965 that a program of educational opportunity

grants was established. Under this program 225,000 undergraduate students from low-income families received grants in 1966-67. Adoption of a clear policy to remove financial barriers should make grants available to about 1.7 million students (27 percent of total enrollment) in 1970-71 and approximately 2.9 million students (32 percent of total enrollment) in 1976-77.

Approximately family income quartile:	Average family income
High (above \$10,000)-----	\$16,016
Second (\$6,000 to \$10,000)-----	8,359
Third (\$3,000 to \$6,000)-----	5,549
Low (below \$3,000)-----	2,321

Recommendation

The Commission recommends strengthening and expanding the present program of educational opportunity grants based on need by providing:

1. That the level of funding be increased so that all college students with demonstrated need will be assured of some financial aid to meet expenses at institutions which they select

2. That grants based on need be available for a period not to exceed four years of undergraduate study and two years of study toward a graduate degree

Determination of need. It will be necessary to derive a simple need formula based on such factors as total family income over the past several years, total family assets, and number and ages of children. The Commission assumes that a maximum grant would often be necessary at the lowest income quartile, that perhaps half of the maximum grant would be the average requirement at the second lowest quartile, and that only a few grants would be made to students from families on the lower borders of the upper half of the income range.

Amounts of grants. Assuming full need, maximum grants would be:

a. \$750 per year to a student during his first two years of work toward an undergraduate degree or certificate

b. \$1,000 per year to a student during his third and fourth years of work toward an undergraduate degree

c. \$1,000 per year for a maximum of two years to a student working toward a graduate degree

No grant would be made unless the student is eligible for a grant in an amount of \$200 or more.

It should be noted that the amounts in (a) and (b) above may be augmented by supplementary matching grants and work-study payments provided in the recommendations below.

Level of funding. It is estimated that the program of educational opportunity grants set forth above would require federal funding as follows:

Year:	Billions
1970-71-----	\$0.9
1971-72-----	1.0
1972-73-----	1.1
1973-74-----	1.3
1974-75-----	1.4
1975-76-----	1.6
1976-77-----	1.6

Supplementary matching grants

Institutions are expected to seek additional funds from private, state, and local government sources for undergraduate educational opportunity grants. It is estimated that over \$800 million in student aid funds was obtained from these sources in 1966-67. It is not known what proportion of these student aid funds was used for grants to students from low-income families. To encourage commitment of more funds from these sources for such grants and to provide greater choice of selection of college for the student, the Commission proposes a program of supplementary matching grants.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that an undergraduate student holding an educational opportunity grant and receiving added grants from nonfederal sources be given a supplementary federal grant in an amount matching the nonfederal grants but not exceeding one-half of the student's original educational opportunity grant.

An upper-division student with full need might, for example, hold a \$1,000 educational opportunity grant. If he were awarded an additional state or private grant of \$400, he would thereby become eligible for a federal supplementary matching grant of \$400, bringing his total grant level for the year to \$1,800. If a holder of a \$1,000 educational opportunity grant were to be given an added \$700 from state or private sources, he could receive a federal supplementary matching grant of \$500 (the upper limit of one-half of the amount of his original educational opportunity grant), for a total grant level of \$2,200 per year.

Level of funding. It is estimated that this program would require federal funding as follows:

Year:	Millions
1970-71-----	\$110
1971-72-----	140
1972-73-----	180
1973-74-----	230
1974-75-----	280
1975-76-----	340
1976-77-----	380

Federal scholarship grants to institutions

The Commission recognizes that any formula for need applied on a nationwide basis may not adequately cover individual hardship cases. To provide some greater degree of flexibility in the allocation of grants to students with financial need, the Commission proposes that some additional scholarship funds be given directly to institutions where holders of educational opportunity grants are enrolled. The college or university would then allocate these funds to students as determined by the institution's own definition of student need.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that each college and university be given a scholarship fund for needy students equal to 10 percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants (not including supplementary matching grants) held by students at that institution.

Level of funding. Federal funding requirements for this program are estimated as follows:

Year:	Millions
1970-71-----	\$90
1971-72-----	95
1972-73-----	105
1973-74-----	120
1974-75-----	135
1975-76-----	150
1976-77-----	160

Work-study program

During the Depression, the federally funded National Youth Administration provided payment for part-time jobs to more than 10 percent of all students then enrolled in higher education. More recently, the college work-study program was established. Originally under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it was continued as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the programs is to stimulate and promote part-time employment for students—particularly those from low-income families—who need the work to stay in school. Through federal grants to institutions of higher education, the program provides work opportunities on campus and in public or private nonprofit agencies engaged in community service off campus. Students may work an average of 15 hours a week while

classes are in session and not more than 40 while they are not in session.

During fiscal 1968, 310,000 students participated in this program, the federal share costing an estimated \$112.5 million. The work-study program has generated enthusiasm among participating students, colleges and agencies, especially at the state and community college levels. Significant numbers of economically disadvantaged youths are enabled to enter and stay in college. These students perform tasks important to academic institutions and agencies serving the community. In tangible and practical ways they develop an additional framework of relationships with the academic community. Work-study is one of the most valuable forms of student aid and ought to be incorporated in any federal program to assist students.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that federal funds be provided to finance institutionally administered part-time employment for undergraduate students. Institutions should use these funds to enable students, who meet in general terms the federal need criteria, to earn up to \$500 per year. Off-campus assignments of educational importance, such as tutorial work, should be encouraged.

Because students from lower socioeconomic groups may experience educational disadvantages in their initial college years, it might be desirable to place some limits on their work-study program participation at the lower-division level. Upper-division students, and lower-division students to the extent consistent with their educational needs, should be encouraged to take part in the work-study program.

Level of funding. This program would require estimated levels of federal funding as follows:

Year:	Millions
1970-71-----	\$510
1971-72-----	540
1972-73-----	620
1973-74-----	700
1974-75-----	775
1975-76-----	850
1976-77-----	870

Counseling and information program

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized establishment of a broad program throughout all levels of education for guidance, counseling, and testing of students and for identification and encouragement of able students to continue their education. One of the stated purposes of that program was to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete secondary school, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions. In 1959 \$7.4 million was initially appropriated for the program. The appropriation for 1967 was \$24.5 million.

The Commission believes, because of the importance of decisions made at the high school level about college attendance, that it is imperative to strengthen counseling and information programs. Students who possess the ability to go on to college-level academic work should be identified, assisted in finding the right college, and advised on the availability of financial aid. Identification of these students early in their high school careers would make it possible to channel them into curricula which would better equip them for higher education. Those with other interests and qualifications who can benefit either from further development before their prospects are clear or from more vocationally oriented education should be guided into courses at the appropriate institution. But not every high school graduate should be guided toward further formal education at that time, and this decision too is an important counseling responsibility.

The federal program should include support of research activities to develop better

ways to identify qualified students, particularly those from disadvantaged groups. Federal training courses should be established for high school teachers and counselors to keep them up to date on financial aid, college programs, and career possibilities. Information centers should be established in metropolitan centers so that parents and students may obtain information about career possibilities and opportunities for higher education.

Colleges and universities should be encouraged to use a portion of their work-study program funds to enable their students to work with high school and elementary school students in various tutoring and counseling programs.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the present federal aid program of guidance, counseling, and testing for identification and encouragement of able students be expanded to include the elements described above and that funding for the program be increased to \$30 million in 1970-71, rising to \$40 million in 1976-77.

Graduate talent search and development program

The nation's 2,300 institutions of higher education vary greatly, not only in function, but also in educational effectiveness. As a result, some students have earned their bachelor's degrees at institutions that have found it difficult, often because of financial pressures, to attain a desirable level of quality in their educational programs. Colleges of this type, often found in the economically depressed areas of the nation, may be the only facilities accessible to many students from low-income families and, in some sections of the country, to students from racial minorities. The developing institutions program, mentioned later in these proposals, is concerned with improving the quality of these colleges. But this improvement cannot be quickly achieved.

At the very time when the nation has growing needs for specialized personnel in health, welfare, technical, and professional fields and in elementary and secondary teaching, it is particularly unfortunate that some students who have completed their undergraduate training find that they are not adequately prepared to undertake graduate programs in these and other needed areas. It is equally unfortunate that some of these students come from the very groups of the population that need opportunities to participate more fully and at increasingly higher levels in the nation's work force.

As a partial remedy to this situation, the Commission urges that a federal program be funded under which certain universities, selected on the basis of specific program proposals, undertake the task of identifying potentially able graduates who have not received undergraduate training adequate to permit immediate pursuit of graduate studies. The programs could vary considerably in nature, but each would provide up to one year of intensive work to enable program participants to undertake their graduate studies more successfully. Students selected would receive a stipend based on need for the duration of the program.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that certain universities be selected on the basis of program proposals submitted to national panels to undertake specific graduate talent search and development programs, and that federal funding be made available for such programs in the amount of \$25 million in 1970-71, rising to \$100 million in 1976-77.

Doctoral fellowship program

For several years, various federal agencies have offered doctoral fellowships and traineeships to students selected largely on the basis of achievement. Grants of this type

were made to over 30,000 doctoral students in 1967.

The Commission has recommended above that educational opportunity grants based on need should be made available to first-level graduate students for a maximum of two years during work toward a graduate degree. In addition, the Commission proposes a program of loans (see the recommendation below) to assist students at all levels of undergraduate and graduate study.

Because of the great importance of encouraging the most able of our young students to continue their graduate studies at the highest level, the Commission proposes a federally financed doctoral fellowship program based on ability for students in all fields of intellectual endeavor. This program would provide stipends to talented students working toward the Ph. D. or equivalent research doctorate degree during the intensive period of their research for the doctoral thesis.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a doctoral fellowship program with selection based upon demonstrated academic ability without reference to need, with fellowships in the amount of \$3,000 annually for a maximum of two years to graduate students advanced to candidacy for a Ph. D. or equivalent research doctorate, the total number of such first-year fellowships to equal three-fourths of the national total of earned doctorates in the previous year.

Selection. Of the total number of fellowships to be awarded annually, half would be selected by national competition. The other half would be granted on the basis of allocations to institutions for certain departments or interdepartmental major programs designated by national panels of experts, and the institutions and departments would then apply their own ability criteria for selection of recipients. Selection would be extended into the social sciences and humanities and not limited to the sciences and health professions as is largely true at present.

Teaching assistantships. A graduate student holding a doctoral fellowship would be expected to devote full time to his academic work, but could be required by the university as a part of his degree program to hold a teaching assistantship and would be permitted to receive a teaching assistantship stipend from the university.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for this program would be:

Year:	Millions
1970-71	\$105
1971-72	110
1972-73	120
1973-74	130
1974-75	150
1975-76	160
1976-77	165

National student loan bank

The Commission's opportunity grant and work-study recommendations are designed to remove financial barriers to higher education for students from low-income families. However, this is not the only kind of student assistance that is needed in a situation of rising educational costs. Grant recipients might wish to attend institutions far from their homes or with high tuitions, at costs greater than the ceilings appropriate to a grant program based on need. For many middle-income families, especially those with several children in college, the burdens of meeting the costs of higher education out of current income are large. Older students increasingly assume the role of independent adults, and continued financial dependence on their families poses significant problems. For, all these reasons, a widely available student loan program in which need is not a condition of eligibility is desirable as a supplement to the programs already proposed.

Economic considerations reinforce this judgment. On the whole, members of the population who have more education enjoy significantly higher earnings than those with less, and this correlation holds broadly over the whole educational spectrum. In one respect, therefore, higher education enhances the earning power of individuals, thus providing the economic basis for repayment of debts incurred to finance that education. In this sense such laws can be viewed as financing individuals' investments in productive though nontangible capital.

Further, the social benefits of higher education which affect the whole nation, over and above those accruing to the individuals receiving it, justify a federal government effort in this area. Additionally, higher incomes result in higher tax payments to the federal government.

The desirability of federal participation in loan programs has already been recognized in such past program as the National Student Defense Loan program established in 1958 and the Guaranteed Loan program established in 1965. These together had outstanding loans of over a billion dollars by 1966-67.

However, the existing loan programs have important difficulties, the greatest of which is an inadequate level of funding. Others include limitations of eligibility in terms of need, 10-year repayment periods which have imposed high burdens and discouraged applicants, and ineffective attempts to make them recruiting devices for such occupations as teaching. What is needed is a much larger loan program of a quite different character.

A particular kind of loan program—namely, one with contingent repayment provisions under which the borrower contracts to pay back a fixed percentage of his income per \$1,000 of debt each year for a long period (30 to 40 years)—has a number of important additional advantages which recommend it strongly over a conventional fixed-contract type of loan.

First, such a loan program would contribute significantly to a further equalization of educational opportunity. If the loan program as a whole were on a self-sustaining basis (as defined below), those whose post-education incomes were highest would help pay for the costs of education of those whose posteducation incomes were lower. Since posteducation incomes are correlated among other things with incomes of the students' families, this would spread the cost of equalization of opportunity over both the current and the succeeding generations.

Second, the prospect of repayment would be a lesser deterrent under a contingent loan program than under a conventional fixed-contract program. This would lead to a wider use of loans since risks would be shared.

Third, the program would further emphasize the independence of the student by encouraging him to meet a larger proportion of his educational costs through a loan.

Certain difficulties which such a contingent loan proposal appears to raise are manageable. Two, in particular, have received wide attention: the possibility of adverse selection of applicants that would prejudice the solvency of the program and the so-called negative dowry of college-educated women who marry and leave the labor force. Detailed studies of the design of such a program (for example, that by Karl Shell and others) show that these difficulties can be met. Further careful study and drafting of such a program are, however, highly necessary.

The Commission recommends this loan program as a supplement to our other proposals, rather than as the basic or sole program for both student and institutional support.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that a federal contingent loan program be created for which all students, regardless of need, would be eligible. With interest figured on the basis

of federal borrowing costs, the program should be self-sustaining, except for administrative costs which would be met out of appropriations. Undergraduates would be eligible to borrow up to \$2,500 per year, and graduate students up to \$3,500 per year, for educational purposes. No student should be entitled to receive more in loans, all types of grants, and work-study payments in any year than the costs of education, including subsistence costs, as officially recognized by the institution in which he is enrolled.

The program would be administered through the institutions of higher education, which will have the relevant information on grants and work-study payments to loan applicants.

Level of funding. A loan program of this sort must be viewed as clearly experimental; it is difficult to predict the extent to which it will be used. But if loans are to be made available to students without reference to need, it will be necessary to have the initial level of funding for the loan program high enough to eliminate any requirements for setting priorities among loan applicants. The Commission suggests that funding be made available to provide student loans totaling \$2.5 billion in 1970-71, possibly increasing to as much as \$5 billion in new student loans in 1976-77.

It is also difficult to predict the level of federal expenditures which would be required by this loan program. Although designed to be self-supporting, the program would require, particularly in the initial years, annual federal appropriations amounting to perhaps 5 percent of new loans committed that year for administrative costs and contingencies. This would amount to about \$125 million in 1970-71, rising to \$250 million in 1976-77.

Part-time students

Growing requirements for retraining during a person's lifetime and the probability that low-income students will have to work part-time suggest that the importance of part-time enrollment may increase in the future. All the programs recommended above are stated in terms of full-time students. The programs should, however, through the implementing legislation, be adapted to provide proportional aid to part-time students.

Cost-of-education supplements to institutions

The proposed expansion of financial aid programs to make it possible for more students to attend universities and colleges will add to the present financial problems of these institutions. The full costs of education are not met through tuition payments. Moreover, the increase in numbers of disadvantaged students will tend to raise per-student instructional costs, because many of these students will need special educational assistance such as tutoring, counseling, and perhaps remedial training in special areas. Cost considerations should not be permitted to discourage colleges and universities from effectively recruiting and assisting potentially able young people no matter what their socioeconomic background might be.

At the doctoral level, the gap between tuition levels and full instructional costs is even greater. To some extent, this problem has been recognized in the past through federal programs which provide cost-of-education supplements to institutions attended by students holding federal graduate fellowships.

The Commission believes that this concept should be continued for the doctoral fellowship program and extended to the educational opportunity grant program as well.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the federal government grant cost-of-education supplements to colleges and universities based on the numbers and levels of students holding federal grants enrolled in the institutions.

Amounts of grants. Accredited colleges and universities, and institutions deemed potentially eligible for accreditation except for their recent date of establishment, would receive the following amounts for each federal grant holder enrolled:

Student level	1970-71	Rising to 1976-77
Lower division.....	\$525	\$750
Upper division.....	700	1,000
First-level graduate.....	1,050	1,500
Doctoral.....	3,500	5,000

Educational assistance programs. As the student aid program brings into higher education a greater number of disadvantaged students, the problem of providing them with special educational assistance such as counseling and tutoring will become increasingly important. The Commission assumes that a portion of the cost-of-education supplement would be used by the institution to undertake programs giving special attention to the educational needs of students who, largely because of socioeconomic factors, have been under an educational disadvantage.

Cost-of-education supplements as guides to future institutional support programs.

These supplements could be used by the institutions at their own discretion to meet general operating costs. Thus they would provide some useful body of experience with general federal support of institutions—experience which could be used as a basis for consideration of the many proposals now being made for such institutional grants. The cost-of-education supplement program is proposed to meet immediate short-run needs, but it will also give the Commission and others both time and valuable data for analysis of the impacts, benefits, and problems involved in proposed programs for long-range institutional support and in the particular formulas being suggested for such programs.

This experience will augment the valuable consideration and study which have already been given to broad programs of institutional support by state study groups such as that proposed for New York and by several education associations. Statements of the various education associations have been reprinted in the Carnegie Commission publication *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education*, prepared by Ronald Wolk. In addition, the American Council on Education has recently issued a comparison of several proposed formulas for institutional grants.

The Commission hopes and expects that many students with grants would be drawn into the smaller colleges across the nation, where they would receive more individual attention and have a better opportunity to participate in the life of the total campus community. Many of these colleges would have the capacity to receive more students if they were given financial support to offset, in part, their added costs. They would thus also have a greater opportunity to diversify their student bodies, as so many of them now wish to do.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for cost-of-education supplements would be:

Year:	Billions
1970-71	\$1.13
1971-72	1.28
1972-73	1.53
1973-74	1.94
1974-75	2.17
1975-76	2.51
1976-77	2.71

The Carnegie Commission hopes in the near future to make a study of and recommendations on state support to private colleges and universities.

Medical education

Medical and health services education is the one major subject area in higher education that the Carnegie Commission has singled out for specific federal aid proposals. The reasons are several: the great needs of the nation in the health field, the growing public concern with these needs as evidenced by Medicare and the many state and local health programs, the high cost of medical training facilities, the fact that new medical education facilities are needed to serve geographical regions without reference to state boundaries, and, finally, the high mobility of medical school graduates, many and even most of whom do not remain to practice within the states that provided their instruction.

It is estimated that facilities to provide spaces for about 75 percent more medical students will be required by 1976-77 to meet the nation's rapidly growing need for medical services over and above the spaces available in 1966, when Medicare came into operation. In contrast to the rapid increase of enrollments in most other fields of higher education, the supply of medical school graduates has grown relatively slowly since the 1920s, and it is apparent that vigorous new efforts must be made to provide more training facilities and to encourage more students to undertake training. At the present time, 20 percent of the new doctors starting practice in the United States each year have received their training abroad, and sometimes it is of a distinctly lower quality than that provided by medical schools in the United States. Additionally, health care is not now adequately available in many rural areas and urban ghettos.

Instructional and capital outlay costs for medical schools far outstrip the levels in other schools of professional education, including schools in which other health personnel are trained; and financing the major part of the needed expansion of such facilities from state and private resources is almost impossible.

Studies now underway give some promise that reorganization of medical education and of medical practice itself can lead to reduced costs of both medical education and medical care. Federal funds should be made available to support the development of expanded training programs for health support personnel. But these possibilities do not provide full solution to the financing problems confronting medical education.

The federal government has been undertaking increasing levels of support for medical school construction (\$18 million in 1966-67 and \$55 million in 1967-68) and training (\$42 million in 1966-67 and \$53 million in 1967-68), but the Carnegie Commission believes higher federal levels are required.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a substantial program of federal aid for medical education and health services for the purposes of:

Stimulating expansion of capacity at existing medical schools

Planning additional medical schools distributed on a geographical basis to provide needed service to areas not now served

Expanding educational facilities and developing new programs for the training of medical care support personnel

Increasing availability of health services in the community of the medical school and the quality of health care delivery

Student aid. A student aid program for medical students should be adopted to provide grants on the basis of need in amounts up to \$3,500 per year for four years, with free choice of institution.

It should be noted that medical students also have access to loans under the expanded loan program recommended above.

Institutional payments. Payments to institutions would be equal to the sum of the following amounts:

1. The institution's enrollment of students working toward the M.D. multiplied by \$4,000

2. That portion of the enrollment working toward the M.D. in excess of such enrollment in the fall of 1966 multiplied by \$2,000

3. The total number of residents and interns multiplied by \$2,250, provided that no individual student shall be counted for more than four years, and provided further that the resident and intern program is conducted under the auspices of an accredited medical school either at its own or at an affiliated hospital

The amounts in (1) and (2) above should be adjusted for medical schools with three-year programs to enable those schools to receive the same amount of institutional aid as four-year schools.

Institutions would be free to use these institutional payments for support of any program which has as its major purpose the instruction of medical students.

Construction funds. Construction funds should be made available at the level of 100 percent for creation of new places, with additional funds for renovation and replacement.

Start-up grants. Start-grants should be made available for nonconstruction costs for approximately 20 new medical schools at the rate of four per year for five years, not to exceed \$10 million per school. These schools should be located in geographical areas not now adequately served by existing medical schools, with a sufficient population base to warrant a medical school, and with a university capable of providing a good environment for a medical school.

Community health service programs. Federal support should be made available for development of programs by medical schools designed to extend the availability and effectiveness of community health programs.

Training of support medical personnel. Federal funds should be made available for programs designed to increase the number of support medical personnel. Such personnel can be trained comparatively quickly and inexpensively. In some fields, such as pediatrics, they can assume a substantial share of the services now performed by M.D.s if they are given proper supervision by an M.D.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for the medical and health services education program outlined above would be:

Year:	Billions
1970-71	\$0.33
1971-72	.35
1972-73	.37
1973-74	.39
1974-75	.42
1975-76	.40
1976-77	.43

Medical education today is undergoing more constructive self-examination than it has since the Flexner report of 1910 and more than is going on in any other field of higher education. This is both impressive and commendable. The new medical schools recommended here can take advantage of the new ideas being born. Expansion of existing schools can provide opportunities for the new types of training for new types of doctors and support personnel now being envisioned. The medical profession as a whole is welcoming expansion of personnel and experimentation in training of personnel and delivery of health care as never before, to its great credit and the nation's great advantage; and the medical students of today encourage these progressive tendencies.

This openness to new concepts and new horizons of service should be fully encouraged as the federal government extends the basic support to medical education which it has given so successfully in the past to medi-

cal research. The second great transformation of medical education and research (the Flexner report having given rise to the first) is now underway, and the United States once again will greatly benefit. The new schools of medicine can be new in program as well as in physical identity; the expanded schools can be greater in their variety and relevance to modern needs as well as greater in size. Medical schools are on the threshold of becoming as important to the quality of urban life as the colleges of agriculture under the land-grant movement have been to rural life.

New money can now be matched by new ideas. Both are important—but the new ideas are the more important. The Carnegie Commission hopes subsequently to make suggestions on the future of medical education and its financing, and fully realizes that better use of health care facilities and personnel is as important as the enlargement of facilities and personnel.

Construction

During the late 1950s and the 1960s the great surge in college enrollment led to a growing deficiency in facilities. It was in recognition of this deficiency that the Higher Education Facilities Act was passed in 1963. But the increased federal aid came late and at too low a level to close the gap. By 1967 college and university instructional facilities would have had to be expanded by 20 percent to provide fully adequate space for the new levels of enrollment. This continuing deficiency resulted, in part, from the federal budgetary stringency which led to decreasing levels of support for college construction at a time when enrollment continued to rise.

Projected levels of enrollment suggest a further increase in this deficiency unless levels of federal support under the Higher Education Facilities Act can be increased. To keep pace with expanding enrollment, while holding the existing deficiency at its 20 percent level, about \$2 billion of federal funds should be available annually for college and university construction.

At present, funds are channeled principally into new construction. We believe more attention should be directed to the use of construction grants for renovation, an approach which might provide some additional facilities more quickly and at lower costs.

During the last academic year 72 new colleges were established. Many more new campuses will be needed over the next few years, and campuses of particular types.

The advance of the junior college movement over the last decade has greatly increased the accessibility of higher education to hundreds of thousands of American youth. A further extension of the growing junior college movement will continue this significant trend.

Colleges to serve the inner-city youth are urgently required in many of our major metropolitan areas. To meet this need, it is estimated that 500 community colleges and 50 urban four-year colleges should be established by 1976.

These new colleges, particularly in urban areas where land is expensive, will have heavier than usual initial costs. The Commission's proposals for construction aid include start-up grants for these institutions.

The Commission believes that support for construction is one of the most desirable mechanisms for channeling federal aid to colleges and universities. Such support carries with it very limited opportunities for control of educational policy; it increases the real assets of the nation; and, combined with matching requirements, it stimulates rather than replaces other sources of financial support for higher education.

Recommendation

Construction grants:

1. The Commission recommends that the amount of federal grants for academic con-

struction be increased from the present provision (two-fifths of construction costs for junior colleges and one-third for other institutions) to one-half of the total amounts required by all institutions for construction, renovation, and replacement of facilities.

2. In addition, the Commission recommends that start-up grants be provided for planning and nonconstruction costs for new junior college and urban institutions, not to exceed \$10 million per institution but averaging more nearly \$1 million per institution.

Construction loans: The Commission recommends that funding levels for the academic facilities construction loan program be increased to provide sufficient loan funds for an additional 25 percent of needed new construction costs.

It should be noted that institutions could thus finance up to 75 percent of new construction through a combination of federal grants and loans.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for construction grants and loan obligation levels would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Grants	Loan obligations
1970-71	1.26	0.53
1971-72	1.58	.69
1972-73	1.86	.83
1973-74	1.87	.88
1974-75	1.88	.89
1975-76	1.92	.91
1976-77	1.22	.61

Funding levels will continue to decline after 1976-1977 as enrollment levels stabilize in the 1980s.

The Commission recognizes that major improvements are possible in the intensity of space utilization and assumes that some of the estimated 20 percent deficiency across the nation can be offset by improved utilization.

Loans for student housing. For several years, federal loans for student housing have constituted an important form of federal aid to higher education. The Commission believes that this support is important to the educational effectiveness of many colleges and universities and urges continuation of the student housing loan program. This Report does not, however, include any recommendations on future levels of support for housing loans. The comparative emphasis on college housing and on privately supplied housing requires careful study campus by campus. College housing is of particular importance to the private liberal arts college with a residential character.

Research

One of the most essential functions of higher education is its contribution to the advance of knowledge in the nation. In recognition of this contribution the federal government has played a substantial role in providing major support for university-based research.

Since the federal government first undertook massive support of research in the universities during World War II, research expenditures have been a very large part of total federal expenditures on higher education. In the early postwar years, nearly half of the total federal support for higher education was directed to science research, and by 1958 the proportion had risen to two-thirds. Research now accounts for about one-third of the total federal funds flowing to higher education institutions.

More significantly, federal funding has been the primary source of support for university-based research activities. Today approximately three-quarters of all university research is federally financed. In some highly research-oriented universities, the figure is almost 90 percent.

The rate of increase of federal support to university research is thus the key element in its ability to expand. During the period from 1956 to 1962, federal support of academic research increased at a rate of about 25 percent per year, but the rate of increase has slowed sharply since 1962. Last year's increase in federal support for academic research was only 2 percent.

It is the Commission's belief that university research, and thus federal support for university research, must increase substantially over the next several years. Both the past increase (before the recent slowdown) and the proposed increase in federal support are based on several factors:

1. Enrollment of doctoral candidates has risen sharply over the last several years and will continue to rise at an average rate of 6.6 percent annually through 1975.

2. Costs of research, like costs of instruction, are rising more rapidly than the costs of the general economy.

3. The new technology, which makes considerable expansion possible in the scope, nature, and quality of research, is also adding to the cost of research.

4. Critical social problems demand greater research efforts in many areas, including the social sciences.

Recommendations

The Commission recommends that the level of federal funding for university and college research be increased over the next several years but with the annual rate of increase declining from 15 percent in 1970-71 to 10 percent in 1976-77. This rate of increase reflects expanding doctoral enrollments, use of more costly technology, and the need for expansion into new fields of research.

The Commission further recommends that a grant amounting to 10 percent of the total research grants received annually by an institution be made to that institution to be used at its discretion. The sum required for this purpose is to be included within the percentages noted immediately above.

Procedures: The present federal system for awarding research grants through multiple agencies based on review and determination of merit of each proposal seems to work relatively well; the Commission does not, therefore, recommend any basic change in the present procedure. However, it might be desirable for all granting agencies to adopt the practice now sometimes used of giving low priority to inclusion of funds for released faculty time, particularly at universities where the teaching load is relatively low; conversely, efforts should be made to increase the teaching services of research personnel, and federal policy can encourage this.

The present system does sometimes make it difficult for colleges and universities to obtain federal research funds for small projects and for planning projects, and young faculty members may be under considerable disadvantage in competing for research funds. The proposed 10 percent supplementary grant to institutions would make it possible for them to provide grants for these purposes.

Level of funding: With one modification, the current level of federal funding for research can properly be used as a base for projecting desirable future levels of support. To some extent research funds are now used to provide traineeships for candidates for research doctorates. If the Commission's proposal for research doctoral fellowships is accepted, this need will be met directly through that program. In projecting future levels of federal funding for research, the Commission has started from a base lower than the present level of support, thus eliminating possible duplication between the present use of research funds and the proposed research doctoral fellowship program.

It is estimated that federal funds for support of research as outlined above would be:

Year:	Billions
1970-71	\$2.00
1971-72	2.30
1972-73	2.62
1973-74	2.96
1974-75	3.32
1975-76	3.68
1976-77	4.05

Special programs

The federal government has been both sensitive and responsive to areas of particular need in higher education and has established a number of special programs to provide federal assistance for these areas.

Recommendation

The Commission has not given consideration to all of these special programs, but does recommend increased funding for the following three programs: aid to developing institutions, library support, and international studies.

Aid to developing institutions: Many of the nation's existing colleges have failed to reach their full capability because of limitations of resources. If expanded educational opportunity is to be provided in the United States, these colleges must become full participants in the academic community. Since 1965, the Office of Education, through its developing-college program, has given some financial aid to such colleges, starting with \$5 million in 1966 and increasing to \$30 million in 1967. In too many instances the level of aid to institutions has not been sufficient to enable significant development, but only to tide them over for another year. Through this program some of these colleges might well be encouraged to combine with each other or with neighboring institutions. This program in its entirety can be of particular value to areas which are deficient in educational opportunity. The Commission recommends that funding for the developing college program be increased from its present level of \$20 million to \$100 million.

Library support: A basic tool of any college or university is its library. The current expansion of knowledge, with the resultant massive explosion in literature in all fields, has sharply increased the cost of even the minimal library for an undergraduate college. Major universities with their heavy emphasis on graduate education and research, face even greater increases in their annual library expenditures. The higher education law does provide support for college and research libraries, but the level of funding has been low. In 1966, although \$50 million was authorized, only \$10 million was appropriated. In 1967 and 1968 the appropriation was increased to \$25 million. The Commission recommends that the full authorization of \$50 million be made available in 1970-71 and be increased to \$100 million by 1976, and that libraries which serve a regional need be given a high priority for grants under this program.

International studies: The years since World War II have witnessed an unprecedented growth in the number of new and independent nations in the world. The problems of their economic and political development and of their accommodation into the international sphere have accentuated the need for stronger university-based programs of international studies. The International Education Act of 1966 authorized some grant programs in this area, but no funds have yet been appropriated. More centers for comprehensive training and research both on specific geographical areas and on particular fields or issues in world affairs should be encouraged. The Commission recommends that the \$90 million authorized for this program be appropriated in 1970-71 and that funding be increased to \$100 million by 1976-77.

Level of funding: The National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education would be initiating new special pro-

grams which, after their developmental phases, would be transferred to appropriate federal agencies.

Total funding for these special programs described above and for the others now in prospect might require \$800 million by 1976-77.

National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education

Research and graduate instruction in the nation's universities have been greatly strengthened over the past two decades, in large part because of substantial research support by the federal government. Parallel gains of this magnitude have not been made in other areas of higher education, such as undergraduate curriculum development, instructional techniques, utilization of resources, and new program areas.

The Commission believes that the federal government can play an extremely valuable role in encouraging developmental programs in higher education by providing initial funds for such undertakings. The continuing rise in the costs of higher education makes it particularly important to develop existing facilities to their greatest potential and to try out new methods and techniques in order to improve operational efficiency and quality. But many institutions find that they do not have a margin of funds for such undertakings.

The Commission proposes the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education to provide encouragement, advice, review, and financial support for institutional programs designed to provide new directions in curricula, strengthening of essential areas that have fallen behind or that have never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and development of programs to improve educational processes and techniques. The Foundation would be a governmental agency operating under the direction of a board and organized along the lines of the National Science Foundation.

It is intended that all programs funded through the Foundation would be short-run or developmental in character. Programs once experimented with, developed, and proved successful under the National Foundation would be transferred into the special programs category mentioned earlier and administered on a permanent basis by other agencies of the federal government, usually the Office of Education.

Examples of developmental programs which might be funded by the Foundation are the following:

Improvement of undergraduate education: Criticism of the quality of undergraduate education has become widespread during the past few years. The recent focus of national attention on research needs and associated graduate instruction has undoubtedly occasioned some neglect of the undergraduate area. In addition, many undergraduate students across the nation have evinced new interest in undergraduate programs which minimize the fragmenting effects of specialization and which emphasize relevance to the current problems of our society. A healthy mood of reform is evident on many campuses and could be encouraged through the National Foundation.

Services to elementary and secondary education: The quality of education at the primary and secondary levels has an obvious bearing on the number and quality of students who enter our colleges and universities, and it is particularly important in assuring greater equality of access to higher education. In recent years, institutions of higher education have begun to assume more responsibility for assistance to the earlier levels in the educational process, providing supplementary training programs for teachers, help in curriculum design, con-

sultation in connection with school problems such as integration, and other similar services. The federal government has given support to these programs in particular areas. In 1967-68, for example, the National Science Foundation awarded grants of \$46 million for teacher training programs in the sciences, and the Office of Education provided over \$12 million for a program of experienced-teacher fellowships. The National Foundation could review new service programs, which through improving the quality of education at the primary and secondary levels would have valuable consequences for higher education as well.

Regional liberal arts centers: Many undergraduate liberal arts colleges have formed consortia to permit them to use more effectively the resources available to each institution. This development could be encouraged through the National Foundation. The Commission urges that federal funds be made available to regional liberal arts centers which would be established by groups of colleges for the purpose of increasing quality, scope, and diversity in undergraduate education, of stimulating more economical and effective use of administrative and teaching personnel, and of sharing library and computer facilities.

The new technology: The newly created program of Networks for Knowledge and on-going programs providing financial assistance for computer use at universities and colleges should be continued. The National Foundation could be particularly helpful, however, in evaluating proposals for experimental or pilot programs designed to determine the effectiveness of new educational uses of the whole range of modern technology.

Urban-grant activities: The land-grant college movement had a significant effect on the nature of the public and, to some extent, the private university. Today, the pressing problems of the city are calling for a new evaluation of the university's relationship to the city.

If universities and colleges are to aid in the solutions of the complex problems of the inner city, they will have to develop new curricular programs and new concepts of public service. Such developmental programs, during their early phases, could be funded under the National Foundation.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education whose functions would be to encourage, advise, review, and provide financial support for institutional programs designed to give new directions in curricula, to strengthen essential areas that have fallen behind or never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and to develop programs for improvement of educational processes and techniques.

Level of funding: The Commission suggests that the Foundation for the Development of Higher Education be funded at a level of approximately \$100 million in 1970-71, rising to \$200 million in 1976-77.

CONCLUSION

The Carnegie Commission has undertaken an independent analysis of the needs of higher education and the needs of the nation as related to the services of higher education. Our analysis has led to the conclusion that federal aid to higher education, beyond the needed expansion of existing programs, should be directed toward the meeting of two urgent national priorities.

One of these priorities is to achieve greater equality of opportunity for all able young people, both for their own benefit and for the benefit of the nation. Today, young per-

sons whose families are in the top half of the income range have a three times greater chance of entering college than those whose families are in the lower half. We believe it is a realistic goal to improve this ratio to two to one by 1976, the two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, with its promise of equality. Our proposals would draw 1 million additional students into college attendance through what might be called a "Civilian Bill of Educational Rights" for qualified youth without adequate financial means.

The second priority is a substantial expansion of health service personnel. Specifically we recommend federal support to increase medical school places for the training of doctors by three-quarters by 1976 and to develop programs for training new types of medical support personnel. This will require the enlargement of existing medical centers and the creation of as many as 20 new centers.

We also propose the continuation and expansion of a number of existing programs: for construction—including start-up grants for, 500 new two-year community colleges and 50 four-year urban colleges; for research—including substantial extension of support beyond the sciences; for the training of Ph.D.s in all academic areas rather than primarily in the sciences; and for new endeavors to strengthen the system of higher education—including the creation of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education, which will encourage experimental programs such as those for the improvement of undergraduate instruction and for urban-grant activities.

These new priorities and the expansion of existing programs will cost approximately \$10 billion per year by 1976, or about one-seventh of the \$70 billion in additional federal revenues prospectively available by that year for new national priorities. We recognize the many other valuable purposes for which this increment will be needed, but we consider that a one-seventh share for higher education is warranted.

Our proposals envision keeping the share of private funds for the support of institutions of higher education at their present level of one-half. We feel that this level of private support is important for the autonomy and diversity of higher education. To assure that federal support is given in forms compatible with this private emphasis, we recommend an expanded student aid program giving the student freedom of choice among institutions, a feature which proved so effective under the GI Bill of Rights. This freedom of choice would be further broadened through a proposed student loan bank.

The total governmental share would remain at one-half, with the federal portion rising and the state portion falling, as has been true for the past decade. The federal government has the greater ability to increase its contribution. Also the new emphasis on equality of opportunity, the increase in health care personnel, the training of Ph.D.'s for employment throughout the nation, the support of scientific discovery, and the strengthening of the whole system of higher education as a great national resource all reflect increasing national concern and responsibilities.

The Commission's proposals anticipate that the percentage of the GNP spent through institutions of higher education will rise by one-half from 2 to 3 percent. In the past decade the percentage doubled, from 1 to 2 percent, as enrollments doubled, and it now seems reasonable that the percentage should rise by one-half in the period to 1976, when enrollments will rise by one-half. Throughout this period the forms of service to society are taking on new dimensions in response to

changing needs of society. There have been and there will be more knowledge, more training, and more service as higher education provides the intellectual sources of technical and social advance.

The prospects beyond 1976 are not clear. But, as enrollments stabilize, it would seem likely that subsequent support will rise roughly with the rise in GNP and will not require a significantly higher percentage of the GNP. The period from 1956 to 1976 will be viewed as the great period of expansion for higher education—the period in which the tidal wave of students was accommodated, and adjustment was made to the impact of greatly augmented scientific research.

We believe that the nation has a great stake in a dynamic, healthy, and flexible system of higher education, and our recommendations are intended to add to the strength and the progress of the system as well as to make possible greater service to society. The major aims of the proposals are:

To provide student aid in sufficient amounts to assure that no qualified student must forgo or cut short his pursuit of higher education because of financial barriers

To assist institutions of higher education with funds for expansion of physical facilities and for added instructional costs to assure the necessary places for all qualified students

To encourage graduate training of professional personnel, with particular emphasis on medical education, to fill critical national needs for practitioners in the health sciences

To support the most talented Ph.D. candidates and the institutions that train them at levels which will preserve and enhance the highest academic quality

To continue support of university research, a function which has already contributed so greatly to the national welfare and which holds the best promise of solutions to new problems of vital public concern

To provide special aid for new directions in curricula, for important areas that have fallen behind through inadequate funding, and for programs to improve educational processes and techniques

The total cost of the various federal aid programs recommended in this Report would be almost \$7 billion in 1970-71 and would rise to almost \$13 billion in 1976-77. The current cost of comparable federal aid programs is about \$3.5 billion. The federal share of the funding of higher education institutions would rise from 21 to 32 percent, and the state share would fall from 27 to 17 percent. The private share would remain at approximately 50 percent.

Even with the levels of federal support proposed here, state and private sources will find the financial burden of basic support of higher education extremely heavy over the decade ahead. Institutions of higher education for their part will find it absolutely essential to make the most efficient and economical use of their available resources, to exercise the utmost restraint and care in the provision of new programs and facilities, and to reexamine their budgetary standards and practices. The Commission believes that quality can be maintained during a difficult fiscal period by scrupulous evaluation of all current and proposed educational programs.

Federal policy toward higher education and support of higher education require constant and careful overall review. We recommend the establishment of a Council of Advisers on Higher Education attached to the White House to undertake studies and recommend policy on the model of the Council of Economic Advisers.

American higher education is today a basic national resource. It affects the hopes and aspirations of the total population.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

[In billions of dollars]

	1970-71	1976-77
Student and programs.....	1.91	3.56
Educational opportunity grants.....	1.10	2.14
[Basic student grants].....	(.90)	(1.60)
[Supplementary matching grants].....	(.11)	(.38)
[Institutional scholarship funds].....	(.09)	(.16)
Work-study program.....	.51	.87
Counseling program.....	.03	.04
Graduate talent search.....	.03	.10
Doctoral fellowships.....	.11	.16
Loan program.....	.13	.25
Cost-of-education supplements.....	1.13	2.71
Medical education program.....	.33	.43
Student aid.....	.03	.04
General support grants.....	.23	.35
Construction.....	.07	.04
Construction.....	1.26	1.22
Research.....	2.00	4.05
Foundation for the development of higher education.....	.10	.20
Special programs.....	.30	.80
Total.....	7.03	12.97

ESTIMATED FEDERAL LOAN COMMITMENTS UNDER COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

	1970-71	1976-77
Construction.....	0.53	0.61
Student loans.....	2.50	5.00

As education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has expanded, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex and demanding, the nation has looked increasingly to America's colleges and universities to meet many of our most important national needs: For furtherance of individual aspirations; for equality of educational and thus economic and social opportunity; for scientific and technological advances to stimulate economic growth; for highly trained personnel to serve a complex society; for cultural enrichment of the quality of life; and for the ideas so crucial to solution of profoundly complex issues.

[In billions of dollars]

	1967-68	1976-77
Research and development.....	1.45	4.05
Student aid.....	.62	3.60
Institutional support cost of education supplements.....	.44	3.06
Construction.....	.57	1.26
Other.....	.37	1.25
Total.....	3.45	13.22

Note: The total of \$13,022,000,000 for 1976-77 includes Federal expenditures for Commission proposals and an estimated \$250,000,000 for certain programs of Federal support to higher education institutions not covered in Commission proposals but expected to be continued. The 1967-68 institutional support figure includes an estimated amount for fellowship and traineeship program expenditures through institutions of higher education which are retained by institutions to defray partially the costs of the training programs.

What the American nation now needs from higher education can be summed up in two words: quality and equality. Our colleges and universities must preserve academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary life. And the campuses must act boldly to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

But these essential national needs will not be fully met unless the federal government assumes new levels of responsibility for higher education. The Carnegie Commission believes that a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need demands our best ideas and intellectual skills and the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to draw attention to another recent and significant report on higher education, entitled "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education," prepared under the direction of Dr. Alice Rivlin, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This report, containing recommendations similar to those of the Carnegie Commission, will soon be printed and made available by the Government Printing Office. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD only the summary of the Rivlin report and the letter of transmittal from the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, to the President.

The material follows:

THE RIVLIN REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, Washington, D.C., January 6, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your Education Message of February 1968, you directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to "begin preparing a long-range plan for the support of higher education in America." In response to your request, I am transmitting this report on a long-range plan for Federal financial support for higher education.

Yours will be remembered as an Administration which looked squarely at the needs of education and acted boldly to meet them. The 1960's have seen an unprecedented increase in the Federal commitment to higher education—from \$2.5 billion in 1963 to almost \$6 billion in 1968. Clearly, America's colleges and universities owe much of their vitality and growth to such landmark laws as the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 represent another major step in the strengthening of higher education.

Yet, despite this progress, many students are still prevented from entering and completing college by lack of funds. Moreover, there are many doubts about the future financial health of higher education, especially its ability to take on large numbers of additional students, and to bear the burden of paying for high-quality education at the graduate level.

Expenditures by institutions of higher education have increased from about 1.4% of the gross national product in 1960 to about 2.3% at the present time. It is essential that we make as our goal an increase to about 3.3% by 1976 in order that higher education may offer high-quality education to the 10 million young people who will be attending college at that time.

This report reviews the objectives of financial support for higher education, examines the financial barriers to meeting these objectives, and recommends a program of Federal action.

The report concludes that Federal aid to higher education in the future should emphasize two major national commitments:

It should promote equality of opportunity by ensuring that all able students can afford to go on to post-secondary education, and that institutions are able to accommodate them.

It should strengthen graduate education and research by providing support for graduate students and developing institutional capacity for graduate teaching and research at an increasing number of centers of excellence.

Enclosed is the summary of the nine major recommendations in the report.

One important long-run issue not resolved by the report is: Should higher education, like secondary education, be provided free of charge to all? Many believe that society as a whole benefits so much from having highly educated citizens that the full cost of higher education should be borne by the taxpayers. Others believe that the benefits of higher education to the students themselves are so great that they and their families should pay at least part of the cost.

Although this issue will continue to be debated in future years, it is clear that present public resources would not permit the establishment of a higher education system totally financed by the taxpayer. For the foreseeable future, we will have to rely on various sources of funds if we are to build and maintain a strong higher education system open to all. Funds from all sources must be increased to meet our objectives.

We must continue to rely on a variety of sources to help students pay the cost of higher education:

Increased family incomes will make it possible and appropriate for many parents to make substantial and possibly increased contributions to the higher education of their children.

Consideration of the benefits derived by industry and expanding corporate financial capacity will combine to support increased contributions from this source.

The increased earnings higher education provides for students suggest that students themselves should be expected to pay part of the costs of their education out of these future earnings, and experiments should be continued with various long-term long repayment methods.

But, there will still be many able students who cannot afford to pursue their education beyond high school unless the Federal Government expands its present student aid programs sufficiently to constitute a guarantee that all those who can do satisfactory post-secondary work will have the funds to go. This report recommends expanding and building upon existing programs such as the educational opportunity grants and the college work-study program. If the recommendations of the report were implemented, Federal aid would be available to the majority of college students who now come from families under \$9,000 and to the thousands of potential college students from these families for whom the lack of financial aid presently creates a barrier to the pursuit of higher education. The number of students receiving Federal grants and loans would increase from the present one and one-quarter million to more than six million by 1976.

The national interest demands that public student financial aid be directed primarily to those individuals who otherwise would not attend college. It should be given where it is needed most, where it permits an individual to pursue higher education who, without aid, could not have done so.

Equality of opportunity in higher education is an empty goal unless colleges and universities have the resources to provide high-quality education to those who enroll. Part of these resources must come from tuition and fees, part from State and local government, part from private giving. But these resources alone will not be sufficient. The Federal Government must also increase its aid directly to institutions to augment the resources available to these institutions.

It seems particularly appropriate and necessary for the Federal Government to expand three kinds of institutional aid:

1. Cost-of-education allowances paid to institutions which enroll federally aided students: The report recommends enactment of cost-of-education allowances for undergraduate student aid programs and increases in such allowances already paid at the graduate level.

2. Aid for graduate education and research: Specialists with graduate degrees

and the research which they make possible are a national resource. States and individual institutions cannot afford to provide this costly resource for the Nation as a whole. The Federal Government must take an increasingly larger financial role in this area. The report recommends a variety of ways of strengthening graduate education and research and increasing the number of centers of excellence.

3. Aid for the capital cost of institutional expansion: New and expanding institutions and those who must replace deteriorating plant and equipment need special help. Federal funds are now available under a variety of programs for construction and equipment. The report recommends consolidation of these programs to give institutions more flexibility in using these funds in accordance with their own plans and priorities.

At the present, all Federal aid for higher education (excluding research) is about \$3.7 billion a year. The recommendations in this report would by 1976 increase this total to about \$11 billion.

In the future, other types of Federal aid may be necessary, perhaps including institutional aid to colleges and universities on a formula basis. It seems more important now to devote available Federal funds to expanding student aid and to the three specialized forms of institutional aid listed above. Further consideration of other types of institutional grants is, of course, not foreclosed. However, much is still to be learned about the impact of formula aid on the quality of higher education, on the balance between public and private colleges, and on the maintenance and growth of support by State and local governments. Congress should be encouraged to continue its examination of all kinds of institutional grants and see if a plan can be formulated which merits support.

Respectfully yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Secretary.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Improving equality of opportunity

Although a high proportion of American young people obtain a higher education, this opportunity is unequally distributed. The report finds that students with the same level of achievement in high school are far less likely to attend college if they come from a low-income family than if they come from a middle-class background. Lack of funds, not lack of ability, is preventing many students from entering and completing college.

1. *Recommendation*—A major expansion of Federal grants for needy and lower middle-income students. This program would assure every student with the ability sufficient funds to pursue a post-secondary education. The recommended program would provide almost half of all full-time students with some grant-in-aid. The amount of aid would depend on a student's family income, but more liberal "need criteria" would greatly broaden the base of Federally-aided students.

In addition, equalization of opportunity can be enhanced through fuller funding of the Developing Institutions Program (Title III HEA of 1965) and the newly enacted program of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students.

Loan funds must also play an important role in student financing. They supplement grants to low-income students and enable middle and upper-income students and their families to spread the heavy cost of higher education over a period of years.

2. *Recommendation*—A national student loan bank to remedy deficiencies in present Federal loan programs. The bank would make long-term loans to students and ensure a larger supply of capital on easier terms in order to allow all students to supplement family contributions, work-study, and schol-

arship funds. The bank would provide an assured flow of funds regardless of geographic location of students or money market conditions in the economy.

B. Improving the quality of higher education

While it is difficult to define "quality" precisely in higher education, it is clear that increasing the effectiveness of the higher education offered to students necessitates increasing the resources available to institutions to attract qualified faculty and to improve facilities, libraries, and teaching methods.

While the report does not find evidence of an imminent "crisis" in higher education finance, there is clearly a need for increasing the flow of Federal resources to higher educational institutions in the future, and ensuring that the institutions bearing the burden of rapid increases in enrollment (which would be accelerated by the recommended programs of student aid) have the resources necessary to provide quality education for this increasing body of students.

3. *Recommendation*—A cost-of-education allowance should be paid to institutions accepting students aided under the grant program. These funds could be spent at the discretion of the institution to improve the quality of its education. This form of institutional aid would be of most benefit to institutions which were rapidly expanding and which were carrying the burden of educating a high proportion of low-income students.

Improving educational quality takes more than money. There is also a need for a new focus on improving the quality of teaching.

4. *Recommendation*—A new project grant program to support experiments to improve the quality of undergraduate teaching, and to devise new institutional programs designed to emphasize the importance of teaching.

C. Improving graduate education and research

The Federal Government has a particular responsibility for strengthening the Nation's capacity to produce highly trained specialists in all fields and to advance knowledge through research. The report finds that although Federal support has contributed greatly to the strengthening of research and graduate education in recent years, this support itself has led to some imbalances and difficulties. Institutions need some discretionary funds to provide support for younger researchers, for development of new fields of study, and for redressing some of the imbalances between classroom teaching and research and between science and other disciplines.

5. *Recommendation*: A substantial expansion of NDEA graduate fellowships and an increase in cost-of-education allowances attached to all Federal fellowships. These increases will permit graduate institutions to provide a more balanced program of graduate student support and will enable them to fund research and curricular projects at their own discretion.

6. *Recommendation*: Expanded funding for existing NSF, NIH, and OE institutional grants to speed the development of new centers of excellence at the graduate level, and establishment of a similar program under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

7. *Recommendation*: To supplement existing research programs, a program of "sustaining grants" equal to a percentage of Federal research awards received by institutions of higher education. These grants would be completely untied; institutions could use them for research or teaching purposes, thus broadening the range of meaningful decisions made at the university level.

D. Encouraging wise use of resources by institutions

All of the other goals can be met more effectively if resources in higher education are

used efficiently, if waste is reduced, and if obsolete practices are eliminated. In general, the institutions themselves are the best judges of what they need to serve students effectively. Federal aid on a project basis or tied to particular types of expenditures may be ineffective in meeting the most urgent needs of particular institutions.

8. *Recommendation*: Existing programs for construction and equipment purchase in several Federal agencies should be consolidated so that institutions would be given a block allocation of funds, the detailed uses of which would reflect the particular needs of the recipient institution.

9. *Recommendation*: A program of grants to institutions for planning and evaluation of the functions and operations of the institution to improve the efficiency of resource utilization.

In addition, the recommended institutional aid in the form of cost of education allowances and "sustaining grants" will provide institutions with substantial additional resources to be used at their discretion.

COSTS AND PRIORITIES

The program outlined in the accompanying report would grow to \$6.3 billion per year in additional funds by FY 1976. Other Federal programs (excluding research) for higher education would add at least another \$1 billion.

About \$4 billion of this total is attributable to the expanded Federal grants for needy students program, and the cost-of-education allowances of that program. This is, by far, the item of highest priority in our recommendations.

PROPOSED PAY INCREASE

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed congressional and administrative salary increases recently recommended by a special congressional commission has stimulated much controversial discussion in and out of Government circles. I have publicly stated on numerous occasions that I am a newly elected Congressman learning my duties and obligations to our constituents and I have no right to advocate or to expect a salary increase of any kind. I sought this office with full knowledge of the compensation provided.

It appears to me that the various salary increases for the President, Cabinet members, administrative appointees, on down to the Members of Congress, are most untimely in light of escalating taxes and the obvious need of this Congress to curtail unnecessary spending. There is presently an immediate and pressing need for the American people to regain confidence in all of our elected officials, local, State, and Federal. The suggested unreasonable salary increases do little to reestablish this confidence and trust of the people in their elected officials.

There is obvious justification for the criticism against the proposed salary increases which are grossly out of proportion to the established guidelines followed during the recent labor contract negotiations which affected hundreds of thousands of employees' paychecks throughout the country. It is fundamentally unfair to advocate skimpy raises for the working man and then recommend and support 40- to 70-percent sal-

ary increases for supposed servants of the people.

The primary purpose for these remarks is to set forth my position on this controversial matter consistently—in Congress and my home district.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF INSTALLATION OF INDUSTRIAL AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress I introduced legislation designated as H.R. 6000, which was intended to encourage installation of antipollution devices by industrial firms. This bill did not reach committee consideration in that session.

Because the need for control of pollution continues to increase, I have reintroduced that legislative proposal in the 91st Congress.

This is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage installation of industrial air and water pollution control facilities by providing a 60-month amortization of the cost of such facilities.

For further comment on the problem and the need for this legislation, I respectfully refer my colleagues to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1967.

MIZE CALLS FOR RELIEF FOR STARVATION IN BIAFRA

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware starvation and disease are ravaging the people of Biafra and, to a lesser extent, the people of Nigeria. Reliable estimates indicate that as many as 2 million have died in recent months. Substantial relief must be provided to that unhappy land.

Cruel as war may be, starvation must surely be more cruel. Famine decimates a population, taking first the weakest—the children, the elderly, and the physically disabled. Those surviving are so drained of energy and resourcefulness that they seldom have the strength to restore the land and reestablish an effective commodity distribution system. Past experience has shown it takes a generation or more to recover from such disaster.

THE NEED IS NOW

Mr. Speaker, if increased food supplies and medicine are not soon provided the people of Biafra, widespread famine will be inevitable before the coming summer has passed. These unfortunate millions may be spared such a fate if our Nation moves quickly to their aid.

It has often been said, "A man never stands so tall, as when he stoops to help a child." So also may it be said that America never stands so tall as when she provides assistance to the innocent victims of foreign disaster.

Our Nation has provided food to relieve

famine in India. We have met emergency requirements in literally hundreds of disasters abroad in recent years. Some examples of this humanitarian aid will serve to document the precedent.

PRECEDENT OF HUMANITARIANISM

U.S. foreign disaster relief is coordinated by the Agency for International Development, under the direction of the Foreign Disaster Relief Coordinator. Capitalizing on a shoestring budget, an imaginative use of the intergovernmental telephone system, and the good will of administrators throughout the Federal service, the half-dozen employees of the Disaster Relief Coordination Office have mustered timely assistance for persons in emergency throughout the world.

In the first few months of 1968 alone, this office responded to floods in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Tanzania. Relief was provided to victims of drought in Lesotho and Botswana. Tornadoes in Malagasy and Mauritius, and a tragic landslide in the Congo caused conditions demanding emergency supplies. Our Government was able to respond.

The United States helped stem outbreaks of cholera in Pakistan and Malaysia, polio in Turkey, and the plague in Indonesia. Earthquakes in Greece, Iran, and Iraq, and volcanic eruptions in the Philippines created intolerable local conditions which our Government was able to mitigate.

This partial list shows that our Nation has traditionally responded to emergency and provided disaster relief, without political concessions or excessive involvement in the internal affairs of recipient nations.

Disaster relief, essentially, is humanitarian, and should remain so.

A CALL FOR U.S. ACTION

With this tradition in mind, and with a view toward mitigating the conditions of desperate want in Biafra, I have joined many of my colleagues in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 98, calling upon this Government to increase significantly the surplus food stocks, relief moneys, noncombat aircraft, and such other transportation equipment and assistance as may be necessary to stem the floodtide of famine sweeping the land.

In order to insure that this aid may not be misinterpreted as an involvement in the civil war raging in Nigeria, our resolution clearly states that the additional supplies be made available to charitable and relief organizations already in the field extending aid to the limit of their resources.

POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT AVOIDED

The resolution also calls upon this Government to enlist the assistance of other concerned nations in meeting the human challenge.

Mr. Speaker, if intelligently applied, this aid can save millions of lives, on both sides of the conflict. It will avoid all political commitments which could later prove embarrassing to the United States.

I urge action on our resolution at the earliest possible time, for in the few minutes that I have been speaking, perhaps a hundred more have died from starvation in Biafra. Such conditions are in-

tolerable, and the only apparent relief for these people is the action which I today recommend.

The cause, in essence, is the dignity of humankind. Our own sense of personal dignity demands prompt action to promote the survival of our fellow man.

EEC SHOULD RECONSIDER PROPOSAL TO TAX U.S. SOYBEAN OIL AND MEAL

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the nations of the European Economic Community are considering action which would severely damage the Kansas farmer, U.S. agribusiness, and the U.S. balance-of-payments position in the immediate future.

The Council of Ministers of the EEC is seriously considering a proposal to impose an internal tax of \$60 per ton on soybean oil, and to further impose an internal tax of \$30 per ton on soybean meal. A decision may come in 30 days. If this proposal is approved, the United States stands to lose an export market of nearly \$500-million per year. Soybeans today represent a third of the total U.S. agricultural export to these nations.

Mr. Speaker, farmers in my State of Kansas have responded to the need to reduce production of wheat and feed grains, and have developed a thriving soybean production as a substitute crop. In regions where dryland farming is predominant, such substitute crops are extremely difficult to develop.

In 1968, Kansas farmers harvested nearly 1 million acres of beans, yielding 23.9 million bushels. The market price has remained relatively good at about \$2.40 per bushel. The Kansas projected planting for 1969 is 980,000 acres and moisture conditions are favorable for a good crop. But if the European market is taken from us, surpluses will grow at home. Intolerable pressure will build to impose severe acreage restrictions, and reduce the support price.

The United States negotiated the right to sell soybeans in the Common Market community. While proposed "internal taxes" will not technically violate the letter of our agreement, they do indeed violate the substantive understanding reached after many U.S. concessions at the Kennedy round of trade talks.

The Europeans agreed to refrain from imposing tariffs on our soybean products. These so-called "internal taxes," while not literally "tariffs," will accomplish the same thing. Their proposed level is so absurdly high that adoption of the schedule would effectively deny U.S. access to the European soybean market.

Mr. Speaker, everyone remembers the famous "chicken war" between U.S. exporters and the EEC. The chicken market represented only \$22 million for U.S. exporters. That controversy pales into insignificance when one considers the \$500-million market endangered today.

Clearly, the United States must bring all pressure to bear on the member Nations of the EEC, and urge them to reject

this self-defeating temptation to revert to protectionism. Violation of the spirit of our carefully worked-out agreement cannot contribute to better relations between the EEC and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, our soybean exporters and farmers are justifiably outraged by this action contemplated by our European trading partners. They reason that trade must be a two-way street. I urge the administration, and individual Members of Congress to speak out, and to collectively take whatever action is necessary to preserve our crucial soybean market in the European Economic Community.

MIZE SUPPORTS EXTENSION OF GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of legislation to extend and expand the provisions of the Great Plains conservation program, I want to point out this program was first enacted under President Eisenhower in 1956. Through the years since then, it has proved one of the most productive conservation efforts ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

The GPCP combines the individual farmer's unequalled knowledge of his own land with the Federal Government's technical resources to produce an exceptionally efficient working arrangement between the two. Under the program, farmers and ranchers enter into long-term contracts with the Government, on a cost-sharing basis, to promote soil and water conservation on individual holdings. More than 31,500 farmers and ranchers have entered into such contracts, improving more than 57 million acres of valuable crop and rangeland. The cost to the Government has been a thrifty \$108 million through fiscal 1968.

Mr. Speaker, this program was initiated to promote long-term agreements, for it is clear that conservation of soil and water resources demands careful development of practices unsuited for short-term accomplishment.

AUTHORIZATION TO EXPIRE

Current authorizing legislation for the Great Plains conservation program is due to expire at the end of calendar year 1971. Thus, the Government is currently denied the opportunity to enter into 10-year contracts with landholders, and much of the effectiveness of the program is reduced as each year passes.

Under the bill which I have cosponsored, H.R. 2062, the GPCP would be extended for 10 full years, and its authorization would be increased to \$250 million. I urge each Member to support this legislation, for every American is the beneficiary when good conservation practices are extended to the rich but vulnerable agricultural base which provides our food and fiber.

FARMER AS PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. Speaker, a farmer is more than an independent businessman. He is more than a producer. He is a "public servant" in a sense, for the land which he main-

tains produces an abundance essential to our national security, our continued prosperity, and freedom from want.

The Great Plains conservation program has been operative in hundreds of counties in the Midwest, designated as "participating counties" by the Secretary of Agriculture. These participating counties are particularly prone to erosion by wind and water. While no counties in my congressional district have been so designated, Kansas does have 62 of its 105 counties which have received benefits over the years.

If the program can be expanded as our bill envisions, it is likely that its application can be extended to those areas in the Great Plains which today are excluded, but have need, nonetheless, for increased protection from the ravages and extremes of erosion.

Mr. Speaker, for insurance against future want, and for timely development of soil and water conservation on a cost-sharing basis, I urge early consideration of this legislation.

THE SALE OF PORNOGRAPHY TO MINORS

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the sale of pornography to minors is big business, and is becoming bigger every day. The unsolicited, mail-order distribution of smut gets into the home and into the hands of children, and there is little that concerned parents can do about it.

I will tomorrow introduce legislation prohibiting the mail-order distribution of pornography to minors, or to families with minors. This bill would put the burden of stopping this trafficking in filth on the purveyors themselves, since they would be subject to criminal sanction if they mailed offensive material to minors. Existing Federal law does prohibit the mailing of obscene material, but the courts have struggled for many years to define "obscene."

The Supreme Court held just last year that the sale of pornography to minors may be much more restricted than to adults. The Court recognized the special responsibility of parents in rearing their children. Now the Congress has an opportunity to aid parents and put a crimp in the activities of smut merchants.

Legislation passed last year permits any postal patron receiving material which he considers objectionable to request the post office to order his name taken off the sender's mailing list. This is but a small step, and does not really meet the problem. First, the material must be in the home before the recipient can object, allowing young children access to books and magazines which their parents do not want them to see. And second, if the recipient does have his name removed from the list, which involves considerable time and effort on the part of both the recipient and the post office, the sender has merely lost a name. If he is convicted under my bill of sending offensive material to minors, he stands to lose far more: up to \$5,000 and

5 years for the first offense, and \$10,000 and 10 years for subsequent offenses.

Mr. Speaker, many people have criticized the Supreme Court for some of its decisions. But here the Court has very specifically set out an area in which legislation is valid, and, I believe, necessary. It would be a shame if the Congress did not take this opportunity to substantially reduce the availability of pornography to the group which may well be most affected by it.

I would urge the House to move swiftly on this legislation. It will effectively allow parents to protect their children from offensive material in a constitutionally valid manner.

LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND EXECUTIVE PAY INCREASE

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I regret the action of the Committee on Rules in not reporting to the floor a resolution of disapproval on the salary increases proposed for Members of Congress and executive officials.

I would vote for such a resolution, but regardless of the position I take, I believe that the American people deserve to have the House face the issue squarely.

The other body at least was willing to vote on the salary question and I think the House should do so also.

GOOD NEWS FROM POSTMASTER GENERAL ON REMOVING POLITICS FROM POST OFFICE

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the first bill I introduced in my first term in the Congress was designed to take patronage out of the Post Office. Therefore, it comes as very good news that President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount announced yesterday that they intend to end the patronage system for selecting postmasters.

One of the main targets of my bill, which I reintroduced in this Congress, and of yesterday's order from the Postmaster General is the present practice of leaving open postmaster jobs while various political powers struggle over patronage. The present system permits postmasterships to stand vacant for extended periods of time. Major post offices with annual receipts in the millions of dollars have been without a postmaster for many months. No organization can tolerate being without a manager for extended periods of time without suffering great losses of efficiency and morale. For example, Mr. Speaker, in my own district, a major first-class post office went without a postmaster for 15 months.

This is one reason that we have been developing a declining mail service. While costs continue to rise, employee morale has gone downhill. From now on, selection of postmasters will be based

solely on civil service merit examinations. The new system will encourage the promotion of postmasters from within the ranks of the postal service.

While the removal of patronage from the postal service is a significant and overdue step, it is only one of a number of actions needed to provide the American people with better mail service. The Government and the Post Office still have a long way to go in moving the mail as fast and as effectively as they should. Hopefully, the removal of the patronage system will be the beginning of better postal service.

KENNEDY GRAVE FUNDS

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the Washington newspapers today carries two letters from citizens outraged over the Government's plan to spend nearly half a million dollars for a huge memorial to Robert F. Kennedy in Arlington National Cemetery.

As I said here 2 days ago, this project must be given careful scrutiny by the Congress with a view to rejecting it.

Here we have the sad spectacle of telling families of servicemen, on the one hand, that space in the cemetery is acutely short and, on the other hand, announcing to these same families and the public at large that they will have to foot the bill for an elaborate memorial on a quarter acre of that scarce land. I include the two letters to the editor for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

KENNEDY GRAVE FUNDS

Even though we are but two lowly airmen in the U.S. Air Force, we feel that we must express some small measure of surprise and even indignation at the \$431,000 appropriation recommended by the Defense Department "to provide public access routes to a grave in Arlington National Cemetery for Robert F. Kennedy" (RFK Site Approved by Nixon," *The Washington Post*, Feb. 2).

No doubt RFK does deserve a better gravesite than all the others who have died or who will die in the service of their country or will be given final resting places in Arlington. But Mr. Kennedy himself would have rather seen the nearly half million dollars spent on one of the many projects he supported for underprivileged but very much alive people instead of on a glorified gravesite which these same people probably could never afford to visit anyway.

Maybe the U.S. Government, in all its wisdom and with all its money, can afford to appropriate funds for yet another far-fetched Defense Department project, but we still wish it could manage to pay us, on time, the \$113 it has agreed to pay us each month.

AMN. JAMES A. BLUMQUIST.
AMN. MICHAEL E. FLEMING.

FORT MYER.

Could you explain why the taxpayers are called upon to furnish \$430,000 as half the cost of an elaborate gravesite and public access at Arlington Cemetery for Senator Kennedy? A President is one thing, a Senator another. Really, the situation is all out of proportion, in my humble opinion.

PRISCILLA S. RANDOLPH.

WASHINGTON.

NIXON AND THE PAY RAISE

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the editorial writer of the Washington Evening News for his straightforward presentation of the facts in connection with the outrageous pay increase for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government.

It is a 28-to-70 pay increase on which the Members of the House of Representatives have never had an opportunity to freely work their will and on which they have dodged a direct vote. Instead it is being slipped through the back door.

The editorial follows:

NIXON AND THE PAY RAISE

We think we can understand why President Nixon has not rejected that \$100,000 raise in pay voted him by Congress and why he is going along with the Johnson proposal for fatter salaries for members of Congress.

He is a practical man, and he doesn't want to offend the members of Congress, a majority of whom are on the other side of the partisan fence anyway.

Most of the members of Congress, it is quite plain, want that \$12,500 raise (more than 40 per cent) proposed by President Johnson just before he went back to Texas.

And under a cute little law passed by Congress in 1967, Congress can have this pay raise by simply not doing anything about it. The 1967 law set up a commission to recommend pay scales for Congress, judges and top government officials. Under the law, if the President passed these recommendations along to Congress in his budget, the pay raises would be effective in 30 days unless Congress specifically rejected them.

Altho some of the more conscientious members of Congress are trying, there is virtually no prospect that Congress will do any such thing. Mr. Nixon's approval of the Congressional salary hike, of course, dims the prospect even more.

Rep. H. R. Gross of Iowa is one of the few who has spoken out in opposition to the pay raise.

"It is incomprehensible," he says, "in view of the 10 per cent increase in federal taxes last year and the demands for economy in government to halt inflation that Congress would even entertain the thought of a huge pay raise."

Rep. Gross is under no illusions about his chances of making this argument stick. But he thinks at least the members of Congress ought to vote on a resolution to reject or approve the pay raise, "so that the taxpayers may know who is raiding the Treasury."

If the Congressmen think they are worth all that money, then they certainly ought to have the courage (or gall) in the face of all those government deficits and rising prices, to stand up and be counted, instead of going at it in this sneaky way.

RETIREMENT PAY FOR RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, in an attempt to eliminate an injustice perpetrated on our retired military personnel,

that will compute the retired pay of those who entered the service prior to May 31, 1958 on current duty rates.

The need for this legislation is obvious.

As a result of the Military Pay Act of 1958, effective June 1 of that year, the retired military personnel of our Armed Forces suffered a serious loss in their compensation due to the precipitous suspension of a law that had been on the books for almost 100 years. The system Congress had eliminated contained specific provisions entitling uniformed services personnel to retired pay based on current active duty rates.

The 500,000 persons who served in two world wars, Korea, and Vietnam, did not have a signed contract with the Government promising that this system would be continued after their service was completed. They did, however, believe there was a moral obligation on the part of the Government not to reduce these benefits after they had been earned. Faith in this belief was strengthened by repeated governmental statements to this effect.

However, under this 1958 law, retirees who entered upon a military career prior to that date, are now drawing seven different rates, depending on the date they retired from active duty. None of these rates are as equitable as was possible under the former law. As a matter of fact, the lowest rate is for the oldest group of retirees and the highest rate is for the youngest. As future pay raises are granted, the disparity between these two groups will continue to increase.

I feel that the bill I have introduced is not only a fair adjustment which will be acceptable to our military retirees, but at the same time will serve to discharge the moral responsibility that our Government has toward these men.

I stand by the sentiments expressed by a Justice of the Supreme Court when, in an opinion pertaining to a case involving the right of the U.S. Government to take reservation land that had been guaranteed to the Tuscarora Indians in perpetuity, he stated:

Great Nations, like great men, should keep their word.

BOY SCOUTS ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, from February 7 through February 13, the Nation will be celebrating the 59th birthday of the Boy Scouts of America. This widespread and invaluable organization was begun right here in Washington on this day, February 6, 1910, by James E. West, and today, the National Capital Area Council is the largest in the country, extending from almost to Baltimore south to Richmond, Va. There are over 2,000 Boy Scout leaders in the metropolitan area who are helping to shape the lives of over 78,000 boys, and there are new troops being formed daily.

Here in Washington, there are troops meeting in schools, churches, and lodges all over the city from New York Avenue

Presbyterian Church to the Urban Center at New Jersey and K, with leadership emerging from the business community, the clergy, teachers, and the military bases in the metropolitan area, Bolling, Andrews, and Fort McNair. The programs in the area are extensive and comprehensive. Two summers ago, a camping program was started at Roosevelt Island in which youths from the inner city had the opportunity to spend 3 days in a wide-open, natural environment.

An effort about which I am particularly laudatory was just recently initiated. The council has just added to its ranks a troop of 21 probationers from the juvenile court. Efforts such as these are gravely needed—here are a group of truly dedicated individuals who are deeply aware of the needs of the young people, in the inner city, and in the surrounding suburbs. There is no generation gap in the Boy Scouts of America. I hope that during this next week, we in the Congress and all of our constituents will honor this group, the Boy Scouts of America, on its 59th anniversary—59 years of invaluable service and genuine productive efforts to create pride in every boy, in himself and in his community. Let us remember the theme of 1969 for the Boy Scouts—"Boy Power—Man Power," America's manpower begins with boypower.

POST OFFICE TAKEN OUT OF POLITICS

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

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest the release issued yesterday by Postmaster General Winton Blount that postmaster and rural carrier appointments would be removed from politics and that effective immediately the Civil Service Commission would conduct open competitive examinations for these positions. I am sure that most Americans will welcome this announcement.

After carefully reading the entire release and the accompanying statement of the Postmaster General, I do have two great concerns. One is caused by some inconsistencies which appear in his statement. The Postmaster General states that his new policy should encourage career employees. Presently postmaster and rural carrier vacancies can be filled under the law through the promotion from within the Department of a career employee. Mr. Blount states that now all vacancies will be filled by open competitive examinations. I believe this will increase the chances for noncareer employees to take these positions and discourage career employees.

My other great concern is that he makes no mention of the veterans. Presently, veterans receive five points and disabled veterans receive 10 points preference and cannot be passed over in making an appointment. The same protection applies to their widows.

While he discusses new legislation for

the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General makes no mention of the veteran or his widow. I certainly hope that he does not intend to tamper with the preferences which are now given under the law.

I have written a letter to Postmaster General Blount today. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1969.

HON. WINTON M. BLOUNT,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I read with great interest your General Release No. 30 issued Wednesday, February 5, concerning taking the Post Office Department out of politics. I believe that a great majority of the people will applaud this announcement. I do find statements included in your release inconsistent and confusing, however. In stating that we must provide the American people with the best possible postal service you say, "The removal of these essentially career jobs from patronage is a vital step toward achieving that goal."

This conflicts with your initial statement that the Civil Service Commission will conduct open competitive exams for all new postmasters and rural carriers. Under the present law vacancies can be filled non-competitively from within the postal service. Holding open competitive exams will increase the possibility of non-career people filling positions which you have referred to as "essentially career jobs." I would greatly appreciate an explanation of your position, since you state that the new policy "should encourage career employees."

I am further disturbed by the fact that you make no mention of protecting veterans who may compete for these positions. I certainly hope that you have no intention of recommending legislation eliminating the five and ten point veterans preference.

I would greatly appreciate an early answer to my questions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. MESKILL,
Member of Congress.

LIST OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, I presented a year-end report on the problem of free-world-flag ships in North Vietnamese trade during 1968. The Department of Defense has just provided me with the first figures for 1969 and I regret to report that the level of this traffic continues at a disturbing level. During this past January, eight ships flying the British flag, two flying the flag of Somalia, and one the flag of Cyprus arrived in North Vietnam. This compares to the 10 such free-world ship arrivals in 1968 and the six arrivals in January 1967.

I should also like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the U.S. Maritime Administration's report No. 24 entitled "List of Foreign Flag Vessels Arriving in North Vietnam on or After January 25, 1966," based on information received through January 24, 1969. The vessels named in this list are prohibited from carrying U.S. Government financed cargoes out of U.S. ports, and I include

it in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

It should be noted, however, that this is not a complete list. Report No. 24 includes the names of some 26 free-world vessels but in fact, for either security reasons, or because of the unlikelihood that they would ever come to American ports, a sizable number of free-world-flag ships have not been listed. In addition the Maritime Administration list gives no indication of the number of times these vessels have gone to North Vietnam and many of them have been there more than once.

Indeed during 1968 there were a total of 149 free-world-flag ship arrivals in North Vietnam.

While our main attention is focused on the peace table at Paris and on other signs of progress, so long as the war continues we must not ignore the ugly facts of this drawn-out struggle and realize that without adequate supplies the enemy could not prolong the conflict.

REPORT NO. 24—LIST OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying the carriage of United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States on foreign flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through January 24, 1969. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China, which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports.

Flag of registry, name of ship	Gross tonnage
Total, all flags, 58 ships.....	399,467
Polish (32 ships).....	243,514
Andrezj Strug.....	6,919
Beniowski.....	10,443
Djakarta.....	6,915
Emilia Plater.....	6,718
Energetyk.....	10,876
Florian Ceynowa.....	6,784
General Sikorski.....	6,785
Hanka Sawicka.....	6,944
Hanoi.....	6,914
Hugo Kollataj.....	3,755
Jan Matejko.....	6,748
Janek Krasicki.....	6,904
Jozef Conrad.....	8,730
Kapitan Kosko.....	6,629
Kochanowski.....	8,231
Konopnicka.....	9,690
Kraszewski.....	10,363
Lelewel.....	7,817
Ludwik Solski.....	6,904
Marcel Nowotko.....	6,660
Mickiewicz.....	4,344
Moniuszko.....	9,247
Norwid.....	5,512
Nowowiejski.....	9,186
Pawel FINDER.....	4,911
Phenian.....	6,923
Przyjazn Narodow.....	8,876
Stefan Okrzeja.....	6,620
Szymanowski.....	9,203
Transportowiec.....	10,854
Wienlowski.....	9,190
Wladyslaw Broniewski.....	6,919

Flag of registry, name of ship—Continued

	Gross tonnage
British (15 ships)-----	85,647
Court Harwell-----	7,133
Dartford-----	2,739
Fortune Glory-----	5,832
Greenford-----	2,964
Isabel Erica-----	7,105
Kingford-----	2,911
Meadow Court ¹ (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Ardrossmore—British)-----	5,820
Rochford-----	3,324
Rosetta Maud ¹ (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Andara—British)-----	5,795
Ruthy Ann-----	7,361
Shlenfoon-----	7,127
Shun On ¹ (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Pundua—British)-----	7,295
Shun Wah (previous trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Vercharman—British)-----	7,265
Taipiang (tanker)-----	5,676
Tetrarch ² (trips to North Vietnam under ex-name Ardrowan—British)-----	7,300
Cypriot (6 ships)-----	41,386
Acme-----	7,173
Agenor ¹ (trip to North Vietnam—Greek)-----	7,139
Amfithea-----	5,171
Antonia II-----	7,303
Laurel-----	7,297
Marianthi-----	7,303
Somali (2 ships)-----	16,082
Shun Tai (trip to North Vietnam—British)-----	7,085
Yvonne-----	8,997
Greek (1 ship)-----	6,724
Leonis ¹ (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Shirley Christine—British)-----	6,724
Panamanian (1 ship)-----	1,889
Salamanca ¹ (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name Milford—British)-----	1,889
Singapore (1 ship)-----	4,225
Lucky Dragon ² -----	4,225

¹ Ships appearing on the List which have made no trips to North Vietnam under the present registry.

² Added to Report No. 23 appearing in the Federal Register issue of December 17, 1968.

Section 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) that such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade and;

(b) that no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c) and;

(c) that vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be with-

drawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

Flag of registry, name of ship

a. Since last report: none.
b. Previous reports:

Flag of registry:	Number of ships
British-----	1
Italian-----	1

Section 3. The following number of vessels have been removed from this list since they have been broken up, sunk or wrecked.

Flag of registry:	Broken up, sunk, or wrecked
British-----	3
Cypriot-----	3
Greek-----	1
Lebanese-----	2
Maltese-----	1
Polish-----	1

By Order of Acting Maritime Administrator.

JAMES S. DAWSON, JR.,
Secretary.

Date: January 29, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES RESOLUTION CONDEMNING IRAQ FOR JEWISH PERSECUTION

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, from New York, as well as many other Members in cosponsoring the resolution presented today condemning the Government of Iraq for persecution of the Jews.

If there was any shred of doubt among men of good will concerning the treatment of the Jews in the Arab Nations, the events of January 27, 1969, should have served as sufficient proof that persecution of the Jews not only lives, but thrives among the Arab people. To make a public spectacle of the hanging of 14 men is an unpardonable display of barbarism, reminiscent of precivilized man. That nine of those men were Jews, executed for their religious faith as much as for the trumped-up charges offered to the so-called court, clearly demonstrates that Arab hatred toward Israel and the Jews knows no bounds. In an age when we are constantly reminded of "man's inhumanity to man," the Iraqis have reached a new low in depravity.

As if the first series of trials were not enough, the Iraqi Government has announced that the second round in the farce has begun. It would be just that—a farce—if the results were not so ominous. Because of the theatrics of the Iraqi court, men may die, just as the 14 died before them, as public monuments to insanity. While it is too late to help those who died on January 27, it is not too late to condemn the Iraqi Government and people for their obvious disregard of human dignity. That protest must make extremely clear our rejection of the Arab persecution of the Jews, for whatever reasons the Arab dictators may offer. Our protest must make extremely clear the support of the United States for the undeniable rights of the Jews in whatever

country they may reside, by force or choice, and that the United States totally and unequivocally rejects any abrogation of the rights and dignity of men for whatever reason.

By requesting that this matter be considered by the United Nations, we will provide both the forum for presenting the facts of Arab denial of the rights of the Jews and a chance for the escape of those Jews still held in Arab countries as hostages in the Arab-Israeli dispute. The machinery for the release and emigration of the captive Jews exists within the United Nations, and we seek the means by which that machinery can be set in motion. If we hesitate, there may be more innocent Jews on the scaffolds of Baghdad, and who knows what other cities in the region.

I support this resolution and the purpose to which it is dedicated, that the United States take the lead in finding refuge for the tortured Jewish minority in the Arab world. I most heartily support the condemnation of the Iraqi regime for its immoral display of ignorance and hatred.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY COMMISSION PROCEDURES

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a series of amendments to Public Law 90-206, which was H.R. 7977, approved in December of 1967. This carried the very innocent title, "To Adjust the Rates of Basic Compensation for Certain Officers and Employees of the Federal Government."

You may recall this was the measure we passed near the end of the first session of the 90th Congress which necessarily raised postal rates in order to give some long needed pay increases to our thousands of faithful postal employees. Yet the provision creating a Presidential Salary Commission was not only ill advised, but now is revealed to contain provisions that no Member could hardly have intended to support in the light of the way the Commission plan has worked in practice.

Accordingly, I have proposed today an almost new section 225, which if passed by the Congress will in my opinion insure sorely needed corrections in Salary Commission procedures.

First, my amendment will provide and insure that no lame duck President can make salary recommendations, because our measure would place the Commission on a calendar year rather than a fiscal year basis and would move forward by 1 year the quadrennial cycle for implementing salary adjustments. Another requirement is that the Commission must make its recommendations to the President no later than July 1. Even if the Commission fails to act until the last year of a President's term of office, this provision will mean that the recommendation must be submitted over 6 months before his term ends. There is a further requirement that the President must advise the Congress no later than August 1 as to his recommendations to the Congress of salary changes in the executive,

legislative and judicial branches. Even though his budget message may not be required until January, our new requirement will make it necessary that the President pass on his own recommendations to the Congress in order that, if this period should ever fall in an election year, there will remain the months of August, September, and October for the issue to be subject to debate in the campaign. Thus every candidate, if called upon, will have to state clearly his position on such salary recommendations.

Still another provision I have supplied as an amendment is the requirement that there be a 180-day waiting period after the budget message is submitted before the raises shall become effective; and finally, the requirement that there shall be a rollcall vote in both the House and Senate necessary to indicate acceptance of the pay raise recommendations.

ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which I have the honor to chair, met today for the purpose of reorganizing. As we enter upon the important duties confided to us by the mandate of the House, it has been my desire to establish a sound basis for the fair and effective operation of the committee. In this effort I have the staunch support of the distinguished members of my committee.

A major point of business was the preparation and adoption of revised committee rules, a copy of which I append to my statement today for the information of the House. The rules the committee has adopted are the most comprehensive and the fairest rules ever adopted by a committee of this Congress and go as far as possible in protecting the rights of persons appearing before the committee while still constituting a workable set of rules for a legislative body keeping in mind its purposes. Other proposals likewise considered, which I shall briefly note hereafter, include a revision of House rule XI with respect to the certification of contempts, and an amendment to the contempt statute (2 U.S.C. 192, 194) to lay a basis for the prosecution of misbehavior before committees of the Congress.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was the first committee to adopt written rules of procedure, the substance of which were, in fact, some years ago incorporated in rule XI of the House. The late Congressman Clyde Doyle, of California, a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in fact drafted the resolution, presently clause 27 of House rule XI, which was adopted by the House in 1955 with a view toward establishing a fair code of procedure for all committees of the House.

Distinguished commentators on congressional investigation, including the

late Mr. Justice Frankfurter, have taken the position that congressional inquiry should remain unfettered if it is effectively to serve its constitutional purposes. We share the basic concern expressed in that point of view. While sharing that concern in drafting the present rules, we have also been mindful that liberty is not license. To borrow the words of Chief Judge Prettyman, a learned jurist of the court of appeals, liberty is achieved by rules which correlate every man's actions to every other man's rights and that liberty, in short, involves reasonable restraints so that the exercise of rights and duties of one may not operate to oppress another. We believe that the rules we have today adopted, strike the happy median.

Nevertheless, we have not lost sight of the fact that we are preparing rules for an investigative and legislative committee and not rules of a court. We are in an area of the administration of law where the discipline of men complements certain fixed rules. This discipline, within the framework of specific rules, should be accepted practically as a reasonable guarantee to the exercise of power that conforms to the spirit of our institutions and finds expression in the concept of due process. In this way, the disturbance to the individual affected by the exercise of power is minimized while yielding to the broader and more imperative demands of the Nation's interest. The distinguished lawyer and former Senator, George Wharton Pepper, aptly said:

Let it once and for all be understood that the power of inquiry exists, that its possession is a great public trust and that the American people are going to pour out the vials of their wrath upon those who prove themselves unworthy of the trust.

I want to take this occasion to state that in drafting the present revision of the committee rules, we have had the benefit of a good deal of spadework on this subject in the reports of the American Bar Association and the proposals of several Members of Congress. I am pleased to note that the new rules substantially embrace the proposals made by Mr. GONZALEZ in this Congress (H.R. 46), together with the provisions of the proposed Code of Investigative Procedure adopted in 1954 by the American Bar Association which had made a thorough study of the investigative procedures of the House and Senate.

A further matter of concern to me and to several other Members of Congress has been the processing of contempt prosecutions pursuant to sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192, 194), which directs the Speaker of the House to certify to the appropriate U.S. attorney for prosecution committee reports with respect to refusals of witnesses to testify or produce papers. It has been suggested that such reports of contempt should be filtered through special committees which would have the duty to study and make recommendations to the House and Speaker prior to certification. I think such a course desirable and useful, and for that purpose I am proposing an amendment to House Rule XI, clause 27, a copy of which I likewise place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Another related subject of great concern to me is the inadequacy of legislation for prosecuting acts of misbehavior of counsel, witnesses, and others in the presence of committees and subcommittees of Congress. It seems to me that unless we have statutory base for prosecuting such misbehavior, we may tend to lose control of the hearing room and find ourselves unable to maintain and preserve the dignity and authority of Congress through its committees. In these troubled days the problem is becoming one of increasing importance. I will not burden this statement by detailing the existing legal situation, except to say that present statutes are inadequate. There is a distinct need for authority similar to that possessed by courts in the misbehavior provisions of section 401, title 18, U.S. Code. I have been in discussion on this subject with Senator McCLELLAN and Senator EASTLAND, and I hope shortly to lay a proposal before the House for remedial legislation. I would hope that this proposal and the above amendment setting up a separate contempt citation committee will be passed and that each be considered in the light of the other, although they will be referred under the rules to different committees, as each does complement the other.

COMMITTEE RULES OF PROCEDURE

I—INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS

No investigation shall be undertaken by the Committee unless authorized by a majority of the members thereof. Committee investigations shall be limited to those legislative purposes committed to it by the mandate of the House. The subjects of inquiry of any investigation shall be specified in the Committee resolution authorizing such investigation.

II—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS—QUORUM—APPOINTMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES

A—Committee or subcommittee meetings to make authorizations or decisions with respect to investigations shall be called only upon a minimum of 24 hours' written or verbal notice to the office of each member while the Congress is in session, and 3 days' written notice when not in session. Any objection to the sufficiency of notice of any meeting shall be deemed waived, unless written objection is filed with the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee.

B—The Chairman of the Committee is authorized and empowered from time to time to appoint subcommittees, and to reconstitute the membership thereof, composed of three or more members of the Committee, at least one of whom shall be of the minority political party, and a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, for the purpose of conducting any investigation initiated by the Committee or performing any and all acts which the Committee as a whole is authorized to perform for the purpose of any such investigation. No subcommittee shall have the authority to release executive testimony, or to report any measure or recommendation to the House.

III—DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO SUBCOMMITTEES

In addition to the general authority delegated to subcommittees under the preceding section, each subcommittee is delegated authority:

A—Subject to the provisions of section X hereof, to determine by majority vote thereof whether the hearings conducted by it shall be open to the public or shall be in executive session; and

B—To admit to the hearing room what-

ever public information media it deems advisable or necessary, provided that the decision of the subcommittee shall not be in conflict with the rulings of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

IV—SUBPENAING OF WITNESSES

A—Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, when authorized by a majority of the members of such Committee or subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by any such Chairman or member.

B—Each subpoena shall contain a statement of the Committee resolution authorizing the particular investigation with respect to which the witness is summoned to testify or to produce papers, and shall contain a statement notifying the witness that if he desires a conference with a representative of the Committee prior to the date of the hearing, he may call or write to counsel of the Committee.

C—Witnesses shall be subpoenaed at a reasonably sufficient time in advance of any hearing, said time to be determined by the Committee or subcommittee, in order to give the witness an opportunity to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel, should he so desire.

V—PUBLICATION OF NAMES OF SUBPENAED WITNESSES

No member of the Committee or staff shall make public the name of any witness subpoenaed before the Committee or subcommittee prior to the date and time set for his appearance.

VI—DISTRIBUTION OF RULES

All witnesses appearing before the Committee or subcommittee shall be furnished a printed copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee and clause 27 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

VII—WITNESS FEES AND TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the Committee or subcommittee, may report to the office of counsel of the Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the Committee, or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

VIII—SUBJECTS OF INVESTIGATION

The subjects of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned or shall otherwise appear, shall be publicly announced in an opening statement before administration of oath or affirmation or receipt of testimony at any hearing and a copy thereof shall be made available to each witness. The information sought to be elicited at the hearings shall be germane to the subject as so stated.

IX—TESTIMONY UNDER OATH

A—All witnesses at public or executive investigative hearings who testify as to matters of fact shall give all testimony under oath or affirmation which shall be administered by the Chairman or a member of the Committee or subcommittee.

B—No witness shall be compelled to testify under oath or affirmation at any Committee or subcommittee hearing unless a quorum of the Committee or subcommittee is present to receive such testimony.

X—EXECUTIVE HEARINGS

A—The Committee or subcommittee shall receive evidence or testimony in executive session—

(1) When the Committee or subcommittee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person in pro-

ceedings pursuant to House Rule XI, 27 (m);

(2) When the Committee or subcommittee determines that the interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might compromise classified information, or might endanger the national security; or

(3) When the Committee or subcommittee determines that the interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might tend adversely to affect the national interest.

B—Testimony or evidence given in executive session and the identity of witnesses called to testify in such session shall not be disclosed by any member or employee of the Committee without the Committee's approval.

C—No person shall be allowed to be present during a hearing of a Committee or subcommittee held in executive session, except members and employees of the Committee, the witness and his counsel, officials, stenographers, or interpreters of the Committee, and any other person whose presence the Committee or subcommittee deems indispensable for the conduct of the hearing.

XI—RELEASE OF TESTIMONY TAKEN IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

A—No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session, or any summary or excerpt thereof, shall be made public or presented at a public hearing, either in whole or in part, unless authorized by a majority of the Committee.

B—No evidence or testimony, or any summary or excerpt thereof, given in executive session which the Committee determines may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person shall be released, or presented at a public hearing, unless such person shall have been afforded the opportunities provided by House Rule XI, 27(m), and any pertinent evidence or testimony given by such person, or on his behalf, is made a part of the transcript, summary, or excerpt to be released.

C—Persons afforded opportunities under House Rule XI, 27(m), shall be advised that testimony, or an extract or summary thereof, received pursuant to such rule may subsequently be publicly released or offered at a public hearing.

XII—TRANSCRIPTS OF TESTIMONY

A—A complete and accurate record shall be made of all testimony and proceedings at Committee and subcommittee hearings.

B—A witness examined under oath or affirmation in a hearing shall, upon request, be given a reasonable opportunity before any transcript is made public to inspect the transcript of his testimony to determine whether it was correctly transcribed and may, if he so desires, be accompanied by his counsel during such inspection.

C—A witness or his counsel may copy at the office of the Committee, or obtain for his own use at his own expense, a transcript of any testimony of the witness which has been given publicly or made public, and with the approval of a majority of the Committee may obtain for his own use and at his own expense a copy of the transcript of any executive testimony of the witness which has not been made public. The witness or his counsel shall be permitted to examine the transcript of his testimony taken in executive session.

D—Any corrections in the transcript of the testimony of the witness which the witness desires to make shall be submitted in writing to the counsel of the Committee within five (5) days of the taking of his testimony, and the request shall be acted upon by the Committee or subcommittee receiving such testimony.

XIII—COMMITTEE REPORTS OR PUBLICATIONS

A—No Committee report or document shall be made or released to the public without the approval of a majority of the Committee, and no statement of the contents of such report, or document, shall be released by any member

of the Committee or its staff prior to its official issuance. Drafts of such reports or documents shall be submitted to the office of each Committee member at least 3 days in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered for release.

B—Whenever a minority of the Committee dissents from a report or document approved by a majority thereof, the minority shall be given a reasonable time in which to prepare a minority report, which shall be filed at the same time as the majority report, and published in the same volume or document.

C—A report or document made public by the Committee concerning any investigation in which sworn testimony was taken shall include pertinent testimony received in rebuttal taken during such investigation, unless the same has been previously made public, or is made public concurrently with the report or publication.

XIV—ADDITIONAL RIGHTS OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY A HEARING OR COMMITTEE PUBLICATION

Any person who believes that his character or reputation has been adversely affected by evidence or testimony adduced in a public hearing, or in the released testimony of an executive hearing, or in the published reports or documents of the Committee, within a reasonable time shall:

(1) Communicate with the counsel of the Committee; and/or

(2) Request in writing an opportunity to appear, at his own expense, in person before the Committee or any subcommittee thereof to testify as a witness in public or executive session.

The Committee or subcommittee shall make such determination with respect to such communication or request, and shall take such other action, as to reason and justice shall pertain, including an allowance of witness fees and travel.

XV—RIGHTS OF WITNESSES WHILE TESTIFYING¹

A person testifying under oath or affirmation before the Committee or subcommittee shall have the following rights:

(a) To be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing. The Committee seeks factual testimony within the personal knowledge of the witness, and such testimony must be given by the witness himself.

(b) To make complete and concise answers to questions and, when necessary, to make concise explanations of such answers. The witness shall be limited to giving information relevant and germane to the subject under investigation.

(c) Rulings upon legal objections interposed by the witness or his counsel to procedures or to the admissibility of testimony and evidence shall be made by the presiding member of the Committee or subcommittee, and such rulings shall be the rulings of the Committee or subcommittee, unless a disagreement thereon is expressed by a majority of the said Committee or subcommittee.

(d) Communications claimed to be privileged, as between husband and wife, attorney and client, physician and patient, clergyman or priest and penitent, and between a State or Federal law enforcement officer and informant, shall be respected, and one spouse shall not be questioned concerning the activities of the other, but the Committee or subcommittee shall not be bound to make its rulings with regard thereto or on the reception of evidence or the examination of witnesses except as required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.²

¹ All witnesses are invited at any time to confer with Committee counsel prior to hearings.

² The rules of legislative bodies and their committees differ from those of courts. The procedures of any body must be geared to its purpose. Courts have one purpose, Congressional Committees another. Courts conduct trials to determine guilt or innocence, or to adjudicate rights. Court proceedings are

(e) Any witness desiring to make a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel of the Committee not less than 48 hours in advance of the hearing at which the statement is to be presented. All such statements or portions thereof so received which are relevant and germane to the subject of investigation may, at the conclusion of the testimony of the witness and with the approval of a majority of the Committee or subcommittee members, be inserted in the official transcript of the proceedings. In addition, the witness may make a statement, which shall be brief and relevant to the subject matter of his examination, at the conclusion of his testimony. However, statements which take the form of personal attacks by the witness upon the motives of the Committee or subcommittee, the personal characters of any Members of the Congress or of the Committee staff, and intemperate statements or statements clearly in the nature of accusation, are not deemed to be relevant or germane, shall not be made, and may be stricken from the record of the proceedings.

(f) If the witness so requests, he shall not be photographed while he is testifying, nor shall his testimony be broadcast or recorded for broadcast by radio or television.

XVI—PARTICIPATION AND CONDUCT OF COUNSEL IN HEARING

A—The participation of counsel on behalf of his client during the course of any hearing, and while the witness is testifying, shall be limited to advising his client as to his legal rights.

B—Prior to the administration of the oath or affirmation to his client, counsel shall be permitted to state his objections to the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, or to procedures claimed to violate his client's legal rights. Counsel shall state such objections briefly and temperately, and shall comply with the rulings and limitations thereon by the presiding member of the Committee or subcommittee.

C—At the conclusion of the interrogation of his client, counsel shall be permitted to make such reasonable and pertinent requests upon the Committee or subcommittee as he shall deem necessary to protect his client's rights. These requests shall be ruled upon by the Committee or subcommittee conducting the hearing.

D—Counsel for witnesses shall conduct himself in a professional, ethical, and proper manner. His failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee before which the witness is appearing, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removal of counsel from the hearing room, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings. In case of such removal of counsel, the witness shall have a reasonable time to obtain other counsel, said time to be determined by the Committee or subcommittee. Should the witness deliberately or capriciously fail or refuse to obtain the services of other counsel within such reasonable time, the hearing shall continue and the testimony of such witness shall be heard without benefit of counsel.

XVII—CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

No recommendation that a witness be cited for contempt of Congress shall be for-

adversary in nature; committee proceedings are not. Committees hold hearings to develop information that will assist in the enactment of legislation. Courtroom procedures are not followed in Congressional hearings or vice versa, because any attempt to apply the rules of one to the other would tend to frustrate the attainment of the different purposes for which they were created. Court procedures governing the reception of evidence and the examination of witnesses are not binding on the Committees of the Congress.

warded to the House of Representatives unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the alleged contempt and, by a majority of the Committee, voted that such recommendation be made.

H. RES. —
RESOLUTION

Resolved, That Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding immediately after clause 27(q) the following:

"(r) No report to the House, or statement of facts reported to and filed with the Speaker of the House, with respect to any alleged failure or contempt under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194) shall be certified by the Speaker of the House to the appropriate United States attorney under such section except following the referral of such report or statement to, and a report thereon by, the special committee created under this paragraph. At the commencement of each Congress the Speaker of the House shall appoint a special committee which shall be composed of seven members, one of whom he shall designate as chairman and not more than four of whom shall be of the same political party, to consider each such report or statement of alleged failure or contempt. It shall be the duty of the special committee to study each report or statement referred to it under this paragraph and, as soon as practicable after each such referral, to report to the House, or to the Speaker of the House when the House is not in session, the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. The report of the special committee shall include, among other things, a statement of its opinion whether the committee or subcommittee before which the alleged failure or contempt occurred exceeded the scope of its authority, violated the constitutional rights of the person alleged to be in contempt, or otherwise acted in a manner contrary to law or to any applicable legislative rules."

THE PROPOSED FCC BAN ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body without the slightest connection with the tobacco industry, I am, nevertheless, concerned to learn of the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission to ban all advertising of cigarettes on the Nation's radio and television stations. My concern does not derive from a tender solicitude for the economic interests of either the media or the industry. It derives from the suggestion that such a power has been given by Congress to a regulatory agency in the absence of a finding that smoking of cigarettes is virtually synonymous with poison.

Admittedly, the use of tobacco or alcohol—or for that matter perhaps any nonedible substance—when excessive can be demonstrably harmful to the human body. Yet this is a far cry from the factual situation applicable to occasional smoking of tobacco. Nothing has changed of late in regard to the facts concerning the harmfulness of cigarettes except perhaps the style and size of the cigarettes themselves. If it was harmful 5 years ago, or 10 years ago, it is harmful today. But it is the excessive use that

harms, and this requires a degree of participation in his own undoing, so to speak, by the person who is harmed, and this can readily be covered by adequate required warnings. Outlawing all advertising by fiat in these circumstances is arbitrarily discriminatory against a single industry. Perhaps it may be a fact that it does not help anyone's lungs to smoke cigarettes and inhale, but virtually nobody is provably going to die of lung cancer from smoking if they hold their consumption down to a few cigarettes a day.

The proposed edict of the FCC that all cigarette advertising should be banned appears to me to be a grasp for power by a Federal agency beyond its proper regulatory function. While the agency at this point has merely started the ball rolling by filing a notice of proposed rulemaking, and the opportunity to file objections and appear at hearings for or against this action will lie ahead, it is a distressing feature of this proposal that a Federal agency should take it upon itself to assert sweeping power of this nature on the basis of its own determination and without new legislation.

Requiring warnings on packages or in advertising that the use of cigarettes may be harmful to one's health is one thing, but to attempt to ban all advertising of cigarettes by administrative decree, in my opinion, exceeds the present statutory powers of the FCC.

An extreme and unreasonable attempt at regulatory action by any Federal commission in the absence of affirmative legislative authority from the Congress is something I cannot support. I doubt Congress would provide this without a finding from the Food and Drug Administration that the case against smoking is vastly stronger than has yet been publicly established. Encouragement of voluntary abstention from acceptance of cigarettes or liquor advertising on the part of broadcasters is one thing—an order prohibiting it by a regulatory agency is quite another. In the absence of specific authorization this is, as one Commissioner has said, "an unreasonable and arbitrary" action.

HUAC IS HUAC—WHATEVER THE NAME

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 89, which would change not only the name but extend the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee, was considered by the Committee on Rules on February 4 and reported favorably the very same day. I testified in opposition to the resolution, pointing out how approval would only serve to give the Un-American Activities Committee a new mandate. I regret that the Committee on Rules did not hold a full hearing and consider the other pending resolutions concerning the committee which would have either eliminated it entirely or transferred its area of concern to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The House leadership has now sched-

uled House Resolution 89 for floor action on February 18, immediately after the recess, which provides very little opportunity for adequate consideration.

Furthermore, the Rules Committee failed to report the resolution under a rule which would permit amendments to be offered. Therefore, if the Member handling the resolution refuses to yield for an amendment, as is to be expected, it will not be possible to offer any amendments unless, of course, the previous question is defeated. Both the haste and procedure under which this measure will be brought to the floor are causes for deep concern for Members who have serious constitutional and other questions to raise about the substantive and far-reaching changes which are envisioned in House Resolution 89.

As I have repeatedly pointed out, the House Un-American Activities Committee serves no useful legislative purpose; its purpose has been to harass and expose. It has flaunted our constitutional principles of justice and due process and brought discredit upon the House of Representatives.

House Resolution 89 asks that this committee's mandate now be broadened to include additional areas of inquiry, and that its name be changed to the "Committee on Internal Security." What would the effect of these changes be? Let me turn first to the first part of the resolution: the proposed change in name.

During the past several years, the opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee has grown both in numbers and in influence. More Members of Congress have begun to publicly express their opposition to the committee, and a distinguished body of lawyers and jurists have urged that the committee be eliminated. Larger and larger numbers of citizens are beginning to question the very concept of a special committee of Congress to investigate "un-American" activities.

The attempt made through this resolution to cloak the committee's activities in a more euphemistic and respectable-sounding name is, I believe, directly related to this growing opposition. For the name of the committee has itself become a symbol of the vagueness and arbitrariness under which its activities are carried on. By changing the name, the sponsors of this resolution hope to give the impression that the committee has been given new certification by the Congress to carry on its investigations.

The second part of this resolution, which would enlarge the mandate of the present House Un-American Activities Committee, would give the committee significantly broader powers than are presently authorized in rule XI of the Rules of the House. Rule XI currently gives it authority to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States," and to determine the diffusion of "un-American propaganda." Under the provisions of House Resolution 89 the committee's mandate would not be limited to the investigation of propaganda but would extend to organizations and groups.

These changes would give the committee the congressional sanction to ini-

tiate new investigations into peace, student and other groups which the committee has already investigated—albeit under dubious authority—under its old mandate. None of the committee's previous investigations suggests this extension of its powers would be in the interest of the internal security of the United States.

In addition, the powers proposed in House Resolution 89 trespass upon the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. As the chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. CELLER) has pointed out in his letter to the Rules Committee opposing this resolution, the powers which this bill proposes be invested in the Committee on Internal Security by paragraphs 11(b) 1, 11(b) 2, and 11(b) 3, clearly overlap the Judiciary Committee's power to investigate crime, espionage, sedition, and other areas of criminal jurisdiction. I would also point out that the Senate committee which—at least in name—corresponds to the committee proposed in House Resolution 89 exists as a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Since there has yet been no explanation as to why the House Un-American Activities Committee is better qualified to carry on these functions than the Judiciary Committee, it must be assumed that the sponsors of this resolution do not offer this legislation as a way of improving the investigation of seditious or treasonous activities. Past experience suggests that the powers sought in this resolution would not be used to investigate espionage or sedition but would rather be used to justify the harrasing and exposing tactics which the committee has habitually invoked. The mandate provided by this resolution would give the Un-American Activities Committee even more latitude than it now has to invoke its own subjective standards of "seditious" or "treasonous" or even "treacherous" activity. The vagueness and ambiguousness of the language constitute additional reasons for rejecting this resolution.

Finally, I would point out again that a number of other resolutions dealing with the Un-American Activities Committee are pending before the Rules Committee. I do not believe that House Resolution 89 should be considered until the Members have been made fully aware of the alternatives offered by these other resolutions. At the Democratic caucus on January 2 I attempted to offer an amendment to the rules, which would have eliminated the committee. However, it was ruled out of order to offer any amendment to the rules. In the past our efforts to amend the rules on the opening day of Congress have met the same fate.

Now that there is the possibility of considering the question of the House Un-American Activities Committee on its own merits without the parliamentary complications of opening the door for other and undesirable changes in the rules, the opportunity is being foreclosed by bringing the matter to the floor under what is in effect a closed rule and without adequate opportunity for Members to consider the alternatives.

To invest this committee with a new mandate to investigate any group or or-

ganization which it believes in its subjective opinion to be "subversive" or, according to the language of the resolution, only "treacherous" will only invite further infringements upon basic civil liberties.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 weeks a staff member of the Oak Ridge Associated University, a nonprofit institution subsidized by the Atomic Energy Commission, visited schools in Cambria County, Pa., with a mobile display called "This Atomic World." He will be in Pennsylvania until March 31 with 1-day stands in various communities, then return to his home base out of which some 20 other units are involved in similar activity around the country.

Each unit goes to approximately 160 schools per year.

In addition, there is a permanent unit, a Life Science Radiation Laboratory, located at Franklin Institute in Philadelphia. It is operated by an Oak Ridge Associated University staff member who puts on demonstrations on the biological aspects of radiation.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that in spending billions of dollars for these and other activities under the auspices of the AEC to boost a fuel whose safety factors, long-term availability, and cost are still in question, the Government is neglecting the source of energy which is essential to keep America's industry viable, her homes lighted, and her defense functional. Grownups and students alike may find fascination and uncertainty in the atom, but they need to understand the dependability and indispensability of coal.

For this reason I intend to propose to the Office of Coal Research that it should undertake an educational program designed to portray the importance of coal to the Nation's economy and security. An OCR program of this nature would have the dual advantage of assuring adequate personnel for the mines and giving young men an opportunity to enter an industry where there are steady work and good wages for professional engineers and skilled technicians.

Most of today's large mines are opened on the basis of a 20- or 30-year contract with an electric power company or for the purpose of supplying a steel company for many years into the future, thus removing the question of shutdowns and layoffs. Last week Pennsylvania's Bureau of Employment Security reported that the \$170.10 average weekly wage of coal miners was highest among all workers during December in the four-county Pittsburgh labor area.

There is also the aspect of the environment that cannot be expected to be expected to be reported in full if the Federal fuel education program is to be limited to AEC faculty direction. While the problem of contamination from nuclear powerplants is still far from resolved, the coal industry has made remarkable progress in attacking pollution of land, air, and water. What is

more, industry management and the United Mine Workers of America are cooperating with Federal and State Governments in a determined program to improve health and safety in the mines.

These are matters that should be brought to the attention of our students and of the general public, for without the growth of the coal industry this country is not going to grow. It is important not only to Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States east of the Mississippi River, but because of the unprecedented demands for energy all over this land there is no single State that will not rely more and more upon an adequate supply of coal for industry and/or domestic use through electric power requirements.

My colleagues from North Dakota, Montana, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Washington will immediately recognize the desirability of an education program to bring about a broad understanding and appreciation of the coal industry, especially among young men seeking careers. There is a coal rush underway in the rich reserve areas of the West and only by encouraging production there and in the Midwest and Appalachian States can we be certain that this country will never want for heat and power.

COMMENDING THE LEADERSHIP OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 133) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 133

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America, an organization of American boys, was chartered by an Act of Congress in 1916; and

Whereas approximately 6,000,000 boys are currently members of this great youth organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the leadership of the Boy Scouts of America be commended for their fine work and praised for continually directing the Boy Scouts into programs which encourage Americanism and pride in our country's heritage.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely wish to observe that while I support this Concurrent Resolution 133 and the purpose of it, I would have been more pleased had the distinguished majority leader and other leaders of the House brought to the floor House Resolution 133, which would have provided for disapproval of the outlandish pay increase for Members of Congress and the executive and judicial branches of government.

Mr. ALBERT. I am afraid I might have had some objection, had I done that, I say to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor one of the most outstanding youth organizations in our Nation, the Boy Scouts of America. In recognition of their contribution and service, we celebrate the week of February 7

through February 13. I, therefore, at this time would like to introduce in behalf of myself and cosponsors a concurrent resolution in recognition of the Boy Scouts of America, an organization of American boys, which was chartered by an act of Congress in 1916 and has an approximate membership of 6 million boys. I resolve that this Congress commend the leadership of the Boy Scouts of America for their fine work and praise them for continually directing the Boy Scouts into programs which encourage Americanism and pride in our country's heritage for which we are all indebted. I know from personal acquaintance with Boy Scouts throughout the Nation that they are a group of superior caliber and high moral standings. I feel it only fitting and proper that we today pay tribute to this great organization.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great organization, the Boy Scouts of America, which will be 59 years old on Saturday. It was on February 8, 1910, that this organization which has done so much good was incorporated. I was an Eagle Scout as a boy, and so I know at firsthand how the Boy Scouts of America nurture the ingredients that go into making a good American citizen. This is an organization which promotes respect for the law, love of God, and love of country. In this era when crime and disrespect for the law are increasing, it is more important than ever that law-abiding Americans support the Boy Scouts of America. Never before in our Nation's history have we so urgently needed the help of this fine organization.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON), the author of the concurrent resolution, may extend his remarks immediately prior to passage of the concurrent resolution; and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 414) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Texas for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 414

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$36,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a joint resolution which provides an appropriation of \$36,000,000 for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and, more especially for ex-servicemen.

This request came to Congress in a supplemental request in mid-January. It is a routine request. The funds are required by law.

The appropriations for this legislation are normally handled by the Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD, who is here beside me and would be glad to answer any technical questions that Members may have. However, I know of no objection and no controversy.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

There is no objection to this appropriation on the part of the minority side of the committee. It is a matter of appropriating the \$36 million which is in the budget message sent to us.

I am advised that the balance available as of February 1 was \$4 million, and that probably will be used, within the next week.

These payments are made to ex-servicemen coming from Vietnam and other areas of the world. When they are discharged and cannot find employment they are entitled to this under the law. It would seem to be a great mistake if we did not provide the money so that these veterans could be paid. This also provides for unemployed Federal workers. It is an obligation which must be met. It seems to me it is advisable to meet it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. We are advised that if we do not provide the funds now, payments due next week cannot be made.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When in January did this come down?

Did the request come in with the budget on January 15?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It is a part of the whole program of the Government. It was cranked into the budget, specifically—in the budget that came to Congress last month.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman: Is this a result of a failure of the Johnson administration to request enough money for this purpose?

Mr. MAHON. We provided some \$92 million last year, which was our best estimate at that time, but it has proven to be inadequate. The year before it was \$93 million and the year before that \$90 million. It has fluctuated, and it is somewhat unpredictable for in advance. This was the best estimate that could be made at that time. We appropriated the full budget request last year.

Mr. GROSS. It is apparently increasing, but from what the gentleman just said apparently the figures, the total expenditures, were not too far apart in each of those years. How many submissions of a deficiency of this kind have we had in the last 3 years? Have we had one every year?

Mr. MAHON. We had one last year.

Mr. GROSS. Did you have one the year before?

Mr. MAHON. We did not.

Mr. GROSS. But you had an underestimated budget last year and this is the second year in succession that the Johnson administration sent up a patently underestimated budget. Is that true?

Mr. MAHON. I would not say it was patently underestimated. It is a matter of one not being able to foretell how many Federal employees will be entitled to unemployment compensation payments and how many Vietnam veterans and other veterans will be entitled to it. It is somewhat unpredictable. I would assume the Budget Director, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, would usually hold it down to the lowest figure reasonably possible, but you just cannot predict the amount which will be due, as a matter of law, well over a year ahead of time. And that is what they are required to do under our budget system.

Mr. GROSS. But \$36 million seems to be quite an underestimation for this particular purpose.

Mr. MAHON. It was, but the original estimate was about the same as the previous 2 years' experience.

Mr. GROSS. With the number of ex-servicemen growing and they knew that it was growing, how could they underestimate to this extent? That is the point I am trying to make. Was this for the purpose of making their budget look good when they submitted it a year ago?

Mr. MAHON. I would not believe so, but, of course, the object is and the effort is always made to hold the figures as low as they reasonably can be.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding.

As I understand it, this is to make up for previously committed funds for our returning servicemen and unemployed

Federal employees, and it is a "must" as far as the Congress is concerned in the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee chairman and certainly the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee from Ohio.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. HALL. My concern, first of all, is that there has been an underestimate in order to make budget figures look good, as was just brought out by my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the distinguished chairman could give us any indication or pledge that we will not have additional fragmented deficiency actions—by unanimous consent—in this or in other departments before the new appropriation bill comes out.

Mr. MAHON. The new budget of last month contained well over \$4 billion in supplemental requests for fiscal 1969. That was presented to us in mid-January. We would like to consider them all in one package, in one bill, but in view of the fact that the funds for the purposes explained here have almost been exhausted, it was felt that action had to be taken before the recess in this particular field.

Now, we might get into this kind of thing on some other portion of the pending supplemental requests. However, I do not foresee it at the moment. Yet I cannot foreclose the idea that there may be other items which will have to be taken up separately.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I understand it is estimated that this fund will run out of money by February 10 while we are in our infamous recess. But, be that as it may, what I want to know is whether or not there will be other reports brought up, and other such requests made, before we have an opportunity to act upon the budgeted appropriations bills as a whole? Of course, I know that depends upon the authorizing activities of the legislative committees. However, can we have some assurance that this so-called supplemental or emergency deficiency action wherein unanimous consent is requested will not be repeated again unless it is absolutely necessary, and that it will show up in the deficit or surplus as reported for this particular fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. Well, we have not had an opportunity yet to have before us the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the new Secretary of the Treasury, and other witnesses. We cannot foresee just what may develop with reference to the subject. But I would hope that we could have one bill for the whole package of supplementals at a later time and I would hope that would be the first regular bill that the House would consider from the Committee on Appropriations. But these funds were all in the budget. This \$36 million is not outside the forecast that was made in the new budget as to a projected surplus.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the \$36 million that we pass here today—and I think we must pass here today and I therefore agree with the gentleman's statement—

will be deducted from the alleged Johnson surplus even though that surplus involved trust funds; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. No; not in any way. It has already been taken into consideration in computing the surplus. It was cranked into the figures for fiscal 1969 sent up in the President's budget for 1970. This does not change the surplus predicted in the budget.

Mr. HALL. I see, then, that we have to revert to the statements made in the well of the House so often that the surplus was from the trust funds and the revolving funds; whereas the actual expenditure funds will be in a deficit situation, but this will not add to that deficit?

Mr. MAHON. This will not subtract from the surplus heretofore projected for fiscal 1969 in the new budget received last month.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group the following members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, chairman; Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FRASER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. WHALLEY, and Mr. BUSH.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week of February 17.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of February 17 is as follows:

On Monday there are three suspensions:

H.R. 4622, to insure preservation of all disability compensation evaluations in effect for 20 or more years;

Second, H.R. 3689, to cede to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Mont; and

Third, H.R. 684, to make certain tech-

nical corrections in title 38, United States Code.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, House Resolution 89, to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday, February 17, 1969, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this poses an inquiry:

On next Friday, which I believe is February 14, the pay increase bill is supposed to go into effect because as of now there has been no disapproval of it.

I would ask if that would require any signing on the part of the Speaker of the House?

I would also ask what the document would be that the Speaker signs?

Mr. ALBERT. I would say in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa that that would be a matter that should be addressed to the Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. My parliamentary inquiry is this, Mr. Speaker:

Is the Speaker of the House going to sign any document—and I know of no other way to describe it, because there is no bill, resolution, or anything else representing, as far as I know, the pay increase.

As a matter of legislative record, will the Speaker be required to sign any document next week involving the increase in pay for the Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of the Government?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, would state that the House has just passed a joint resolution which, if the Senate acts upon it, will have to be signed by the Speaker, and the Vice President or Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The Chair understands that the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa is in relation to the proposed pay increase?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has no knowledge of any action to be taken by the Chair in signing any document such as an enrolled

bill in relation to this matter, but the Chair would make the additional observation that, if it were necessary to sign such a document—and as the Chair stated previously, the Chair can see no necessity for such a document—then the Chair would do it with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct that there is no enrolled bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is the understanding of the Chair that the pay increase will not require signing of any enrolled bill. It is further the understanding of the Chair that when the 30 days expire, then the pay raise recommendation automatically goes into effect as provided by law.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON FEBRUARY 19

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, February 19, 1969, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

REFORMING THE METHOD OF CHOOSING A PRESIDENT

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced three separate proposals for reforming the method of choosing a President. The three proposals embody different solutions to the problem—the district plan, the proportional plan, and the popular plan.

I did so both to indicate the scope of my search for the best solution and to make clear my conviction that the present method of electing a President needs refashioning.

The present structure is inadequate for at least seven reasons:

First. It allows a candidate with fewer popular votes to be elected President. This happened in 1888 when Harrison, with 47.86 percent, defeated Cleveland, with 48.66 percent; in 1876 when the electoral commission decided that Hayes, with 48.04 percent, defeated Tilden, with 50.99 percent; and in 1824 when the House elected John Quincy Adams, with 30.54 percent, although Jackson, with 43.13 percent, received more popular votes.

Second. It allows electors to disregard the vote of the people in casting their ballot in the electoral college. This occurred in 1796, 1820, 1824—although that is disputed—1943, 1956, 1960, and 1968. The lengthy testimony before a Senate subcommittee in 1961 by Mr. Henry D.

Irwin, a Republican elector from Oklahoma in 1960, should illustrate the unnecessary danger in the present system. In 1960, Mr. Irwin attempted to organize the electors to vote for someone other than either Kennedy or Nixon.

Such future attempts may all fail. However, why should such opportunities exist? Electors no longer are chosen as the men best able to choose a President. As far back as 1826, Senator Benton reported to the Senate that—

The electors have degenerated into mere agents, in a case which requires no agency, and where the agent is useless, if he is faithful, and dangerous if he is not.

Third. When no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, the election devolves upon the House of Representatives with every State having an equal vote. This is called undemocratic. It is. But it was so intended. Only twice has the House elected the President—in 1800 and in 1824. But the contingency looms over every close election.

Fourth. Since every State has plenary power over appointing electors, practical politics has forced every State to adopt a unit rule whereby the State delivers to the winner of the State all of its electoral votes. The unit rule has the following effects:

It promotes voting fraud because the entire election can hinge on a few popular votes in heavily populated States;

Likewise, the effect of accident in counting popular votes can be disproportionate to the mistake;

The heavily populated States have disproportionate power;

Minority groups voting en bloc cast the "swing" votes in these key States which are generally close and thus receive a disproportionate amount of attention;

The minority party in so-called sure States is effectively disenfranchised;

The incentive to vote in the "sure" States is diminished; and

There is the chance that a candidate who wins the small States by a large margin and loses the big States by a narrow margin may, although he has the highest popular vote, lose the election.

Fifth. Because every State has as many electoral votes as it has Representatives and Senators in the Congress, there is a disparity between the people power and the electoral power of every State. This is true not only because of the two bonus votes allotted each State but because every State, no matter how sparsely populated, is given one Representative in the House and thus one electoral vote.

This inequity is crossed with the countervailing inequity of the unit rule, noted before. The net result is that the voting power—the ability of a voter to affect the outcome—of a voter in a large State is inherently much greater than that of a voter in a smaller State. It can be mathematically demonstrated that the inequity of the unit rule is greater than the inequity of bonus votes.

Sixth. The present system does not feature a fail-safe method for counting the electoral vote, as the debacle in 1876, clearly demonstrates. The 12th amendment states: "The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all

the certificates and the votes shall then be counted." What law—State or Federal—determines disputes arising over a State's electoral vote?

Seventh. The anachronism of the electoral college is clearly seen in that it makes no provision for the death of candidates occurring between "the time of chusing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes." The reason for this lapse is that constitutionally the election takes place on the latter day and not on the day on which the States permit their citizens to indicate their preferences. Section 3 of the 20th amendment provides:

If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President.

A person becomes a President-elect only after he is "elected," and a person is elected only by receiving a majority in the electoral college.

Thus, if the winning candidate were to die before the electoral college voted, the election of the President—in a very real sense—would devolve directly upon the national committee of the winning candidate's party. Thus if Richard Nixon had died on the day after the November election, the Republican National Committee would have filled the vacancy. No doubt, the Republican electors would have acted accordingly in casting their votes. In such a case, the electors could not have elected Nixon and thereby allowed AGRNEW to become President by operation of the 20th amendment because Nixon would not have been a "person" within the meaning of the 12th amendment.

The seven failings indicate that reform is necessary. The disease is clear; the remedy is not.

Yesterday, the House Committee on the Judiciary began its hearings on proposals to amend the Constitution. I shall diligently attend those hearings. I will listen to all sides of the question. I hope that the committee will report out a resolution in the best interests of the Nation, which can and will be adopted by both the House and the Senate and then ratified by the required number of the States.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT SETS AN EXAMPLE

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, following these remarks, I shall place in the RECORD the text of the inaugural address delivered in January by the speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, the Honorable Marshall Cobleigh. In it, he describes reforms that have been undertaken or are being undertaken in the legislature of the Granite State.

My purpose in bringing this to the attention of the House is to stress the backwardness of our own procedures and hope to embarrass my fellow Members, as I am embarrassed, into collective action.

Speaker Cobleigh cites one of my fa-

vorite quotations from the great Jefferson and I shall repeat it in these remarks:

Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times.

Congress has not advanced with the times. The only change it has made recently, which has had any public impact is to accept substantial increases in the pay of the Members, after abdicating its responsibilities in this area to a special commission.

The Senate did pass a congressional reform bill last year but it was blocked in the House. The trouble lies in this body, which will have another chance to cleanse itself of the sin of diffidence this year by approving the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969, sponsored by myself and numerous other Members from both parties.

Because this subject is so important to the future of effective representative government I will summarize the contents of this bill.

TITLE I

Title I improves "the committee system," by providing for:

First, open meetings of committees and public disclosures of votes taken in committee meetings;

Second, prompt filing of committee reports;

Third, abolition of proxy voting in committee;

Fourth, the right of a minority of the members of any committee to file additional views to the committee report;

Fifth, a prohibition against floor consideration of a bill until the committee report has been available to Members at least 3 days;

Sixth, annual authorization for additional committee staff, with fair consideration for adequate staff needs of the minority;

Seventh, public notice of committee hearings and provision for live telecasting and broadcasting of open committee hearings;

Eighth, advance receipt of statements of committee witnesses and summaries of daily testimony;

Ninth, the right of minority members of a committee to call witnesses;

Tenth, committee hearings while the House or Senate is in session;

Eleventh, better performance by all committees of the legislative oversight function; that is, review of the administration of existing laws; and

Twelfth, the allowance of additional explanatory views in conference reports, and equal time in the debate of conference reports.

TITLE II

Title II strengthens congressional "fiscal controls" by providing for:

First, the use of automatic data processing of Federal budget information;

Second, involvement of the General Accounting Office in the establishment of a standard classification code of activities and expenditures, and more efficient location of budget information,

provision for expert assistance in the analysis of cost-effectiveness studies, and preparation of tabulations of budget data;

Third, improvement of the budget document;

Fourth, the appearance before the full Appropriations Committee of each house of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers within 30 days after submission of the budget;

Fifth, closer examination of multi-agency programs;

Sixth, open hearings of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate;

Seventh, mandatory rollcall votes on all appropriations bills;

Eighth, more comprehensive reports on supplemental and deficiency bills; and

Ninth, greater participation by the legislative committees through a projection of costs on new legislation in committee reports, review of fixed obligation and grant-in-aid programs, and authorization of programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriations review.

TITLE III

Title III improves the "sources of information" of Senators and Representatives by providing for:

First, additional professional staff for committees, including professional and clerical staff for minority members of any committee;

Second, comparability of pay of Senate and House committee staff personnel;

Third, use of consultants by committees;

Fourth, specialized training for professional staff of committees; and

Fifth, improvements in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; including authorization for use of automatic data processing techniques.

TITLE IV

Title IV improves "Congress as an institution" by providing for—

First, a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

Second, an office of Office Placement and Office Management to assist Members and committees in securing trained personnel and office management advice;

Third, greater authority for the elected officers of each House to supervise employees under their jurisdiction;

Fourth, improvements in the Capitol Police, Senate and House pages, and the Capitol guide service;

Fifth, an August recess;

Sixth, removal of postmasters and rural mail carriers from the patronage system;

Seventh, appointments to military academies on a merit basis;

Eighth, conversion of the complicated base pay system in the House of Representatives to gross salary figures; and

Ninth, return of excess stationery allowances to the general fund rather than to the personal funds of the Representatives.

TITLE V

Title V amends the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act by providing for:

First, the broadening of coverage to

require registration by individuals and organizations who solicit or receive funds and have influencing of legislation as a "substantial purpose;"

Second, a more complete disclosure of lobbying expenditures;

Third, the transfer of the responsibility of the maintenance and publication of lobby registration records to the General Accounting Office; and

Fourth, the disclosure of arrangements of contingent fees for purposes of influencing legislation.

Title VI contains the effective dates of the legislation.

I hope that everyone who peruses this summary will go to read the inspiring statement of Speaker Cobleigh, of New Hampshire. He will then know not only what determined men are determined to do, but can see what such determination has accomplished in a legislative body of equal or greater tradition and of nearly equal size.

I commend Speaker Cobleigh and the members of the New Hampshire General Court, past and present, who contributed to these advances and to the general welfare. The text of his address, as reprinted in the January 16 issue of Roll Call, follows:

STATEMENT OF MARSHALL COBLEIGH,
SPEAKER, NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE

The federal-state system is on trial. State government is on trial. The New Hampshire General Court is on trial. The 400-member House is on trial. And how we perform in solving the vital problems facing us in the next 90 legislative days will determine in a large measure whether or not these institutions will survive and remain a viable force of government.

I am distressed by the attitude of the public towards the New Hampshire Legislature; and, in fact, against all legislatures across the country. Facing facts, to some degree the public's attitude is our own fault and is a product of the way our legislature is organized and the manner in which it functions. The need for respect and confidence in our legislative process and in legislative procedures has become more important as the impact of state legislation has become more widespread. Yet, certain of our procedures have resulted in the raising of questions as to whether all proposals before the legislature receive equally fair treatment.

Where else would you see committee chairman pocket veto good bills and prevent them from being debated on the floor of this House? Where else would you find a \$330 million business that did not even furnish each of its committees with a permanent room where they can meet when they choose and keep their records? Where else do you find policy-making bodies arriving at major decisions affecting hundreds of thousands of people without first receiving reports from qualified staff? Where else would you find a business that works six months out of two years?

QUILLS AND SPITTOONS

A legislature slowed by archaic rules, underpaid, limited by time, and inadequately informed, obviously, has great difficulty in doing an effective job. Only the absence of quill pens, and spittoons distinguishes the present day General Court from the days when some of these rules and procedures I seek to change were adopted.

It is time we changed the structure of our Legislature to utilize modern decision-making systems. It is no longer adequate to maintain a structure designed so the individual members can get home each night to tend their crops. It is no longer adequate to meet at a time of day that was set be-

cause of the train schedule when we no longer have any passenger trains in the State of New Hampshire.

This is an important business with which we are entrusted. As former Mass. Senator John Powers said:

"No matter what business you may be engaged in, the General Court can make or break you. We decide the minimum salaries you must pay. We decide the days and hours you may be open. We decide the prices you may charge. We tax your business, your buildings, your stock.

"We draw the broad outlines, both financial and curricular, upon which your children's education is based. We create and maintain jurisdiction over the city and town governments which tax your homes, hire your teachers, provide police and fire protection, and collect your garbage.

"We construct the highways on which you travel. We tax your gasoline, your cigarettes, your liquor. We license the doctors who treat you when you are ill, the nurses who care for you, and the men who bury you; as well as plumbers, electricians, pharmacists, engineers and a hundred other professional and trades people with whom you deal every day of your life."

Yet the public does not respect us, and pays us only \$100 a year and yet still complains about our caliber and our performance.

LACKS CITED

As the veteran members know our Legislature suffers from inadequate professional staff! from lack of comprehensive organization; and is handicapped by restrictions imposed by the State Constitution as to when it can meet. Generally speaking, the Legislature lacks the tools for detailed analysis of the effectiveness of state programs.

In putting the N. H. Legislature's problems in perspective, I think it is fair to state that, while we have many outdated practices, we are actually much further advanced than many of our sister states, and credit for this, of course must go to my predecessors in this office, and particularly to Stewart Lamprey, who in his ten years at the helm of one of the other branches of this legislature, has innovated many reforms in a quiet way, Jefferson said:

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

I believe state governments must be modernized before they can expect to reverse the trend toward federal assumption of the state's traditional responsibilities. It is clear the drafters of our Constitution envisioned three branches of government with a system of checks and balances. While the Constitution provides the framework, it is necessary that each branch assumes its responsibility by operating efficiently.

FEDERAL EROSION

If we do not modernize our procedures to solve N.H.'s problems in N.H., then the slow erosion by the federal process will become an avalanche of unbelievable proportions. It is when the states are not responsive to the people and their problems, that the federal government moves into the vacuum.

The issue is not state's rights, but state's responsibilities. The challenge is to develop a legislature capable of acting on problems rather than belatedly reacting under pressure of other units of government. At stake is the future of representative democracy in a complex technological era. The rewards of legislative reform can mean better use of tax money, revenue raised by the states as well as that raised by the federal government. The rewards of legislative reform can mean improved human welfare and a safe-guarding of individual liberty.

The important first step is a strong, efficient, and effective state legislature.

I have already, in my capacity as Majority Leader of the 1967-68 legislature, initiated some steps to improve the efficiency, and thus the professional quality, of our legislature. In September we formulated eight task forces to study our current procedures, and it's my pleasure to announce that as a result of their activity and dedicated service, we can unveil today a legislative intern program which has been arranged through the cooperation of the University of N.H. and Dartmouth College as a pilot program to make available twelve students to the legislative branch of government for research and staff assistance. I might further add that this will be done at no cost whatsoever to the Legislature during this session.

As a result of this move, I can announce to you that I have been able to eliminate ten untrained positions on our legislative staff at a savings of close to \$20,000. This was done not by firing veteran employees, but by not replacing unskilled employees with additional unskilled employees. I can further announce that we have set a policy of hiring no defeated legislators as legislative attaches, and that we have adopted a policy of using personnel tests in the selection of any new legislative employees.

CITES NEW STEPS

As you know, we will be voting later on today on proposals developed by my task force to consider revisions of the legislative rules and procedures, directed toward increasing the efficiency of our operation without injury to the democratic method. In these proposals we are seeking to replace one major deadline—the July 1st deadline—with a series of smaller deadlines so that we can more equally distribute the legislative workload. We are also proposing for your approval a realignment of our committee structure for the same reasons. We have prepared the first orientation manual for new members, and while it is a modest effort, at least it is a step in the right direction. I will propose a Constitutional amendment call for the Legislature to take office upon election and to organize in November so we will not again be delayed by division of authority. We are making a comprehensive study of the legislature's duplicating and printing facilities with the hope of reducing our substantial expenditure in this area without decreasing our efficiency.

For the first time in the history of the N.H. Legislature, every committee will have a permanent room so that it may better schedule its activities and so that they can meet longer each day and thus generate more business for floor activity early in the session.

FULL-TIME COMMITTEES

It is imperative that committees have a room of their own, have adequate meeting time, and that they meet every day until all bills have been cleared from the committees. We can no longer afford the luxury of one hour a day committee hearings. We must redistribute the committee workload and we must work the committees longer and harder. For this reason I propose a change in the starting time of the daily session. I will not prejudge whether a change to morning sessions or afternoon sessions would be more effective. I therefore propose that next week we try afternoon sessions with the committee meeting in the morning. That the week after we try morning sessions with the committee meetings in the afternoon. The third week we go back to the old system of 11:00 meeting. On the fourth week I would propose a referendum to determine the best meeting time after the entire house has had a week's try of each procedure.

I consider it essential that we implement the recommendations of the various committees that are proposing rules changes especially those rules that would establish deadlines for (1) the introduction

of bills; (2) for the early consideration of bills by committee; and the elimination of the pocket veto; (3) for the completion of action by the originating house; and (4) for the completion of final legislative action. I think we can all agree that the idea of working a few hours each day for the first month or two of each session and then working around the clock for the last month of the session can only have a serious detrimental effect for the entire State and the legislative process.

PAY REFORMS

As I'm sure you can see by now, I love this House of Representatives, and I believe strongly in it and I seek to make it more effective. I am going to propose for your consideration under Constitutional Amendment No. 1 a proposal to take the antiquated pay provision for the Legislature out of our Constitution, amending the Constitution by having the pay and expense allowance for Legislators set a year before each session by a Blue Ribbon Commission—one half of whom will be appointed by the Governor and one half of whom will be appointed by the Supreme Court of our State. I think that this proposal will meet the objections of the citizens who have feared allowing us to set our own pay and will establish a vehicle for eliminating a problem that makes it a real sacrifice for many of us to serve in this body.

Regarding the size of the House, I do not propose to support any reduction in the size of our House. I do not think that 400 is a magic number but I support the citizen-legislator concept. I recognize there are those who differ with me on this issue. I know that government is the art of the possible. I am convinced that it is impossible to reduce the size of the Legislature except at a Constitutional Convention; therefore, I will exert my energies in making those changes that are attainable. I would point out, however, to those of you who support keeping the Legislature at its present size that you have a responsibility to make this Legislature effective, and I'm convinced that to make it effective, we must adopt the rule changes that will be proposed later on today. Because there has been a problem of communication between the leadership and the membership I will today institute a system of utilizing three assistant majority leaders, a party whip, and six section leaders so that we can more effectively communicate and have a meaningful discussion of our proposals.

INEFFICIENCY COSTLY

Majority Leader: Harlan Logan.

Assistant Majority Leaders: Webster Bridges, Lawrence MacKenzie, David Sterling.

Section Leaders: Donald Hayes, Donald Welch, William Andrews, Maurice MacDonald, Theodora Aucella, Jeanette Gelt.

We will propose making the Legislature a continuing body during the biennium for which it is elected; we will support annual sessions or at least allowing the Legislature to spread the number of legislative days over the biennium.

We will make the functions and interrelationships of the Legislative Council, the Judicial Council, the Fiscal Committee, the Office of Legislative Services, and other such groups the subject of a comprehensive study.

It is hoped that such moves would place the legislature in a position in the formulation of public policy rather than in the position of merely reacting to expanding federal legislation and the many competing pressures of citizens for more services.

Staff and facilities are necessary to improve the information available and expedite other aspects of the legislative process. The cost of an inefficient legislature is difficult to determine but should be estimated in relation to the cost of these improvements.

Because I am concerned about the survival of the legislative branch of government and in fact state government itself, I am today appointing a Blue Ribbon Legislative

Advisory Committee whose responsibility will be to make a broad and comprehensive study of the organization, facilities, functions, and needs of the General Court—with the goal of discovering and recommending ways and means of improving and strengthening the ability of the General Court to fulfill its responsibilities in our representative democracy.

CLEVELAND PROPOSES ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the last presidential election, the United States came perilously close to a major constitutional crisis. All of us who sat up that long November night watching the returns come in, will remember it was not until the following morning that we knew a President had been elected.

Had the voting patterns in a few key States changed ever so slightly, the election would have been thrown into the House of Representatives, and the result, I fear, might have been chaos. I do not think we can let that warning go unheeded.

There have been many proposals put forward for electoral reform, direct election, a district plan, and others. I feel my plan combines the best elements of all of them, and I ask my colleagues in the House to consider its merits.

To begin with, we should recognize that a constitutional amendment whereby the President is elected directly by popular vote is unlikely to be accepted. I know this plan has had some support in the House, but I remind my colleagues that we need the approval of 38 States to ratify the amendment.

The federal system was designed by our forefathers, and wisely so, to protect the rights of the smaller States. I doubt very much these States would accept any proposal weakening the federal system, which the direct vote plan would do.

PROPORTIONAL ELECTORAL VOTES

My proposal then is to keep the federal system and the electoral college, but to do away with the electors. Furthermore, I recommend that a State's electoral votes be divided among the candidates according to how many popular votes each of them received.

Under the present system, the candidate who carries a State receives all of that State's electoral votes, even if he wins the popular vote by only one vote. This is unwise and unfair and should be changed. In some States it encourages poor voter participation.

Under my plan, if a presidential candidate receives 60 percent of a State's popular vote, he would receive 60 percent of the electoral vote. In the case of New Hampshire, therefore, he would receive 2.4 of our 4 electoral votes.

To win the election, a candidate would need at least 40 percent of the electoral vote. Otherwise, a runoff election would be held between the two candidates receiving the most electoral votes.

I feel my proposal is strong because it retains the federal system which is so much a part of the American heritage. At the same time, it abolishes some of

the major weaknesses of our present method of choosing a President. It takes the House of Representatives out of the picture, and it removes the threat of the unfaithful elector.

STRENGTHEN TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

My plan might also strengthen the two-party system of government. The winning candidate would need a minimum of only 40 percent of the electoral votes, instead of the present 50 percent. And even if third- and fourth-party candidates were successful in preventing a first-round victory, they would be eliminated in the runoff election.

There is one other advantage as well. The United States has a notably poor voter participation record in elections. Last November 5, barely 60 percent of those eligible to vote actually exercised that right. In many European countries, voter turnout often exceeds 80 percent and sometimes even 90 percent. In South Vietnam's elections of September 1967, 83 percent of the registered voting population went to the polls.

In America, the turnout of voters is particularly poor in States that are overwhelmingly dominated by one party. In these areas, there is little incentive for good voter participation. Many voters feel it is not worth their time to vote, since the result of the election in their State is practically a foregone conclusion.

Under a system where the electoral vote is divided proportionally to the popular vote, a man's vote takes on increased importance. Political parties, therefore, whether firmly in the majority or otherwise, would work harder to turn out a larger vote.

Mr. Speaker, electoral reform is a matter of extreme urgency and importance. The United States has been playing, in effect, a game of electoral roulette every 4 years in its election of the President. I do not think we can afford to let that game continue.

THE CASE FOR AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join several of my colleagues today in once again giving special emphasis to the case for an all-volunteer army.

In days when the subject was not as popular as it appears to be today, I joined four of my colleagues in conducting an in-depth study of the Selective Service System, the demands of the Defense Establishment and every relevant area of current manpower procurement policy. The results of this study were published October 31, 1967, in a book entitled "How To End the Draft; The Case for an All-Volunteer Army."

We pointed out at that time that not one of the 31 specific recommendations which we had made would commit the U.S. Government to an irreversible course toward a voluntary system which would jeopardize national security. We went on to state:

Each of the reforms described would amount to an adjustment of current policy

leading toward the evolution of an all-volunteer system. We do not advocate the abolition of Selective Service. We advocate a program of reforms which individually and collectively can work to reduce the size of draft calls—hopefully down to zero.

Among the basic conclusions reached by our study, I would today like to re-emphasize three.

First. An all-volunteer Armed Forces may be possible within 2 to 5 years, if preliminary steps are taken now in pursuit of that objective. This is true even if we must maintain the current force levels required by the Vietnam war.

Second. We are opposed to raising military pay to a level in excess of civilian pay scales—and we believe it would be unwise to create an all-volunteer military force if this were the only means by which it could be achieved.

Third. On the other hand, current military pay is not only not an inducement to enlistment, it is an obstacle to enlistment. To the degree possible, military pay should be made commensurate with pay for equivalent jobs in the civilian economy.

Twice during the 90th Congress, I introduced legislation to bring military pay up to these standards. Today, I am pleased to reintroduce this legislation with the hope that it will receive positive consideration by the Congress.

Finally, let me say that I am delighted that the ideas we espoused in October 1967 have received more than passing support and attention from our new Chief Executive, President Nixon, from several Members of the Senate, from a growing number of colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and even from some corners of that labyrinth which we affectionately refer to as the Pentagon.

President Nixon particularly is to be commended for the official and active support he is giving to the effort to bring our Military Establishment up to date. His efforts to implement the concept of an all-volunteer military force with a concurrent gradual reduction in the need for compulsory service deserve the backing of all of us here in the House of Representatives.

My colleagues and I are, therefore, also introducing today a House resolution expressing endorsement of these efforts by the President. Since many of the changes required to implement the reforms may be made by the administration, through the Department of Defense and the selective service system, without any action by the Congress, we believe it is important for the House of Representatives to so express its endorsement of these efforts by President Nixon.

I encourage your consideration of this resolution, as well as your support for implementing legislation which has now been introduced.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding and to indicate my wholehearted support of this resolution and the action of the President in pursuing the concept of an all-volunteer army.

As the gentleman from Vermont knows, he, I, the gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. WHALEN), and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) have worked on this concept for many months. We have worked with the idea of fostering this concept of an all-volunteer army.

I am hopeful that through the support of the President and the efforts of the President and the Department of Defense we can see a realization of this concept.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Vermont, for his leadership in this study group and the work that he undertook in connection with the book we published, "How To End the Draft," which details the concept of an all-volunteer army and his leadership in bringing before Congress today the resolution that is being introduced.

Those of us who wrote "How To End the Draft" firmly believe that the debate on the draft must be kept as constructive and responsible as possible.

Mr. Speaker, our President, Richard M. Nixon, has actively urged draft reform, and has endorsed the volunteer force concept. We in Congress must work to bring about the fulfillment of what has truly become a national commitment to draft reform.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York very much. I want to express to him my appreciation for all his contributions to the book and the resolution we have here today.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. As one of the four co-authors in the House of the book "How To End the Draft; The Case for an All-Volunteer Army," I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Vermont, one of my coauthors, for taking this special order this afternoon. I share his views and those of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) with respect to the administration taking the leadership in the evolution of an all-volunteer Army policy.

I am pleased to join my coauthors, Messrs. HORTON, SHRIVER, and STAFFORD, in sponsoring this resolution in which 43 other Members of the House are participating.

In 1967, we undertook our study in the context of keeping the debate on the draft as constructive and responsible as possible. It was not undertaken because of the war in Vietnam nor was it in any way a criticism of military or foreign policies of the United States. Rather, let me reiterate, we attempted only to outline the reforms which would amount to an adjustment of current policy leading toward an all-voluntary Armed Forces. We did not, nor do we now, advocate the abolition of the selective service. We do advocate a program of reforms which individually and collectively can work to reduce the size of draft calls, hopefully, as the gentleman from Vermont has indicated, down to zero.

Mr. Speaker, often the subject of the draft is debated only in emotional terms. I trust that as a result of the President's deep interest in this matter, we, in this Congress, can be the innovators of a more equitable, effective, and efficient military manpower procurement policy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution to the book, to the resolution, and to this dialog.

(Mr. SHRIVER (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to join with my colleagues in cosponsoring the resolution endorsing President Nixon's efforts to begin preparation for an all-volunteer military force for our country. As one of the coauthors of an extensive study of our Selective Service System, "How To End the Draft: The Case for an All-Volunteer Army." I am satisfied that our efforts have helped to bring this issue before the American people for extensive discussion and eventual action.

With the recent Presidential directive to the Defense Department to begin detailed plans for an all-voluntary Army, President Nixon and Secretary Laird have taken the first positive steps toward modernizing our manpower policies in recent history.

In the free society of our Nation and in view of our growing population base from which an adequate military force can be raised, it is time to reexamine the necessity for service enforced by conscription. It is interesting to note that of all our uniformed services only the U.S. Army has relied to a major extent on compulsory service to fill its manpower needs. It should be pointed out, however, that some form of universal registration will still be needed to fill manpower needs in times of national emergency even with an all-voluntary Army.

The resolution introduced today concludes with the statement:

"The House of Representatives will welcome for consideration legislation needed to implement the concept of an all-voluntary military force with a concurrent gradual reduction in the need for compulsory service."

In keeping with this statement it is my intention in the coming weeks to continue my study of our Selective Service System, and to introduce appropriate legislation both to make the present system more equitable and to prepare the way for the all-volunteer Army in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to include in my remarks an excellent editorial which appeared in the Hutchinson, Kans., News last Monday entitled, "Volunteer Army":

VOLUNTEER ARMY

President Nixon is making good on one of his campaign promises. He has instructed the Defense Department to draw up a detailed plan for discontinuing selective service to be implemented as soon as a substantial reduction in spending in Vietnam is possible.

The present draft system should be done away with. It discriminates against those young men who for any reason are unable to continue their education beyond the high school level. Those who remain in college have been able to avoid their obligation for military duty.

Manning the defense forces with volunteers will be more expensive, of course. It will be necessary to increase military pay and to add fringe benefits to attract enlistments in sufficient numbers.

Present estimates are the increased cost will be from \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year. But there will be compensating economies. Under the existing system it is highly expensive to train men who spend no more than two or three years in uniform. With a force made up largely of career men, the training bill will be sharply reduced.

The United States has had to depend on conscripts since prior to World War 2. That is considerably more than long enough. It should depend for its defense on those who volunteer for service.

WANTED: A CONSENSUS THAT SUPPORTS LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we continue to live in disgraceful conditions of lack of respect for law and order, resulting in the intolerable situation that law-abiding citizens dare not venture from their homes without danger of attack. We live in fear. The direct losses suffered by businessmen, individuals, and the communities of the Nation as a direct result of crime and criminals have reached astronomical proportions. The indirect losses are also severe.

We have heard a great deal about the introduction of adequate controls since last year when we thought conditions of crime had reached their peak. Unfortunately, our crime statistics continue to reach new heights and the Nation's Capital has become one of the focal points of criminality. It is heartening that President Nixon has given attention to the Washington crime and violence problem in the first days of his administration. Since the extremely dangerous conditions that prevail here raise questions concerning the effectiveness of Federal control, it is gratifying to see that consideration is being given to curbing means of crime by permitting judges to hold in jail hardened criminals awaiting trial who seem likely to commit further offenses if released. We need more judges, we need more courts, we need more police. More than anything else we need a consensus that supports law enforcement and a greater effectiveness in coordination among local, State, and National police agencies.

Our most important domestic objective today must be the maintenance of public order and the inculcation of respect for law. I had these problems in mind during the 90th Congress when I introduced legislation to create a House committee to study the resources available to each level of government in combating crime, the efforts being made by each, the duplication of effort, the need for additional assistance and the particular types of criminal activity faced at each level of government.

There continues to be a need for such a top level study but the need for prompt top level action becomes more acute. I feel that the House should initiate and pursue such a study, promptly make the appropriate recommendations and provide the necessary assistance to begin the work of restoring tranquillity and security in the Nation.

I have again filed legislation to estab-

lish a Committee on Coordinated Crime Control, as a select committee of the House, to investigate criminal activity in the United States with a view toward determining the scope of current efforts at the local, State, and Federal governments to combat crime and the resources available to each level of government for this purpose.

The Committee on Coordinated Crime Control would be composed of 12 members appointed by the Speaker of the House who would also designate a chairman; not more than six of the members would represent the same political party.

I have in the past warned that we must place our faith in democratic enforcement of the law by strengthening our efforts in the traditional form and must repel suggestions of repression. We must keep this warning uppermost in mind as we contemplate our course of action to control acts of crime and subversion which in many instances represent a calculated attack upon our society and our institutions.

The Congress and Executive have taken some preliminary steps and we have provided some funds but it is apparent that we are moving neither swiftly nor forcibly enough and that the increasing crime statistics make obvious the need for a greater concentration of endeavor and additional expenditures together with more effective use of present and projected resources. If dire consequences are to be prevented, success in anticrime efforts is imperative at all levels of government with all public agencies working effectively and in harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this resolution with the hope that it will be given prompt and favorable consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us is vitally concerned about the subject of peace. I cannot conceive in this day and age of anything that is more important to any American citizen than the question of securing peace throughout the world.

It is tragic that mankind—so successful in developing the most intricate technological devices, in discovering the most obscure and complex secrets of nature, in conquering vast new worlds through space exploration—has failed so miserably at the task of living peacefully with his fellow man. We have achieved a trip to the moon, Mr. Speaker. Has not the time come to achieve the adventure of a peaceful earth?

Surely we share the conviction that there is no easy road to peace and security. We must reevaluate our concepts of the true meaning of peace and place it in a positive frame of reference.

It is for this reason and to take a step in that direction, that Senator HARKE and I are today introducing a bill to establish a Department of Peace, with a Secretary of Peace at its head, and to create a Joint Committee on Peace and International Cooperation in the Con-

gress. We are joined in the sponsorship of this legislation by 58 colleagues in the House and 14 Members in the other body. They are: Senators BAYH, BYRD of West Virginia, CRANSTON, HATFIELD, INOUE, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MUSKIE, NELSON, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio; and Representatives ADDABBO, GLENN ANDERSON of California, BELL, BIAGGI, BLATNIK, BOLAND, BUTTON, BRASCO, BROWN of California, BURTON of California, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, CONTE, CONYERS, DANIELS, DELLENBACK, DENT, DIGGS, DONOHUE, DULSKI, DWYER, EDWARDS of California, EILBERG, FARBERSTEIN, FRASER, FRIEDEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, FULTON of Tennessee, GRAY, HAWKINS, HECKLER of Massachusetts, HELSTOSKI, HORTON, JACOBS, JOELSON, KARTH, KOCH, McCLOSKEY, MATSUNAGA, MIKVA, MINISH, MOLLOHAN, MOORHEAD, NIX, OTTINGER, PELLY, PEPPER, PODELL, REES, REUSS, ROSENTHAL, ROYBAL, RYAN, SCHEUER, ST. ONGE, SULLIVAN, VANIK, WALDIE, and CHARLES WILSON of California.

The bill transfers to the Department of Peace certain existing agencies and functions of our Government and establishes new concepts for the resolution of international conflict.

The Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be transferred to the Department, as will those functions of the State Department that pertain to the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The bill also gives the Secretary of Peace jurisdiction over the International Agricultural Development Service, now in the Department of Agriculture. In addition, this measure will establish the International Peace Institute under the Secretary of Peace.

The purpose of the Department shall be to promote the cause and advancement of peace by this Nation throughout the world. The Secretary will develop and recommend to the President appropriate plans, policies, and programs designed to foster peace. He will coordinate all activities of our Government affecting the preservation or promotion of peace. The Secretary will cooperate with the governments of other nations in research and planning for the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and he would encourage similar action by private institutions. He would also encourage and assist the interchange of ideas and persons between private institutions and groups in the United States and those in other countries. Further, he would encourage the work of private institutions and groups aimed at the resolution of international conflict.

The purpose of the International Peace Institute is to furnish training and instruction to prepare citizens of the United States for service relating to the field of promoting international understanding and peace. This will operate much like the military service academies except that its graduates will be trained for employment by the Department of Peace, by international organizations, or private agencies whose activities are related to peace.

The Joint Committee on Peace and International Cooperation which the bill creates in the Congress will study matters

relating to the Department of Peace, coordinate programs, and guide the several committees of Congress dealing with relevant legislation. This committee would be comprised of seven members each from the Senate and House.

The idea of a Peace Office in the executive branch is not new. In fact, we can trace the beginnings of this movement back to the early 1790's when two distinguished Americans—one black and one white—set forth similar proposals. In the fall of 1792, in the first edition of "Banneker's Almanack and Ephemeris of the Year of Our Lord 1793," Benjamin Banneker, a surveyor, mathematician, and astronomer who was sometimes called the "Black Ben Franklin," included an essay proposing a Peace Department.

And, in 1799, Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote "A Plan for a Peace Office for the United States." He advocated a Secretary of Peace to balance the Secretary of War role in the President's Cabinet.

Similar proposals were echoed during the course of the 19th century by various publicists and legislators but none of these efforts led to constructive action. There were several initiatives in the 20th century taken in the U.S. Congress to establish varying forms of a Peace Agency.

As recently as 1955, President Eisenhower took a step in this direction, creating by Executive order, a special Peace Office within the State Department, headed by a special Presidential assistant with Cabinet rank.

The President noted at that time:

The massive resources required for modern armaments, the huge diversions of materials and of energy, the heavy burdens of taxation, the demands for years of service of vast numbers of men, the unprecedented destructive power of new weapons and the international tensions which powerful armaments aggravate, have been of deep concern for many years.

Since then, Congress established the Peace Corps; it created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; it extended the foreign aid programs and established the Agency for International Development.

Despite these steps, however, there is today in the Government of the United States no one actually in charge of peace. There is no Cabinet-level department working at the problem full time to the exclusion of other responsibilities.

Peace is everyone's concern and no one's job, a situation which probably explains why, despite repeated expressions of determination, we have failed to convert a peacekeeping intent into a peacekeeping capability.

We must recognize that the State Department is not, and can never properly be, a Peace Office. Every Secretary of State since Thomas Jefferson has seen his duty as Jefferson saw it: to handle foreign affairs to the best interest and advantage of the United States. And that is as it should be.

The Department of Peace, as we envisage it, will define and advance our larger interests with new techniques and new energy. It will extend to the area of foreign affairs the philosophy of

checks and balances which has worked so well within our federal system of government.

The bill we are introducing is broad in its scope, for it develops new concepts, blends them with existing programs and attempts at long last to redefine our national purpose as one dedicated toward peace. It will reassure and encourage rational people everywhere, for truth slips through barbed wires and climbs over great walls.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman in the well for his leadership in his fight for the establishment of a Department of Peace. Probably more than anyone else in the House or Senate, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is responsible for the concept of a Department of Peace now embodied in the bill being introduced today.

I believe that many of my colleagues are not aware of the fact that the gentleman from New York has been working on the concepts embodied in this measure ever since he has been a Member of the House of Representatives. However, it was only recently that he authored the bill which we introduced today.

There has already been widespread support throughout the country for a Department of Peace. Many dignitaries in the fields of the arts and sciences, as well as leaders from the field of education, have indicated their support for this bill. Many of those are here today in Washington, D.C., lending national support for the principles and provisions set forth in this legislation.

I would like to take this opportunity to indicate my cosponsorship of this measure, and to express my full support for the concept upon which it is based: the promotion of peace among nations.

I urge my colleagues to do everything they can to have hearings held on this bill as soon as possible. I also urge speedy passage of this important measure out of committee so that it can be brought to the House floor for the House to work its will.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we do have established in the executive branch of the Government a department especially directed toward the institution of peace.

It is time that the American people have a spokesman at the Cabinet level to speak on behalf of peace in the councils of the Cabinet, at meetings at the White House, and to the Nation to inform them of the efforts being made in this special area.

Over the years we have developed programs aimed at promoting peace throughout the world, but these have been scattered under various departments and agencies. We must face reality—no single agency in the Government of the United States has overall charge of peacekeeping and peacekeeping activities.

This bill, under the auspices of the

Department of Peace, would define and advance the interests of the United States in reaching world peace. It would balance at the highest level of Government the roles of the State and Defense Departments, placing its objectives on an equal level with them.

For the first time the rest of the world would have a true picture of what we are really doing to bring about and maintain peace around the globe.

By consolidating existing agencies such as the Peace Corps and Agency for International Development under the Department of Peace, our efforts to help other nations help themselves will have new thrust and impetus.

The time is ripe to set up a permanent full-scale department working exclusively for peace as envisioned in the legislation before you today. Our hopes for the future demand that we strive for peace throughout the world.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his leadership in developing a new concept which, if passed, would immeasurably help man to live in harmony with his neighbor. The antithesis of peace is war. That is why our overriding national purpose must be dedicated to the goal of peace.

I thank those who have cosponsored this bill and I urge my other colleagues in the House to get behind this concept and support it. Hopefully, we can have a bill enacted in the 91st Congress which will take the first step toward the establishment of a Department of Peace.

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks, and I wish to express my gratitude for the valuable contributions he has made to this legislation. He has been a stalwart supporter of this bill since its inception and is responsible for much of the backing it has received.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to take this time to join the gentleman in the presentation of the proposition he offers to the House, the creation of a Department of Peace.

I am glad he referred to the early history of our endeavors in this regard. I think it is not wrong to recall—and you will probably do so later on in your remarks—the fact that this Nation has a pretty good reputation in this regard already. We are qualified both by attitude and by experience. It was in 1901 when the Nobel Peace Award was established. Since that time 15 representatives of our country have received that award. This is more than any two or three nations combined can boast of. It is a very significant record.

As you know, sir, you represent a community that has furnished some magnificent leaders in this Nation. It was Nicholas Murray Butler who took over a little school, a junior college, and built it into a tremendous university, Columbia University, who early had a very great interest in this field. He wrote a series of articles entitled "The International Mind," which is worthwhile reading even today. He was instrumental in getting the Carnegie Foundation to set

up a Foundation for Peace. He, along with many important leaders of Congress, was responsible for setting up the World Court. He was one of the recipients of the Nobel Peace Award. So was Elihu Root, who was from your State, and so was Teddy Roosevelt.

We have a reputation to be proud of and a record to point to and a base to operate from.

I am happy to see the gentleman take this leadership which he has taken in this regard. Hopefully the bill that you and I want will get serious consideration so that we can work officially with the talents available here and across this land help to strengthen this administration and the State Department in the promotion of what the world yearns for so much; that is, peace and tranquillity.

Thank you.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGL) for his kind words. We certainly appreciate his association with this legislation. He has been a pillar of strength in so many good causes and meaningful legislative issues in this House. It is indeed a privilege to have the gentleman with us in this monumental endeavor.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in again introducing a bill to create a Department of Peace, which could greatly enhance the prospects for a deescalation in international tensions. I sponsored similar legislation, H.R. 19650, in the 90th Congress, and I commend the able gentleman from New York for his initiative.

A Department of Peace, headed by a Secretary who had a working mandate to press the need for peace upon the executive and legislative branches of the Government, would institutionalize a perspective that is urgently needed in the councils of government. It would also provide a means for Americans anxious to achieve peace to press their case upon governmental leaders. Both of these functions would expand the influence of those who seek to reduce the possibility of international military conflict.

Mr. Speaker, all Government agencies, in addition to carrying out the programs mandated to them by Congress and the executive branch, speak for certain constituencies which are particularly involved or committed to the issues with which these agencies deal. The Department of Agriculture provides a vehicle for farmers to express their views and to make their needs known. The Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor similarly give special attention to the needs of their constituencies. The fact that the desire for peace transcends established "constituencies" should not prevent us from creating a central institution which can devote all of its time to working for peace.

There is a need for a department which can speak on behalf of the peace constituency, which is steadily growing larger. This constituency played an important role in bringing about the current reassessment of our international posture. It helped to convince former President Johnson to reverse the policy of escalation in Vietnam and to seek

instead a negotiated diplomatic settlement. More and more Americans are recognizing the threat to world peace which conflicts like the Vietnamese war represent and are demanding substantive changes in our foreign policy. This constituency needs to have ready access to governmental policymakers. A Department of Peace would provide that access.

In a recent series of articles published in the Washington Post, Bernard D. Nossiter discussed the plans and expectations of many of the large aerospace companies when, and if, the war in Vietnam is brought to an end. Almost all of the officials of these firms whom Mr. Nossiter interviewed showed scant interest in converting their military production operations to industrial ends which could help to solve our domestic ills. Instead, they looked forward to a steady expansion of the production of military "overkill" hardware. These industries act as a lobbying force on Congress and the executive branch. They have the special ear of procurement officers and policy planners in the Department of Defense. The imbalance of the present Federal budget—which allocates 40 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government to "defense"—testifies to the effectiveness of this lobbying force.

Under the provisions of our bill to create a Department of Peace the Secretary of Peace would be given Cabinet-level status. He would administer programs aimed at achieving a general peace which are already in existence, such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as new programs which are developed by his Department. Operating as he would at the Cabinet level, the Secretary of Peace would be in a position to act as a full-time advocate for peace and, hopefully, to offset some of the pressures placed upon the executive branch by the arms and weaponry lobby. Many officials in the Government are, of course, presently attempting to play this role. But the present arrangement diffuses these individuals among several agencies and thus diminishes their effectiveness. The creation of a Department of Peace would, by concentrating energies and resources, enhance the efforts of those working to achieve peace.

The expansion in support for this bill this year is indicative of the broad-based support for this legislation. The American people want peace. Increasingly, they are recognizing that if peace is to be achieved there must be strong institutions devoted to the development of policies which are calculated to promote peace.

The creation of a Department of Peace would constitute an important step in the creation of the new perspectives required to achieve a general and lasting peace.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our love of peace must be exhibited openly to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined in sponsoring a proposal calling for the establishment of a Department of Peace. Such a measure deserves the most serious consideration from the Congress of the United States. There are several major reasons for us to give favorable consideration to this endeavor. At present the

world teeters on the brink of an abyss. It has teetered in this manner since the first atomic explosion. The arsenals of the world's great powers bulge with weapons so horrifying as to boggle the imagination of mankind. These weapons are being mass produced on a continuing basis. Their sophistication as weapons systems is matched and surpassed only by their power of destruction.

At present there is nuclear and thermonuclear hardware in existence to destroy the life of every man, woman, and child on the planet. In addition, several super-states, including our own, are working secretly on major instruments of destruction in the fields of chemical and bacteriological warfare. We hear talk bubble to the surface of the Nation's press of anthrax bombs and cholera bacilli, all to be utilized in world war.

The oceans of the world are patrolled by submarines each capable of destroying continents. Russian missile submarines are being built to match ours. Red China is rapidly moving along in each of these areas, we are led to believe.

Weapons systems are being junked which could alter the balance of power in most areas of the world. Client states of major powers play deadly little games of international roulette, not realizing that interlocking alliances can pull superstates into local struggles. Regional nationalism aggravated by miniature Hitlers and Napoleons pose menaces to all mankind. Geopolitics rules the world, and the major powers dare not allow these many pots to boil over, scalding the entire mass of mankind.

It is as essential for us to elevate the search for peace to a Cabinet level as it is for us to do the same for the waging of war. We almost worship war in the Nation today. Everywhere are the signs of militarism, and they are growing. We have a Military Establishment under which the Nation groans. Billions are shoveled into the military maw, and yet it cries for more. The Pentagon and the Department of Defense are institutions which seemingly defy challenge. Shall we not create a small counterweight to them which would symbolize our Nation's devotion to peace and the highest principles of mankind?

A Department of Peace could gather all our Nation's helter-skelter efforts toward that goal into one agency which could and would coordinate these efforts. Its umbrella could shelter and nourish viable ideas and proposals aimed at alleviating tensions, just as the Pentagon does the same for new weapons systems.

This proposal does not seek to institutionalize the search for peace as a fly becomes imbedded in amber. It does not seek to fossilize peace by formalizing its search. Rather it attempts to focus the efforts of many who are wasting much of their efforts. Sanction of such a Government department would show what America really wants. It would allow the world to gaze upon our peacemakers as well as upon our arsenals. This is not a flight of fancy. For if we do not attempt to make progress on this front, we shall be doomed to become the captives of our own engines of destruction. In such a case, we shall roll down the slope of

menace and over the brink of disaster into the abyss of doom. We have an opportunity to make a significant contribution to the well being of our country, the world and the future. Let us not lose the opportunity.

Men remember the peacemakers with love and those who wage war with fear. The battles of the legions of Rome are long over and forgotten. Their works of peace are recalled, enshrined, and visited. Their laws and their men of wisdom are ennobled in our memories, not their masters of slaughter.

Let it be said of America that we fought not to enslave other men, but to free them. Let it also be said of us that we strove to bring light and serenity to men's lives instead of doom and strife.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with 57 of my colleagues in the House to sponsor legislation establishing a Department of Peace at the Cabinet level. It calls for the creation of a Department of Peace which will incorporate the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into a single agency whose primary function will be to "promote the cause and advancement of peace" in the world community. It is viewed by some as the liaison to all of the multilateral international organizations, leaving bilateral arrangements within the scope of the State Department.

Another feature will be the creation of an International Peace Institute within the Department to furnish training and instruction to eligible citizens to serve in peace-related and international organization fields. The Institute will then be a prime source for recruitment in furthering the goals of the Department.

With the introduction of this bill, we have formally translated the basic desires of this Nation into action, giving added emphasis to the underlying goals of our country—the establishment of international harmony and peace.

I am heartened and inspired by the widespread support the proposal has received, both in the private and governmental sectors. Perhaps this points to a new day when a Department of Peace will at the very least receive as much attention and budgeting support as the Department of Defense.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BACK-DOOR PAY RAISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the

formation of the first Congress, we have been able to get along fairly well with the system under which Congress legislates after a free and open debate followed most often on important issues by a roll call vote so that the people may know how their elected lawmakers have conducted the public's business.

But a little over a year ago, in December 1967, the Congress decided to go underground and in the Postal and Salary Act of 1967 bound together in one package a grand conglomeration of legislative give and take. This was H.R. 7977 which subsequently became Public Law 90-206. It was a measure filled with "sweeteners". There were a lot of quid pro quos. Buried in the bill was section 225 that provided for pay increases following proposals by a Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries. This later came to be known as the Kappel Commission. Frankly some of us discovered the Commission's provision buried in a recommittal motion which would have also set aside and rendered sterile the meritorious and badly needed pay raises for our loyal postal and Federal employees at that time.

But over all, the entire measure contained several bad features. The Commission could make its recommendations quadrennially or only once in 4 years. This meant that at least once every 8 years a lame-duck President with only a few days left in his term of office as outgoing President could pass the buck to a new President perhaps of different political persuasion from his successor.

Worse still, coming at the beginning of a term of Congress, the leadership of the new Congress would be occupied with many priority procedures. New rules have to be considered and adopted; committees reorganized; staffs organized; and remember all of this is coincident every 4 years with the excitement and time-consuming activities taken up by planning and carrying out all of the programs associated with a Presidential inauguration.

It is not difficult to see that such salary recommendations, coming at the end of a President's term and the beginning of a new Congress, make it most difficult—if not impossible—to negate or reject the recommendations. What happened this year is typical and perhaps a perfect example of the operation of the act. The President made his recommendations on January 15. Even then the announcement had already been made that the Lincoln Day recess would begin the night of February 6. Under the best conditions and most perfect circumstances, this would have left only 23 days for the Congress to consider the matter of raising its own pay.

While the foregoing is an indictment against the mechanical problems and difficulties attendant upon the commission method of raising the salaries of Congress, the courts, Cabinet officers, and other Federal employees, there are also imperfections in procedure. In my opinion that which is of much greater severity is the principle that Congress has delegated its authority to the executive branch. I submit this is not only

wrong in principle; it may even be contrary to the Constitution.

Congress should, ought, and must, if it intends to demonstrate its responsibility, retain the constitutional authority granted it for considering the merits of any proposal that would adjust the salaries of Federal employees. The mere fact that our own salaries are involved should provide no excuse, reason, or justification for the Members of Congress to in any way shift, avoid, or abdicate this authority. What has happened is that there is a sort of casual procedure we have indulged in up to this point, by permitting recommendations to become effective if for some reason they just happen not to be rejected.

I am sure no one could claim as a result of our comments that we are trying to deny to any of the categories of Federal employees that they are entitled to some upward adjustment in their salaries. I feel certain that most Members would support by record vote some increase in their salaries if it was no greater in size or percent than those heretofore granted our postal employees, our social security retirees, or the members of the armed services. On the other hand, there is the unheard of 41-percent increase for Members of Congress.

The real fault and the worst complaint about the present exercise in salary increases is that it is a back-door approach to the problem. The voters in our district have trusted me enough to elect me six consecutive times as their Representative in the Congress. I recognize that trust is a two-way street. I know it is my duty and responsibility to trust my constituents. By that I must show my trust in them enough to debate for the public record the extent to which I am willing to commit myself to be entitled to a pay raise.

Over the past few years I have enthusiastically voted for pay raises for the postal and civil service employees, ranging from 12 to 14 percent. I have supported raises for members of our Armed Forces and increases for our social security retirees. It is fair to say that the same inflationary forces that justified these increases apply also to the pay of Federal judges, high officials in the Federal Government, and yes, even Members of Congress are not exempt. I happen to be a Member who has no law practice or no ownership of any business in which I can share the profits while serving in Congress. Yet, every one of us knew when we filed for office in 1968 what the salary would be. It is interesting to note that for the 435 House seats and the 34 Senate seats that were at stake, or for 469 jobs, there were 1,009 general election candidates and more than 7,000 primary candidates for less than 500 jobs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, every one of these aspirants knew the pay of Members of Congress.

Returning to the central theme of my remarks, I repeat once again that the real issue is not how much a Member of Congress is worth, or how much a Federal judge or a Federal department head should earn. One of the two real issues is the fiscal problems we face in this country today, and the other is the preservation of the legislative process.

On the fiscal question we should be reminded that our debt stands at \$364 billion. We may even have to raise the debt limit again this spring. Over my protest and without my support the Congress enacted last year a 10-percent surtax intended to raise \$7 billion. It now appears this tax will be extended beyond the June 30 expiration date. How is it possible to say that there exists fiscal responsibility, or for that matter, any responsibility in a procedure which raises the pay of Members of Congress by \$6 million and yet conceals from the taxpayers the names of the lawmakers who approve of this increase.

Moreover, I cannot see any way to escape the escalative effects of the raise to be approved. Oh, it is not just the \$6 million for Members of Congress. If we allow ourselves to receive a 41-percent increase, our congressional staffs will be the next to ask for a raise. Then once again all the lower-paid Federal employees, the postal workers, the military, and the retirees. If Congress gets for itself a 41-percent increase, all of the other Federal categories will feel entitled to and demand increases, and when they put on the pressure how can a Member refuse to grant these requests?

President Johnson a while back asked organized labor to hold their wage demands to the 3½-to-5-percent range. Those who then cooperated could quite rightfully now decide that they had been left out. They could without too much criticism demand that the contracts be reopened.

The really sobering thought and the question that is almost without answer is, where will it all end? Inflation increased by more than 4 percent last year. It is my considered opinion that when this 41-percent raise in congressional salaries becomes effective, it will inspire other raises that will cause the 4 percent to be far exceeded in 1969.

If I may be permitted, I would like to return for some comment on the other major issue in this whole question of salary increases. It is a matter which is of almost equal concern with that of inflation. It is the disruption of the legislative process or the abdication by Congress of its legislative authority by creating the device through which the Executive can, without limit, commit funds for salary purposes. This mechanism not only deprives the Congress of its constitutional responsibility for handling public funds, but it places more authority in the hands of the President than can ever be justified.

I doubt if the architects of this section 225 yet realize that in the statute which they created authorizing the President to make recommendations for increases in salaries, there is not one single word to prevent him from making reductions by the use of the punitive process even to the point of elimination of some Federal posts that the President may dislike or prefer to see discontinued, but which Congress in its wisdom has not seen fit to abolish.

An entire commission or Federal agency could be wiped out or rendered totally ineffective by the simple expedient of severe salary cuts contained in a

package of recommendations with a lot of desirable increases sufficient in amount and to a sufficient number of recipients as to discourage negative action by Congress, and particularly a Congress hardpressed to organize itself in the first days of a new session.

Oh, I know the proponents of section 225, creating the Commission, will say there is a sort of veto in reverse. But why go at this problem the very opposite from the way it should be handled; that is, by letting the President legislate and the Congress veto instead of the other way around? The slight power of congressional veto as it is now provided in section 225 comes under circumstances that make it very difficult, if not impossible, to exercise at the beginning of a new session. That is why I suggest that my amendments to section 225 are so important.

It is hardly a secret that I have been critical of section 225. Yet one can never criticize without offering alternatives. I do not propose to scrap or abolish completely the Commission on Salaries, because some of its functions such as study and research are of some value and should be retained. However, I have provided, first, that not 30 days, but 90 days, be provided before the recommendations become effective, in order that there may be time to thoughtfully consider the amounts of pay increases. I have also provided for the necessity of a rollcall vote before these increases can be accepted. I have prepared an amendment to section 225 to, second, readjust the quadrennial period and to eliminate recommendations from a President with less than 6 months remaining in his term of office. This provision would so adjust the timing of recommendations as to make certain that every such proposal be subject to debate either prior to or during a political campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the amendments I have proposed will be given hearing by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I submit we should never again be caught in the same circumstances as we have this year under existing law.

CENSUS REFORM HAS 109 SPONSORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, congressional demands for reforms in the 1970 decennial census continue to increase. This call for repeal of the jail sentence penalty entirely and removal of the \$100 fine from all but a few subjects essential to the population count stems from public condemnation of present Census Bureau policies. There are now 109 sponsors of this legislation.

Census reform is a bipartisan effort and its advocates span the spectrum of political viewpoints. The 109 sponsors represent districts in 36 States and Puerto Rico. These Congressmen serve more than 44 million Americans. This demand to limit criminal penalties on decennial census questions has been prompted by the Census Bureau's ex-

ceeding the proper limits of population enumeration by continually expanding the length, complexity, and inclusion of overly personal questions in the census. Letters from irate constituents, newspaper editorials and articles, and the personal judgment of my colleagues after reviewing the actual forms to be used in 1970 are the sources of the opposition to present Census Bureau plans.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the views of the clientele of the Census Bureau, the statistical user community. Although the Census Director says his Bureau serves the public, citizens who provide this data on themselves are on the short end of Census Bureau consideration. Large corporations are behind the extensive household utility items such as questions asking if a person has a television, clothes washing machine, dryer, home food freezer, and so forth, and Government officials who have an insatiable appetite to extract more and more facts about the American citizenry have prodded inclusion of dozens of income, marital, education, housing, and employment subjects. The cozy relationship between the Census Bureau and Federal statistical users has gone beyond the semblance of public service. I believe this is an unwholesome alliance which causes improper expansion of the collection of personal data under threat of fine or imprisonment. I have yet to find anyone who can justify a \$100 fine or a 60-day jail sentence if a person refuses to indicate whether he owns a car, second home, or how much rent he pays. This is totally incompatible with the fabric of American constitutional government.

When hearings are scheduled on these 109 census reform bills the lineup of vested interests arguing for the status quo will be long and impressive. As is so often the case, the general public who are the providers of all personal information, will have no highly paid lobbyist on their behalf. I suggest that all my colleagues who want census penalties repealed, to request an opportunity to testify before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. If these spokesmen for the people of this country would bring the letters, relate personal conversations with alarmed constituents, collect the many newspaper and broadcast editorials, and discuss their own judgment about the propriety of the 1970 census, I feel certain we will meet success. Nevertheless we must anticipate an uphill fight to restore rights of personal privacy in the census and affirm the intended constitutional purpose of this enumeration of our population.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the names of each sponsor of census reform bills and a list of some of the Nation's newspapers which have endorsed these proposals:

SPONSORS OF CENSUS REFORM LEGISLATION

E. Ross Adair, of Indiana.
Joseph P. Addabbo, of New York.
John B. Anderson, of Illinois.
John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio.
Walter S. Baring, of Nevada.
James F. Battin, of Montana.
Page Belcher, of Oklahoma.
Jackson E. Betts, of Ohio.
Edward G. Biester, of Pennsylvania.

Benjamin B. Blackburn, of Georgia.
 Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts.
 W. E. Brock, of Tennessee.
 William S. Broomfield, of Michigan.
 Garry Brown, of Michigan.
 John Buchanan, of Alabama.
 J. Herbert Burke, of Florida.
 George Bush, of Texas.
 Earle Cabell, of Texas.
 Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan.
 Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
 Del Clawson, of California.
 Harold R. Collier, of Illinois.
 Barber B. Conable, of New York.
 Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.
 Jorge L. Córdova, of Puerto Rico.
 William O. Cowger, of Kentucky.
 Glenn R. Davis, of Wisconsin.
 John R. Dellenback, of Oregon.
 David W. Dennis, of Indiana.
 Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois.
 Samuel L. Devine, of Ohio.
 William L. Dickinson, of Alabama.
 John J. Duncan, of Tennessee.
 John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois.
 Paul Findley, of Illinois.
 O. C. Fisher, of Texas.
 George A. Goodling, of Pennsylvania.
 Charles H. Griffin, of Mississippi.
 Martha W. Griffiths, of Michigan.
 James R. Grover, of New York.
 Gilbert Gude, of Maryland.
 James A. Haley, of Florida.
 Durward G. Hall, of Missouri.
 Seymour Halpern, of New York.
 John Paul Hammerschmidt, of Arkansas.
 Margaret M. Heckler, of Massachusetts.
 William L. Hungate, of Missouri.
 John E. Hunt, of New Jersey.
 Edward Hutchinson, of Michigan.
 Carleton J. King, of New York.
 Thomas S. Kleppe, of North Dakota.
 John Kyl, of Iowa.
 Peter N. Kyros, of Maine.
 Robert L. Leggett, of California.
 Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California.
 Manuel Lujan, of New Mexico.
 Donald E. Lukens, of Ohio.
 Robert McClory, of Illinois.
 Paul N. McCloskey, of California.
 William M. McCulloch, of Ohio.
 Jack H. McDonald, of Michigan.
 Martin B. McNeally, of New York.
 Catherine May, of Washington.
 Thomas J. Meskill, of Connecticut.
 Robert H. Michel, of Illinois.
 Clarence E. Miller, of Ohio.
 Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas.
 William E. Minshall, of Ohio.
 G. V. Montgomery, of Mississippi.
 John E. Moss, of California.
 Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan.
 Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota.
 Jerry L. Pettis, of California.
 Richard H. Poff, of Virginia.
 Howard W. Pollock, of Alaska.
 Adam C. Powell, of New York.
 Robert Price, of Texas.
 David Pryor, of Arkansas.
 James H. Quillen, of Tennessee.
 John R. Rarick, of Louisiana.
 John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.
 Donald W. Riegle, of Michigan.
 Howard W. Robison, of New York.
 Paul G. Rogers, of Florida.
 William V. Roth, of Delaware.
 Richard L. Roudebush, of Indiana.
 John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania.
 Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin.
 Herman T. Schneebell, of Pennsylvania.
 Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.
 William Lloyd Scott, of Virginia.
 H. Allen Smith, of California.
 J. William Stanton, of Ohio.
 Sam Steiger, of Arizona.
 Samuel S. Stratton, of New York.
 Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio.
 Burt Talcott, of California.
 Charles M. Teague, of California.
 Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin.

John V. Tunney, of California.
 James B. Utt, of California.
 Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio.
 Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., of Louisiana.
 Jerome R. Waldie, of California.
 J. Irving Whalley, of Pennsylvania.
 William Whitehurst, of Virginia.
 Charles E. Wiggins, of California.
 Lawrence G. Williams, of Pennsylvania.
 John M. Zwach, of Minnesota.

NEWSPAPERS ENDORSING CENSUS REFORM

The Daily Star Journal, Warrensburg, Mo.
 Passaic Herald News, Passaic, N.J.
 St. Alban's Messenger, St. Albans, Vt.
 Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio.
 The Titusville Herald, Titusville, Pa.
 Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N.H.
 News-Democrat, Belleville, Ill.
 Syracuse Post Standard, Syracuse, N.Y.
 New York Daily News, New York, N.Y.
 The Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich.
 News, Shelbyville, Ind.
 The Hoosier Purchaser, Indianapolis, Ind.
 The Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla.
 Advance-News, Ogdensburg, N.Y.
 Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif.
 The Wall Street Journal, New York, N.Y.
 The Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Meriden Journal, Meriden, Conn.
 The Sunday Star-News, Wilmington, N.C.
 Billings Gazette, Billings, Mont.
 Independent-Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif.
 Sentinel, Woodstock, Ill.
 Capital, Sedalia, Mo.
 Herald, Stanford, Fla.
 Star-Banner, Ocala, Fla.
 Citizen-News, Dalton, Ga.
 Valley Courier, Alamosa, Colo.
 Times Union, Albany, N.Y.
 Toledo Times, Toledo, Ohio.
 Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala.
 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo.
 Omaha World Herald, Omaha, Nebr.
 Mansfield News-Journal, Mansfield, Ohio.
 Newark Evening News, Newark, N.J.
 Akron Beacon Journal, Akron, Ohio.
 Chicago American, Chicago, Ill.
 Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark.
 The Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich.
 The Toledo Blade, Toledo, Ohio.
 The Evening News, Perth Amboy, N.J.
 Memphis Germantown Star, Memphis, Tenn.
 Salem Evening News, Salem, Mass.
 The State, Columbia, S.C.
 Times Picayune, New Orleans, La.
 States-Item, New Orleans, La.
 Chronicle, San Francisco, Calif.
 Register, New Haven, Conn.
 American, Chicago, Ill.
 News Sentinel, Fort Wayne, Ind.
 Tacoma News Tribune, Tacoma, Wash.
 Lincoln Daily Courier, Lincoln, Ill.
 The Decatur Review, Decatur, Ill.

LEADING CONSERVATIONISTS COMMENT ON H.R. 3114, CONSERVATION ADVISERS ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, I introduced H.R. 3114, the Conservation Advisers Act of 1969. The bill would set up a high level three-man Council of Conservation Advisers to pull together all the conservation activities of the Federal Government. The Council is modeled after the highly successful Council of Economic Advisers, except that members would have staggered 6-

year terms rather than serving at the pleasure of the President as members of the Council of Economic Advisers do.

The bill also would establish a Senate-House Joint Conservation Committee modeled after the Joint Economic Committee.

Before introducing this bill, I sent copies of it in draft form to scores of of the Nation's leading conservationists and conservation organizations. Their letters and comments were both gratifying and helpful, and many of the suggestions they made have been incorporated in the bill. I would, therefore, like to include in the RECORD at this point some of the letters I received. They follow:

THE APPALACHIAN TRAIL CONFERENCE,
 Kingsport, Tenn., December 20, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
 Rayburn House Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: I would like to thank you for your letter of November 22 and copy of the bill you propose to introduce in the next session of Congress to establish a Commission on Conservation. It was thoughtful of you to distribute copies of this proposed legislation for comment before you introduce it.

I feel that it is highly important that some body be set up which has broader responsibilities than either the Congress or the Administration in looking after the natural resources of our country. Furthermore, it would seem that for maximum effectiveness this body should be non-political.

I have become aware of several proposals of this nature, including your own. I have not had an opportunity to study all of these proposals, so at this point I am a little uncertain as to what is the best approach to accomplish the objective we all have in mind.

In your section 2, lines 7 and 8, would it be possible to define more precisely the quality of environment we want? For example, that which fosters and promotes the general welfare is often a matter of opinion and the word "quality" in itself does not expressly require "high quality."

In line 12 of section 2 you might wish to add "undeveloped open space" to the list.

In section 5. (a), I would suggest that the joint eight members of the Senate and eight members from the House each consist of four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party making this Joint Conservation Committee as non-political as possible.

I would be interested in following the progress of your bill and would appreciate receiving a copy of it following its introduction in the 91st Congress.

Sincerely,
 STANLEY A. MURRAY,
 Chairman.

CHEMSFORD, MASS.,
 December 8, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for letting me see a copy of your proposed bill to establish a Commission and a Committee on Conservation.

I speak now strictly as an individual, although I am currently the President of Trout Unlimited. At a meeting of our Executive Committee I shall discuss your bill and when it is finalized and introduced we shall very probably express TU's thoughts on the matter.

Let me first ask a question: do you propose that the three man Commission be set up on a full time basis? The job is so big that it is possible that it would have to be. Hence, the salaries involved will be dependent on the answer to this question.

You are proposing that the annual report of the Commission be ready January 20 and that the Committee file its report by March 1. Does this give the Committee enough time for its job?

Should the Committee be as non-partisan as possible and if so would four members from each party better serve this aid instead of five and three?

At the moment these are my only thoughts.

I think your idea has a considerable amount of merit and I will be most interested in the final draft. We surely need some serious efforts to coordinate the ideas and efforts of the various agencies dealing with these enormously vital matters—matters on which depend in a measure the very existence of our people.

Sincerely,

MARTIN BOVEY.

FEDERATION OF WESTERN OUTDOOR CLUBS,

Bozeman, Mont., December 6, 1966.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for sending a copy of the proposed "Conservation Commission Act of 1969." There is no doubt as to the need of some coordination between government agencies as well as between them and the public. Your bill may well start the ball rolling that will bring about this aim. Something with some teeth in it to require coordinating action must be considered.

The Commission only advises a Joint Committee that in turn suggests programs and changes to legislative committees. No mention is made of required action that may need to be taken to make a correction of existing malfunction of agencies or departments of the government.

Don't we need something with more authority to see that necessary changes are made? Recommendations are not enough.

Technology and science have drawn our world nations close together. Incredible progress in the destruction of the non-renewable resources through this same technology and science is a relentless threat to our survival. As a nation then we should take a firm hand in the total field of world ecology which is suggested, but not required, by the "Conservation Commission Act."

Very truly yours,

KENNETH K. BALDWIN,
President.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
SOIL CONSERVATION BOARD,
Madison, Wis., December 9, 1968.

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you very much for providing the Board with a copy of your proposed legislation on the establishment of a Commission on Conservation and a joint Senate-House Conservation Committee. This certainly is a commendable piece of legislation since it hits closer to anything we have in the way of bringing about some semblance of a national natural resource policy. I believe most of us would agree that this is the only reasonable approach to natural resources since they are in mobile reach of everyone and since our emphasis in the future must be on development of our resources.

The Soil Conservation Board will not meet in time for consideration and comment on your proposed bill. I have no further comments or recommendations to make except to say that what is needed is a truly national natural resources policy.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HORVATH,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY,

Washington, D.C., December 12, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I was very pleased to receive your proposed bill for establishing an independent commission on conservation.

This appears to me to be a very fine bill, a very fine move, and a specific need. I am enthusiastic about your bill and want you to know that in behalf of the officers and members of the American Fisheries Society we encourage the passage of such a bill. You may look forward to our support.

I note where the Executive Secretary of the American Fisheries Society has written you his views concerning this bill and has pointed out that you should use the word fish in conjunction with wildlife wherein it occurs in the bill. I want you to know that I believe that Dr. Hutton is correct in this, and I feel strongly the word wildlife does not imply at all times the field of fisheries and aquatic life. Some say that it does. There is much evidence to indicate that it does not. It would be advisable I am sure, for you to put the word fish and other aquatic life along with wildlife.

I shall be pleased to be kept informed on the status of your bill and if at all possible for me to testify in behalf of this bill when the hearings are held, I will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

ELWOOD A. SEAMAN.

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY,

Urbana, Ill., December 19, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: My attention has been directed to your plans to introduce a bill at the beginning of the next session of Congress that would establish a high-level Commission on Conservation as well as a Senate-House Joint Conservation Committee. I understand that you are willing to receive comments and suggestions on this legislation.

In my judgment, the objectives of the bill are sound and are intended to provide the focus of attention and evaluation that is long, long overdue. I suspect you will encounter substantial objection to certain portions of the bill (particularly Section 4(a)(4)) by several departments and agencies of the government who are not anxious to have the effectiveness of their programs examined too carefully by a knowledgeable and influential group, but I hope such objections will not deter your efforts to achieve the legislation. Some 15 years of intimate association with agencies of the federal government have suggested to me that such objections are more often based on a threat to the agency's program than on what is good for the American public. I am quite sure that is not news to you.

There are several points that I might question, too. With two exceptions, however, they are minor items in the long run and are probably not worth the time of either of us to pursue further. My first exception concerns what is meant by natural resources in the bill. Are you referring to all natural resources including minerals, gas, oil, etc., or do you mean living and/or renewable natural resources? My other exception involves a point that bothers me considerably with reference to living or renewable natural resources. In our usual definition of the term we often consider all manner of living things and the immediate environment in which they live. Why do we not include man—specifically brainpower and special skills—in the definition? Surely we must recognize that brainpower is the most precious resource this country owns. Without it we would not have had the weapons and materials that won our

major wars, and we would not have the production capabilities of modern agriculture, the remarkable advances in medicine and surgery, the achievements of our space program, or the extraordinary developments in industrial technology. Without it we do not have a chance of winning the population-food supply problem that is now on the horizon as history's most critical threat to our civilization—more specifically, to the adult generation of the children now in elementary school. Yet brainpower is the resource with which we are most cavalier in our treatment and planning. The shameful misuse of our mentally talented young persons in current military draft practices is a prime example. Our nation's sights have always been set too low. We go overboard for this cause or that one but fail to recognize that the greatest threat of all is bearing down on us rapidly and—believe me—the cards are stacked against us at the present time. I hadn't intended to get off on this type of discussion but it does illustrate why I am concerned that our human skills and talents must be included among the natural resources we need to conserve, and use in the wisest most effective manner.

One more point. I wonder if a blue ribbon Commission of 5 rather than 3 members might not be more effective and bring a wider variety of necessary talents to bear on the problems for which we evidently share mutual concern.

I am most pleased to have this opportunity to express my thoughts on the contents of your bill. May I wish you good luck and Godspeed in achieving its successful passage through the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE SPRUGEL, Jr., Chief.

THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERPRETIVE NATURALISTS, INC.,
Derwood, Md., December 12, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: This professional organization of environmental interpreters thanks you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed bill "Conservation Commission Act of 1969." You may be sure that we support any legislation which seeks to weld the efforts of Federal, state, and local governments in the job of environmental rehabilitation. It seems that your commission would at long last provide direction for the very many agencies and organizations concerned with conservation and the enhancement of the environment.

We approve your proposal to stagger commissioners' terms of office to at least partially offset political considerations and feel that you have provided safeguards to insure that this would truly be a gold bond commission. We have long felt that conservation interests should be represented by some entity directly responsible to the President and to the Congress.

We stand ready to support your fine effort in any way we might assist.

Sincerely yours,

STANTON G. ERNST,
President.

NATIONAL FISHERIES INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1968.

HON. HENRY REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for sending the National Fisheries Institute a copy of your proposed bill to establish a Commission on Conservation.

We have reviewed this and at this point do not believe there is a requirement for the establishment of another commission. We had hoped that the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, together with

the Department of Interior, could just as easily provide the Congress, the President and the nation a report on the state of our environment.

Again, thanks for the opportunity to review this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

LEE J. WEDDIG,
Executive Director.

MASSACHUSETTS FOREST
AND PARK ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 11, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: We were pleased to receive your letter of November twenty-second, transmitting a copy of your bill to establish an independent Commission on Conservation.

It strikes me as a forward-looking, well conceived piece of legislation. In the face of growing environmental problems, it is timely to give conservation the kind of emphasis spelled out in your bill. We pledge our support in working for its passage, and we would appreciate being kept informed of its progress.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN W. NASON,
Executive Director.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
DIVISION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES,
Ithaca, N.Y., December 2, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REUSS: Your letter of November 22 and the copy of your proposed bill was sent to Dr. Rexford Daubenmire as President of the Ecological Society of America. Since I succeeded Dr. Daubenmire as President in August 1967, it was forwarded to me. Dr. John E. Cantlon of Michigan State University has now succeeded me as President but, since he is out of the country, I shall presume to answer.

I think my reservations about this bill are adequately summarized in my statement on pp. 172-173 of the "Joint House-Senate Colloquium to discuss a National Policy for the Environment" (Ninetyth Congress, Second Session, July 17, 1968, No. 8). No three-man commission could be expected to encompass the necessary range of qualifications for the task envisioned. And, unless the range of competencies to be included on the commission is specified in detail, you may be assured of a cynical reception by those who understand and are genuinely alarmed by what is happening to our environment.

Ecologists and conservationists generally, will applaud the motives inspiring a bill like this but, in my opinion, will not support it because of a conviction that something much more definitive and with powers beyond writing an annual report is urgently needed.

Respectfully,

LAMONT C. COLE,
Professor of Ecology.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR
INTERNATIONAL WILD LIFE PROTECTION,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sorry not to have been able to respond earlier to your request of 22 November for comments on the draft bill you propose to introduce to Congress for the establishment of an independent Commission on Conservation and a Joint Conservation Committee.

You are to be congratulated on this excellent bill, which so clearly fulfills an urgent

need for policy guidance of our complicated government structure at the present time dealing with federal efforts to maintain the quality of our natural environment. I have two suggestions you may wish to consider.

In Section 2, the Declaration of Policy, line 11, when you speak of the utilization of natural resources to meet human, economic, and national defense requirements, I would suggest the word "ecological" be added after the word "economic." I realize the ecological approach is one that is included by implication, but believe it would strengthen the policy to have the wording in the statement.

My second suggestion is that the Commission should concern itself not only with the quality of the environment in our Nation, but also with the effects of our actions that contaminate the biosphere and affect people as well as plants and animals on a world-wide basis. For example, DDT in the Antarctic penguins, or other side effects from man's tampering with living portions of ecosystems. While I realize you do not wish to get involved in the area of international conservation, it would be valuable and important to include it somehow in your terms of reference for the new Commission.

If you think well of these suggestions, I would appreciate your passing them on to Senator McGovern.

With best wishes for the success of this important bill.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD J. COOLIDGE,
Chairman.

MINNESOTA-WISCONSIN BOUNDARY
AREA COMMISSION,
Hudson, Wis., November 17, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your letter of November 22nd informing us of the proposed bill regarding a national commission on conservation. I have replaced Dr. H. Peter Odegard as executive director of the Boundary Area Commission and am honored to be among those from whom you seek advice on such matters.

I assume that the membership of such a proposed commission would be made up of private citizens rather than agency personnel. The experience of our own Commission indicates that this is a good way to give some official status and recognition to the "public interest" in the development of governmental policies on conservation and resource development matters. I wonder, however, whether or not limitation of three persons in the makeup of such a commission would provide a broad enough base for development of constructive policy recommendations. In one sense, the output of such a small group, worthwhile and rational as it might be, might easily be looked upon as being too narrow since it would not have had the benefit of the input of very many individuals at the commission level. In order to be more representative of the broad spectrum of public interest, then, it might seem prudent to consider expanding the membership of such a commission to perhaps seven or nine members.

In another sense, it would seem that the functional aspects of the commission's operation would be enhanced by having a larger number of commissioners. This would allow for the establishment of subcommittees within the commission itself for the purposes of looking into specific aspects of conservation problems and opportunities, and would also allow for more latitude in the conduct of commission meetings themselves where it might be easier to arrange for the attendance of a majority of the members of a larger body.

The most laudable feature of the proposal,

in my opinion, is the establishment of the Senate-House Joint Conservation Committee in Congress. How nice it would have been to have had such a committee to resolve problems between the two bodies on such matters as the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the proposal to prohibit pollution of navigable waters in the nation by vessels.

We would appreciate your cooperation in keeping us posted on the progress of this proposed legislation, and thank you again for seeking our advice on its preparation.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. HARRISON,
Executive Director.

STONY BROOK-MILLSTONE WATER-
SHEDS ASSOCIATION,
Pennington, N.J., November 27, 1968.
Re Proposed Bill on Conservation.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I have one of two observations to make in relation to the captioned matter.

The word Conservation is so badly overworked and so little understood that I would propose substituting "Physical environment" for it.

In spelling out the qualifications of the Commission Members one might add that they must be people with ecological perspective. What I am in effect saying is that a well trained forester, wildlife manager, soil scientist, botanist, biologist, or what have you would not qualify as a Commissioner unless he had the broad perspective of seeing his own expertise and knowledge in relation to all other disciplines concerned with the physical environment. This would not be easy but it is germane and fundamental to bringing your declaration of policy to fruition. Good luck.

Cordially,

PAUL M. VANWEGEN,
President.

AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1968.
HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: After one reading of your proposed bill whereby an independent Commission on Conservation would be established to coordinate the conservation policies of the various departments and agencies of the Federal government etc., I highly commend you for your efforts. I feel that such a proposal will fill a void that has existed throughout our Nation's history.

I strongly urge you to add the word "fish" at the places indicated on pages 1, 3 and 4 of your draft copy which I am enclosing. As you probably know, many people do not include "fish" in this definition of "wildlife." After a more careful reading of your bill, it is possible that I will comment further.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. HUTTON,
Executive Secretary.

BOB & BESSIE WELDER
WILDLIFE FOUNDATION,
Sinton, Tex., November 27, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS
U.S. House of Representatives
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a great honor and pleasure to receive your letter of 22 November transmitting the proposed bill which you hope to introduce early in January 1969, to be called the "Conservation Commission Act of 1969."

May I state very frankly that I think you have done a remarkably fine job with this.

I like your Declaration of Policy. There are few points in this with which I believe anyone who knows anything of the subject matter could take exception. I think you are rendering a great public service in the effort you are making.

The only minor suggestion I can offer is that you might want to consider whether or not your Commission of Three is adequate since you are dealing with five or more major subjects. I would suggest that you give consideration to the possibility of changing your three-man commission to a five-man commission, so that you can get members who are knowledgeable in the five subjects to be treated. It seems to me these subjects logically divide into air, soil, water, wildlife-forestry-grazing, and outdoor recreation, including scenic or open spaces.

It seems to me your proposal would be a great step forward as we have been needing something like this for quite some time. Those of us in the conservation field greatly appreciate your leadership and interest in this important field. I shall study the proposal further and if any other ideas come to me that seem to be at all significant, I will write you again. I have been in your office on a few occasions in years past and talked with you regarding various conservation matters when I was an official of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I was in Washington, D.C. last week but did not have opportunity to call either at your office or at the office of other outstanding congressmen with whom I am fairly well acquainted.

With kindest personal regards and, again, our sincere thanks for your great leadership in the important field of conservation.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE COTTAM, *Director,*
Weilder Wildlife Foundation.

LEWIS & CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION,
November 27, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: V. L. Clark, Chairman, Board of Trustees of the J. N. "Ding" Darling Foundation, has shared with me your form communication of November 22 in regard to your proposed bill to be introduced at the 91st session of Congress, to be known as the Conservation Commission Act of 1969. I am replying not only as Vice Chairman of the Darling Foundation, but perhaps more particularly as Chairman of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, as a member of the Advisory Council to the Public Land Law Review Commission and as one tremendously interested in the causes of our natural values and our people's outdoor heritage.

I have had the opportunity within the last two months to review in detail the colloquium held this summer by various members of Congress and the administration in regard to the establishment of a national policy in behalf of natural values and our natural environment of this nation. Although this conference was not very well publicized, I think it was a tremendously important meeting and I congratulate you and the others who had a part in this splendid beginning effort to establish a national policy on environment. Your bill I believe would complement and perhaps serve as a catalyst in saving many of the natural values and natural resources that are going to be so much in our peoples' well-being in the years to come. Certainly I as an individual, and I am sure that we of the Darling Foundation, would think highly of this bill. Although our Foundation is not permitted as you well know to lobby, since we are a non-profit corporation, I am sure that as an individual and other trustees of our Foundation, we can well express a personal view with complete propriety.

You may be interested in knowing that I

intend to present as a member of the Advisory Council to the Public Land Law Review Commission, a recommendation in this general area in regard to the establishment of a national policy on environmental control and appreciation. It's interesting to note that the context of my statement parallels your proposed bill.

We were regretful that you could not be present with us at our last Lewis and Clark Trail Commission meeting held in Portland. It was one of our best meetings and we also had the second of our scheduled three public hearings. This went excellently and with some fine recommendations by those who appeared. Our next meeting of the Commission will be held in the St. Louis, Missouri and Wood River, Illinois area May 14-16. I am hopeful that you can be present. This undoubtedly will be the last meeting of our Commission in view of the fact that the expiration date under Public Law 88-630 is October, 1969. You'll be hearing from me in regard to a unanimous motion at the meeting in Portland of our Commission, which asks Congress to extend our Commission in approximately the same format. Hopefully you would see fit to support such an effort.

It's a pleasure indeed to be visiting with you again even though by letter. With sincere good wishes.

Cordially yours,

SHERRY R. FISHER,
Chairman, Lewis & Clark Trail Commission.

HAWK MOUNTAIN
SANCTUARY ASSOCIATION,
Kempton, Pa., December 6, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your letter of November 22 and for the opportunity of commenting on your proposed bill setting up a Commission on Conservation. I do have a few suggestions which you may wish to consider.

To make the qualifications of the Commissioners a little more definite, might it not be worthwhile to insert in Section 3(a) after "training, experience, attainments," the following: "and broad knowledge in the biological and ecological fields."

Maybe this would be redundant but in Section 3(c)(2) I suggest the insertion of "environment-changing activities" after "natural resource conservation and development." If this suggestion were adopted, you would have to insert "activities" after "conditions" in the 4th line of the paragraph and after "developments" in the last line.

Because I do not thoroughly understand the workings of Washington and because I feel that the success of any effort along your suggested lines is going to come principally from public pressure, possibly you would like to insert "and shall make public" after "Congress" in the 2nd line of Section 4(a). Maybe this is covered in Section 3(d) but it doesn't seem to me this is clearly so.

Again, many thanks for the opportunity to comment on this very fine and much-needed legislation. If we can be of any further help to you or Senator McGovern, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH W. TAYLOR.

THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you very much for your November 22nd transmittal of a proposed bill to establish a conservation commission.

I think the basic objectives and major details which your proposed bill are aimed at establishing are most worthwhile and I want to encourage you to carry through with your plans.

Several questions do arise which might have some importance:

Do "conservation", "conservationist", etc. need definition for the purposes of the bill?

Can a three-man commission be so constituted that there is an equitable distribution, or balance, between the various approaches to "conservation"? Perhaps a larger commission, though a bit more unwieldy, would provide better balance.

In Section 3(b), 3(f), and 5(e), are these an open-end checkbook which Congress cannot control?

Do Sections 3(e)(2) and Section 5(d) impose a manpower-fiscal burden upon federal bureaus for which they may not have planned or budgeted?

Please do keep me informed of progress on your bill. I wish you well with it.

Most sincerely,

FRED G. EVENDEN,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Lansing, Mich., December 27, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: In behalf of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, I wholeheartedly support your proposed bill which would establish a commission on conservation, charged with the responsibility of making recommendations which would preserve and improve the quality of our environment.

It has been our firm conviction that we urgently need a comprehensive national policy with respect to environmental pollution. While we do have segments of such a policy in the Air and Water Pollution Law, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and various other measures, we clearly lack an overall policy with respect to our goals and objectives in preserving environmental quality. Your bill would appear to be a very logical way of attacking this problem.

It is equally important that the various states assume more responsibility in preventing environmental pollution. We are particularly impressed with recent action taken by the State of California in establishing an Environmental Quality Council. There is an urgent need for a similar body to be established in Michigan, and, I suspect, in many other states.

In summary, you may be sure that the Michigan Department of Natural Resources will strongly support your proposed bill to establish a commission on conservation. In this regard, we would appreciate your advice and counsel as to how we can be most helpful in securing the passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

A. GENE GAZLAY,
Assistant Director.

THE DESERT PROTECTIVE COUNCIL, INC.,
La Quinta, Calif., December 24, 1968.

Subject: Environmental improvement and protection in conservation.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for a copy of your proposed Bill that will provide for a Conservation Commission of three citizens appointed by the President and a provision for a joint Congressional Committee on Conservation. Also thank you for asking for my comment on your proposal, long overdue, and questionably sufficient to reverse the present rapid deterioration of the environment.

While it may seem to be nit-picking, I should seriously consider dropping the word "conservation" and employ a more descriptive and meaningful term that embodies an ecological intent, such as "Commission on Environmental Improvement and Protection". There are good and sufficient reasons

February 6, 1969

for such change. The word "conservation" is badly mutilated and abused. May we point out that so many "conservation projects" have been little more than tinselled gimmicks to sell more bows and arrows, guns and shotgun shells, and the great majority of the public may well be apathetic for just such reasons.

The end results of your plan will be just as good as the members of the Commission. If the Secretary-Treasurer of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute is one of the Commissioners, as he has been an advisor for the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, a subsidiary of the National Educational Association, you can well guess the quality of the "conservation product".

Lastly, if the action merely equates the wonders and values of the natural world with bushels of potatoes and onions, you can expect little stimulation of our coming generation to develop an attitude of reverence and love, which is the essential ingredient in the formation of a genuine conservationist.

Sincerely,

HENRY M. WEBER.

NORTH CAROLINA
RECREATION COMMISSION,
Raleigh, N.C., December 31, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: In reviewing your proposal as to the "Conservation Commission Act of 1969" several points are suggested. We shall share our experience with you.

(1) The proposed bill is of a very general nature. Terms seem to be used interchangeably throughout the bill which express, interchangeably, the functions, powers, duties and related actions by which they are to be achieved. It might be difficult, for example, for laymen or professionals to relate words used on page 5, Section 3, (c), (4) to those found in Section 3, (e), (1).

There are many existing governmental agencies at all levels (Federal, State, county and municipal or combination thereof), private non-profit and private for profit that can and would contribute to the establishment of policy and in providing direction for human, natural and man-made resource preservation, acquisition, development and use. It appears to us that, as you have it, there is danger that it will be a federally skewed body, without sensitivity as to state and local needs, and with little contact as to the private and commercial sectors.

(2) In the introductory brief the word "coordination" is used relative to conservation policies by governmental agencies (all levels). Coordination implies only force. We do not believe that coordination can be accomplished without cooperation. Cooperation implies voluntary action. Involvement of all sectors, governmental, private non-profit and private for profit must be established, much of which can, only, be voluntary, at the very inception of the idea or there will be another superimposed pressure that tends to cause resistance, because it is not sensitive to real needs.

(3) We are concerned that the proposed bill follows old and outdated, established, federal patterns, which we are trying to change. It might permit the federal staff which is employed by the Commission to, again, (in the old pattern) develop guidelines, requirements and policies which can be inconsistent with the intent of any Congress-enacted legislation. This is often done now. If any coordination is done by the federal staff, in such a setting, with state and local government officials and the private sectors, they are usually asked to react (by such a federal staff) to new procedures in an allowed time period that is too short to permit adequate consideration of the federally developed recommendations. This is partly

caused because the federal agency is given new staff resources to handle the new duties, while state and local governments often must assume new responsibilities without commensurate staff additions.

Your bill proposes a sixteen-member Joint Conservation Committee, composed of eight members of the Senate and eight members of the House, as outlined in Section 5. In order to avoid another statute that only creates another body with potential federal controls, with only one of the purposes being to control existing Federal conservation programs, it appears to us that we shall need a more broadly representative board. Not only would we need Congressmen familiar with and having access to Federal conservation programs but also, to include carefully selected lay citizen leadership and recreation, park and other career personnel from state and local government levels. After all, in the final analyses, these are the ones which are to be served through and by any action taken by the Conservation Commission. Representation should come, thus, from a combination of all of these aspects of concern which, admittedly, is not the easy way.

The easier way, with just one or a few of these resources being tapped, has been the historic background of too many Federal statutes which were conceived and developed with the very best of service intent, but for only one aspect of need.

We have endeavored to provide you with our honest and carefully conceived thoughts based upon our 23 years of advisory and consultant service to the fields of public, private and commercial recreation throughout North Carolina and in other states. Our remarks have been drafted with a sincere intent to advise with you concerning your proposed legislation, and are admittedly frank.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH J. ANDREWS,
Director.

ROB & BESSIE WELDER WILDLIFE
FOUNDATION,
Sinton, Tex., January 14, 1969.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I am delighted with the Press Release that tells of the new bill you have introduced to establish a top level Council of Conservation Advisers to coordinate the nation's conservation and ecological activities. This is one of the most fundamental and needed bits of legislation that I know of. During my 25 years as a government employee in the Fish and Wildlife Service, I saw numerous examples of the need of coordination and objective communication between bureaus and departments. It seems to me in addition to this top-level activity the Secretaries of at least Interior and Agriculture should be encouraged to set up coordination committees of their own that would coordinate plans, programs and proposals that are contradictory or overlapping. Very frequently these run counter to each other. Controls are needed but they should be objective and they should be coordinated. Likewise, in land management and development there needs to be coordination. This is sadly wanting. I should like to see the President-elect himself take action to see that his own departments coordinate their efforts in this respect. There is need of coordination at least between Interior, Agriculture, Public Health, the Army Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.

Again, my congratulations for your clear thinking and for presenting this very wise proposal. Your record in conservation is outstanding and all of us interested in the conservation field will ever be grateful to you.

With warm regards,

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE COTTAM,
Director, Welder Wildlife Foundation.

THE TRAILFINDERS,

Banning, Calif., January 7, 1969.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thanks very much indeed for sending me a copy of your bill proposing a high-level Commission on Conservation.

In view of the deep concern many of us share regarding recent statements made by Mr. Nixon's selection of Governor Hikel to serve as Secretary of the Interior, I feel that your move is most timely.

I shall do what I can to interest our California delegation to the Congress in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY C. JAMES.

CITIZENS NATURAL RESOURCES
ASSOCIATION OF WISCONSIN,
December 20, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Please excuse my delay in answering your letter of November 22 relative to your proposed bill establishing a Federal Commission on Conservation. I have taken the opportunity to confer with a number of groups and many individuals in order to get a good cross section of opinions on your proposal.

My personal opinion is that there is a real need for improved coordination and understanding of the scope and interaction of various federal and state programs which have an affect upon our natural resources. A high level Commission on Conservation might be able to exert real influence on such programs. I found that the general sentiment of people contacted ran along these lines.

If I can be of any assistance in the support of this legislation, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK M. BAUMGARTNER,
President, CNRA.

AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 6, 1969.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: My attention has just been drawn to a letter from you dated November 22, 1968, transmitting a proposed bill to be submitted to Congress creating a Commission on Conservation.

From my personal viewpoint, the objectives of the bill appear to both fill a real national need and to give a voice to an element of our population that too often feels left out in important national decisions. I regret that I cannot comment on behalf of the American Water Resources Association at this time. There will be an Executive Committee meeting of that organization in March, and I will bring the proposed bill before that meeting. I will be interested in being kept informed of the progress of the bill in the meantime.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD SILBERMAN,
President.

WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION
OF THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN,
Philadelphia, Pa., December 31, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: This is a reply to your letter in which you asked WRA's reaction to your proposal to introduce a Bill which would set up a high-level, three man Commission on Conservation to report each year on the state of our environment and recommend appropriate action.

Although I did not poll our 650 member organization, nevertheless I did query a rep-

representative number of our Directors in search of reaction of our membership from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds.

Approximately 80% of those responding were not in favor of the proposed Conservation Commission. The reasoning behind this majority stand is that creation of one more group on Conservation will merely tend to cause more confusion in Federal Conservation activity that now consists of overlapping agency activities. Instead, WRA suggests that reorganization of existing agencies into one body covering all environmental problems would be a more valuable effort, plus the provision for adequate administrative and supervisory effort to assure accomplishment of things already covered by law. Further, WRA feels strongly that President-elect Nixon's Environmental Task Force and the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment should adequately cover the same functions as the proposed Commission.

Thank you for this opportunity to review this proposed Bill.

Very truly yours,

PAUL M. FELTON,
Executive Director.

KINGSPORT, TENN.,
December 9, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Your proposed bill concerning creation of a Commission on Conservation and a Senate-House Joint Conservation Committee was circulated through me by Mr. Stan Murray, Chairman of the Appalachian Trail Conference.

I wholeheartedly agree with the concept of the bill and its goals. Please let me know when the bill is introduced in the House, and its counterpart in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

L. POWELL FOSTER.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND
PARK ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., December 10, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Thank you for your letter of November 22 enclosing a draft of a bill which you plan to introduce at the coming session of the Congress, to establish a three-man Commission on Conservation and a Senate-House Joint Conservation Committee.

I believe that the general purpose of your proposed bill is excellent.

You may want to consider including in your bill a limit on the amount of funds that are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year. You may also want to consider the possibility of including an expiration date, say five years after enactment, so that the Congress would automatically have an opportunity to amend the act in such ways as the five years of experience would have shown to be desirable or to terminate it if that appeared to be desirable. No doubt such details will be brought up for consideration if hearings on your proposed bill are held.

I appreciated very much the opportunity to read your proposed bill and to have the opportunity of commenting on it.

Sincerely,

SAL J. PREZIOSO,
Executive Vice President.

LAW OFFICES OF LEO THOMAS CONNOR,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 27, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your letter of November 22, 1968 addressed to the Indian Rights Association relative to your plan to introduce a Bill in the next

Session of Congress for the establishment of a Conservation Commission.

Our Association is wholeheartedly in favor of the principles of your Bill and of Conservation in general, and we wish you eminent success in having your Bill enacted into Law.

Faithfully yours,

LEO T. CONNOR,
President.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY
TRAIL CONFERENCE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 10, 1969.

Re Conservation Commission Act of 1969.
HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REUSS: I reviewed your proposed bill to create a Conservation Commission.

I understand that no head of a Government department, including the Secretary of the Interior, would be a member of the Commission. The Commission should be completely independent of any department and free to speak its mind on conservation, natural resources, and natural environment.

The objective of the Commission should not be, as stated in Section 3(a), "to promote . . . development, and utilization of natural resources . . ." The various Government departments, federal and state, are presently organized and empowered to perform such promotion. The emphasis should be on conservation, improvement of human environment, and wise use of natural resources. I presume that the Commission would be able to recommend any reorganization of federal department functions and authority to the end that Government programs will be reviewed, coordinated and evaluated as to their effects on conservation, resources, and human ecology prior to approval of such programs. A plan, for example, has been proposed to reorganize the Department of the Interior.

The bill on the whole is an important forward step.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN A. DANIELSEN.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
January 19, 1969.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you and bless you for introducing a bill to establish a Council of Conservation Advisers and a Joint Congressional Conservation Committee. This advance is imperative to the efforts to preserve the land, protect wildlife and rescue and restore our environment. Under Secretary Udall the Interior Department has been conservation-oriented and has done marvelous, often very difficult things. Also, too often it was powerless to aid in conservation battles because it had no voice in decisions making policies or permitting actions affecting ecology, a livable, quality environment, the land, waters, wildlife, etc. This legislation will greatly improve the possibility of saving "our good earth", especially now with a new administrator in the Interior Department, and your efforts will eventually be praised and appreciated by those who presently may not care.

I assume the Council will include ecologists, "senior scientists" and leading conservationists. We probably would still need a Department of Natural Resources, to which the Forest Service would be transferred, and which could prohibit destructive activities of the Engin. Corps, the FPC and AEC. Also we need a Conservation Amendment to the Constitution someday soon. This is a tremendous step. When you have time, I hope you will let me know to what Committees it has been assigned.

Sincerely,

MRS. WINIFRED HELPER.

CULVER PROPOSES CONGRESSIONAL REFORM IN AREA OF INTERNAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress I had the opportunity to serve as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities until I recently accepted another committee position. My experience on the committee has been both informative and valuable.

Based on this experience as well as a long concern for the problem, I have formed certain ideas as to how the Congress can best discharge its dual responsibilities of protecting the internal security of our Nation and guarding the civil liberties of our Nation's citizens.

Yesterday, I submitted two resolutions on this subject which I hope will be considered at an appropriate point. As a prelude to such consideration, I wish to urge that full hearings be scheduled on this most vexing and important subject.

The time is opportune for the Congress to consider anew its responsibilities in this area. Serious divisions strain our society. We in the Congress should do everything to mend and nothing to tear. The past excesses of the Committee on Un-American Activities have fostered excesses on the part of its critics, and so contributed to a destructive spiral of reaction and counterreaction.

Four new members have just been appointed to the committee. The committee also has a new chairman, who has opened this very question himself by introducing legislation to change the name of the committee. While I have grave doubts about the wisdom of House Resolution 89 and its omission of any concern for committee procedures it does signify a concern that propaganda should be removed as a subject of investigation. The proposal thereby recognizes, although in my opinion it does not give effect to, the proposition that one man's propaganda is another man's cherished beliefs. Neither may be intruded upon under our Constitution by laws or by lawmaking.

For these reasons I believe the responsible course is not hasty action on any particular proposal. Our action in this area over the past, including the very establishment of the committee as a standing committee 24 years ago, has often been characterized by political emotion rather than by patient examination. Full hearings would give the Congress the best opportunity to develop the wise—and constitutional—balance between civil liberties and internal security.

It is a step in the right direction to eliminate those vague words of seeming authority—propaganda and un-American—as House Resolution 89 proposes. But we delude ourselves if we think that the problems spawned by this committee will be solved even in part, if we merely change words and fail to grip the very serious root issues suggested by those words. We should not set sail here under a false flag—either we are genuinely interested in reform or we are engaging in political public relations.

In my judgment, meaningful reform in this area must involve a more precise and confining mandate for investigations concerning matters of internal security. Such an effort would at the least seek to weigh the respective interests of internal security and civil liberty and mark out as clearly as possible in the legislation and in the legislative history the respective boundaries of each interest, however wide or narrow. Change which maintains the full authority of investigation is not reform, in my judgment.

The mischief of the HCUA as presently constituted is, very simply, that the Congress grants investigating powers that are inimical to constitutional principles and unwise as legislative policy. The public has a right to expect the Congress to frame its inquiries with more clarity and care than the present formulation suggests.

In my judgment, any meaningful changes must carefully formulate categories of activities—not organizations—which may be investigated. The vice of any investigating authority that creates a category of organizations which may be investigated is that once an organization falls within the category, all activities—innocent ones as well as threatening ones—may be investigated.

The problem, of course, is that the innocent activities are most often those of speech, association, and belief. These have been probed consistently by the HCUA in the past and if the powers of investigation are maintained intact, nothing will preclude their being probed again in the future.

We operate under the Constitution; and we operate of necessity in this field under the Constitution as faithfully and conscientiously expounded by the courts. The Congress has its own responsibility to itself to assure the integrity of the legislative process. But let us remember what the first amendment actually says: "The Congress shall pass no law" abridging the freedom of speech; it is we ourselves who are restrained.

We can and should, therefore, draw guidance from the decisions of the Supreme Court. I might add that if we succeed in putting our own house in better order, one beneficial result may be to give the Court somewhat less business in this realm.

The cases decided by the Supreme Court—and I would invite attention to the subheading, "Supreme Court Decisions and Proposed Resolutions," further in my statement—suggest two guides which the Congress should bear in mind when considering the needed revision of the Committee on Un-American Activities' authority and procedures. First, where confrontations between the interests of internal security and the interests of free speech seem likely, the Congress should address the internal security interests with regulation drawn no more broadly than those interests require. Second, where confrontations between these opposing interests seem inevitable, the Congress should carefully determine whether the internal security interests are sufficiently "overriding and compelling" to warrant an intrusion upon first amendment freedoms.

Such a process of deliberation by the Congress will, I submit, encourage a more exact and careful definition of the national interest, and thereby foster a scope of permissible investigation which makes the fewest possible incursions into the preserve of the first amendment.

The very times in which we live suggest a pragmatic reason why the investigating authority should not be cast as broadly as it presently is. In the past the HCUA has often functioned under its overly broad mandate to provide gratuitous publicity to those they purport to oppose at the expense of the reputation of Congress. As these groups increasingly seek out rather than shun the spotlight of the mass media, the Congress needs some assurance that its committees will not become unwitting foils for publicity-seeking extremists.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared my own resolution on this subject which I believe avoids the defects I have noted. It prescribes a more precise and narrow investigating authority for a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and I believe my resolution's approach would assure a more effective discharge of congressional responsibilities in this most sensitive area. It provides the following investigating authority:

The Committee is authorized to investigate for legislative purposes those activities of groups or organizations which involve espionage, sabotage, insurrection, force or other coercive acts when such activities attempt to alter or overthrow the lawful authority of the Government of the United States.

In my view, any genuine threat to the internal security of our country lies in the area of espionage, sabotage, and force—not speech, assembly, or thought. In limiting investigations to acts of this sort, we address the real internal security interests of the country. And by addressing only those interests, we avoid the fatal defect of unnecessary incursion into the realm of political activities protected by the first amendment. This I believe my resolution will accomplish; and I hope the Congress will give its consideration to the resolution at the appropriate time.

In addition, I would respectfully submit that the Congress should also consider the soundness of investigating committee procedures in its deliberations on this subject. I have proposed a "Code of Fair Committee Conduct" in a second resolution which would be substituted for section 27 of House rule XI. Such a code would help insure that all persons dealt with by investigating committees are dealt with fairly.

To briefly summarize its most salient features:

It would provide for a regular system of committee approval before investigations are initiated, hearings are held, reports or committee prints are released, or measures are recommended to the House;

It would protect the rights of a minority viewpoint on the committee through adequate notice of hearings and the substance of testimony to be offered, and through the allowance of a reasonable time to prepare a minority report;

It would insure that defamatory or de-

grading information about any person's political or religious beliefs or associations is not taken in public committee session or otherwise made public unless the person is afforded an effective right of reply;

It would insure the highest reliability in investigating committee information by providing witnesses a reasonable opportunity to more fully develop pertinent factual questions under inquiry at the conclusion of their testimony;

It would provide in general that committee files on the beliefs and associations of individuals remain confidential to the Congress unless released by a committee majority in each case; and

It would regularize committee procedures for citing an individual to the House for contempt.

We all are agreed, I am sure, that the Congress has no powers of investigation to expose for the sake of exposure. Such a code would give reality to that principle. Equally important in my view, it would build in procedures which history has shown are most likely to produce the most accurate and complete information. It would therefore be a significant step toward assuring that the Congress time and the taxpayers' dollars are not wasted gathering unreliable information with no relevance to our legislative business.

You will note from my resolution concerning the scope of investigative authority that I have proposed that all internal security functions be consolidated within the Committee on the Judiciary. I propose this because I believe the demands of reasonable administration suggest a consolidation of internal security functions in the Judiciary Committee which presently has jurisdiction over espionage as well as the criminal code in general and because I believe that assignments in this highly sensitive area bearing so immediately on constitutional responsibilities and restraints should go to Members who are lawyers by education and who can bring to bear the required judicial temperament.

In conclusion, there is no subject to which we as Members of Congress have a greater obligation than the protection of the very life of our Nation against those who would destroy it, and the preservation of our constitutional freedoms against those who would defy them. The reconciling of civil liberties with internal security is a most exacting task. Appealing formulations can be found on each side of the equation. On the one hand, the Supreme Court has written that:

The right of a government to maintain its existence—self-preservation—is the most pervasive aspect of sovereignty. (*Dennis v. United States*, 341 U.S. 494, 519 (1951).)

On the other hand, the Court has also stated that:

For almost two centuries, our country has taken singular pride in the democratic ideals enshrined in its Constitution, and the most cherished of those ideals have found expression in the First Amendment. It would indeed be ironic if, in the name of national defense, we would sanction the subversion of one of those liberties—the freedom of association—which makes the defense of the Nation worthwhile. (*United States v. Robel*, 389 U.S. 258, 264 (1967).)

I would seek to embrace both of these competing values. We must respond to any real threats to our internal security; at the same time we must protect our heritage of civil liberties. In short, we must seek in our own times what other generations of public officials have labored after: the assurance of continued life and vitality for our political institutions, brought about by means that make the life of those institutions worth continuing.

I believe the Congress would perform a distinct service by scheduling full hearings and inviting distinguished experts to testify on the wise—and constitutional—balance we must strike between these values.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AND PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

In *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109 (1959), the Supreme Court applied the so-called balancing test to uphold questions asked of a witness about his past associations with the Communist Party. The Court made clear, however, how it had weighted the balance between the Government's interest in internal security and the individual's interest in first amendment freedoms. It stated that:

Because the case concerned communism, the legislative action was allowable, in a non-communist context, the Court added, these facts would certainly have raised constitutional issues of the gravest character. (At 128. See also, *Wilkinson v. United States*, 365 U.S. 399 (1961), and *Braden v. United States*, 365 U.S. 431 (1961).)

In 1963, *Gibson v. Florida Leg. Investigation Comm.*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963), presented a similar issue involving the Miami NAACP and its membership list which the Court held could not validly be subpoenaed. The Court confined *Barenblatt* narrowly to its facts, and reformulated its balancing test to require "a substantial relation between the information sought and a subject of overriding and compelling state interest—at 546.

In *DeGregory v. Atty. Gen. of New Hampshire*, 383 U.S. 825 (1966), the Court once more faced the question of a witness' refusal to answer questions about his past associations. Like *Barenblatt*, these questions involved the Communist Party but in this case the Court reached the opposite result and held the questions invalid. It found no showing of "overriding and compelling state interest" that would warrant intrusion into the realm of political and associational privacy protected by the first amendment—at 829.

After *DeGregory*, little remains of the premise for *Barenblatt*'s balancing test: the presumption of national interest attending all Communist investigations. Henceforth, the judicial thumb will be on the opposite side of the balancing scales: the Government will have to build a careful record which shows an "overriding and compelling interest" in the constitutionally privileged information being sought.

The Supreme Court has had particular occasion to comment on both the mandate of authority and the procedures followed by the HCUA. Its leading decision in this respect is *Watkins v. United*

States, 354 U.S. 178 (1957). The Court there observed:

An excessively broad charter, like that of the House Un-American Activities Committee, places the courts in an untenable position if they are to strike a balance between the public need for a particular interrogation and the right of citizens to carry on their affairs free from unnecessary governmental interference. It is impossible in such a situation to ascertain whether any legislative purpose justifies the disclosures sought and, if so, the importance of that information to the Congress in furtherance of its legislative function. The reason no court can make this critical judgment is that the House of Representatives itself has never made it. (at 206)

Simply narrowing the mandate of authority alone will not assure adequate or appropriate safeguards for the constitutionally protected values of speech, belief, and association. The troublesome nature of HCUA investigations in this regard was aptly summarized by the Supreme Court, again in the *Watkins* case:

The mere summoning of a witness and compelling him to testify, against his will, about his beliefs, expressions or associations is a measure of governmental interference. And when those forced revelations concern matters that are unorthodox, unpopular, or even hateful to the general public, the reaction in the life of the witness may be disastrous. This effect is even more harsh when it is disclosed and judged by current standards rather than those contemporary with the matters exposed. Nor does the witness alone suffer the consequences. Those who are identified by witnesses and thereby placed in the same glare of publicity are equally subject to public stigma, scorn and obloquy. Beyond that, there is the more subtle and immeasurable effect upon those who tend to adhere to the most orthodox and uncontroversial views and associations in order to avoid a similar fate at some future time. That this impact is partly the result of non-governmental activity by private persons cannot relieve the investigators of their responsibility for initiating the reaction. (at 198)

Adverse effects such as these should not be allowed to impede or detract from the legitimate legislative purpose of committee investigations. Neither should they undermine public confidence in the integrity of congressional procedures. We should make it perfectly plain that none of our committees is intended to operate as a kind of highly publicized grand jury sitting in continuous session. To that end I have proposed two resolutions designed to match our constitutional responsibilities with the applicable constitutional restraints. The text of these two resolutions follow:

H. Res. 211

Resolved, That rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

- (1) by striking out clause 19;
- (2) by renumbering clauses 20 through 31 as clauses 19 through 30, respectively;
- (3) by striking out the word "espionage" of clause 12(c); and
- (4) by inserting immediately after clause 12(s) the following new section:

"(t) Internal security. The committee is authorized to investigate for legislative purposes those activities of groups or organizations which involve espionage, sabotage, insurrection, force or other coercive acts when such activities attempt to alter or overthrow the lawful authority of the Government of the United States.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

Sec. 2. (a) Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

- (1) by striking out clause 1(s); and
- (2) by redesignating clauses 1(t) and 1(u) as clauses 1(s) and 1(t), respectively.

(b) Clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "and Un-American Activities" and inserting immediately after "Government Operations" the word "and".

(c) Clause 2 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "clause 22" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause 21".

Sec. 3. As of the date of adoption of this resolution, all property of the Committee on Un-American Activities is hereby transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary and shall be available for use by the latter committee to the same extent as if such property was originally that of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sec. 4. Nothing in this resolution shall affect (1) the validity of any action or proceeding of the Committee on Un-American Activities or of the House of Representatives before the date of adoption of this resolution, or (2) the validity of any action or proceeding by any officer or agency of the executive branch of the Government, or by any court of competent jurisdiction based on any action or proceeding referred to in clause (1) of this sentence.

H. Res. 212

Resolved, That rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out clause 27 and inserting immediately after clause 26 the following new clause:

"27. Code of Fair Committee Conduct".

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Sec. 1. (a) The rules of the House are the rules of its committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees. Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith.

(b) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee, and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(b) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

(c) No report shall be made to the House,

and no report or committee print shall be released to the public without the approval of the committee.

(d) Whenever a minority of a committee dissents from a report approved by a majority, the minority shall be given a reasonable time after distribution of the majority report to members of the committee in which to prepare a minority report. Such minority report shall thereafter be filed at the same time as the majority report and shall be published in the same document as the majority report.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) All committee investigations shall be conducted within the limits of the authority conferred by these rules upon the committee.

(b) No investigation shall be initiated unless approved by a majority of the committee, but preliminary inquiries that do not require the issuance of subpoenas or the holding of hearings may be initiated by the committee staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

(c) The subject under inquiry shall be announced with particularity at the beginning of every hearing and information sought to be elicited at such hearing shall be pertinent to the subject announced.

SEC. 4. (a) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions until released by a majority vote of the committee.

(b) The identity of witnesses called to testify before the committee in executive session shall be confidential information until released by a majority vote of the committee.

(c) Committee information from any and all sources concerning the beliefs and associations of an individual shall be confidential to the Congress unless it and its source or sources are fully disclosed at an open hearing of the committee or released by a majority vote on the committee in each case: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall limit the access of duly authorized officials of the executive branch to such information.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 5. (a) Each committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall promptly distribute copies of such statements and shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

(b) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which shall be not less than two.

SEC. 6. (a) No committee hearing shall be held without the approval of a majority of the committee.

(b) Except as provided in section 7 and the subsections below, all hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public; a committee may hold executive sessions—

(1) for the purpose of marking up bills or voting; or

(2) if the committee so determines by a majority vote.

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever it appears that any evidence or testimony to be received in open session may tend to defame, degrade, incriminate or seriously embarrass any person because of his political or religious beliefs or associations, the committee shall receive such evidence or testimony in executive session.

(b) If the committee decides to release or to publicize evidence taken in executive session which tends to defame, degrade, or incriminate or seriously embarrass any person because of his political or religious beliefs or

associations, or if evidence received in public session tends to that effect, it shall—

(1) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness on his own behalf;

(2) receive and execute on good cause shown requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses and/or the production of documents;

(3) afford such person the right briefly to cross examine in person or by counsel the witness or witnesses who adduced such evidence; and

(4) make public such rebuttal evidence at the same time it releases or publicizes such public or executive session evidence or any part thereof.

SEC. 8. (a) A list of witnesses to be subpoenaed shall be circulated to all committee members in advance; upon the request of any such member the committee shall vote whether to issue a subpoena.

(b) All subpoenas shall state with particularity the name of the witness, the time and place of the hearing, the subject under inquiry and the documents to be produced.

(c) Witnesses subpoenaed to appear at a hearing shall be given a reasonable opportunity to prepare for the hearing and to retain and consult counsel.

SEC. 9. (a) A copy of the committee rules, if any, and paragraph 27 of rule XI of the House of Representatives shall be made available to witnesses.

(b) Witnesses may be accompanied by counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their rights. Counsel may briefly state any objections on behalf of the witness and the grounds therefor.

(c) At the close of questioning of the witness, counsel may briefly examine the witness on the subject under inquiry.

(d) Witnesses shall be allowed a reasonable time after their testimony in which to file a brief statement pertinent to the subject under inquiry with the committee which shall become a part of the hearing record.

SEC. 10. (a) A complete and accurate transcript of all testimony and proceedings at committee hearings shall be made.

(b) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee. In cases of indigency, the committee may waive such payment.

COMMITTEE DECORUM

SEC. 11. (a) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House of contempt pursuant to title 2, United States Code, section 194.

(b) Whenever any person summoned as a witness to give testimony or to produce documents upon the matter under inquiry defaults, or refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, the committee may order the witness to show cause why he should not appear, produce documents or answer the question propounded. If the witness improperly refuses to appear, produce documents or answer the question propounded, the committee may cite such person to the House for contempt pursuant to title 2, United States Code, section 194.

(c) No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt shall be forwarded to the Congress until the committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and approved such recommendation by a majority vote.

DELEGATION OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY

SEC. 12. (a) Any and all authority given the committee under this section of rule XI may be delegated by the committee to any subcommittee: *Provided*, That no authority may be delegated under section 2(c) or section 11(c).

(b) All limitation herein before expressed as to committee action shall fully apply as to action by any subcommittee.

UPWARD AND ONWARD TO NEW HORIZONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the irrepressible American appeared in these legislative halls recently—in fact, three of them did. They had been out on a little “skylarking” trip—to the moon and back. Here to greet them were the high official representatives of most of the organized societies on earth. These, though about to burst with pride and admiration, managed to suppress their deep feelings beneath a few warm words and some hearty cheers. The returning voyagers responded with some light “kidding” of each other and the assembled officialdom.

Is not that just like Americans? No invocation of the high drama of the occasion. No boast of pomp and power. No wallowing in heroics. We were proud of our men. That is all there was to it.

Not that the astronauts were unaware of what had gone into the expedition into space. They referred to the discoveries of scientists through the ages, Galileo and Kepler and the rest. They spoke of the mathematical calculations necessary to plan such a trip. They acknowledged the tedious and painstaking task of developing and perfecting the necessary machinery, and the immense cost of it all. But they made light of it. It was just doing what comes naturally. And the result was inevitable. And that is what makes it American, and normal.

Most Americans are preoccupied with what we call the everyday tasks of living. We are ignorant of what goes on in the highly compartmentalized areas of science and art and philosophy. Perhaps we are indifferent to them, even contemptuous. And so when some truly remarkable feat is presented to us as an accomplishment, we do not know enough about what is involved in it to understand it, and so appreciate it.

But when some important policy of government is being formulated, or when some new medical technique is being invented, or when a trip to the moon is being planned, somebody had better know what he is doing. Technical journals do report on the fine points of the game, at length. One of these journals, *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, gives some hint of the high accuracy of rapidly moving objects necessary to get back to earth from a moon orbit, and which I venture to quote with the hope that most of us can understand it:

At the conclusion of the historic lunar orbital flight, the crew accomplished the critical maneuver of deorbiting the moon and establishing an earth return trajectory. This maneuver had to be conducted behind the moon, out of contact with earth's tracking and communications network.

The trans-earth insertion burn was a 3-min. 23 sec. firing of the 20,500-lb.-thrust SPS engine, 5 sec. over from the desired time. However, the spacecraft received a

velocity addition of 3,522.8 fps., (feet per second) only 0.5 fps. more than the predicted value. Resulting velocity of 8,841 fps. successfully put the Apollo 8 on the desired trajectory to earth.

Apollo 8's highly accurate return through the earth's atmosphere qualified the Block 2 version of its onboard guidance and navigation system for future lunar return missions. This version has 2,048 word capacity in its erasable memory, twice the number of the earlier Block 1 version.

The AC Electronics system had to steer the spacecraft to hit a corridor 26 naut. mi. wide from the point of the last mid-course correction 167,500 naut. mi. from earth and at an angle of 6.5 deg. from the local horizontal, within plus or minus 1 deg. at a velocity of 36,220 fps. (about 7 miles per second.)

Evidently the ability to make such calculations and then build them into operational hardware can not be acquired by the hippies and yippies and all the assorted malcontents who clutter up our university campuses, and who refuse to learn anything themselves, and who do what they can to prevent anybody else from learning. And these are the ones who complain to the effect that all these billions of dollars wasted on the space effort might be better used in giving all the benefits of modern achievement to the incompetents who never seem to be able to find a place for themselves in this age of unparalleled opportunity.

For these—and for all of us—the spacemen had one profound thought. Said Colonel Borman:

Exploration really is the essence of the human spirit, and to pause, to falter, to turn our back on the quest for knowledge, is to perish, and I hope that we never forget that.

Now, I would be a very shallow human being if I did not confess to you that while I am deeply committed to our space exploration program, and to unlocking the secrets of the universe and of the moon, I am even more deeply committed to the future of this country and this earth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from February 6, 1969, through February 26, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for Thursday, February 6, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CULVER (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), for 5 minutes,

today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYATT.
Mr. POFF.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. CEDERBERG.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.
Mr. HARVEY.
Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. RUPPE.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
Mrs. REID of Illinois in two instances.
Mrs. DWYER.
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. HORTON in five instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mrs. DWYER in three instances.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. LANGEN.
Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND in three instances.
Mr. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.
Mr. PATMAN in three instances.
Mr. PODELL in two instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
Mr. REES in two instances.
Mr. HANNA in two instances.
Mr. ROGERS of Colorado in two instances.

Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. WAGGONER in four instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. FISHER in four instances.
Mr. TAYLOR.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. OLSEN in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
Mr. MIKVA in two instances.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. TUNNEY in two instances.
Mr. DENT in two instances.
Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. KOCH in four instances.
Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 7, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

489. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a report of claims settled during the calendar year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

490. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of proposed action to conduct one program at a level in excess of that authorized in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act and rule XL of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3832. A bill to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps so long as such office is held by the present incumbent; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.R. 6464. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act (and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California:
H.R. 6465. A bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such Department certain functions of the Departments of Commerce; Labor, Agriculture; and Health, Education, and Welfare; and other agencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6466. A bill to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of government, by providing Federal cooperation and assistance in the establishment and strengthening of State and local offices of consumer protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 6467. A bill to eliminate hunger in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. WHALLEY):

H.R. 6468. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 6469. A bill to amend certain provisions of existing law relative to low- and moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 6470. A bill to change the definition of "ammunition" for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6471. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6472. A bill to accelerate the construction and rehabilitation of low- and moderate-income housing in the United States in order to fulfill the national goal declared in the Housing Act of 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6473. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for inclusion in the Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6474. A bill to provide for a Federal Athletic Commission to regulate organized sports when and to the extent that such regulation is in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6475. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6476. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6477. A bill to provide compensation for firemen not employed by the United States killed or injured in the performance of duty during a civil disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6478. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6479. A bill to authorize the conduct of certain research and development through the Coast Guard in order to develop an effective electronic guidance system; to the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6480. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 6482. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital in the Halifax area of Volusia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 6483. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for pollution control, law enforcement, educational, and welfare purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6484. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of a multilevel parking facility in connection with the Federal building, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6485. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for the application of such title to State and Federal employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6486. A bill to improve law enforcement in cities by making available funds to be used to increase police salaries and to add more police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6487. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6488. A bill to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unmarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNIS:

H.R. 6490. A bill making an appropriation to carry out the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 in Wayne County, Ind.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6491. A bill to require disclosure of the specifications of gasoline sold at retail; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6492. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$500 in all cases the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 6493. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by the Wholesome Meat Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase (by providing an additional \$600 exemption) the personal income tax exemptions allowable with respect to certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LENNON, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. PELLY, Mr. KEITH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. CLARK, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FREY, and Mr. FEIGHAN):

H.R. 6495. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, for the purpose of controlling oil pollution from vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 6496. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6497. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron, and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 6498. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYLLIE:

H.R. 6499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the installation of industrial air and water pollution control facilities by providing for a 60-month amortization of the cost of such facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6500. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 6501. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KATHE, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 6502. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DIGGS, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 6503. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 6504. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 6505. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6506. A bill to clarify the application of section 1073 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6507. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain awards in recognition of outstanding achievement in the field of sports shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. McFALL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. SISK, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. REES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 6508. A bill to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, landslides, and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself and Mr. HANNA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, and BOB WILSON):

H.R. 6509. A bill to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, landslides, and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 6512. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residence to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6513. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act or to child's, widow's, or widower's insurance benefits on the basis of disability under section 202 of such act, and individuals in the corresponding categories under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 6514. A bill to amend section 404(a) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain contributions to plans benefiting self-employed individuals made after the close of the taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid during such year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 6515. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6516. A bill to include prepared or preserved beef and veal within the quotas imposed on the importation of certain other meat and meat products; to reduce the per-

centage applied to certain aggregate quantity estimations used, in part, to determine such quotas from 110 to 100 per centum; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH (for himself, Mr. ELLBERG, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 6518. A bill to provide that household appliances be conspicuously marked to show the foreign country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 6519. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in or about the construction of the Panama Canal", approved May 19, 1944, as amended, so as to provide benefits for certain persons not now covered by such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6520. A bill to give the President authority to alleviate or to remove the threat to navigation, safety, marine resources, or the coastal economy posed by certain releases of fluids or other substances carried in ocean-going vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 6521. A bill to increase from \$55 to \$80 the amount of the minimum primary benefit payable under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 6522. A bill to assist the States in raising revenues by making more uniform the incidence and rate of tax imposed by States on the severance of minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.R. 6523. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6524. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 6525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to indemnify farmers whose hay is contaminated with residues of economic poisons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6526. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6527. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6528. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide minimum annuities for employee annuitants and spouse survivor annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 6529. A bill to change the fiscal year

of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 6530. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6531. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation for the Social Sciences in order to promote research, education, training, and scholarship in such sciences; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6532. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 6533. A bill to amend Public Law 90-206, relative to the effective date of recommendations submitted to the Congress pursuant to the report of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6534. A bill to amend section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 to extend to 180 days the period of time in which the Congress has the opportunity to take action on the recommendations of the President under such section with respect to Federal executive, legislative, and judicial salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REID of New York (for himself and Mr. BRADEMAs):

H.R. 6535. A bill to remove financial barriers so that all high school graduates will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6536. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide increased support for medical education; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6537. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6538. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 additional year the authorization of project grants for rat control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 6540. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 6541. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6542. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. FREYER of North Carolina):

H.R. 6543. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. WATSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 6544. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6545. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6546. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6547. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for school assistance in federally affected areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6548. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 6549. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6550. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to \$1,000 for 1969 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6551. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6552. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 6553. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 6554. A bill to establish a Federal oil shale development program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 6555. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. VAN DERLIN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 6556. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prevent pollution of water by oil, and to establish a revolving fund for the removal of oil discharged into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 6557. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers and single persons who have attained age 30 and maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 6559. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction or rehabilitation of housing facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6560. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to provide grants for costs of initiating services in community mental retardation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6561. A bill to amend title XIV (and title XVI) of the Social Security Act to permit aid to the permanently and totally disabled to be paid, under approved State plans with Federal matching, to individuals in institutions for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 6562. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to beer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6563. A bill to change the definition of "ammunition" for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 6564. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 6565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for expenses incurred in providing education and training for mentally retarded or physically handicapped children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.J. Res. 415. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 416. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.J. Res. 418. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 419. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 420. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for

men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.J. Res. 422. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 423. Joint resolution to establish a commission to conduct a full and complete investigation of the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 424. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 425. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 426. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 428. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 429. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.J. Res. 430. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of presidential and vice-presidential electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Bible readings and the voluntary recitation of the Lord's Prayer and other nonsectarian prayers in public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H. Con Res. 134. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 223. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives concerning a means toward achieving a stable and durable peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. Res. 224. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the commitment of U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 225. Resolution making it the sense of the House of Representatives that the secret trial and public execution of Iraqi citizens be condemned and requesting the President of the United States to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request a special meeting of the United Nations Security Council to seek ways and means of

preserving the human rights of the people of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BOLAND and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 226. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the restoration of human rights in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ELLBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H. Res. 227. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the restoration of human rights in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Res. 228. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. COWGER):

H. Res. 229. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHRIVER (for himself, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, and Mr. MCKNEALLY):

H. Res. 230. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD (for himself, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PELLY, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. SCHWENDEL):

H. Res. 231. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WINN, Mr. ZWACHE, and Mr. CAHILL):

H. Res. 232. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to establishing an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PREYER of North Carolina):

H. Res. 233. Resolution to amend Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide additional procedures with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before committees of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H. Res. 234. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 235. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H. Res. 236. Resolution providing that the House of Representatives endorses efforts of the President of the United States to begin preparation for an all-volunteer military force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6566. A bill for the relief of Jesusa Bacalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 6567. A bill for the relief of Mie Matsushima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 6568. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Asuncion Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6569. A bill for the relief of Corazon Paca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6570. A bill for the relief of Clothilde Margarita Cordero-Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 6571. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6572. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scirtino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6573. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Turco, Calogera Gennaro Turco, and Giovanna Turco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 6574. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Sirus Amiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6575. A bill for the relief of Miss Elma H. Ashton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6576. A bill to authorize the transfer of two vessels to the Harry Lundberg School of Seamanship for nontransportation use in the training of merchant marine personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 6577. A bill for the relief of Herbert W. Lindsay and Marie Lindsay; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6578. A bill for the relief of James R. Dickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6579. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw Juchniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 6580. A bill for the relief of Maria D. Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 6581. A bill for the relief of Bernard A. Hegemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6582. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bunomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 6583. A bill for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6585. A bill for the relief of Mr. and

Mrs. A. F. Elgin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6586. A bill for the relief of Louise Adda Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 6587. A bill for the relief of Constantino R. Cabunoc and Purificacion T. Cabunoc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6588. A bill for the relief of Salvio P. Cerrada and Constanca A. Cerrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6589. A bill for the relief of Gotel and Ester Blachar and son Alejandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6590. A bill for the relief of Alfio Quaccci, his wife Antonia, and their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Licitra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 6592. A bill for the relief of Neil Bernard Poole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 6593. A bill for the relief of Martha Pilworn Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 6594. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6595. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pin-Yang Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6596. A bill for the relief of Li Chik Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 6597. A bill for the relief of Gallia Frid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cardone Via Orotoza Praino and her children, Salvatore, Michele, and Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6599. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paraskevi Giouroukos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6600. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Mallaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Czeslawa Niewiarowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6602. A bill for the relief of Benjamin, Esperanza, and Rowell Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 6603. A bill for the relief of Harvey Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6604. A bill for the relief of Elena C. Vda. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 6605. A bill to allow the Sierra Club to retain its status as a tax-exempt organization until its right to this status has been adjudicated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6606. A bill for the relief of Antonino Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6607. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp. 4 Klaus Josef Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.