United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, February 24, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Rudolf Troost, Estonian Lutheran Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, on this 51st Estonian Independence Day we pray for the return of freedom and independence to long suffering Estonia. Save us and other countries from the evil teachings and doings of communism.

Make us thankful nations, knowing that "if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8: 36) and let the wicked know "that his day is coming" (Psalm 37: 13).

Show us light to fight the forces of darkness, teach us to speak softly, but make strong our hand.

Help us to share our blessings with other countries, who are starving for food—or for freedom.

Bless our President, our Speaker, and Members of this House and help them to protect us from our enemies, who conspire day and night to bury us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 20, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

THE PRAYER OF THE REVEREND RUDOLF TROOST

(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, it is a great honor for me to have one of my constituents deliver the opening prayer today. The Reverend Rudolf Troost of the Estonian Lutheran Church of Silver Spring, Md., has honored us with his prayer in commemoration of the 51st anniversary of Estonian independence, which he and his people celebrate this day.

The Estonian struggle stands as a stirring example of efforts to secure and retain peace against Soviet oppression. After the outbreak of the Second World War, Estonia and the other Baltic States, Latvia and Lithuania, became victims of the conspiracy of the totalitarian powers of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. The final outcome of this conspiracy was the forcible incorporation of these countries into the U.S.S.R. The Soviet assault in 1940 against its Baltic neighbors marked the first step westward in the ruthless march against Europe.

Mr. Troost, whose presence here today we acknowledge, has not himself been a stranger to this Soviet and Nazi aggression. He was captive in a Nazi prison camp for some 40 days at which time he was able to make his escape. That he is here today espousing the cause of the Estonian people attests to the irrepressibility of the longing for peace where there is no peace. Americans view with sad regret the fact that people anywhere must still endure such a longing.

Thus, in response to the celebration of the 51st anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, we honor the work of such churches as the Estonian Lutheran Church and her minister for their endless efforts in the cause of peace, we gravely acknowledge those absences of independence and peace in too many countries in the world, and we resolutely renew our pledge as a nation and the Congress of continued efforts toward the universal goal of peace for all men.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year, over 400,000 school students participated in the contest.

I feel that the area of eastern Kentucky, which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, has been greatly honored and distinguished by the outstanding ability of a young man from Ashland, Ky., who delivered the winning speech from our State.

The young man, Mr. Thomas M. Hall, resides at 2409 Central Parkway, Ashland, Ky.

At this point in the RECORD, I include his winning speech.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

The nation in which we live is founded on freedom. The privileges of the democracy we enjoy are unknown to most of the world's people. How dearly those people must love freedom! How they must wish that there were something they could do to promote freedom for themselves and their children.

Yet, there is a time when even a free nation imposes certain responsibilities upon its citizens. I speak not of obeying the laws and paying taxes. The duties I would call to your attention are not to be found in any lawbook or in any moral code.

The challenge of freedom is in the safeguarding of that freedom. Thousands of young soldiers have met that challenge with their death. All the great legislation handed down to us by Congress in the nearly two hundred years of our nation's existence, was formulated by men who wanted to do a little more than was required of them to promote freedom.

But anyone can tell you that soldiers and statesmen alone have not made America great. But rather it is the great number of individual, responsible citizens who find it their duty to do all they can to promote freedom. They confess, though not in the literal sense, that there is no greater honor than to work for the same cause as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, MacArthur and Kennedy. They serve in a more, basic, more fundamental way, but their deeds are no less important.

They take it upon themselves to get the best possible education and to keep themselves well informed. With this knowledge as a basis for action, they then vote in every election, they participate in civic functions, and they try to instill in their sons and daughters the same high ideals. They are the ones who truly guide our nation's destiny. For they are the ones who petition, who write to their congressmen, and who stand firm for their beliefs.

Freedom's challenge, then, is one of participation. All of us, you and I, hold the hope for the freedom of our posterity; our very sons and daughters.

Now, rioting, sit-ins, and flag-burning have all been called protest, have all been called participation. But the thinking person realizes that democracy has left other doors open to him. He knows that far more has been accomplished by men sitting down together to honestly discuss their differences than has been accomplished in any riot.

We must also be aware that apathy and a lack of desire to meet the challenge of freedom is also dangerous. "Home of the free" does not mean "Home of the carefree". Where would we be today? What freedoms, if any, would we enjoy had it not been for those great men, famous and unknown, who in the past have met freedom's challenge?

Constantly striving for a better nation. Educating and informing oneself. Working overtime through responsible words and deeds to preserve freedom for ourselves and our children. This, indeed, is freedom's challenge.

THOMAS M. HALL.

PROGRESS UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker—

I think the difference in my community

between riot and disruption has been Title I money. I think it has saved us from this.

This is one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, in which the superintendent of schools for St. Louis, Mo., Dr. William Kottmeyer, evaluated the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in his testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor. Superintendent Kottmeyer further stated that full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act "might well make the difference between conflagration in my community and not."

When asked if ESEA were fully funded could the St. Louis school system spend additional money effectively and efficiently Dr. Kottmeyer responded:

I could think of no more effective way to spend money.

Dr. Edward Palmason, a member of the school board for Seattle, Wash., evaluated ESEA, particularly title I, in much the same way as Dr. Kottmeyer. He said:

I can tell you this: the crisis in our cities is much less than it would have been if you had not given us Title I funds. I don't know what we would have done without them.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has conducted 13 days of hearings on H.R. 514, a bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for 5 years. Last week I had an opportunity to review and study the testimony presented during the first 9 days of hearings. I would like to share with my colleagues today certain observations which are overwhelmingly supported by the testimony we received in this 9-day period. The hearing record establishes without doubt that programs carried on under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been most effective in improving the quality of elementary and secondary education. Testimony reviewed is in unanimous support of H.R. 514 which proposes a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Further the testimony checked supports what I reported to be the view of school superintendents across the Nation—that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is grossly underfunded—not only in terms of the disparity between appropriations and authorizations but more importantly in terms of the disparity between the amount of money available and the enormity of the job to be accomplished. It is abundantly clear from the testimony presented to the committee during the first days that local school officials—those implementing programs in the community—are enthusiastic about the progress which has been made; that they are in support of a continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act but that they are deeply concerned about the inadequacy of the level of financing for these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues some of the statements presented in our hearings which have led me to these conclusions. With respect to the effectiveness of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the superintendent of Boston public schools, Dr. William H. Ohrenberger, states:

Title I has enabled Boston to establish a comprehensive enrichment program that provides vitally needed educational services a day school, after school, and summer school basis for some 20,000 disadvantaged pupils. It has also enabled Boston to pioneer a model demonstration sub-system program of innovative education for some 900 pre-kindergarten—Grade 12 pupils in the heart of the inner city. Finally, Title I is funding a work-study program which provides a combination of schooling and work experience for some 320 boys and girls who are potential dropouts.

Although these programs are still in their infancy, improvement in reading achievement and academic performance has been noted. In addition, individual case studies and questionnaires to parents reveal increased enthusiasm for school activities on the part of both pupil and parent.

That federally sponsored programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been of great benefit to our schools cannot be denied. Without such assistance we would have been unable to extend and expand our enrichment program for disadvantaged children, or to initiate many experimental programs. I feel that these programs will have a far-reaching effect on the entire school system and will improve greatly the quality of education in Boston. However, the continuation of these educational programs hinges directly on sustained federal support.

Dr. Joseph Manch, superintendent of the Buffalo, N.Y., public schools commented:

I can now state that in Buffalo, and in New York State as a whole, ESEA Title I is effective. The evidence is far from complete, but it indicates that disadvantaged children are erasing that disadvantage. Here I would like to include in the record our Title I Evaluations and the New York State Title I Evaluation report for 1966–67.

In our largest single project, utilizing nearly $2.5 million of the $4.9 million Title I funds, 27,000 children, an average of over 1½ years retarded in reading and mathematics, were provided remedial assistance during or after the school day. It has been our experience that a 6 or 7 month gain over 10 months in such programs can be expected. These children averaged a gain at the rate of a full year.

In another program—a pre-kindergarten program cited as one of the State's ten best ESEA projects and cited further by the Office of Education in Profiles in Quality Education—I think you may have seen this report and this program is cited on page 1. Preschool boys and girls in the target area were exposed to a wide range of educationally and culturally stimulating experiences. A pre- and post-test measurement showed a gain of 8 and 9 points in intelligence quotient.

With respect to the effectiveness of ESEA in Philadelphia Dr. Mark R. Shedd, superintendent of schools, added:

Other impacts of course do occur systemwide. At the Sayre Junior High School in Philadelphia, for instance, the principal and staff, urged on by a community weary of watching its children progress from grade school to high school without learning how to read, established a basic skills center last year, using Title I funds. In one year the center served some 200 youngsters with severely retarded reading levels, and in one semester the average pupil enrolled in this program improved almost three levels in reading as measured by standard achievement tests. . . .

In North Philadelphia, to cite another illustration, the combination of a dynamic principal and modest increment of Title I funds for curriculum and staff development has completely turned around Simon Gratz High School. Only three years ago Gratz was widely regarded, and justifiably so I believe, as the worst school in the city. Three years ago only 13 students from a graduating class of 600 went from Gratz to college. The dropout rate at the school was in excess of 40 percent. Rate of attendance was the lowest in the whole city.

Last year, 168 Gratz graduates went to college—an improvement of 1300 percent. The dropout rate has been halved. Teachers are vying for transfer assignments in rather than out, and virtually all 4,000 students are wearing large "Gratz is Great" buttons in their lapel.

Dr. E. C. Stimbert, superintendent of schools in Memphis, evaluated the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as follows:

We are rather proud of the fact that we can handle a dollar as well as anyone else can. I am referring to the staff. I am referring to the kind of accountability we have on all tax moneys. I would say without fear of successful contradiction, as the saying goes, that these funds are the kind of funds that we are getting tremendous returns from. As far as accountability for the dollars is concerned, yes; but in terms of what is happening to the boys and girls because of these programs, I think this is kind of a new age in education . . .

Speaking of specific projects in his evaluation, Dr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of the Cleveland public schools system said:

There has been a significant consistent gain in reading skill among pupils in our reading improvement projects: boys particularly have shown strong improvement. One good example here is that during the past two years the number of books taken home by children from our libraries has increased, in our target area schools, by over 60 percent. In fact, last year the children in the inner city of Cleveland took home over 1,300,000 volumes out of our library. This is great.

Children who have participated in our pre-kindergarten project have performed in kindergarten and first grade well beyond the rates comparable of children without such services. Head Start is working.

In a special project for seriously intellectually underdeveloped though not mentally retarded children between 5 and 8, there was an increase in IQ of from 5 to 19 points for one-third of the children participating.

Children in remedial mathematics groups have shown significant gain as compared to similar children not receiving such special attention. We now have a group of 30-odd mathematicians, specialists in the elementary schools, that move in the areas where we have our greatest problems and work especially with those children.

At the senior high school level, schools receiving Title I services experienced at 10 percent decrease in the dropout rate last school year, as compared to the preceding year.

One of our most impressive results has been achieved in our job development project where nine out of every ten participants secured full-time employment in Cleveland business and industry. We have over 100 businesses who have opened their doors to the Cleveland inner city high school graduates. We followed this group one year after their placement to see what had happened to them. In 90 percent of those placed, one year later they were still on the job and half of those placed on jobs had received promotions.

With regard to long range benefits, Dr. Briggs added:

Another significant long-range benefit that Title I has brought to the schools of Cleveland is an emerging new staffing pattern

through which the competencies of more people at various levels of training are being utilized. This includes teacher aides, assistant teachers, tutors, parent educators. By the way, we have 3,500 volunteers working in the Cleveland schools without pay: home-school liaison aides, technicians and other expanding classifications. In other words, a true community team to try to improve the quality of education for our children. In these roles, many inner-city residents, including parents, are entering a new relationship and involvement in education. This is good for children and good for their parents.

Mr. John Wagner, a member of the school board for South Bend, Ind., commented:

I think probably the highlights of the prepared statement might be of interest to other people in attendance. To give you a rough idea of the size of our school corporation, we have something over 37,000 students. There are 41 elementary and eight high schools in the public school system, and there are eight elementary schools and two secondary schools in private education in our community.

Under Title I of the Act, we have involved 13 public schools and eight private schools in the Title I program. Our evaluation of the program, has been that it probably should be classified as one of the most important and inspiring programs that has been added to our educational system in many years.

Mr. G. Warren Phillips, superintendent of schools for Valparaiso, Ind., and chairman of the Federal Policy and Legislation Committee of the American Association of School Administrators indicated their title I program has been evaluated in a number of ways:

We have evidence shown by tests, by student behavior and by the judgment of teachers that we are making significant progress. This is a good program. As we have acquired staff that is skillful, the program has become stronger.

Mrs. G. Theodore Mitau, vice chairman of the board of education for the independent School District No. 625, St. Paul, Minn., in her evaluation, said:

Never in the history of American education have programs been introduced that have had a more dramatic impact upon the quality of educational offerings in the cities of the United States than those introduced under ESEA. The professional staff judgments, community reactions, and pupils' performances all testify to their effectiveness.

In St. Paul, the ESEA and kindred laws have made possible a broad range of new and exemplary educational programs. Of particular significance today are those programs that provide direct benefits under Title I of ESEA to children suffering from poverty and other forms of educational disadvantage. For children whose worlds are only a few blocks wide, we can offer extensive field trip programs, enriched elementary library services, and an educational horizon that puts fewer limits on what children may dream of becoming.

There is not time to tell of the 400 children from the very poor who, because of Title I money, had their first dental examinations. (We bought a Hi-Speed dental unit for Jackson School. We need ten more like it.) Nor to tell of the work of our Parent Consultant, who serves as a special kind of person to parents having handicapped children so that benefits carry over and build home-school relationships into the family unit. Nor to tell of our consultant in the area of inter-racial activity, who works to establish community rapport with the disadvantaged or minority groups resulting in a climate of mutual trust and improved channels for two-way communication."

Another school board member, Mrs. Margaret Nielsen of West Bend, Wis., said:

Federal funds allocated to our local district have been an extremely important stimulant in the overall updating of our program. The funds from ESEA enable us to accelerate and improve our program to the point where we are years ahead of where we would be if we were to rely on only local tax monies. The total money supplied has provided a stimulant for growth and focused our attention on the need to solve programs which had been present for many years.

Mrs. Nielsen's high evaluation of title I can perhaps best be understood in the context of her response to the question:

Suppose the Congress, through some miracle, should decide to double the amount of money in education so that you would receive twice as much, or another $28,000, do you think that ought to come in Title I or be spread amongst some of the other Titles as well. Or should we give it to you in something akin to general aid?

She answered:

I personally feel that it should come in Title I. I think it has provided a tremendous impetus in our school district in solving some problems which we are solving very nicely.

During these first 9 days of testimony there has been discussion about the validity of those few reports which have been critical of title I, such as the Tempo report. Speaking specifically about that report, Mrs. Frances Carnochan, chairman of the Legislative Commission of the NEA, an organization representing some 2 million teachers, said:

We are aware of the so-called Tempo report which the public press has, perhaps unwittingly, blown out of all proportion to its "findings." This report is based on evaluation of programs in eleven school districts out of 16,000 school districts with Title I programs, and 35,000 children in 132 schools in these districts, out of some nine million eligible Title I pupils. It is in our opinion virtually worthless.

Speaking of his title I programs in Cleveland, Superintendent Briggs also disagreed with the critics. He said:

I am in total disagreement with the critics, particularly as it applies to Cleveland. When I see our schools open in the summer, when I see swimming pools, neighborhood swimming pools that we put into the inner city, 22 of them last year and thousands of children lined up every day using them, when I see children in 40 preschool centers now operated under Title I, 40 preschool centers in Cleveland with their mothers in there nearly every day, or at least every week their mothers are in, when teachers tell me that children are coming into kindergarten and first grade better prepared, when I see the dropout rate in the five inner city high schools drop ten percent, I cannot help but feel that the critics are wrong. I know very well they are wrong. It does not make as much news though.

Much of the discussion in the hearings in this period has centered on title I. Too frequently I am concerned that we fail to recognize the significances of and the contributions being made by title II of the act which provides support for library materials and textbooks. The following statements confirm my impression that this title also has made a valuable contribution in improving elementary and secondary education.

Miss Cora Bomar, director, division of educational media, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, in Raleigh, commented as follows:

Some comments from the teachers at the Morehead Elementary School in Durham, North Carolina concerning their demonstration school library project indicate the impact of a demonstration school library project. One teacher said "indispensable." Another teacher said "It has provided me with varied materials so that I might reach all children in at least some aspect of learning." Another teacher said "it allows more individual and group work because head sets, tape recorders and film strip projectors are available. NDEA Title III funds provided the hardware for this project, whereas ESEA Title II provided the software."

Another quotation from a teacher: "The increased materials provided information and ideas that strengthened all of our classroom activities." And the final quotation—and the one that I think is very important—one teacher said "The students have been stimulated to investigate more subjects."

* * * * *

I could go on at length sharing with you the impact of ESEA Title II programs in North Carolina and in other States. I have many examples here on the table before me. However, at this time, I will simply state that Title II is a program essential to the improvement of educational opportunities of all of our children. The full potential of the program has not been attained because of the limitation of actual appropriations. We therefore recommend that appropriations be up to the level of current authorization. Because of drastic reductions in appropriations this fiscal year and the recommended appropriations in the 1970 budget, many Title II programs initiated the first three years of the Act will be drastically curtailed. The second recommendation: Advanced funding be implemented as soon as possible. Congress is to be commended for authorizing this advanced funding last session.

New York City has been a leader in the school library field. We have a great number of very fine librarians and many teachers and principals who are dedicated to the concept of enriched learning through a variety of resources. Title II has helped to provide these resources. I strongly urge its continuance, its full funding and its expansion.

Miss Frances Hatfield, supervisor of instructional materials, board of public instruction, Broward County, Fla., said:

I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss some of the phases of Title II which I see from my vantage point as a supervisor of the library program in a large school system which serves 110,000 children in 103 schools . . .

On behalf of the American Library Association and especially of the over 12,000 members of the American Association of School Librarians, I wish to thank this committee and the Congress for its interest in providing legislation which has such beneficial effects.

I strongly urge passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, and full appropriations in order to assure a continuing effort to achieve quality education for all boys and girls in the schools of the United States.

That the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been effective in improving and expanding the availability and quality of instruction for migrant

children was attested to by Austin H. Armitstead, chairman, National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children:

Today we would like to confine our remarks largely to the effect of the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89–10). Before making these comments we would like to say that they are based on staff observation of dozens of classrooms in a number of states, staff participation in teacher training programs, the reading of state education agency program reports and consultation with numerous program staff at the local and state levels.

There is no doubt that the funds which have been available under the ESEA Migrant Amendment—up to $45 million in the current fiscal year—have made a difference in the status of migrant children's education. Although it might have been presumed that Title I funds, which were intended to provide for all disadvantaged children including migrants, would indeed, without a special program for migrants, provide increased educational opportunity, they did not make any substantial change in its first year of operation. We found in a survey of 1966 programs that only 11 states could report any use whatsoever of Title I funds for migrant children. And even in most of these 11 instances, aid was not of any substantial or special form. This is a sharp contrast to the 44 states who participated in the Migrant Amendment program in 1967 and 1968. This would seem to indicate very strongly that states had little interest in educating migrant children until earmarked funds were made possible for that purpose alone.

Mr. Speaker, do local school officials support a 5-year extension of ESEA? The answer to this is a resounding "Yes."

The deputy superintendent of schools for Los Angeles, Graham Sullivan, said:

First, may I say to you that we support fully the extension of ESEA for a period of five years.

Without question, ESEA as well conceived, was carefully planned, provided broad coverage through its various titles. Its authorization is flexible enough to permit states and local districts to use funds provided by the legislation to attack most of the major problems. I think one of the interesting things about ESEA and the real important things about ESEA is the fact that the various titles each make their own contribution to programs that will improve and strengthen education, and yet there is a linkage from one program to another.

Superintendent Shedd, of Philadelphia, added:

My message is really quite simple. To fail to extend H.R. 514 at this time will be calamitous. To fail to provide a substantially increased level of funding soon will be unfortunate. ESEA funds have become an essential part of our program in the school district of Philadelphia, and for two basic reasons.

The first lies simply in the nature of the programs we have been able to mount and will be able to continue only with Federal funds. They are essential programs.

The second is that ESEA funds constitute for us, and I believe for most of the big cities, the critical increment—the change dollars necessary to overcome institutional inertia and produce institutional change.

I believe we are at a critical juncture in Federal involvement in the funding of public education precisely because we are at a point where the clear gains realized through ESEA will either be consolidated and expanded, or they will wither away. It is the simple facts of life that the extension of ESEA at the mere level of appropriation recommended for the fiscal year 1970 will simply permit the withering to begin. High expectations in the community, as well as among educators, will turn to frustration—and that is a most volatile kind of alchemy.

Dr. Gary N. Pottorff, vice president, board of education, Wichita, Kans., added:

I think probably in our case the original plan drawn up for the benefit of the local citizens, community action programs, parochial and public schools, to determine where the need was the greatest. I don't think the need has changed from the five years of the present bill. I think perhaps the extension of the title I funds would be of the greatest importance to us.

Superintendent Ohrenberger of Boston, like Dr. Shedd and virtually everyone, recommended not only extension but also full funding of ESEA, particularly title I.

Dr. Ohrenberger stated:

I earnestly request that Congress not only extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for five years, but also that it increase substantially the funding thereof. At present, federal funding under Title I is not adequate to meet the needs of all children for whom the legislation was designed. The present programs serve approximately one-half of the disadvantaged children in Boston.

Superintendent Donovan, of New York City, spoke of title I as follows:

On Title I, I might tell you that this Title in our city has served a particularly important purpose. I hope that Title I continues to be funded fully in the future and I hope that Title I remains categorized because I do believe that only through that way can we devote it to this particular purpose.

He added:

I think unless you continue to fund this and fund it with even greater funds than you have up to now, the big cities of this country—and my city in particular—are going to be in a terrible situation in their public schools. Our city and our State are finding difficulty in funding, the city because of constitutional limitations and the State for other reasons in its funding. This has come to us as a particular help in the most critical area we have, which is the growing number of disadvantaged children in the cities. I would like it to continue to be categorical aid until such time in the future as perhaps the Federal Government can so fund education that we wouldn't have to worry about categories. I don't see that time right now. I want it devoted to the critical areas of our city where it is going now. If you cut it off, sir—and I do not mean you but if this Congress should cut this off, I really don't know where we would turn.

Mr. John Wagner, South Bend Community School Corp., South Bend, Ind., said:

I think it is very important that the Title I program be expanded because at least in our own situation the results that have been obtained with the limited funds indicate a much greater potential if adequate moneys were provided, because we have been limited by some of the reductions and the increase in costs are forcing us to cut the programs. We have had to drop several people from the staff that we would like to continue. As these people are dropped the program cannot help but become less effective. I think it is a worthwhile program and should be financed to the maximum.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is not one Member of this body who is not aware of the problems brought about by our failure to adequately finance our education programs. In the face of increasing costs, it is clearly not enough even if we keep the programs at a constant level.

Mrs. G. Theodore Mitau, vice chairman of the board of education for the Independent School Dictrict No. 625, St. Paul, Minn., advised us of what happened in St. Paul because of inadequate financing. She stated:

We desperately need the Title I funds to continue and expand this most important endeavor. One of our most successful Title I programs was a tuition-free summer school serving 3,500 students. Our school funding does not allow for summer school expenses. Therefore, we have to charge tuition fees to make the program self-supporting. This fact serves to eliminate those very students that need the most help. Title I funds for a time served this program. Our 1966 summer school for deprived students was immensely successful. These students didn't become street roamers. Many have returned to our regular classes by making up deficiencies. Certainly the presence in summer school of large numbers of Negro youths helps to defuse difficult summer confrontations. These young students, disillusioned, alienated, frustrated, comprise the social dynamite which has been so well described by Dr. Conant. This summer school program was eliminated because of the cuts in the Title I allotments during the past year. It needs to be restored. We also had to eliminate a fine program known as the Remediation Center, the Curriculum Centers and in-service training for teachers because of the cuts made in fiscal year 1969.

In Trenton, N.J., the problem was similar. Mr. David Tankel, director, ESEA title I, Trenton public schools, said:

For example, in the next school year we must release one-half of our teacher aides because of a smaller 1969–70 allocation. I repeat, it is unrealistic to expect local boards of education to pick up the programs that are dropped. They just do not have the wherewithal to consider this step.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to clarify one very important point—the testimony before the committee is not without a sense of priority. All of us realize that much has to be done—and that at this point in time, there are limited resources. Local officials appearing before the committee are very well aware of this. Let me share with you some of their notions of priority.

Deputy Superintendent Sullivan, of Los Angeles, said:

As far as I am concerned, our most critical task right now is strengthening the education program in the disadvantaged areas before anything else.

He was asked:

Is that your No. 1 priority?

He responded:

That is my No. 1 priority?

Our panel of school board members indicated that indeed full funding of title I has the highest priority.

Mr. Hazen Schumacher, board member and past president, board of education, Ann Arbor public schools, said:

I think all of us have stated in one way or another that we feel this is probably the highest priority; yes, sir. That is the way I feel.

Mrs. Nielson, of West Bend said:

I would agree that the highest priority would be to fully fund Title I.

Mr. R. Winfield Smith, president, National School Boards Association, and director, upper Perkiomen board of school directors, added:

Surely we all agree with that.

Dr. Kottmeyer of St. Louis was asked:

If Congress would fully fund the authorization for Title I, so that you could obtain your full entitlement of $8 million, are you presently in a position to wisely expend $8 million?

Dr. Kottmeyer responded:

Sir, as we are spending 70 percent of that money at the point that I indicated to you before, we would simply continue to expand this program again and again and again, and I think would be the wisest way and would be a salutary lift to the school program in our city.

He was asked:

Would you place the priority on programs for disadvantaged youngsters before we go to general aid?

Dr. Kottmeyer answered: "Yes."
He was asked "Why?"
And he responded:

Because we all at least give lip service to equality of educational opportunity and equality of educational opportunity obviously does not exist.

I think we should strive to do that and achieve that first.

In our discussion of priorities I should mention that quite clearly the testimony during the first 9 days of hearings places a higher priority on extension and full funding of ESEA than on general aid to education. Asked whether they were advocating general Federal aid to education before full funding of title I the members of our school board panel responded:

Mr. SMITH. I think what we are looking for is that on top of Title I.

Mrs. NIELSEN. I would agree.

Mrs. SPICER. Me, too.

Mr. WAGNER. I concur.

Mr. SCHUMACHER. Yes, I agree.

In a similar vein Dr. John Lumley, executive secretary, NEA Legislative Commission, and NEA assistant executive secretary for legislation and Federal relations, said:

As you know, our position is that general federal aid is needed in this country, but it is needed on top of these programs.

Mrs. Carnochan of the NEA, commented:

Mr. Chairman, the Commission has tossed this around many, many times at the legislative commission, and we concur that these programs must be continued because we are not just talking about the tangible things, we are talking about the many intangible things which are going through the mind of these youngsters and developing, and if this were dropped now it would be just one disaster on top of another disaster. The small challenge of the greater challenge which these youngsters have had would disappear and they would be disappointed once more. We cannot afford this as a nation and the Commission does concur wholeheartedly that we need this and then, on top of it, general aid to education.

Other associates on the NEA panel agreed with the statement that general aid is needed but must come on top of, not in lieu of, existing programs—and only after these are fully funded.

Mr. Tankel, of Trenton, said:

If we begin cutting out Title I programs, we have people back home in the rural areas, in the cities, who are going to be disappointed once again. We are just going to be building up a constant series of frustration with all of the inevitable problems that follow these frustrations. You are absolutely right.

Mr. William Raymond, director, ESEA title II, Tempe Elementary School District, Tempe, Ariz., added:

I agree exactly. As I stated before, I think you create a lot of dissatisfaction, frustration and psychological damage in a community where you have initiated programs and then you cut back. Parents see their children in these programs and they see progress being made, and then when they are stopped they wonder why. So I wholeheartedly agree I feel, that general aid should be on top of these programs.

The following statement made by Dr. Joseph Manch, of Buffalo, N.Y., is a further illustration of this point of view:

The first point refers to the issue of general aid versus categorical aid, and I notice there some members of the committee very much interested in that. While public education continues to be fundamentally a local problem, it is a national concern. It is in the national interest that we do at least two things: upgrade the whole level of education and at the same time, narrow the wide range of educational opportunity which now exists in the schools of this nation. But in attempting to work in behalf of this nation's general interest, we must allocate our financial resources in the most efficient, effective manner possible. Categorical aid, as reflected in Title I projects, meets this test.

The point is—as I said to the Senate counterpart of this committee 18 months ago—if we have limited Federal funds available for equalizing educational opportunity, the greatest attention should be paid to the most glaring deficiency—the problem of educational deprivation which works to disequalize educational opportunity, particularly in the large cities. This is where we must develop a sharper focus.

In a series of responses Dr. Edward Palmson, of Seattle, made the following observations:

The only other objection I would have is that militant teacher groups would try to negotiate grants for higher salaries.

* * * * *

If you gave us a grant of $100 per child, for example, for a school year, the teachers would want the whole hundred dollars. With the negotiation law that we have in the State of Washington, if we didn't grant them the increase that they asked for, they would impose sanction or go on strike.

* * * * *

We would spend in on basic programs, buying books and planning curricula and things we need.

* * * * *

This is just manna from heaven, if it is categorized that they cannot get their hands on it.

* * * * *

The big advantage of the Title I funds is that we can use them for food, hungry children, or their health needs, use for some of the bare educational factors. This is the point I am making. The money can be used for disadvantaged poverty-stricken children.

True, we have to have teachers to teach these children, but at least we can funnel some of the funds into these other areas.

Dr. Bernard Donovan, of New York City, adds:

What I am concerned about is that when we get block grants that go into general funding, that general funding then becomes approachable by all. For example, in my city I wouldn't want that fund to disappear in collective bargaining instead of going to disadvantaged pupils—and it very well could.

As Dr. Donovan's response indicates there is again confusion about the meaning of the proposed "block grant" approach to providing aid to elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure my colleagues expected there has been considerable discussion about the so-called block grant approach in the initial days of our hearings. Yes, there has been not only considerable discussion about but also considerable opposition to such an approach.

The following will illustrate my point:

Mr. William Raymond, Tempe Elementary School District, Tempe, Ariz.:

Regarding block funding, I at this point in time believe I would be opposed to it.

Dr. Graham Sullivan, deputy superintendent of instruction, Los Angeles City Schools:

Well, as I indicated in my prepared testimony, we have great concern about a block grant approach that does not provide and assure adequate funds going to the big cities. I would say, as far as we are concerned in Los Angeles now, we certainly would prefer it as it is rather than moving in the other direction.

Mr. David Tankel, Trenton Public Schools:

I believe I understand the point, Mr. Chairman, I personally, and I am not speaking for NEA, would be against block funding. If I dare in these august halls to mention the word, I am afraid we would be opening up a keg of worms in the political situation what would be very, very hard to control.

I think that vested interests within the states would very often tend to push the money to needs that they see rather than to using them in the manner that they are not being used. I would be opposed to block grants.

Dr. Mark Shedd, of Philadelphia, commented:

At the time when you get the categorical aid program funded at full level of authorization and beyond, if it were up to me, then I would be willing to take a look at block grants, but under the present circumstances, I think it would be a calamity to go to the block grant concept.

Dr. Ohrenberger, of Boston, added:

I prefer the present program, Mr. Chairman. I perhaps could illustrate that by indicating that if a block grant approach were made to my particular state, I am afraid that the real problem of the urban community is not felt statewide.

Under categorical aid specific amounts are allocated to me to perform functions and programs that I have dreamed of for many years in the area of the disadvantaged, which is Title I. We have inaugurated a program on our own in one district. There were still 12 districts without this service. This is what categorical aid did for us.

If this were a block-grant type, I am afraid that perhaps other priorities would have gobbled these funds up, particularly with reference to teachers' salaries. I favor the categorical aid and I would also hesitate or I

would be inaccurate by say if block grant came to us I would take it over and above.

* * * * *

In other words, we have to attach priorities on it. The block-grant system, in my opinion, perhaps might be dissipated in areas other than those spelled out so completely in Titles I, II and III. I do lean very, very heavily and favorably on the categorical aid.

Dr. Donovan, of New York City, said:

Well, sir, I have testified on this many times. I am still of the same belief. I happen to be a city superintendent in what I consider to be a friendly State. By that I mean the State Commissioner of Education, the State Education Department are as aware of the city's needs as that department in any other State. However, despite that friendliness, I would prefer to see the funds be categorical and be specified for the large cities. There are too many pressures upon a State Education Department to divide large sums of money among all kinds of groups seeking it, all legitimately, too, but I think that the cities have a particular problem and while we get along very well with the State, I would not like to see any system come into effect which would deny the cities a direct fair share of the funds for their problems.

Dr. Paul Briggs of Cleveland stated:

I am fearful that much of it, a large portion of it will never get to the child of the city, the child of the ghetto, the child who is disadvantaged. You see, we have in most of our states a philosophy of distribution of money for schools based on the concept that the tax calculation of a school district determines its ability to provide services. We do not take into account the problems of the people of the school district. This is why in the City of Cleveland, with only 70 percent the total school population of the state when we have 30 percent of the relief children of the state, we have a problem that is way out of proportion to other school districts.

With the heaviest youth unemployment in the State of Ohio being in the inner city of Cleveland, we have a need for a kind of program there that is not found anyplace else in the State.

I think that under Title I the Federal Government found a kind of magic formula of going right to the heart of the thing and saying those who are poor are the ones that are going to be helped. We have been successful to a certain extent in the last legislature in our foundation program by getting the members of the legislature to put into our foundation formula what we call an ADC factor, which is based on this Title I principal, because we knew we could get a straight categorical grant from the legislature of so many dolairs per ADC child. This has helped us tremendously.

The legislature seems to be pleased too, but the complicated method of distributing state funds is such that you may be pretty sure, unless some guidelines are set up on your block grants, the money is not going to get to the children of the inner city.

Mr. Phillips, of Valparaiso, said:

This act was designed for a specific need confronting this nation. Goals have been established at the national, state and local level. The program is in being basically three years. Know-how is being developed. I think it is imperative that we follow through on this. I think it would be a tragedy if we were to start off in another direction and leave this, if I am in touch with your question.

Mr. Phillips was asked:

Do you feel that a block grant would take us completely off the path we are on?

He responded:

I have some difficulty in defining a block grant. If I knew specifically the meaning intended for block grants, I could make a better answer.

Frequently, when I raise questions I find that there are certain limitations or directions written into the intent of a block grant which brings it somewhat into the direction of what we call categorical aid.

I think the plea I would make is not to abandon this program. Basically, we would favor general aid, but not by the elimination of a program that is in being and which promises much. If you mean on top of this, my answer would be quite different than in place of it.

Members of the NEA panel commented:

Mr. Chairman, the NEA Legislative Commission again feels this would be wrong for the same reasons which I stated previously. We would ruin what we had done so far and we have no opportunity really to evaluate these programs when they had been under way for a sufficient length of time. So we would be against the block grant.

Mrs. Carnochan is chairman of the Legislative Commission of NEA.

Mrs. Carol Belt, art coordination, Trenton Public Schools, Trenton, N.J., made the following statement:

I concur with the statements of the other members and my director here. I approach him for our funding and I would go along with his statement. It would be a shame, I would say yes, it would be terrible so see our programs fail, the things we have started thus far. They should proceed and grow as they are doing or as we hope they will do. I would be against block funding.

NEA panelist Dr. John Lumley added:

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the NEA believes fundamentally in a general aid program to the states which they could use for public education, not only public but nonpublic children. But we believe that this has to be in addition to the Elementary-Secondary Education Act, and we certainly would not want any block grants in the ESEA.

Dr. E. C. Stimbert, of Memphis, said:

I felt this question would be asked again. I am not sure I have a firm answer about it for the reason as we define general, categorical, and block. I think perhaps we are doing what sometimes schoolmen have done by trying to improve education by changing the organization a little. I think if the dollars are available and if you take the remark I made a little while ago, that we have different regulations in different states, what might be an undesirable technique or procedure in one area might not be in another. I think, frankly, in the matter of ESEA, I would like to see it handled as it is right now without any change in the procedure. I do not know whether that is an answer to your question or not, but I am a little on the fence.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of these hearings I stated that it was my firm conviction that we must take care of first things first—that we should not go to block grants until we take care of our first priority—properly educating the disadvantaged by providing adequate funds.

Dr. Palmason of Seattle commented:

I agree.

Dr. Richard Ando, of Honolulu, added:

Hawaii agrees.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that American education agrees, and to the accomplishment of this basic goal shall we direct our efforts.

A FARM LEADER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the rural people of this Nation are always hit hardest in a period of high interest and tight credit. The major rural and farm organizations fully recognize this fact and they are among the most vehement opponents to the present Federal Reserve policies.

Mr. Fred Heinkel, of Columbia, Mo., president of the Midcontinent Farmers Association, and one of the Nation's best known and most respected farm leaders, spoke out against high interest rates in the February issue of Today's Farmer.

Mr. Speaker, this article calls attention to the fact that high interest rates add to the cost of every item in the economy and thereby fuel the fires of inflation.

I quote from Mr. Heinkel's article:

The irony of it is that this boost in the cost of borrowing money was presented as a move to control rising prices. It is supposed to slow inflation. *In my opinion it will do nothing of the kind.*

Interest is a cost. It is a direct one for many, an indirect one for all. There is no question that higher interest adds to costs.

Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of the text of Mr. Heinkel's article in the RECORD:

HIGH INTEREST RATES FEED THE FIRES OF INFLATION

(By F. V. Heinkel)

Costs are going up, up and up. Now one of the agencies which could do something about it has poured more fuel on the fires of inflation.

I'm talking about the Federal Reserve System. It has a responsibility toward national monetary policy Last month it raised the discount rate another quarter of a percent. This rate is reflected in the interest banks charge and has pushed the prime interest rate to seven percent.

The irony of it is that this boost in the cost of borrowing money was presented as a move to control rising prices. It is supposed to slow inflation. *In my opinion it will do nothing of the kind.*

Interest is a cost. It is a direct one for many, an indirect one for all. There is no question that higher interest adds to costs.

One clear example: Utility companies all over the country now are lined up before state regulatory agencies asking for rate increases. (There are 15 or more applications right now in Missouri.) For what reasons are the utilities seeking higher prices for their services? At the top of their list are two, both tied to increased interest. One, they maintain they're entitled to higher gas, power and telephone rates because interest is adding to their costs. Two, they feel they must have higher profits in order to attract new capital in the face of rising interest on other securities.

If higher interest raises prices then how is this supposed to control inflation?

The theory is that as interest rates are boosted then the demand for credit will subside, this will lessen the money supply and thus curtail demand and prices for goods and services.

Well, let's look closer at that.

Who will back off from credit because interest costs are up?

Will consumers desire less financing for autos, tv's and the like? Ridiculous! Interest charges on these loans already are much higher than seven per cent; they run three and four times that amount—as high as the

law will allow. That is what is tying up credit now. Small loan companies and banks are scrambling to write all of that kind of credit they can get hold of.

How about big businesses? Will they cut borrowing for expansion and inventories because the interest rate is up? Some may. But many large industries so control their selling prices they can pass on costs. Higher prices will be their reaction. Look at the example of the utilities.

What about farmers. They can't pass on the cost. But will they borrow less for fertilizer and seed? Will they feed their livestock less? Not if they want to remain in business. A farmer has no real choice. He can't afford to use less capital for these inputs essential to maximum efficiency.

Who, then, is going to use less credit bebecause interest rates are up? The answer is, nobody.

There is an approach the Federal Reserve governors could use which would effectively aid control of inflation. They have the authority to buy and sell government securities. By exercising it they can immediately and directly reduce the amount of money in circulation. This would ease pressure on prices.

This wouldn't help interest costs. To maintain them would require other, simultaneous, action to cause a corresponding reduced demand for credit.

A few years ago credit regulations were loosened. Where payment for consumer products had formerly been scheduled over a 24 month period, new provisions permitted repayment of consumer notes over 36 months. This has sucked up available credit like a blotter takes up ink.

This easy money policy has gotten us into trouble. It has redirected buying and selling techniques. Buyers used to ask how long will a product last? Will it perform? Is it worth the price? Such questions have more and more given way to the one: Can you finance it for me?

The result: Inflated prices and a shortage of credit at higher cost for business expansion and farm production.

Tightening of consumer credit should accompany a reduction in money supplies. Such a two-pronged attack—reducing the amount of money available and the demand for credit—would cool inflation.

The cost of living index, the best measure of inflation available, has gone up more than 10 per cent in the last three years. This price spiral is particularly hard on those in rural areas—on farmers, small businesses, workers in local industry and service employees.

I don't presume to be a financial expert. Nor do I want to leave the impression that inflation is simple. It isn't. But I do know that inflation is serious and that *a direct approach such as I have suggested is needed* if we really want to put the brakes on these runaway prices.

TRUTH IN LENDING MADE SIMPLE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a few months the truth-in-lending provisions of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 will be in effect. One of the reasons for postponing the effective date until July 1, 1969, was to give the Federal Reserve Board time to draft and promulgate the implementing truth-in-lending regulations. Last week the Board completed its work and the regulations were published.

Those of us who have been following the progress of the regulations have for the most part been satisfied that the Board has carried out the congressional intent. The reservations will surely be worked out. In any event, the gentlewoman from Missouri who contributed more than anyone else to the strength of this law has indicated that her Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs will hold hearings at which the responsible officials of the Board will discuss the regulations.

Shortly after the publication of its regulations, the Board prepared a question-and-answer summary designed to explain the regulations in simplified terms to creditors as well as consumers.

The document is a good job. It translates the most complicated provisions of the statute into terms that all can readily understand. Complaints to Congressmen over the incomprehensibility of bureaucratic regulation go with our jobs. One only wishes that all Government agencies would interpret their regulations for the general public in this simplified manner.

The question-and-answer summary prepared by the Federal Reserve Board follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE,
February 13, 1969.

What is Truth in Lending?

When Truth in Lending goes into effect on July 1, 1969, how will it affect department stores? Automobile dealers? Mortgage lenders? Banks?

Could retailers be sued for failing to disclose the cost, terms and conditions of the credit they offer?

These and other questions are answered in a series of explanatory questions and answers developed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to foster better understanding of the Truth in Lending law and the Federal Reserve regulation implementing it. Both go into effect on July 1, 1969.

Truth in Lending will require the disclosure of credit terms on virtually all types of consumer credit beginning July 1. Regulation Z, which was published by the Federal Reserve Board on February 11, spells out the rules to be followed by the nation's creditors in carrying out the provisions of Truth in Lending.

The special question-and-answer summary attached outlines Regulation Z in broad terms. Creditors who must comply with the law should refer to the regulation itself for specific provisions.

TRUTH IN LENDING: SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(NOTE.—These questions and answers are published by the Federal Reserve Board to foster better understanding of truth in lending. They are no substitute for the truth in lending regulation Z which should be consulted by persons who must comply with the truth-in-lending law.)

1. What is Truth in Lending?

It is a major part of the Consumer Credit Protection Act signed into law on May 29, 1968, following its adoption by the 90th Congress. It will require creditors to inform their customers of all the direct and indirect costs, terms and conditions of a credit arrangement.

2. What is the purpose of Truth in Lending?

Its purpose is to foster the informed use of credit by consumers. It is designed to make consumers aware of the cost of credit and enable them more readily to compare the terms available from various credit sources.

3. Will Truth in Lending fix a maximum charge for credit?

No. Truth in Lending will fix no maximum or minimum charges for credit. It will merely insure that a customer is advised of all the costs and conditions of the credit he is seeking.

4. Is there a government regulation spelling out how a creditor should comply with the law?

Yes. Congress assigned the task of writing the Truth in Lending regulation to the Federal Reserve Board. The basic regulation—designated Regulation Z by the Board—was published on February 11, 1969. Enforcement of the law and the regulation, however, is divided among nine different Federal departments and agencies according to classes of creditors.

5. What's the effective date for Truth in Lending?

July 1, 1969. Beginning on that date, all creditors covered by the law must comply with the disclosure and other provisions of Truth in Lending.

6. What types of credit are covered by Truth in Lending?

Generally speaking, only credit to individuals for personal, family, household or agricultural purposes which does not exceed $25,000. All real estate credit made to individuals for such purposes is covered, however, no matter what the amount.

7. Are any types of credit exempt from Truth in Lending?

Yes. Business and commercial credit are exempt as is credit to governmental units at the Federal, State or local levels. A governmental unit which extends credit to an individual for personal, family, household, agricultural purposes must abide by the law, however. Also exempt are transactions in securities or commodity accounts with a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and some types of transactions under regulated public utility tariffs. As mentioned earlier, credit exceeding $25,000 is also exempt except for real estate credit.

8. Can a State law substitute for the required Federal disclosures?

Under the law the Federal Reserve Board shall exempt from Federal disclosure requirements classes of transactions within a State if it determines that State law imposes substantially similar requirements and adequate enforcement is provided. Guidelines for States seeking this exemption are being drafted by the Board.

9. Who must comply with Truth in Lending?

Any person or business which regularly extends or arranges for credit to individuals for personal, family, household or agricultural purposes. This includes banks, savings and loan associations, department and other retail stores, credit card companies, automobile dealers, credit unions, consumer finance companies, mortgage bankers and even hospitals, doctors, dentists, plumbers and electricians if they regularly extend or arrange for credit.

10. In what way must the credit terms and conditions be disclosed?

The information must be in the terminology specified in Regulation Z and must be clear and conspicuous and in writing. The creditor may include additional information beyond that required by law and regulation, but must not confuse the required disclosure.

11. In general, what information must be provided?

The charges a customer must pay to obtain credit including, in most cases, the finance charge and the annual percentage rate.

THE FINANCE CHARGE AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE

12. What are the finance charge and the annual percentage rate?

They are the two must important concepts evolving from Truth in Lending. They will tell the customer at a glance just how much

he is paying for credit both in dollar terms and as a percentage.

13. What must be included in the finance charge?

In general, all charges imposed by the creditor and payable by the customer—or by another party for the customer's account—either directly or indirectly to obtain credit. The finance charge includes not only interest but also such charges as loan fees, finder's fees, time price differentials, investigation fees, premiums for credit life insurance required by the creditor, points and other similar charges.

14. Are all charges and fees part of the finance charge?

No. Some costs—specified in Regulation Z—may be excluded if they are itemized and disclosed to the customer. Examples are taxes, license fees, registration fees, a fee for a certificate of title and fees fixed by law which are paid to public officials. Some types of real estate closing costs such as title examination fees, notary fees, appraisal fees and fees for the preparation of a deed may also be excluded from the finance charge.

15. In what form must the finance charge be expressed to the customer?

It must be stated both as a dollar and cents total—except in the case of the sale of a dwelling where the total dollar finance charge need not be stated at all—and as an annual percentage rate.

16. What is the annual percentage rate?

Simply stated, it is the relative cost of credit in annual percentage terms.

17. Is a creditor required to state the annual percentage rate along with the finance charge?

Yes. It must also be stated in the case of the sale of a dwelling, although the total finance charge need not be listed on this type transaction. Until January 1, 1971, the creditor at his option may state the annual percentage rate in dollar terms, such as $11 finance charge per year per $100 of unpaid balance. After this transitional period, however, the rate must be stated as a percentage.

18. How accurate must the annual percentage rate be?

It must be disclosed to the nearest one-quarter of one per cent.

19. How is the annual percentage rate computed?

That depends on whether the credit is open end or other credit such as instalment credit.

OPEN-END CREDIT

20. What is open end credit?

It is an arrangement under which credit may be extended from time to time with finance charges levied against any unpaid balances each month. Many revolving charge accounts offered by department stores and credit card accounts are of this type.

21. How is the annual percentage rate computed on open end credit?

The finance charge is divided by the unpaid balance to obtain the rate for one month or whatever other time period is used; this result is multiplied by 12 or the number of time periods used by the creditor during the year. In the case of a typical charge of 1½ per cent of the unpaid balance with bills presented monthly, the annual percentage rate would be 18 per cent.

INSTALMENT CREDIT

22. How is the annual percentage rate computed on credit other than open end?

It must be computed by either the actuarial method or the "United States rule." Under both methods the annual percentage rate is the same where payments are equal and are made at equal intervals of time.

23. Is there a convenient way to determine the annual percentage rate?

Yes. Tables have been prepared by the Federal Reserve Board to determine the annual percentage rate based on the finance charge and the number of weekly or monthly payments to be made. These tables may be obtained at nominal cost from the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, or from any of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks.

24. Can you give some examples of the actuarial method?

Yes. Using a bank loan of $100 repayable in monthly installments over one year at a 6 per cent add-on finance charge, the annual percentage rate would be 11 per cent. In this case the borrower would repay $106 over one year but would have use of the $100 loan only until he made his first payment. At that point he is repaying part of the principal and has less money at his disposal.

Using the same set of circumstances but this time with a 6 per cent finance charge discounted in advance, the annual percentare rate would be 11½ per cent. Thats' because the customer in this case would receive $94, must repay $100 and again would have full use of the loan only until he made his first payment.

SPECIFIC DISCLOSURES—OPEN END CREDIT

25. What specific information must be disclosed at an open end credit customer?

That depends on whether the customer is opening a new account or already has an account, for example, with a department store.

26. What information must be disclosed before a person opens a new open end account?

The customer must be advised in writing of the following provisions:

The conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed and the period within which payment may be made without incurring a finance charge.

The method of determining the balance upon which a finance charge may be imposed.

The method of determining the finance charge.

The periodic rate or rates used, the range of balances to which they apply and the corresponding annual percentage rate or rates.

The conditions under which additional charges may be imposed and the method for determining them.

A description of any lien the creditor may acquire on the customer's property.

The minimum periodic payment required.

27. Must similar information be sent to persons who already have open end accounts on July 1, 1969?

Yes. The same information must be sent to the customer by July 31 if the account has an unpaid balance. For accounts on which no balance is owed, the same set of disclosures must be made by the first billing which follows use of the account.

28. Is a periodic statement required on open end accounts?

Yes, if there is an unpaid balance exceeding $1 or if a finance charge is made.

29. What information must be disclosed in the monthly statement?

These provisions to the extent they apply:

The unpaid balance at the beginning of the billing period.

The amount and date of each purchase or credit extension and a brief description of each unless this was furnished previously.

Any payments made by the customer; returns, rebates and adjustments.

The finance charge expressed in dollars and cents.

The periodic rate or rates used to compute finance charges on the account and the range of balances applicable.

The annual percentage rate.

The unpaid balance on which the finance charge was computed.

The closing date of the billing cycle and the unpaid balance as of that date.

30. Where must these disclosures be made?

Some must be made on the face of the statement; others may be made on the face of the statement, on its reverse side or on both the periodic statement and a separate form enclosed in the same envelope.

SPECIFIC DISCLOSURES—CREDIT OTHER THAN OPEN END

31. Is a different set of disclosures required for credit other than open end?

Yes. The disclosures are spelled out in the Truth in Lending regulation.

32. What are some examples of this type credit?

A loan from a bank to buy an automobile is a good example. Another is credit by a store to buy a big ticket item such as a washing machine or television set. In all cases, the loan or credit sale is for a fixed period of time and the amount and number of payments is specified as well as the due date of each payment.

33. Are the finance charge and annual percentage rate disclosed in this type transaction also?

Yes, except in some specified first mortgage real estate transactions where the total dollar amount of the finance charge need not be stated.

34. What other disclosures must be made?

The customer must also be told:

The date of the transaction or, if different, the date which the finance charge begins to accrue.

The number, amount and due dates of the payments.

The sum of these payments except in the case of a first mortgage to finance purchase of a dwelling.

The amount or method of computing any default, delinquency or similar late payment charges.

A description of any security interest to be acquired by the creditor.

The method of computing any penalty charge for early repayment of the credit plus a statement outlining the charges which may be deducted from any rebate or refund.

35. Must the creditor always disclose the annual percentage rate?

On credit other than open end credit the annual percentage rate need not be stated if the finance charge is $5 or less and applies to credit of $75 or less; or if the finance charge is $7.50 or less and applies to credit exceeding $75.

36. What other disclosures must be made?

That depends on whether the transaction is a loan or a credit sale.

LOANS

37. What must be disclosed in a loan transaction?

In addition to the basic disclosures listed under questions 33 and 34 above, the customer must also be told:

The amount of credit which will be paid to the customer or for his account including all charges, itemized individually, which are included in the amount of credit but are not part of the finance charge.

Any amounts deducted as prepaid finance charges and required deposit balances.

The total amount to be financed.

CREDIT SALE

38. What else must be disclosed in a credit sale?

In addition to the basic disclosures listed under questions 33 and 34 above, the credit sale customer must also be told:

The cash price.

The downpayment.

The difference between the cash price and downpayment.

All other charges, itemized individually, which are included in the amount financed but which are not part of the finance charge.

The unpaid balance.

Any amounts deducted as prepaid finance charges or required deposit balances.

The total amount financed.

The sum of the cash price, the finance charge and all other charges. This item need not be disclosed in the case of a first mortgage.

39. When must all this information be furnished?

Generally before the credit is actually extended.

40. Where should the disclosures be made?

They may be made on the face of one of the loan or credit papers, or on a separate statement.

41. Are monthly statements required in the case of credit other than open end?

No. But if the creditor does send statements he must list the annual percentage rate and the period in which payment must be made to avoid late payment charges.

REAL ESTATE CREDIT

42. Is real estate credit covered by Truth in Lending?

Yes. Real estate credit to individuals in any amount is subject to Truth in Lending disclosures.

43. What special provisions apply to real estate credit?

There is no need to disclose the total dollar amount of the finance charge on first mortgages to purchase dwellings. The customer in some cases has the right to cancel a credit arrangement within three business days if his residence is offered as collateral for credit.

44. Does a first mortgage on a residence carry this right of cancellation?

A first mortgage to finance purchase of the customer's residence carries no such right to cancel. A second mortgage on the same residence, however, is subject to the cancellation provision, as is a first mortgage which is not used to finance the purchase of the customer's residence.

45. Is a mechanic's lien—an interest retained in a residence by a plumber or other craftsman who does work on credit—subject to the right of cancellation?

Yes, if the craftsman imposes a finance charge or allows payment in more than four instalments. And this will probably prompt the plumber to wait three business days after an agreement is signed to begin work.

46. May this right of cancellation be waived if the customer needs emergency repairs and can't wait three days?

Yes. A customer may waive his right to cancel a credit arrangement if his safety, property or welfare would be endangered by any failure to make repairs immediately.

47. Must the creditor or craftsman disclose to the customer his right to cancel the contract within three business days?

Yes. It must be disclosed in writing and in specified language before the three day period begins.

CREDIT ADVERTISING

48. Is the advertising of credit covered by Truth in Lending?

Yes. In general, no advertisement may state that a specific down payment, instalment plan or amount of credit can be arranged unless the creditor usually arranges terms of that type.

49. What other general advertising provisions are provided?

No advertisement may spell out a specific credit term unless all other terms are stated clearly and conspicuously.

50. Does this apply only to newspapers, radio and television advertising?

No. It applies to all forms of advertising including magazines, leaflets, flyers, catalogs, public address system announcements, direct mail literature, window displays, billboards or any other media.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

51. What Federal departments and agencies enforce Truth in Lending?

Although the Federal Reserve Board issued the regulation to carry out Truth in Lending, enforcement is spread among these nine departments and agencies:

The Federal Reserve Board for State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for other insured State banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System.

The Comptroller of the Currency for National banks.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for Federal credit unions.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board for savings and loan associations.

The Interstate Commerce Commission for carriers—trucks, buses and trains—which it supervises.

The Civil Aeronautics Board for air carriers it supervises.

The Agriculture Department for certain creditors under the Packers and Stockyards Act.

The Federal Trade Commission for all other creditors, such as retail stores, small loan companies, service establishments, professional people, etc.

52. What are the penalties for violating Truth in Lending?

Willful violations are punishable by a fine of up to $5,000, up to a year in jail, or both. Furthermore, if a creditor violates the law, the customer may sue him for twice the amount of the finance charge (and if successful, the customer could collect not less than $100 or more than $1,000), for court costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

53. How long must a creditor save his papers to prove compliance with the law?

Evidence of compliance should be preserved by the creditor for at least two years from the date of the transaction.

54. Is inspection of creditor records possible?

Yes. Under the law each creditor must make his records and evidence of compliance available for inspection by the appropriate enforcement agency.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide a $2,000 personal exemption for all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give the low and moderate income families long-overdue relief from high taxes. The Ways and Means Committee is now studying tax reform and is considering the closing of the massive tax loopholes for the rich.

Now the Congress must move on the other front—by removing the inequities from the average American family.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a news release which I issued today on the this bill:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 24.—Representative Wright Patman (D., Tex.) today introduced legislation to raise the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $2,000 "as a means to wipe out the inequities in our tax system."

Mr. Patman described his bill as "a prime antidote for the taxpayers revolt."

Mr. Patman's bill would exempt the first $2,000 of income for the individual taxpayer and would provide a similar $2,000 exemption for the taxpayer's wife and for each of his dependent children. Mr. Patman said his bill was designed primarily to give tax relief to families.

"It has been the low and moderate income families who have been carrying the great burden of income taxes and it is time that the Congress wiped out these inequities," Mr. Patman said. "The family is the basic strength of America and this bill is full recognition of that fact."

Mr. Patman said he anticipated that there would be charges that the $2,000 exemption would reduce Treasury revenues too drastically.

"This is the kind of charge that will come forward from those who do not want to close the tax loopholes on the wealthy," he charged. "If these loopholes are closed, there will be more than enough new revenue to the Treasury to offset this $2,000 exemption."

"I feel strongly that tax reform—the closing of loopholes—should be accompanied by an immediate removal of the heavy burdens of taxation on the low and moderate income families," Mr. Patman said. "Such a two-pronged attack—the closing of loopholes and tax relief for the average American family—will stop the taxpayers revolt before it gets started."

SPEAKER McCORMACK RECEIVES COVETED MINUTEMAN AWARD

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure of attending the Reserve Officers Association's midwinter conference banquet held last Friday evening here in Washington.

Our own Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, was honored that evening when he was presented the coveted Minuteman Award, the Reserve Officers Association's annual citation to the American who has contributed most to our national security in these times, 1969.

The Minuteman Award was presented to the Speaker by the very capable Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird.

In accepting this award, the Speaker made a forceful, hard-hitting speech, relating to those present some of the historic debates and decisions he has been a party to, decisions which have shaped the destiny of this country.

The Reserve Officers Association is a great patriotic group dedicated to keeping America strong. Our Speaker has the same dedication.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Mississippi has brought to the attention of the House of Representatives this honor which our great Speaker has received. If there ever was a "minuteman" from the great city of Boston, that "minuteman" is the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and I am delighted to join the gentleman from Mississippi in saluting our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: MORE IS NEEDED

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr.

Speaker, future development of this Nation depends greatly upon the quality of education given its citizens. Certainly, better education ranks among the highest priorities for those Americans trapped in poverty and hopelessness.

Improved housing, increased job openings, a cleaner environment, these all are vital factors; but, without the chance of growth realized through broadened education, dramatic breakthroughs envisioned in many plans for advancement will not come about.

One area in which educational demands are pressing concerns citizens who come from a non-English-speaking background. They live within two cultures, and, many times, interaction between cultures is poor.

As examples of those educational problems, and the ways they are now being solved, I would like to insert two papers by leading Mexican-Americans presented last year to the Teacher Corps rural migrant preservice programs at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles:

THE MOST IMPORTANT ADVANTAGE

(By Armando Rodriquez, Chief, Mexican-American Affairs unit, U.S. Office of Education)

There are no such things as disadvantaged kids. This has been the bag of the Mexican-American. He is tabbed as disadvantaged. It is the opposite that is true. It is the schools that are disadvantaged. American education has failed to communicate with Mexican-American kids. It has created barriers to learning based on differences in language. We don't have kids who are dumb, disadvantaged, poor learners. We just have a school system that has failed to teach them. We have an educational system that hasn't trained teachers to understand other cultures; it hasn't given them the equipment or the training necessary to communicate with the Mexican-American.

You represent the first generation of teachers who will have the tools to be the real catalysts between the school and the Mexican-American community. You will have that most important advantage to bring to the Mexican-American kid . . . communication and understanding.

I'm not asking you to act like missionaries. I don't want you to love these kids. I want you to teach them! Don't try to substitute your failure to teach with love. If you fail to teach, find out why.

As members of Teacher Corps and pioneers in HILT (High Intensity Language Training) you have been given a chance to become leaders in bilingual education, to effectively demonstrate the Teacher Corps goal of bringing innovation and change to the classroom. The success of this program will open the door to future bilingual education programs. Teacher Corps has provided the impetus. But we are a long way from accomplishment.

In order to comply with even the minimum processes necessary to educate Mexican-American children, we must train 100,000 bilingual teachers. We need these teachers to eliminate our monolingual and monocultural society; we need to promote cultural pluralism in our schools.

Bilingual education is not just a project for learning a foreign language (in this case, Spanish). It is the first step toward gaining experience and knowledge that make it possible for you to bridge the gap between languages and cultures, to facilitate successful entry into the school environment for the Mexican-American child. Bilingual education is another tool for being a better teacher, a better citizen, a better American.

We must use the Mexican-American cultural heritage to rich advantage in our educational system. This country has assumed the monocultural and monolingual role for generations. We have always stripped our immigrants of their language and culture and expected them to conform to our customs and traditions . . . to the American way of life. We must recognize the contributions of other cultures to the American heritage and must stop trying to blot out differences. We must stop trying to maintain a monolingual, monocultural society.

There are 5½ million Mexican-Americans, 1½ million Puerto Ricans, half a million Cubans and other Spanish-speaking citizens . . . a total of 7 million citizens . . . who, for the most part, bring bilingualism as an asset to our culture. This is an asset that we Americans need to recognize and adopt.

The Bilingual Education Act was a national moral and legal commitment for bilingualism. Bilingualism must become as common as tacos and frijoles, apple pie and french fries. It must become as common in our schools as reading and arithmetic, as common in government as law and order, as common in business as the use of computer data. Bilingual education in every school in the country is the vehicle for fulfilling this national commitment.

What is your role? With bilingual education and cultural understanding, you are equipped to do the job. You will be leaders in the field of bilingual education, the forerunners. But you are going into a field of disbelievers. They will be doubters. They will be threatened because you speak two languages. They will suspect you. But, if you have commitment, you will provide leadership. It is going to be a tough hard fight. You have a massive selling job to do. You will have to be persuasive salesmen.

Your classroom successes may hopefully bring about many changes in teacher preparation programs. The training institutions may finally prepare teachers to teach real kids instead of distributing credentials to people to function in mythical classrooms. You in Teacher Corps can do more to bring change rapidly and forcefully than any new text books used by monolingual, monocultural teachers. You are the pioneers who are going to show that the job can be done—that with cultural understanding it is possible to teach and to teach all kids with cultural understanding—through bilingual education.

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Dr. Julian Nava, member, board of education, Los Angeles, city schools; professor of history, Valley State College, Los Angeles)

Five to ten years ago it would have been inconceivable for me to talk to a group such as this one concerning the problems of Mexican-American education. The longer we look at the problems, the more complex they become. The problems have always been there, but now people have raised their voices. You are not alone in looking at these problems. There are thousands who are now realizing how difficult it is to make an impact on the problems of the Mexican-Americans.

As I look at the books that appear in print every year that are relative to my own field of Latin history, I cannot help but realize that there are virtually no books appearing on the Mexican-American. There are scores of good ones on other racial and ethnic groups. And so I am now working on a general adult history of the Mexican-American and on an eighth grade text book. My point in mentioning this is that I have progressed painfully slowly in my writing, but, as slow as I am moving, I still think mine will be the first book published on the subject. In short, we are dealing with a scarcity of material that applies to this group. This group is less identifiable than the American Negro. It is the dearth of published materials concerning who and what the Mexican-American is that is the handicap.

The Negro is 100% American. Culturally he is 100% American and he has made profound and widespread inroads into American history. The Mexican-American is not less American, but rather he is something else besides. He is bi-cultural and bi-lingual. This bi-cultural, bi-lingual hang up is as important to the Mexican-American as color has been to the Negro.

Two men who have studied the adjustment of minorities in the United States are John Higham and Oscar Handlin. Higham, dealing with ideas, has done a study of the American Character. Handlin writes of the ordinary man in the ghetto. His book, "The Uprooted," concerning the southern European immigrant who moved to the United States has an impact that will be with us indefinitely.

Higham discusses the development by the 1840's of the quirks, traits, and characteristics of American society which he calls "nativism."* He says that this developed during the 1790's and early decades of the 1800's and was an attempt to preserve the characteristics that led to the American Revolution and independence. The Americans imposed their attitudes and values on the earliest immigrants to this country. These attitudes were Anglo-Saxon in origin—what we would call WASP (White Anglo Saxon Protestant) today—and these people became the dominant group. The founders of this country were highly socially stratified. They were the first "Establishment." The early immigrant groups were small enough in number that the attitudes and values of the "Establishment" could be imposed upon them. By the time the Europeans flooded the United States after the Civil War, we had a society structured and formed and the immigrants conformed to it. Cocky, self-assured, belligerent, and sublimely confident—these are the traits of nativism. To the American mind the American culture assumed superiority over all the other cultures in the world.

What this all means in regard to the Mexican-American now as well as 100 years ago is that when the two cultures met, i.e., nativism and the Spanish Catholic culture, you had more than simply a clash of cultures. You had an irreparable conflict. The attitudes formed by the American pioneers about the Spanish were derogatory, and the Spanish felt the same way toward the American. The Americans had no feeling either of responsibility or guilt as far as treaties or other agreements made with "inferior" groups. When the pioneers moved west, it was not unusual that there was animosity resulting from these cultural conflicts. There was assimilation, one into the other group. But you had the built-in hostility that manifested itself in so many ways towards the end of the 19th century.

We have never lost a war and history is usually written by the victor. Thus the entire history of the Southwest is described in terms of the conqueror and the conquered at every level: the Protestant over the Catholic, freedom of thought over authoritarianism, democracy over monarchy, Causacian over the darker skinned people. In general, it describes a people who were aggressive, revolutionary, and innovating as against the traditionalist, authoritarian society.

The Mexican-American society is one that places more emphasis on adaptiveness and acceptance than on change. There is more concern with life after death than with the here and now. This is what established caste and class and role. When the Mexican-American has resisted the assigned role, he has had to have cunning or luck, money or

---

*John Higham, *Strangers in the Land; Patterns of American Nativism 1800–1925,* Rutgers U. Press, New Brunswick.

political power. Most did not have this and so they fell into the categories assigned to them.

At the time of the Mexican-American War the Mexican government was attempting to break up the large missions' titles and give homestead rights to the people. The government gave the Indians on the missions freedom and gave them a share of the land. When the Americans took over the Southwest, they superimposed a county land system which provided English land measurements and titles. The Mexican-Americans owned vast areas of land and lost this land in the transfer to American authority because they did not understand the English language, laws or ways.

So you have in the Mexican-American, from the start, a mixed breed of Spanish and Indian—dispossessed of land, conquered in war, yet indispensable for many years as a worker on the land. He withdrew into himself as slaves turn into themselves. He learned to say "Si, señor," and to swallow his pride, and to accept the attitude of the Americans.

This is the history and the heritage of the Mexican-American. For years he was the mainstay of handicraft and farm labor. In some counties he was forbidden to vote or faced insurmountable opposition. Alienated, cynical, discouraged—exhibiting before long the stereotype of the Mexican-American as developed by the Anglo-American.

There were the refugee Mexican-Americans vs. the resident Mexican-Americans. For many, residence in the United States was transitory. My own family came here fleeing from the violence of revolution. When conditions of revolution in Mexico became impossible, parents insisted that their young sons and daughters go north. My mother came to Texas in this way and met my father. Father always expected to go back to Mexico. He went to Fresno to pick fruit. He went up and down California picking fruit. Forty-two years later my parents still lived in California although my father was a Mexican resident until the day he died. Mexico was his country. My mother finally became a citizen. I became an American in school as did my brothers and sisters.

The Mexican-American is difficult to understand because he is many things. From personal testimony I know that the schools are used to melt everyone together and that has been a mixed blessing. Imposing the Anglo-Saxon values on all creates problems. In a sense, it is a good idea, but it could be done in a different way. The school could deal separately with factors that affect only the Mexican-American, the Irish, the Jew, the Negro.

Now we have a new ball game that started after World War II. Although Mexico still sends in more immigrants than any other country, immigration from Mexico has levelled off. In a few years there will be a quota system for Latin American states, but if you have family here you will be quota exempt. According to the U.S. Labor Department there are practically no braceros, but there are hundreds of thousands of "green carders" (aliens who enter the United States on work permits at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor). These workers are being transported further and further from the borders.

Where do these workers come from? The cities? Anyone from Mexico City who is well adjusted there would be an idiot to come to the United States. Most come from the farm lands and country side where regional differences of dialects and skills survive and so we are looking at many varieties of Mexicans. Simply by proximity there is a constant supply of these new Americans.

When we look at the progress that has been made and become depressed, it is because we are always looking at different Mexican-Americans. The average residency in the barrios averages perhaps ten years. The people become assimilated and move out. Then others move into the barrios.

You are working with the migrants—a changing breed. Groups like you fasten your safety belts. You have a long ride and a rough ride. As long as Mexico is next door we are going to get brand new Mexican-Americans. You will never be out of a job. Unlike some of the problems with other immigrant groups, this is an on-going situation. The renaissance and rise of Mexican culture will steadily wipe away the historical image of the Mexican. The Mexicans in Mexico are proud of their heritage and anxious to spread their new pride. They are more outspoken and more effective. Their education is beginning to catch up to their sensivity.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has played a major role in the area of bilingual education. Two years ago, a massive program was approved and initial plans begun to aid the 3 million students who would benefit from expanded bilingual teaching.

But, while Congress gave its approval to a broad bilingual program approach, the Johnson administration only asked for a fraction of the authorized funds. Once again, a tragic tradeoff was made between the needs of financing a useless war effort in Southeast Asia and the crucial domestic problems which confront us every day.

To date, less than 500,000 children are benefiting from bilingual education programs authorized by Congress. That is not enough. As the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times notes:

The cost of additional funds is minor in comparison to the high price society pays for every dropout.

The editorial follows:

BREAKING THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

Issue: Will Congress this year again fail to provide sufficient financial support for bilingual teaching programs in U.S. schools?

Congress in 1967 finally decided to help break down the language barrier that so limits the educational opportunities for non-English speaking students.

To date, however, appropriations have fallen far short of the $30 million authorized for bilingual education programs. The $7.5 million thus far allocated has not made much of a dent in the barrier.

Millions of Mexican-American youngsters have dropped out of school simply because they couldn't understand their teachers. Half of all Mexican-American students in California schools get no farther than the eighth grade, according to Sen. George Murphy (R–Calif.), one of the sponsors of the bilingual teaching bill.

The Times urges Congress not only to appropriate the full amount authorized but also to consider voting additional funds to assist those educationally deprived children.

Lack of instruction in their native tongue is a major factor in the average grade level of 7.1 for Mexican-Americans, as compared to 9.0 for Negroes and 12.1 for Anglo-Americans.

Los Angeles schools have been making an increasing effort at bilingual teaching, with almost all the money coming out of local and state funds. Instruction in Spanish is now given to more than 5,000 students in city schools, mostly at the secondary level.

But money is not the only problem.

The number of Spanish-speaking teachers is far less than the demand, a problem that the Ford Foundation will try to solve with a $325,000 grant for language training program in education schools.

Resistance to bilingual teaching also has been noted among some principals and administrators, although such programs have been officially endorsed by school districts.

The answer is more and better bilingual teaching. Although additional funds will be required, the cost will be minor in comparison to the high price society pays for every dropout.

For East Los Angeles, which I represent in Congress, the bilingual teaching program will have a significant impact. The importance of the entire program to Los Angeles was reflected by passage of the following motion by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors a year ago this week:

On a motion by Supervisor Ernest E. Debs, Los Angeles County Supervisors today urged Congress to authorize a $5 million appropriation to implement a proposed Federal bilingual education program to aid school children with language handicaps.

Debs pointed out that the program would be especially beneficial to the East Los Angeles community, where many children from Spanish-speaking families are at a disadvantage in classrooms where only English is spoken.

"Experience has shown that the high incidence of dropouts by Mexican-American youngsters is largely due to the language barrier," Debs said. "Teaching of elementary subjects in Spanish as well as English will give these children a fair chance to keep up with the class and to get the primary education they need in order to go on to college or to compete in the job market."

By today's action, the Board of Supervisors requested the House Committee on Education and Labor, and the California congressional delegation, to implement the bilingual education legislation.

As one of the earliest supporters of the Bilingual Education Act, I have been disappointed by the low funding priority given these programs. I urge Congress to bring the programs up to their maximum funding levels. Therefore, today I am introducing two bills which increase appropriations for bilingual education to the originally authorized amounts for both fiscal 1969 and fiscal 1970.

F–111, BEST FLIGHT SAFETY RECORD OF ANY CENTURY SERIES AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, during the 1-minute rule last Thursday, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL), under leave to extend his remarks, inserted in the RECORD an extremely harsh and factually inaccurate commentary upon the safety record of the F–111 and those who build it.

I feel sure that the rather extravagant comments of our colleague were based upon misinformation or perhaps partial information and not upon any deliberate intent to distort or misstate the record.

Under leave to extend my own remarks today, I include a copy of a friendly and kindly letter I have written to our colleague in this connection, as well as a chart comparing the number of accidents suffered by each of our military aircraft of the Century series, beginning with the F–100.

This chart demonstrates that, at 5,000

hours, 10,000 hours, and 20,000 hours of actual flying time, the F–111 has suffered fewer accidents than any of the others. At 20,000 hours, for example, the F–100 had suffered 29 major accidents; the F–101, 18; the F–102, 22; the F–104, 28; and the F–111, 10.

I invite the attention of our colleagues to this factual comparison.

The material referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1969.

Hon. BERTRAM PODELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BERT: I was interested to note your remarks inserted in last Thursday's Congressional Record concerning the F–111 aircraft. Having known something of this plane and having had the privilege of flying it, I was quite surprised at the extravagance of your comments, Bert, and particularly your language employed to describe its accident record.

You cite the figure of eleven accidents, and on this basis conclude that the F–111 is a "flying deathtrap", a "complete disaster", an "utter disaster", an "airborne coffin", "a fraud", "a grisly monument to all that is evil", "a shocking failure", a "gargantuan cropper", "a piece of trash", "a colossal abuse," and "a blood tinged stain upon our country". Three times you refer to the manufacturer as "criminally liable" and pronounce the judgment that it is being built with "money almost stolen from the public."

Whew! Remind me never to match hyperboles with you.

In view of these comments, Bert, I'm sure it will come as quite a surprise to you that the F–111 actually has one of the best flight safety records—if not the very best—of any military aircraft of the Century Series.

As of February 20, the F–111 has been flown a total of 24,228 hours in 10,894 separate flights. Here is the comparation record, in number of accidents, based in each case upon 5,000 hours, 10,000 hours, and 20,000 hours of actual flying.

NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS—ALL CENTURY SERIES AIRCRAFT

Aircraft	5,000 hrs.	10,000 hrs.	20,000 hrs.
F–100	7	14	29
F–101	9	16	18
F–102	9	12	22
F–104	14	17	28
F–105	8	12	14
F–106	7	8	11
F–111	[1] 3	[1] 6	[1] 10
F–4	6	8	11

[1] F–111 in each case has produced fewer accidents per hours flown.

It is not really surprising to me, Bert, that you apparently were unaware of these facts. You can hardly be blamed for not knowing of this record. Few people do. These other aircraft apparently were not considered "controversial" and therefore their accidents never made headlines. The tendency of news media to magnify and sensationalize every negative comment or occurrence in connection with the R–111 and to minimize or ignore the many positive facts of record is perhaps without parallel in modern journalism. Nor can we blame the press entirely. This tendency has been fed, unfortunately, by a few headline-hungry politicians who've observed that one can always get more attention by placing extravagant blame than by reciting facts in their right perspective or by telling the good news of engineering accomplishment.

It is significant, though, that at least five members of Congress have taken the trouble to inspect the plane personally, to talk directly with the Air Force pilots who fly it, and to take actual flights in it to observe its really remarkable capabilities. These include Senators Cannon, Muskie and Goldwater, and Congressmen Robert Price as well as myself. All of us have been enormously impressed by the genuine enthusiasm which the pilots themselves hold for the F–111! I think it is a fair summation to say that Senator Goldwater, one of the early and outspoken critics of the initial contract award, now believes firmly in the efficacy of the product. In fact he was man enough to make a public statement to this effect quite recently.

Certainly, Bert, any accident is a great misfortune, and every aircraft manufacturer—just as every automobile manufacturer—has the prime duty of designing and building as safe a vehicle as is possible. In this connection the following facts are extremely pertinent.

1. The escape module in the F–111, designed to throw the pilots free in event of a crash, is probably the best and most effective yet built. In several of the highly celebrated F–111 accidents, the pilots actually escaped injury. Unlike many escape systems, the F–111's is effective even at low altitudes.

2. The short takeoff and landing characteristic of the F–111 is in one sense a safety factor for emergency operations of various sorts. This aircraft will take off and land on shorter airstrips than any other Air Force model capable of such advanced speeds.

3. No other aircraft has such a complete redundancy of systems—in other words, a series of spare electric and mechanical systems designed to actuate and take over automatically if the primary systems should fail. So far as possible, these have been designed to protect even against pilot errors.

4. Undoubtedly the most significant—and most revolutionary—safety development of the F–111 is its Terrain Avoidance system which operates by radar. Bert, I've tested this system personally at very, very low levels over extremely mountainous country. It works! With this system actuated, it is just almost impossible for a pilot to fly the plane into a mountain or building even on the darkest night and in the worst of weather.

The significance of this particular innovation for pilot survivability should be immediately apparent. It was given an extremely thorough testing in most adverse conditions in Southeast Asia, where the Air Force flew 584 missions including training missions. Fifty-five of them were actual combat strike missions. The planes flew in at such low low altitudes that the enemy radar could not pick them up and enemy anticraft weapons that could not focus on them. They came back without a single hole, and Lt. Col. Dean Salmeier, who flew some of these missions, has said:

"There is no question in my mind that on most missions the enemy did not even know we were there until we were gone. . . . The aircraft is definitely capable of making strikes at night, in all weather, and with extreme accuracy."

The F–111, Bert, is the only aircraft in the arsenal which will do these particular things.

Frankly, I do not know what happened to the two which were listed as "missing in action" in Southeast Asia. I don't think the Air Force knows. But I very well recall that, on one of the first B–29 strikes in World War II, 88 planes went out and fewer than 20 of them returned. It is believed that few if any of the others were felled by enemy action. Nobody knows, nor ever will know, what happened to most of them. Interestingly, no member of Congress arose to denounce the B–29 as a "deathtrap" or its manufacturers as "criminally liable."

The loss of men and machines is the heartbreaking handmaiden of the grisly monster of war. May God in His mercy teach man the wisdom to rid this planet of its hideous curse! I applaud you, Bert, for your obvious concern over the welfare and safety of our young American men who volunteer to fly our warplanes. It is in every sense a laudable concern. But, as you can clearly see from all of the foregoing, your very harsh blame is in this case misplaced.

Certainly, Bert, I began with the clear assumption that you did not purposely distort the facts, nor set out intentionally to defame our Air Force or the engineers who designed this plane, nor to malign the fine and decent craftsmen and workers—among them some of my very closest friends and constituents—who build this aircraft. To have intentionally misstated and exaggerated a matter of this kind would have been demagoguery of the very cheapest and rankest form. In my mind your stand absolved you of any such intent.

I have gone to this rather considerable effort to provide you with these particular facts from my own personal knowledge, Bert, because you expressed an interest in having such facts and seemed to have been frustrated in your efforts to get at them.

In light of the foregoing, I am sure that you as a fair-minded man will recognize that the language you employed to characterize the F–111 and its builders was extravagantly unwarranted to say the least, and the harsh judgments you pronounced upon it and them most inappropriate. I observe with interest your invitation to be shown factually in error and your offer, upon such demonstration, to "retract this statement on the floor of the House". To do so is the mark of a big man, my friend, and you'll prove yourself to be one in faithfully keeping that pledge.

Call on me whenever I may be helpful in any way. Very best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JIM WRIGHT.

FATHER HESBURGH HITS THE BULLSEYE ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, has placed in proper context the issues involved in student campus demonstrations.

He has said:

Anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion, be it violent or nonviolent, will be given 15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist.

Thereafter, if the disruption goes on, students will be suspended on the spot and nonstudents will be subject to arrest as trespassers. After another 5 minutes of further meditation, students continuing to disrupt things will be expelled.

Incidentally, this is exactly the same policy toward illegal demonstrations that I have been urging since the riots in Washington in April of 1968.

If we are to have a functioning society, we cannot allow those dedicated to its overthrow to disrupt it. Certainly we do not wish to stifle disagreement, but this does not mean that we will consent to the frustration of the law abiding by the lawless. Constructive change does not mean disintegration.

It is significant that Father Hesburgh's statement should have been followed by a statement by President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard which agreed in substance with the policies of Father Hesburgh. President Pusey's declaration was made in response to a policy consensus

signed by 100 members of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences who averred that:

A university community dedicated to free inquiry and discussion cannot tolerate any interference with, or disruption of, its academic exercises.

This realization of the necessity for a firm hand on the part of our college administrators is long overdue, but it is nonetheless welcome. Perhaps if the reliance upon peaceful discussion and the immediate suppression of violence are firmly supported on our campuses, this necessary philosophy will spread to our law enforcement officials and the proper distinction will be made between informed and rational discussion and the violence which at best is mindless and at worst is subversive of our national interest.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and a deep sense of responsibility that I assume the chairmanship of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee.

For the past 12 years I have served as member of this important subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee; my new responsibilities will provide me with an even more exciting challenge and opportunity for constructive action.

I view the work of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee as particularly important for three basic reasons:

First, because there is no area of the world which is more important to our country than our own Western Hemisphere. The future of the United States and of our sister republics of Latin America is closely intertwined. Our security, our economic progress, and our ability to play a decisive role in world affairs, are decided largely by what happens right here on our own two continents.

Second, because the challenge effectuating the modernization of Central and South America is bigger than many have realized. For many years, most recently in the concerted effort of the Alliance for Progress, we have sought to cooperate with our Latin American neighbors in reaching that goal. In 8 years of consistent, fairly energetic effort, however, we have barely begun to probe the challenge of reconstituting and updating the economic, social and political structures of Latin America and of solving the problem of underproduction and of rapidly growing populations.

And, third, because the potential for realizing our mutual objectives is also much greater than many people think. The bountiful resources of Latin America—its population, its vast land area and its mineral and other natural resources—augur well for the future of the South American Continent.

What we need, however, is a better, more effective approach to the task of developing the full potential of the Western Hemisphere and of bringing all of its constituent states into the modern environment of the late 20th century: an approach which will produce more, and faster, than the methods which have been employed during the past decade.

I feel that our subcommittee can play an important role of exploring these crucial aspects of inter-American relations by assessing past performance and suggesting new approaches, and by acting as a sounding board for relevant and diverse views about the tasks and the opportunities of the decade before us.

I would be less than frank if I would not admit that the initial record of the Alliance for Progress inspires more gloom than satisfaction.

One basic goal of the Alliance was a 2.5 percent per capita annual increase in the gross national product of the member countries, but only 1.5 percent has been achieved and I have serious doubts that this increase has had any significant impact on the masses of the people.

At this rate of progress, Latin Americans who live at the edge of subsistence—whose annual income is estimated at about $200 a year—will have to wait half a century to double the level of their standard of living.

Furthermore, Latin America may have actually lost ground in such fields as education, housing, and food production when the growth in its population is taken into account.

This is not to say that the Alliance has failed in its undertakings; rather, that the undertakings of the Alliance have been too narrow and too timid in scope to contend with the pressure of a rapidly increasing population and tied too tightly to the conventional wisdom of the 1930's and 1940's.

For example, I feel that the programs of the past several years have relied too heavily—almost exclusively—on the existing governmental machinery which in itself has been in need of considerable updating.

We have paid too little attention to the role of private initiative and enterprise—profit as well as nonprofit—in bringing the benefits of modernization, industrialization, and economic development to the masses of the people of Latin America.

We have also stressed government-to-government aid in cases in which a change, or an accommodation, in the field of trade would have been much more productive.

And we have largely ignored the need to involve the masses of the people in the tasks of development, both in the planning and the execution of development plans, and in the sharing of their benefits.

Some of us here in the Congress have tried to remedy the latter situation by writing title IX into the Foreign Assistance Act—the title which proposes, as a basic premise of U.S. foreign aid policy, the encouragement of wide, even total, participation of the people in shaping their own Nation's future.

I hope that the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee will be able to hold hearings on these subjects—the shortcomings and the successes of our past policy—before the full Committee on Foreign Affairs turns its attention to the foreign aid program.

I would like to add one more thought: The United States stands ready to cooperate with Latin America in meeting the challenges posed by its expanding population and the growing needs of its people but we do not seek to impose our will in achieving these objectives. I, for one, feel that the people of Latin America are fully capable of developing their own approaches to economic, social, and political progress, within the framework of our mutual goals.

They have to "do their own thing."

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that in the course of debate last Tuesday on the resolution establishing the new House Committee on Internal Security, I then advised the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), that I would lay before the committee a proposal to make a study in depth of revolutionary violence within this Nation. At the committee's initial meeting on Thursday last, I did so. A copy of my statement to the committee on this subject is appended.

I am pleased to note that a resolution approving my proposal was unanimously adopted by members of the committee present. Pursuant to the committee's direction, I have forthwith directed staff studies and preliminary inquiries to be made on this subject, and will from time to time report the results of these studies to the full committee, together with my recommendations, with a view toward determining whether the committee may deem it desirable and necessary to conduct full-scale investigations and public hearings.

For the information of the House, I also note that the new committee has adopted rules of procedures which I believe are the most comprehensive and the fairest rules ever adopted by a committee of this Congress. I likewise append a copy of the new Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Internal Security. I think you will agree that the rules go as far as possible in protecting the rights of persons appearing before the committee, while still constituting a workable set of rules for the purposes of a legislative body.

The material mentioned above follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1969.

To: Members of the Committee on Internal Security.

From: Richard H. Ichord, Chairman.

Subject: Proposal for Study of Revolutionary Violence Within the United States.

I desire hereby to lay before the Committee a proposal for study and investigation in depth of revolutionary violence within this Nation.

It is becoming increasingly evident that one of the gravest threats to our internal security and to the free functioning of our democratic institutions is posed by the activities of certain organizations which would effect changes in our government or its administration by other than constitutional processes. Recent investigations of this Committee, the statements of responsible officials, Federal and State, and daily press reports, appear to me to sustain this conclusion.

In this respect, moreover, we are faced with ever-mounting demands from the Members of the House and the public for legislative action, both for additional legislation and with respect to the examination and appraisal of the administration and enforcement of existing law, including proposals for constitutional amendment as well.

I need not state that the legislative problems we face on the subject of subversion are of the utmost complexity and difficulty, not solely from the constitutional standpoint, but equally so from the standpoint of developing practical and effective legislation. We must find the answers to certain basic questions, among which are the following: Is additional Federal legislation necessary? What form should such legislation take? Should these statutes be essentially regulatory or penal? Can we profitably amend existing statutes in this area? What is the Federal role, as contrasted with the State role, in the exercise of the police power on this subject?

In addition, a number of bills have already been referred to the Committee. Undoubtedly additional legislation will also be referred to it from time to time. Such legislation involves a number of subjects vital to the protection and maintenance of our internal security, including such subjects as the protection of defense facilities, the security of classified information released to industry, Federal employment security, vessel, ports, and harbor security, the protection of our armed forces during periods of undeclared war, passport security, proposals with respect to the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, etc.

The answer to the foregoing questions, and the disposition of such legislation, will obviously require the most painstaking and thorough inquiry and understanding of the extent, character and objectives, the organizational forms, financing, and other facts, with respect to those organizations and individuals engaged in revolutionary violence, sedition, and breach of peace and law, as are proper subjects of investigation as mandated by the House. Obviously, we cannot legislate in a vacuum.

I therefore submit for your approval my proposal that, under my direction, the staff be authorized to undertake preliminary studies and inquiries, the results of which I shall, from time to time, report to the full Committee with a view toward the subsequent authorization of such full scale investigations and public hearings as to the Committee may seem desirable and necessary.

Following discussion on this proposal, I will entertain the following motion:

"Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to cause staff studies and preliminary inquiries to be made with respect to the organizations and subjects herein proposed, and to report on same from time to time, with his recommendations, with a view toward determining whether full-scale investigations and public hearings shall be authorized and conducted by the Committee with respect to any such organization or subject."

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 set forth 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 whatever 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 subpena 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 subpenaed 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 subpenaed 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 subpenaed, 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 proceedings 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 TESTIFYING[1]

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]

(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 all 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 forwarded 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.

[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 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.

EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as our American youth are encouraged to perform disobedient acts and are educated against discipline, it is interesting to compare our moral and educational breakdown with their counterparts behind the Iron Curtain—the youth of Communist Russia. Some youth on our campuses have sought to make a mockery of the right to academic freedom by acting out against patriotism. On the other hand, the Russian youth are given compulsory training starting at the age of 10—and by age 18, when drafted for military service in the Red army, have already 2 years of military training.

There is a breakdown in our country with the result that we are raising a generation without the understanding of the need for respect and discipline in the will to survive.

The strength of our country is in our homes, churches, and schools, and if there is a crisis in education we must find the root cause for corrective action.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news articles which follow my remarks:

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Nov. 28, 1968]

MILITARY TRAINING STARTS AT AGE 10 FOR RUSSIAN BOYS

(By John Weyland)

Moscow.—Military training in the Soviet Union now starts at the age of 10.

Schoolboys throughout the country are organized into squads, detachments and battalions. Under adults commanders they practice drill, firing, the use of gas masks, other military skills and rendering medical aid.

The program introduced by the Kremlin leadership is being widened this year. Marshal Ivan Bagramyan, the World War II hero who has charge, this month ordered Pioneer units which had not taken part before to do so in 1968–69.

Soviet children from 10 to 15 belong to the Pioneer organization, which provides group activities and Communist indoctrination.

Older boys get more sophisticated military training the last two years before being drafted at 18. The Kremlin decreed this in 1967, also reducing the draft age one year.

The defense minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko, explained that the Soviet Union was "taking all steps necessary to strengthen its defenses."

The Soviet Union dropped schoolboy soldier programs after World War II.

The boys' training units, even for the youngest, have their political commissars alongside the millitary commanders, just as in the Soviet armed forces. They also have their military newspapers and political information classes.

From the start boys are told how they should think and instilled with patriotic feelings.

One of their tasks as "young armymen," the term used here, is to visit sights associated with the heroes of communism in the Revolution and World War II. They are also introduced to servicemen and veterans, who tell them about great deeds done for the motherland.

On military holidays, of which there are many, the boys' units are inspected as they drill and march. Each has its own bugler and drummer. The "young armymen" wear their red Pioneer scarfs in lieu of a uniform, and the officers have insignia of stars like those of the regular branches of the service.

Competitions are held on the regional, provincial and republic levels to pick out the detachments which excel in military-like exercises. A final in June produces the winner for the country. This unit receives a big medal proclaiming "victor" to attach to its banner.

[From the Communist Daily World, Feb. 6, 1969]

TWO-FRONT ATTACK PUSHED AGAINST ROTC PROGRAMS

(By Michael Jay)

The Reserve Officers Training Corps ROTC, is in trouble on campuses throughout the country. Long a target of anti-war activists, the military training programs are now under attack from at least two fronts.

Members of Students for a Democratic Society have decided to push the fight for the abolition of ROTC programs on the nation's campuses this spring. In so doing, they believe they can develop student understanding of imperialism and its relation to the campus.

This was agreed to at the National Council meeting of SDS last December at Ann Arbor and was further elaborated at an east coast regional meeting of the radical student group last weekend at Princeton. Some 300 students attended.

BREAK WITH TRADITION

This approach marks a departure from the traditional forms of opposition to ROTC and military recruiting on campus which have centered on the "moral issue," rather than the political question of imperialism.

The other attack on the program is coming from faculty policy making bodies at various schools, the most recent of which is Harvard. The Harvard faculty voted Monday to remove academic status from the program. The Yale faculty did the same thing last week. Other faculty groups are considering similar measures.

At these schools, ROTC will become a "legitimate" extra-curricular activity with students receiving no credit for their training.

While this will invariably decrease student enrollment in the program, it fails to meet the radical demand for its abolition.

According to an Army spokesman, 88 percent of the Army's officers come out of ROTC and officer training schools.

COMPULSORY COURSES DECLINE

The same spokesman revealed that the number of colleges and universities with compulsory ROTC courses has dropped from 132 to 95 in the last five years. This had led to a drop in enrollment in that period from 159,849 to 150,982.

At the same time, the Army says that no school has dropped the program in the last five years. The total number of ROTC schools stands at 268.

The Army has issued a list of 30 schools which, it says, have either added or intend to add ROTC programs. Most of these are small schools, located in the south, with a handful of all, midwestern and northern schools included.

Opposition to recruiting and ROTC has resulted in recent demonstrations at Columbia, CCNY, Rutgers, Michigan State, Tulane, Illinois, Howard, Stanford, Boston and Yale, to name a few.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Feb. 23, 1969]

STUDENTS PLAN DRIVE ON RACISM

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. National Student Association, a predominantly white organization noted in recent years for its preoccupation with foreign affairs—"with a lot of hot air and bombast on things like the free student movement in the Ukraine," according to its current president—is turning its formidable energies to what its members regard as the sorry state of affairs here at home.

One new plan is to help the country's Negro college students organize their own "network," linking the already militant movements on Northern and Western campuses with Negro colleges in the South.

The NSA has only limited funds for this antiracism project. It received a $7,260 grant from the Ford Foundation last year to finance a study of the problems of Negro college students but activities from now on will be supported by its own money—about $50,000 a year in dues and income from the sale of books, records, life insurance and travel services.

The NSA broke its controversial financial ties with the Central Intelligence Agency two years ago this month.

President Robert Powell, 24, a graduate student on leave from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, said the association has hired three experienced Negro organizers from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee as consultants and on-campus representatives at Southern Negro colleges.

He said NSA believes that these colleges are run, for the most part, by "white trustees" and "white Negroes," but that recent violent campus demonstrations involving race issues have disclosed that "occupying the administration building does not always get results."

A large NSA effort, backed by a three-year, $105,000-a-year Ford Foundation grant and a smaller one from the Stern Family Fund, is going into new kinds of student protest that Powell called "guerrilla in style, in the sense that they co-op the university, but basically non violent and non confrontationist."

He said the organization of Southern Negro campuses probably would adopt the same tactics.

"By not being overtly threatening," Powell said, stressing "overtly," we think we can build coalitions of young faculty and students, of liberals and radicals, which can bring changes, not by occupying administration buildings, but by showing the doubters."

NSA, with dues-paying membership of 387 schools, obviously would like to have a broader base, and its young leaders believe they can get it by "being relevant to student needs."

Under a $315,000 Ford Foundation grant, they are setting up a national information center here on "experimental education" at the college level—a term that translates roughly as student-controlled "free university" education, without academic credit.

Powell is optimistic about their chances of changing the educational system.

"Experimental education is an issue around which you can build some incredible coalitions and get things done," he said. "Almost everyone—students and faculty—really thinks the educational system we have is rotten. My own view is that it is not good for anything but job accreditation because it really has nothing to do with education or with the issues that the country must face—racism, technology, wealth and leisure."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, Feb. 20, 1969]

LAKE CHARLES SURVEY REVEALS MANY AGREE WITH COMMUNIST POINT

LAKE CHARLES.—All junior high and high school students, faculty members and administrators in the Calcasieu Parish School System were asked just one question:

"Do you agree that the fairest economic system takes from each according to his ability and gives to each according to his needs?"

Thirty-four per cent said yes and 21 per cent had no opinion.

Less than half said no.

The question was a direct excerpt from the Communist Manifesto, which outlines the economic philosophy of communism.

In May of last year, the Greater Lake Charles Chamber of Commerce and the Calcasieu School Board decided to survey all 15,235 junior high and high school students in the parish, and their leaders. The survey was to find out the understanding of students and teachers of American business and the free enterprise system.

The survey concluded that the greater majority of those completing the survey did not have any understanding whatsoever of the free enterprise system.

And state education officials say the results could lead to a crash program to teach all Louisiana students how the free capitalistic system works.

Asst. State Education Supt. Mack Avants said the survey had done a great service for the parish and the state.

The National Chamber of Commerce recommended such surveys last year, but the one released here Wednesday was the first to encompass an entire school system.

The Communist Manifesto question was the last on the survey.

VALID ANSWER

Another one asked: "The best way to raise living standards of most people is to?" Only 20 per cent chose "produce more goods and services per man hour." Thirty-one per cent said increase the legal minimum wage and 41 per cent said lower prices and 8 per cent said limit profits.

To "keep prices of most things at a reasonable level," only 23 per cent said competi-

tion in a free market place, 44 per cent said some kind of government price control; and 22 per cent said limit profits. Eleven per cent had no opinion.

On other questions those surveyed indicated either a misunderstanding or complete lack of knowledge about such aspects of free enterpise as business must operate at a profit, that economy flourishes with more goods and services per man hour of work, and that government spends only what business produces and within itself government generates no dollars, the chamber said.

WELCOME TO VIRGINIA, MR. FINCH

(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 many Americans were convinced that Mr. Finch, of Health, Education, and Welfare, was just another "South baiter"—picking on the South to conceal race problems in his own State.

One would expect that—like his deputy, James Farmer—he would live in Washington, D.C., where his children might benefit from the broad spectrum of this more socially enlightened area, having a proper ratio of race mixture.

Disappointingly, Mr. Finch moved his family into northern Virginia.

What excuse can Mr. Finch offer Senator THURMOND? That he is "just another political hypocrite." That he "can see the mote in the eye of the South, but not the beam in his own—or California's?"

If Mr. Finch ever accompanies his children to school in "occupied" Virginia, he will have to admit that he has exercised his freedom to choose rampant "noncompliance" for his children.

TAKE IT EASY, MR. FINCH

1. Your threat to close more schools in the South because of their failure to mix the Blacks and the Whites in a proportion satisfactory to your predecessors comes as a shock to the millions of people who voted for Mr. Nixon. It is to be hoped that you are not planning to persecute the White people of America, including the Southern Whites as vote bait for 1972.

2. Why did you issue your first ruling for Southern schools instead of schools in your home state of California where Fremont High School in Los Angeles has been given the legal privilege of operating since Black mobs demanded a black principal and got one by causing the White principal to be fired merely because he was White and got Black management of the school system without any suggestion that the Federal government might close the school for being reorganized strictly on a racist basis and on an anti-white basis? How do you propose to handle the Los Angeles school district? Are you going to cut off all Federal appropriations to Los Angeles because they have officially approved a segregated high school, organized in response to flag-burning mob violence in favor of Black control?

3. What about Brooklyn, New York where a program of segregation and local control designed by the Ford Foundation has been approved by the educational authorities of New York on a racist basis? Not only have White authorities been removed because they were White and replaced by Black authorities, glorified by mob violence and physical threats but scores of White teachers have been fired because they were White. Do you proposed now to cut off all Federal support to the school district of New York? Just what is your policy?

Every decent American citizen wants every family, regardless of race, creed or color, to enjoy Constitutional privileges. But the reaction expressed at the polls last November was a reaction against the outright persecution of a whole segment of our society involving not only the Whites of the South but the Whites everywhere.

CITIZENS CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

TRUTH IN TRADING STAMPS BILL

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to correct one of the most serious inequities in the American marketplace—the situation under which housewives are forced to purchase trading stamps as a tie-in sale when fulfilling their families' most basic food needs.

The truth in trading stamps bill has several major provisions but the most important is the one that will create an option for the housewife who now is required to pay the 2 percent that trading stamps contribute to food costs. Under the terms of the bill a true cash value would be placed on each trading stamp and the housewife would have option of redeeming her stamps for cash or for a premium.

The problem of trading stamps is older and more serious than a somewhat similar problem—the use of games of chance as a promotional device by retail food stores and gasoline stations. This morning I testified before the Federal Trade Commission on proposed FTC rules governing the use of games of chance as a retail promotional device. I also brought into my testimony the problem of trading stamps as a contributing factor to the rising cost of living.

Because of the relevance of my testimony before the FTC to the introduction of the Wolff truth in trading stamps bill, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LESTER L. WOLFF FOR A FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION HEARING ON PROPOSED RULES GOVERNING THE USES OF GAMES OF CHANCE IN RETAIL FOOD STORES AND GAS STATIONS, FEBRUARY 24, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission: I appreciate sincerely the opportunity to appear before you today on the matter of proposed regulations governing promotional games. Prior to my election to Congress I spent 25 years in the private sector as a marketing executive as well as having taught marketing at the college level. I mention this because it should be relevant to the testimony I am offering today.

At the outset I want to say that I favor both of the proposed regulations in principle. The games of chance that have grown so rapidly in the retail field are an appropriate area for federal regulations. I therefore welcome the Federal Trade Commission's involvement in this area.

Whatever action is undertaken by the FTC must be pursued with the knowledge that games of chance are a permanent aspect of retail promotion. We cannot, nor should we, attempt to eliminate such promotions as they are basic to retail operations and justified by the historical precedent.

But there are problems in the operation of these games. Congressmen Dingell and Conte held illuminating hearings and their testimony here today, combined with their report to the House Select Committee on Small Business, provides substantial evidence of the problems created by the use of games of chance especially in the gasoline station business by unscrupulous operators.

But the problem with promotional games of chance seems not with the large companies in the field. Rather it is with the parasitic growths that, sensing a quick if unscrupulous profit, attach themselves to an otherwise legitimate promotion.

That the leaders in the field are not the source of the problem is demonstrated by the existence of the Industry Guidelines for Retail Food Store Promotional Games promulgated prior to FTC action in this area. These industry guidelines, which correspond to the Commission's proposed Rule One, are actually stronger than the FTC proposal. I would respectfully suggest that the Commission consider adoption of the tougher industry guidelines in lieu of proposed Rule One.

But no amount of rule-making within the prescribed FTC jurisdiction will be adequate in dealing with the unscrupulous fly-by-night promoters who jump in and out of this business and generally operate on a local basis to escape the purview of the FTC. When these less reputable firms operate on an intrastate basis it is imperative that state governments move to enforce regulations similar to those put into force by the FTC.

But beyond this it is entirely possible for the FTC to bring into the scope of its authority those operators who adhere to intrastate promotions in an effort to circumvent the law. I urge the Commission to establish a broader interpretation of FTC authority which will make it possible for the Commission to involve itself in intrastate promotions undertaken by retailers who, in the normal course of their business, deal in interstate commerce. Clearly all retailers purchase merchandise from out-of-state sources and consequently could be brought into FTC purview. By plugging this unnecessary loophole the Commission can eliminate problems caused by nefarious schemes that attack the basic concepts of good marketing.

To sum up on this first point, gentlemen, I earnestly believe there is a need for regulations such as your proposed Rule One that would establish "Truth in Retail Games." However, I do not believe you have gone far enough in the commendable effort to control deceptive practices and believe the already existing industry guidelines provide a stronger control on games. I further believe that only an extension of FTC authority in this area will enable you to deal effectively with the smaller, more localized promoter who is more likely to engage in deceit than the more reputable, larger and generally legitimate promoters.

Now, on the matter of your proposed Rule Two. I heartily endorse your proposal to eliminate the coercion that has forced many gas station owners to participate in games. Conclusive evidence of coercion was brought out at the hearings held by my able colleagues, Congressmen Dingell and Conte. And the National Federation of Independent Business has provided me with further evidence that coercion by gasoline suppliers, on the matter of game participation, has repeatedly forced small gas station owners into bankruptcy.

While I do not take the position that games of chance should be eliminated from retailing, I strongly believe that participation should be at the option of the individual retailer.

Now as I applaud the Commission's efforts in attacking the widespread problems of games of chance—which definitely contribute to the rising cost of living as tie-in

sales—I am amazed and deeply troubled by the non-feasance or, perhaps, malfeasance and misfeasance of the Federal Trade Commission in failing to set guidelines for a much greater influence upon the cost of living . . . the widespread, almost pervading, use and misuse of trading stamps as a tie-in sale. The failure of the FTC to act decisively in this area is a great disappointment to me.

Hunting expeditions in this area have been undertaken by the FTC, but to date the greatly needed frontal attack on the problem that confronts every housewife who is forced to buy trading stamps as an accompaniment to her most basic household needs has been lacking. Commissioner McIntyre no doubt can recall from his days on Capitol Hill the constant barrage of letters that come to the Select Committee on Small Business from retailers and housewives in protest over the practices of trading stamp companies.

My own hearings on trading stamps turned up substantial evidence of coercion by oil companies on the matter of trading stamps, similar to that experienced regarding games of chance. Yet the older and more serious problem of coercion on the use of trading stamps remains neglected while the less serious, although quite real, problem of games of chance is considered by the Commission.

Some illuminating facts demonstrate the relative gravity of the impact games and trading stamps have on retail operations. The FTC's own report of December, 1968 "On the Use of Games of Chance in Food and Gasoline Retailing" indicated that measured as a percent of sales that trading stamps cost the consumer almost five times as much as games.

In fact, it has been clearly demonstrated that trading stamps add two percent to the cost of food for the average family. Since the annual cost of food is $50 billion this means the annual cost of trading stamps is one billion dollars. Without the cost of trading stamps every American family could have the equivalent of one week's groceries free every year.

Recognizing that the hearing today is addressed to the matter of games, I shall not belabor the issue of stamps. However I did want to mention it because of the parallel that exists between stamps and games and the unexplained failure of the FTC to attack the problem of stamps.

I, therefore, respectfully take this opportunity to call upon the FTC to take action immediately to establish a long overdue set of guidelines for the use of trading stamps in retailing.

While I do not want to eliminate trading stamps there should be an option for the housewife to exchange her stamps for either cash or the premium. There is no reason why a tie-in sale should be forced on a housewife; a tie-up sale that requires her to purchase a piece of a toaster with every loaf of bread or a screw for a washing machine with every package of soap.

How long shall the public be damned?

While I am here I shall be happy to add whatever information I can on the matter of games of chance and/or trading stamps in retailing if the Commissioners have any questions.

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

(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 introducing legislation which would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

This legislation would amend the section of the act relating to "banned hazardous substances" to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by regulation to keep out of interstate commerce channels any toys or products intended for use by children which have electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

Under present law, toys or other articles intended for use by children may be banned if the category of hazard involved is essentially of a chemical nature—toxic, corrosive, irritating, sensitizing—or is otherwise hazardous because flammable, pressurized, or radiational.

In effect, the categories of toy hazards against which the present Hazardous Substances Act provides possible protection are limited to two: pressurized and flammable.

I think this protection to our children should be expanded, and that is the intention in this legislation that I am introducing today. The three additional categories would be: electrical, thermal, and mechanical.

By adding these three categories, we can attack a number of hazards, including, but not limited to, sharp or protruding edges, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, electrical shock and electrocution, heated surfaces and unextinguishable flames.

Mr. Speaker, the need for these additional categories to apply to toys and other articles intended for use by children is great. The facts speak for themselves:

Of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in the United States, more than 15,000 of them die each year from accidents at a rate of 28 per 100,000 population. This figure is higher than the deaths from cancer, contagious diseases, heart diseases, and gastroenteritis combined.

More than half of the children who died as a result of accidents in 1966 were preschool children—birth to 4 to 5 years.

Another 17 million children annually are injured severely enough to restrict normal activity or require medical attention—a rate of 300 per 1,000 population.

The National Commission on Product Safety, created by Public Law 90–146, just released an interim report and in that report recommended legislation essentially along the lines of that which I am introducing. The Commission has held public hearings in New York City and in Boston in 1968, and more are scheduled for this year. I am pleased with the work that the Commission has done, and I look forward to the final report of the Commission at the end of the year.

In the course of these hearings, the Commission was appraised of incidents involving toys and other products designed for use by children and of resulting injury and death which shock the conscience and should cause the Congress to act quickly to prevent further unnecessary disasters.

The Commission learned of the use of jequirity beans in necklaces, jewelry, rosaries, and dolls' eyes. A single bead, chewed and swallowed, to a child might be fatal; chemistry sets were found with inadequate or nonexistent caution labels; a child is even capable of producing temperatures 200° F. and higher; a metal casting set with temperatures of up to 800° F.; a dart gun which could cause a dart to be inhaled into a child's lung if the muzzle end is placed in the mouth.

In addition, the Commission focused much of its attention to the problems of the improper or defective design of infant's cribs. Testimony during the Commission's hearings estimated that some 200 infants a year strangle in their cribs. Most of these deaths were attributable to a faulty design of the top of one type of crib, and in other instances to slats along the side which are too widely spaced thus permitting the body of the infant to slide through, but not the head. At the present time, there are no governmental or industry guidelines relating to these construction factors.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the manufacturers of these cribs were invited to testify before the Commission, but declined to do so which I think is unfortunate.

Moreover, the toy industry in this Nation has an annual sales range of from $2.5 to $3 billion. While the Safety Standards Committee of the Toy Manufacturers of America does make efforts to correct hazards, most of the safety work is concentrated on making playthings that are safe when used as intended.

I think it necessary to point out that most toys are bought for the user, not by the user. Also, the user is frequently not able or is not likely to read instructions and cautions. Industry incentive to bring about safe design and be aware of potential use of a product can be improved.

Perhaps too, the National Safety Council should do more in this area. At the present time the National Safety Council does not act as a clearinghouse for toys, nor is there a systematic review by the Council of toys that come into the marketplace, nor is there a review of instructions for use of a toy.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give early consideration to this legislation, and by strengthening the law, we can prevent much of this tragedy which strikes so many families unnecessarily.

THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY AND ITS UNWISE TAX PROPOSAL

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

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, action has been proposed by some of the six countries comprising the European Economic Community or Common Market which would have profound and deleterious effects upon agriculture in southeast Missouri and the entire Nation as well. If implemented this proposal would impose a consumption tax of $60 per metric ton on vegetable oil and $30 per ton on cake and meal sold in the Common Market countries. No crystal ball is necessary to predict that this would have a disastrous effect on U.S. agricultural exports and ultimately upset our precarious balance of payments. Forty percent of the more than 1.3 billion bushels of soybeans, or the equivalent thereof in oil, meal, or their products,

grown annually in the United States is sold abroad and 50 percent of the export sales are to European Common Market countries. Soybeans and soybean products account for more than one-third of all U.S. agricultural exports to the Common Market. The value of these is approximately $500 million.

While the action proposed by some of the Common Market ministers may be technically within the law, it obviously violates the "spirit" embodied in the Kennedy and Dillon rounds of trade negotiations. In a sharply worded, unanimously endorsed resolution deploring the tax, the House Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, predicted that if enacted, the tax would result in a reduction by about one-third of U.S. sales of soybeans and their products in the Common Market countries. This represents the equivalent of 60 million bushels or the product of 2 million acres.

In terms of Missouri this means that if the tax had been in effect in 1968, only 13 million bushels of soybeans produced in Missouri would have been sold rather than the 20 plus million normally purchased by the Common Market countries. In effect the market for thousands of acres of Missouri soybeans would be lost.

We are not without recourse, however. Prominently mentioned as possible means of retaliation are higher import duties on European automobiles, office equipment, typewriters, and wines.

U.S. negotiators have voiced strong objections to the proposed tax and have relayed the warning that such a move would result in the erection of barriers to the entry of Common Market products in this country. Their warning was given currency by the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 91 by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The resolution describes the proposal as a major blow to American agricultural producers, processors, and exporters tending to provoke retaliation by the United States.

Commenting on the matter, former Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman stated:

I feel that this matter of continued open access to the European Community markets for our soybeans and soybean products is one of the most important trade problems to confront the American farmers since I became Secretary of Agriculture. If the proposed action by the Community should take place, I can think of nothing that would do more to turn back the clock on the effort we have made to improve access to foreign markets for our farm products.

Fortunately, there is no unanimity between member countries of the Common Market. In a conversation with another Congressman, German Finance Minister, Franz Joseph Strauss pledged opposition to the tax. Minister Strauss recognizes that the best interests of Europe lie in the lowering of barriers to trade, not their erection. With this I agree and I hereby urge President Nixon to place this issue in a priority position on the list of topics to be discussed on his forthcoming European trip. We must make it abundantly clear that the United States will not stand idly by while action is taken which is so injurious to our economy. They must be convinced that the potentially disastrous consequences of the tax far outweigh the minimal benefits of the short term.

A POSITION ON THE SENTINEL

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am getting an increasing amount of mail from constituents on the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

I received one letter, for example, last week, objecting to my suggestion to President Nixon that he halt the program. I had urged the President to defer it at least until after we have had some nuclear disarmament discussions with the Soviet Union.

This constituent said he wanted a Sentinel site located in Seattle to protect him in the event of a missile attack on the United States. Apparently he did not know that the missile defense is not that simple; that a missile defense as presently developed probably would not protect him. I am sure this individual did not know that there are many ways for an enemy to confuse or decoy the defense missile into exploding before the offensive nuclear warheads reach their target. Many leading scientists think the program is a waste of money and would not work.

My own thinking is that our present offensive capacity is sufficient to deter any missile attack by Red China because, as former Secretary of Defense McNamara stated last year, it would be insane and suicidal for her to launch a missile attack when in retaliation we could completely destroy her.

In other words, a light deployment of U.S. AMB's would not deter Communist China, but our overwhelming offensive power would, or at least it seems reasonable to so conclude. It seems to me a halt in this anti-ballistic-missile defense system would hardly change that picture.

And, as for the second step, if we took it, to develop a so-called heavy ABM shield for defense against a Soviet attack with her more sophisticated capacity, I see no reason not to delay. To continue now probably would only induce the Soviets to vastly increase their offensive forces so as to overcome any added defensive capacity of ours. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is no assurance, regardless of cost, that a defense against Soviet attack would be possible.

The Nation wants an end to the nuclear arms race with the Communists, but it seems to me the better course in achieving arms limitation would be to delay the Sentinel program at least for the time being.

If I thought this meant a risk or would allow the Russians to outdistance us, I would think differently. But as long as the United States or the U.S.S.R. do not attain first-strike capability, I do not see that either country would ever decide to initiate an attack on the other.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, let us delay spending billions of dollars on a nuclear anti-ballistic-missile system until we have talked nuclear disarmament with the Soviets.

THE INDIAN SITUATION ON THE PINE RIDGE RESERVATION OF SOUTH DAKOTA

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Sunday, February 23, 1969, issue of the Washington Post, under the byline of William Greider, who has written an excellent article on the Indian situation on the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

I would particularly point out some of the latter paragraphs. He says:

Somehow, something goes terribly wrong. Six out of every ten Pine Ridge high school kids quit school without graduating. Many never start. Suicide attempts—including a lot of young people—are twice as high as the national rate. Juvenile crime is nine times greater than in other rural areas. Alcoholism starts early.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone is interested in knowing why this is true, all they need do is make a quick study of human nature. "Where there is no hope the people perish." These reservations offers no hope to anyone—young or old. There is nothing for the young people on these reservations—no jobs, no industry, no income, no hope, and no future.

As the writer quotes:

"We want to be with our people," said Louis, "but if there's no jobs, what's the use?"

That is the push-pull which the sociologists think is tearing them apart. They have one eye on the outside world, which means opportunity and fears; the other eye on the reservation, which means security and hopelessness.

This is exactly what I have been telling this Congress for 18 years, but no one wants to listen. They prefer to remain in the old rut. The solution, Mr. Speaker, is jobs, income and opportunity. The way to obtain this is by giving a tax exemption to any industry that will come onto these reservation areas and hire these people. This gives the young people something to look forward to. This gives them some incentive to remain in school—some incentive on the reservation where their people and their relatives live. They want a future the same as anyone else, but the reservation offers nothing, and can offer nothing without jobs, and industry cannot go out in these remote areas without a substantial subsidy.

For 10 years I have had legislation pending in the Congress which would provide a subsidy similar to what other emerging nations, and other emerging countries, have offered, and are offering. We do not need an expanding Bureau of Indian Affairs. Let the Bureau take care of the land holdings of the tribes and the allottees, but let the Indians have some future through jobs, which can only be produced by locating industries on the reservations. Instead of spending 150 years of guardianship making these people feel they are unwanted wards, let us give them 15 years in industry, with opportunity, instead of 150 years of reg-

ulation, and then let us see what happens.

The article follows:

WOUNDED KNEE STILL FESTERS

(By William Greider)

PINE RIDGE, S. DAK.—The Oglala band of the Sioux Indians, encamped on the great prairies of the Pine Ridge Reservation, have learned to celebrate small favors. So, a few weeks ago, the men got their ceremonial costumes out of hock, the feathered bonnets and beaded breastplates which they pawn in surrounding white communities between powwows.

Over at Custer State Park, the buffalo herd maintained as a tourist attraction was being thinned. The park management slaughtered and quartered the animals and sent some of the meat over to the reservation. At churches and community centers, the Oglala gathered for feasts and dancing. Tribal politicians collected unearned thanks for the happy occasion.

It has all become civilized, this business of white men and Indians. In the old days, when the Sioux were freshly defeated and newly dependent on Army rations for their survival, the soldiers would turn loose a cow then watch as the Indians chased it across the meadow and killed it, re-enacting their lost status as Great Plains hunters.

Now, most of it is reduced to paperwork, application forms and eligibility lists, committees formed to see who will get a job and who won't, who gets a new house or pump so he won't have to haul water from the creek. Give them free buffalo meat and their hearts and minds will surely follow.

A GALVANIC NAME

The shooting between the races ended on this reservation in 1890 at a creek called Wounded Knee. Some history books mention it briefly as a battle, but the Sioux remember it as a massacre.

In December, 1890, several hundred Sioux were intercepted by cavalry, disarmed and slaughtered. The frozen bodies of men, women and children were stacked in a long trench and, like deer hunters, the soldiers posed for pictures around the grave.

Wounded Knee. The name is like an electric impulse to the sleeping mind. It jogs the older ones out of their self-consciousness with a white stranger; it pierces the reserve which white men take for apathy.

"There's one little boy who lost his little moccasin," said Jessie Little Finger. "He had two hard-tack crackers in his hand, frozen, when they found him. There's another woman, she was already dead and she had a little baby nursing at her breast.

Mrs. Little Finger's grandparents died there. Her father and her uncle were small boys who ran from the Hotchkiss guns and lived to describe it.

"The soldiers told them to sit all in the ring and they took their weapons," Mrs. Little Finger explained. Her fingers drummed rapidly on the tabletop, her voice hushed. "Pretty soon, the people looked around and they saw the guns on the hill and they started to run, but they were all shot. My Dad's brother was shot in the back; my husband's father, his heel was shot off. They were little boys then, and they lived with those things."

A REMUNERATIVE SHRINE

Recently, a group of white men decided to absolve their fellow Americans of any lingering guilt. They formed the Wounded Knee Memorial Association Inc. to raise several million dollars to erect a monument at the site of the massacre.

"This monument," they announced, "will be built by the American people to, in part, fulfill an unpaid debt in the cause of human rights and as witness to one of the darkest pages in the history of American progress." The monument will have a butane eternal flame.

The white men also formed the Sioux Corp., which bought a 30-acre tract next to the gravesite, a tract that includes the ravine where many of the Indians died. There they intend to build a motel, a trading post and other moneymaking tourist attractions. "What we hope to have here is something like a miniature Gettysburg," said one of them.

The Indians did not understand, or else they understood too well. The survivors of Wounded Knee long ago erected their own modest monument beside the mass grave.

"It's not beautiful," said Mrs. Little Finger, "but we're poor Indians. They say they will give jobs to Indians, but I don't think we should sell our grandfathers' and grandmothers' bones."

With some detachment, Toby Eagle Bull, executive vice president of the Pine Ridge tribal council, laughed at the neatness of the proposal, serving white guilt and making a little money at the same time. "They ought to have a monument of a cavalryman on a horse with his sword raised to chop off the head of an Indian woman carrying her baby," Eagle Bull said, dropping his guard. "That's the way it was."

Still, some of the Indians are signing petitions in favor of the monument. "You'll find," said Eagle Bull, "no matter what it is, you can always get some Indians to go along."

The shooting stopped a long time ago, but hardly anyone at Pine Ridge would say that the war is over. "To be truthful," a Jesuit missionary said, "if we had a million Indians here instead of 10,000, I think we'd have troops stationed here, too."

A CABIN ON A RIDGE

Each man seeks his own answers, if he is strong enough. Still lean at 56, Pete Catches broke off from his family and from the tribal politics which had supported him.

"The people now are accustomed to this way of life, this welfare," he explained. "Just a very few want to be left alone. The Bureau (the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which supervises the reservation) is hard to live by. A lot of times they made us say yes when we want to say no."

With a young woman, Pete Catches went up the side of a ridge, just below the line of ponderosa pine, to live in a tent. When fall came on, he built a small log cabin; the carpentry is snug. The watertight roof is covered with sod and the dirt floor is pounded as smooth as linoleum. A cup, a broom, a kerosene lantern hang along the wall, which are lined with muslin. The wood stove requires a thick pine log in the morning and another at nightfall.

"I really like to live the rest of my life as realistically as I can," he said. "That's why I grew my hair, the way God made me. I want to pray to God with this pipe and heal people. Let God judge my way."

The silken black hair is braided over his shoulders like a rich shawl. He is a full-blood Sioux and a wichasha wakan, a healing man, a man who calls the spirits. The corners and rafters of his home are adorned with the religious paraphernalia of chanunpa—the sacred pipe. A prayer flag hangs outside on a long, slender pole. With his prayers and guidance, others fast in quest of holy visions.

"A real Indian," he said, "never begs. We never try to go into the poverty program. Our young people—they walk the highway and try to thumb a ride. I will walk the highway all day long and never ask for a ride."

Most of the Indians are Christianized, but three generations of missionaries have not extinguished the Indian religion. The spiritual men, still numerous on the reservation, are regarded by their own people with mixtures of derision and awe. The people frequently consult both the wichasha wakan and the Public Health Service hospital.

Pete Catches, as much as he can, has reduced life to the elemental—foraging the canyon for wood, hauling water up the hill, praying to the spirits. He does not pretend that others will follow.

"Now we have two Indians," he noted sadly. "One is educated and has no pride. One is leaning and clinging to his Indian way and has pride. That is the way it is."

CORPORAL CULTURE

"Acting white" is still a stinging expression used by the older, the more conservative. But a pretty teen-age girl, Iris Between Lodge, describes how Lakota, the native language, is dying among her generation: "If you do try to speak Indian, the kids make fun of you. Big Indian, they call you."

"I remember," said Toby Eagle Bull, whose hair is prematurely white, "when I started school, I couldn't speak a word of English. I was living with my grandmother, and she didn't believe in sending kids to school or having anything to do with white people. When the police came out and took me to school, the only thing we kids could talk on the playground was Indian. Every Saturday afternoon, they had a spanking session for all of us."

Now, the cultural conversion takes a new turn. The "black robes," the Jesuits who founded the Holy Rosary Mission in 1888, are teaching Lakota at their school, as well as Indian culture and history. The BIA has started a course in Sioux civics at the Bureau boarding school. The priests are thinking of setting up some sort of oratorical prize for Lakota.

"With the kids, the language is associated with poverty and drunkenness and ignorance," said Father Glen Wellshons, the guidance counselor at Holy Rosary. "There's no status in it for them. These are attempts to show respect for what is Indian in them. They should be grounded and somehow made whole."

That is the heart of the problem at Pine Ridge. The 70 years of occupation have debased and beaten down what is Indian, but the people have not been converted into white men.

THE FUNDAMENTAL FAMILY

For centuries, the Sioux functioned harmoniously without money. As the anthropologists describe it, their survival depended on constantly contriving sophisticated uses of what the land would yield. Before Wounded Knee, it was buffalo. Out of this survival economics, a web of values was impressed on the Indian mind, values which, one Government psychiatrist observed, "make white middle-class America look culturally deprived."

As a unit of survival, the Sioux family meant something much larger and stronger than two parents and their children. The Indian kids still confuse their white teachers occasionally by referring to their mother's sister as "mother" or their first cousins as "brothers and sisters." The system of personal relationships—which protected individuals from the ultimate threats of death, illness and starvation—was more complex than any Social Security law enacted by a white legislature.

People—getting along with other people—came before personal possessions. It was both physically awkward and unnecessary to lay aside great stores. Abundance was shared. The natural rhythm of the land and the strength of the family provided the security for the future. The Indian sense of time has always struck white men as hopelessly impractical.

Remnants still survive. When a teenage boy died recently in an auto accident, his grandmother, despite the family's poverty, gave away cherished possessions to the

mourners—his portable radio, his clothes, her handmade quilts. Funeral sharing is less civilized than Probate Court; still, it persists among the very poor.

"The Indian is not one bit like the white man, who thinks about nothing but his money," a high school senior said in a classroom essay. "The whites also never help anybody. They must always get paid for it."

But the essayist conceded that things are changing: "They will keep changing for the Sioux until they live like white people. When that happens, this reservation will be a living hell."

A PRICE TAG ON SHARING

The money economy has already obliterated the basis of the old values and the cultural fabric is torn beyond repair. An Oglala family is still likely to take in a brother's or sister's family that is homeless, further crowding the cabin. But a son-in-law with a car may charge Grandma $5 to drive her into town so she can consult the free Government clinic.

When a missionary introduced the simple institution of a rummage sale, his parishioners were unsettled. "They were happy to donate their old clothes to the church," he recalled, "but they were shocked when we put them up for sale." In time, they accepted it.

When telephone service was extended to the more affluent Indian families, many of them found it necessary to get unlisted numbers. Other, less fortunate Indians were using their numbers to make long-distance calls. Sharing has its limitations in the modern scheme.

The landscape of Pine Ridge, raw but beautiful, is littered with evidence of the cultural conflict. Trails of cow dung and beer cans line the main-traveled roads across the prairies. Along the canyon creeks, where cottonwoods have grown twisted by the wind, the tiny shacks and log cabins are surrounded by junked cars, an incredible number of junked cars.

Each fall, most families receive their lease checks, usually several hundred dollars, money collected and distributed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which leases the Indian-owned lands for cattle grazing and farming. During this brief false prosperity, the used car lots in the surrounding white towns do a rush business: if a family lives in an isolated cove, owning a car can be a matter of survival. As the cars break down, parts are swapped or tires are sold. The hulks accumulate.

TENTS STILL PERSIST

With the introduction of trailers and the construction of several public housing projects, reservation housing has improved considerably in recent years. But a third of the Indian families still live in log cabins and a few still live in tents. Because their homes are so small, the yard is used as an attic. When the spring snows are done, families move outdoors to tents and makeshift beds in the abandoned cars.

Some prefab buildings are scattered across the reservation, left over from an Army ordnance depot which closed. They are warmer than a tent, bigger than a log cabin, but some families regard them as mixed favors. In a blizzard, the people cannot find the bottled gas to run the stove or the money to pay an electric bill by searching the creek bottom, where they once found wood.

Survival now depends almost exclusively on the Government. The 10,000 Indians are scattered over acreage twice the size of Delaware, but the economic center is Pine Ridge, a community of nearly 3000 with the Spartan appearance of a temporary Army post.

The BIA, the police, the municipal center are in brick buildings. There is a row of identical white houses where the Government officials live. The rest consists of flotsam housing surrounding several schools and churches, a hospital, two gas stations, a grocery store and a lunch counter cafeteria. For the rest of life's necessities or luxuries, the people drive off the reservation (even for their alcohol, since the tribe enforces prohibition).

Aside from the modest welfare checks and all of the social services it provides, the Government is the only stable employer. Unemployment runs close to 40 per cent on the reservation. Of the Indians who do receive paychecks, more than half work for the Government—as school bus drivers or accountants, policemen or highway crewmen, as bureaucrats for the tribe's elected council or as subjects of an antipoverty program.

Inevitably, the better educated, the mixed breeds who look and act more like white men, get most of the jobs, which sows resentment. "If anything comes along," said an old full blood, "the ieska (mixed breeds) get it first. Whatever it is, the housing or the cattle loans, it will reach the Indian last."

EVEN FISHHOOKS FAIL

For one reason or another, the long succession of attempts to make the Indians into self-sufficient white men have failed. So the Sioux are developing a peculiar reservation culture.

Cattle ranching has increased over the last decade, but it has a limited future because of the huge amount of land required. The Bureau tried relocating the people in cities, but many of them came back. The outlook for economic development is not especially promising.

A fishhook factory opened at Pine Ridge in 1961 and employed 200 to 300 Indians. The wages were low and the jobs had no future, but the workers, it is said, were adjusting to a time clock-and-paycheck mentality. Last summer, the fishhook factory closed. Its managers explained that competition from imported fishhooks made the reservation production impractical.

Over the years, the failures and frustrations, the shifts of Government policy have created such divisions among the people that it is hard to get them to agree among themselves on solutions. A promising proposal for an Indian-controlled demonstration school ran afoul of tribal politics and was defeated in a referendum.

Full bloods resent blond, blue-eyed Indians who are making it as cattle ranchers on Indian land leased at preferential rates. The mixed breeds say that the "old Indians" would rather perish than face realities. They all resent the Bureau and its red tape, yet live with the fear that the Government will someday walk away and leave mass suffering in the vacuum.

These pressures seem to be cracking the tribe's strongest institution—the family. All of the statistics on divorce, separations, unwed mothers suggest that the family is losing some of its durability. Foster children, once unheard of among the Indians, are becoming commonplace.

Against this history, the Oglala Sioux do not talk about dramatic breakthroughs. A few young men who have been away to college are trying to organize business co-ops, but their ideas are still vague and untested. They already face opposition within the tribe.

As one missionary suggested, most of the Sioux have tried to invoke their ancient adaptability to conform with the welfare colonialism. "They see these programs coming from Washington, and they've seen so many of them," he said, "they view them in terms of survival.

"We had a committee to decide who would get jobs in one of the poverty programs. The whites on the committee would look at an applicant's work record and experience. The Indians were looking at who had the most children."

THE HISTORIC FUTURE

William Good Voice Elk, whose name evokes beauty and harmony to the Sioux, stood amid his squalor and six children and tried to talk about the future. Ask him about tomorrow, and he begins by discussing today and yesterday.

"We wanted to get one of those new houses," he offered, pointing to Army-surplus homes across the road. "We filled out an application." His family lives in a small tent heated by a wood stove, and has been living there for five years.

"We were going to get a pump so we wouldn't haul water," his wife Rose put in. "I asked the Public Health for a pump, but I never did get it."

A basket filled with rotting garbage stood outside the tent. A small boy with a runny nose and puffy face, with a ring of dirt on his belly just above the trousers, stood by his father.

Mrs. Good Voice Elk complained about the welfare checks. They work summers on the farms in Nebraska and every year their lease check is $375, but mainly they are living by the hands of others.

The father and mother are 36 years old but their faces seem past 50, an age which the percentages say they will never reach. "I went down to the Pine Ridge last month to see about a job," he said. "There's no jobs around here at all."

Good Voice Elk looked off down the road, then glanced over at the visitor. For an instant, when their eyes met, a flicker of embarrassment crossed his face. He had not answered the question.

THE PERISHABLE YOUNG

"These Indians," said Hobart Keith, an Indian, too, "better learn to swim or they're going to drown."

As tribal judge, Keith presides over the weekly procession of drunks, disorderly conducts, petty larcenies and truants who constitute Pine Ridge's juvenile crime problem.

In line with the other constrictions of reservation life, the kids face arrest for violating a 10 p.m. curfew on weekends. To get drunk, they drive over the line to Nebraska saloons, and occasionally the ride back ends in death. Many of the younger ones get high at home sniffing glue or gasoline.

"It seems like we bury more of our young people than the old ones who are through with life," a parish priest observed.

The young people of Pine Ridge are the most perplexing because they seem so promising. Clothes-conscious and pretty, the girls wear miniskirts and bell-bottom slacks and green eye shadow. The boys carry transistor radios tuned to KMOA, the rock voice of the middle border.

"Everything should be geared to the children," said Toby Eagle Bull, the tribal leader. "We can't do that much for the older group; we can't stay on the reservation forever. We have to educate these kids so they can get along with the whites."

Most whites would buy that, probably. Essentially, that has been the policy of the Government from the start. Assimilate. Let them jump into the melting pot with everyone else.

Somehow, something goes terribly wrong. Six out of every ten Pine Ridge high school kids quit school without graduating. Many never start. Suicide attempts—including a lot of young people—are twice as high as the national rate. Juvenile crime is nine times greater than in other rural areas. Alcoholism starts early.

A Public Health Service study of mental patients at Pine Ridge reported that "55 per cent of the dreams and early memories dealt with problems around dependence-independence, that 40 per cent dealt with the problems of aggression . . . Of the dreams and early memories related to aggression, 68 per

cent dealt with themes of being hurt, either by others or by oneself."

THE BREAKING POINT

Studies of school performance suggest the personal agony. The Indian kids start out below average on the national tests, then they seem to catch on and actually score above average for several years. At adolescence, their performance falls apart—at the point when they grasp what it means to be an Indian in a world made for white men.

A group of teen-agers kicking it around found different words. At an age when most kids feel like conquering the world, they talked of the future realistically, without inspiration.

"They're just fed up and trying to get out," said Louis Moves Camp, a 16-year-old full blood. "The reason a lot of teen-agers drink is because the parents drink. A lot of kids want to go, but they don't want to leave their families.

"I've been in big cities," said Iris Between Lodge, "and I felt like I was that low—like I was dirt because I was an Indian."

Yet she and her friends want to go, too.

"We want to be with our people, said Louis, "but if there's no jobs, what's the use?"

That is the push-pull which the sociologists think is tearing them apart. They have one eye on the outside world, which means opportunity and fears; the other eye on the reservation, which means security and hopelessness.

Gerald One Feather, a 30-year-old college graduate who returned to Pine Ridge in the hope that he could aid its development, described the dilemma:

"The people have been trying, but you reach a point where you give up. You don't have the power to do anything. The kids are forced to make a decision—either be an Indian or be an American. The kids say, 'Well, I'll try to be an American'."

Some of them make it. But many drown, the modern casualties of the Indian wars. Since Wounded Knee, the pacification has been going rather badly.

DENVER & RIO GRANDE WESTERN RAILROAD TAKEOVER

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, which is domiciled in Colorado, recently found itself involved in an apparent takeover maneuver by an organization which describes itself as an "investment banking-holding company."

This firm, the Carter Group, Inc., has only been in existence since September 1968. This is an unusual organization in several respects.

For one thing, it was formed without a single member of its executive committee having a substantial background in railroad management—the individual resumes in the firm's prospectus bears this out—and yet the first acquisition which the Carter Group has its sights on is the very successful Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad.

For another thing, I find it remarkable that two-thirds of the stock in this company—which appears to be the principal trading commodity in the threatened tender offer—would be owned by a group of men who have put up only 8 to 9 percent of the tangible assets.

I believe this matter should be the concern, primarily, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and I understand that a thoroughgoing SEC investigation has been requested.

However, it occurs to me that the ICC also should look into this situation, which promises to be repeated if the Carter Group should be successful in their Rio Grande venture. The railroad industry, after all, is one of the most heavily regulated in the Nation, and surely the Commission would look with alarm at the demise of an expert management by a group which—to quote the prospectus again—is trying to profit by "the creative interplay of the acquisition technology."

DRAMATIC INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF LUMBER

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the dramatic increase which has occurred in the last 15 to 18 months in the price of lumber and plywood in our country. As a retail lumber merchant, I am thoroughly familiar with this situation.

I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to statistics put out by the Bureau of Labor showing that between December 1967, and December 1968, the average mill price of softwood lumber rose 30 percent, and the price of plywood rose 77 percent.

Since December of 1968, however, we have had further dramatic increases in the price of both softwood lumber and plywood, both items of which are fundamental and basic to the construction of new homes.

Dimension lumber which consists of 2 by 4; 2 by 6; 2 by 8; et cetera, in green fir sold late in 1967 at approximately $70 per thousand. The price on January 16 was $112 per thousand; on February 12, $128 per thousand; and last week $140 per thousand. One-quarter-inch AD plywood—the price on this item indicates general prices on various grades of plywood—was approximately $60 per thousand late in 1967; by January 16, the price was $125 per thousand; and last week it was $144 per thousand.

The lumber manufacturers on the west coast today do not seem to have any established price list, but it is simply handled on the basis of an auction with the sale going to the highest bidder.

We had an instance which occurred in one of my retail yards 2 weeks ago where we had a quotation from a mill on a carload of plywood that a contractor needed. We quoted the contractor a price, called the mill back on the telephone 2 hours after the quotation was received, were advised that they were sorry but the price had gone up $8 per thousand.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Banking and Currency and also the Judiciary Committee investigate this tremendous increase in the price of lumber and building materials, which is going to seriously hamper new construction and President Johnson's program of construction of thousands of lower-income housing units in this country.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TAKES FIRM STAND AGAINST EEC'S PROPOSED INTERNAL TAX ON SOYBEAN OIL AND MEAL

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the crucial importance of a favorable balance of trade. That fragile balance, smaller this past year than anticipated, is truly one major foundation upon which our currency must depend for support.

In the past few weeks, many knowledgeable Americans have become increasingly concerned over reports from the European Economic Community indicating that those nations are seriously considering imposition of an "internal tax" on oilseed products. The proposed tax is so high that it would, if imposed, effectively deny U.S. access to an annual market of nearly $500 million in oilseed products. Its impact on American agriculture would be serious; its impact on the U.S. balance of trade would be catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread interest Members have shown in this delicate trade problem, I insert a recent letter I received from the Honorable George V. Hansen, Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, in the RECORD at this point. I am pleased that the administration has chosen to take a firm stand on this issue.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MIZE: This is with respect to the concern which you have expressed over the European Community's proposal to place a consumption tax on oilseeds and oilseed products.

As you may know, on December 19, 1968, the Commission of the European Community submitted to the Council of Ministers (the Community's Executive Body) its long awaited policy program to reform the agricutural sector, including specific provisions relating to fats and oils. The Commission proposes to introduce a tax of $60 per metric ton on vegetable and marine oils and $30 per ton on meals and to take the initiative in launching negotiations for an international arrangement for fats and oils. Such measures ostensibly designed to stabilize the edible fats and oils market, particularly butter, are in fact designed to plug the hole in the otherwise highly protective wall of their Common Agricultural Policy through which oilseeds and high-protein meals enter duty free without restriction.

We consider this to be most important trade problem that has arisen in agriculture between the United States and the European Community because of the magnitude of our trade in oilseeds and oilseed products—nearly $500 million in 1967/68 and expanding. Impairment of our access to the important European market would have a serious impact on farm incomes and on the U.S. balance of payments. In addition, it is another example of the Community's policy of shifting most of the burden of supply adjustment to third countries through intensification of import restrictions and export aids. We have, therefore, taken an extremely strong position in opposition to the tax.

The U.S. Government has continuously and forcefully warned the European Commu-

nity that their proposed tax would sharply reduce the Community's imports of oilseeds and oilseed products and would result in a massive impairment of the present access available to American exporters. We made it clear that we could not agree to any action or subscribe to any arrangement which would limit our export opportunities, or deny to us the benefit of concessions negotiated under GATT. We also made it clear that such action would leave us no choice but to retaliate promptly to restore the balance of concessions. You may have seen in newspaper stories the thought that our retaliation might include such important exports as European automobiles, typewriters, office equipment, wines, and similar items that Americans buy from them in large amounts.

What we, in fact, are saying to the European Community is that the enactment of a consumption tax on oilseed products could lead to the most serious trade policy confrontation between the Community and the United States with commercial and political implications extending beyond agriculture.

We will continue to make representations to the Community through all available channels to keep unimpaired our access to Community markets for our oilseeds and oilseed products.

Our latest information is that the Council of Ministers is not likely to act on the proposal in its present form. Final action, if any, is not expected to be taken in the immediate future.

Please let me know if I may be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE V. HANSEN,
Deputy Under Secretary.

TAX REVISION AND TAX REFORM

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee relative to tax-exempt organizations. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert a copy of my statement and other material into the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman: I would like to begin by complimenting you and your committee upon instituting this series of hearings. The pressures for tax revision and tax reform are building at a rapid pace. The taxpaying public is making its desires known and it is incumbent upon us as legislators to be responsive to their demands.

I had originally requested time to appear before your committee last week. When I learned that our colleagues, the Honorable Wright Patman and the Honorable John J. Rooney were each planning to appear and discuss possible abuses of tax-exempt privileges, I decided to request a change in the date of my appearance so as to avoid as much as possible a repetition of the matters called to your attention by these two gentlemen.

I would like to comment, in passing, that the testimony provided by these two gentlemen deserves, and I am sure it will receive, full and serious consideration by the members of this committee. Their testimony has served to point up the degree to which the so-called "charitable" organization operates under privileges not accorded the average taxpayer, whether he be laborer or businessman, and the degree to which these privileges are being abused for partisan political activity.

Certainly, all of us would agree that charitable and humanitarian purposes rightly receive support and encouragement from the Federal government in the form of special tax privileges. In equal degree, however, I am sure we would also agree that combatants in the political arena should all labor under the same set of rules and the same handicaps. From our mutual experiences in the realm of politics, I am sure we will all likewise agree that money is the mother's milk of a political campaign. To the degree that one combatant in a political campaign receives direct or indirect financial or material support to his campaign from a source enjoying a financial subsidy through special tax privileges, to that degree the equality of rules between two political opponents is upset.

I noted with considerable amusement news accounts of the appearance of Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the Chairman of the Board of the Ford Foundation when he explained a disbursement of in excess of $131,000 to individuals who had been closely associated with the late Senator Kennedy in his campaign for the presidency. It is my understanding that the purpose of the Ford Foundation is to encourage research into fields which would otherwise go begging for research. I would assume that any organization having this purpose, before embarking upon a new venture involving considerable expenditure of funds would first ask itself "What results are expected from this expenditure?" Indeed, any business organization or government organization which did not ground all of its activities upon this fundamental question could not long survive.

Mr. Bundy, however, is a man of great imagination and is not limited to such simple business or government fundamentals. It appears that his primary motive in making disbursements is to display his personal concern and desire to do charity for individuals with whom he holds a personal sympathy. He stated in his testimony that his principal motivation was to display his degree of concern for the Kennedy family (which so far as we can generally determine has small need for financial assistance) and when asked as to what results were expected from his display of grief, replied "It may be several years before any results, if any, appear".

I would never question the right of Mr. Bundy, acting for himself or acting as a head of an organization to use his personal funds for whatever purpose he sees fit. What I do question, and what is the legitimate area for inquiry by this committee, is the degree to which the taxpayers of this country should subsidize the peculiar whims of others. In my own opinion, any tax subsidy is a privilege and any use of funds acquired through the enjoyment of tax privileges should be absolutely barred from use in political campaigns or for political purposes.

The purpose of my appearance today is to invite to the attention of the members of this committee a bill which I have prepared and which will be introduced today in the Congress. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide a legal framework to prevent groups or organizations having tax privileges from diverting the funds entrusted to them into the political arena.

My legislation first recognizes that any organization has a right to defend its own existence. When tax-free foundations are under attack, in general, or if any particular tax-exempt organization or its activities are under attack, then it is only proper that such organization have the right to make appearances and in effect "lobby" on behalf of its own survival and the continuation of its privileges. The American Bar Association, a non-profit, non-partisan organization supported for the purpose of conducting research in the field of law and the administration of law, has prepared a model law which would govern the activity of tax-exempt organizations. The Committee on Tax-Exempt Organizations of the American Bar Association concluded that a distinction should be made between supporting a political candidate and a political issue as exemplified by proposed legislation.

The very purpose of many trade associations is to promote legislation of interest to that trade association. The proposal of the Subcommittee of the American Bar Association did not prohibit such activities.

In my own opinion, it is a legitimate exercise of the right of freedom of speech for a group of invididuals, whether they be businessmen, laborers, or churchgoers, to establish an organization to present their views to legislative bodies and individual legislators for consideration.

The activity which is prohibited in the recommended code of the American Bar Association is direct intervention in a political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to a particular political candidate.

I have incorporated in my proposed legislation the language of the model law drawn by the Committee on Tax Exempt Organizations. This language would permit organizations to "lobby" on behalf of the causes and purposes of the organization and permit organizations enjoying tax benefits to seek public support for the causes which it espouses.

The language of this proposed code, however, presents an absolute prohibition against the use of funds by a tax exempt organization on behalf of a political party or a political candidate.

The penalty for violation of the prohibition would be the loss of tax-exempt status (that is the deductability of donations or gifts by supporters of the organization and the treatment of all revenues from any source as income for tax purposes) for the year in which a violation has occurred and for the three years following. The reason for extending the period of loss of tax privileges beyond the year of violation is to prevent flagrant abuses by an organization during an election year and then grant that organization the privilege of building its war chest during the next three years in preparation for the next political campaign.

A second purpose of my proposed legislation is to prevent the use of dues collected by labor unions and other similar organizations for the purpose of supporting a political candidate. As I have commented earlier, I regard the right of individuals or groups of individuals to band together for promoting a particular purpose as being a legitimate extension of the right of freedom of speech. I draw a sharp distinction, however, between promotion through the use of tax privileges of purposes espoused by a group and the promotion of particular political candidates or political parties.

The labor unions of this country are perhaps the most notorious violators of the Corrupt Practices Act which prevents direct corporate involvement and, in its language, prevents direct political activity on the part of labor organizations.

The courts have numerous times reported cases in which labor leaders readily acknowledge the use of union funds for direct intervention in political campaigns. For example, United States v. Anchorage Federal Labor Council 193 F. Supp. 504 (1961); United States v. Planters Local #481 et al 172 F. 2d 854 (1949); United States v. International Union United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America 352 U.S. 567 (1957); and United States v. CIO 335 U.S. 106 (1947). Union leaders do not deny the direct participation of their organizations in political campaigns. For example, see article in the September 19, 1968 *Wall Street Journal.*

The cases which I have cited above all relate to prosecutions under the Corrupt Practices Act which specifically prohibits the use by labor organizations of their general funds for political purposes.

There is a grievous inconsistency between the language of the Corrupt Practices Act, the Internal Revenue code and the practices of the Internal Revenue Service. The inconsistency in the law arises because the statutory prohibition contained in the Corrupt Practices Act is not carried over into the Internal Revenue code. In short, activity which is subject to criminal prosecution in one section of the law is not prohibited under the Internal Revenue code which authorizes tax privileges for labor organizations.

Indeed, the Internal Revenue Service does not recognize the Corrupt Practices Act as being a part of the U.S. code. When one group, the National Right to Work Committee, was under investigation by the Internal Revenue Service for the avowed purpose of finding justification for stripping them of their tax privileges, an inquiry was made to the Internal Revenue Service as to whether a like investigation would be proper with regard to labor organizations. We all recognize that the National Right to Work Committee and labor have purposes that are exact opposites to each other. I am attaching hereto copies of the correspondence for the benefit of the committee. The correspondence speaks for itself and reveals a callous disregard for the principle that all groups similarly situated are entitled to equal protection and equal treatment under the law. The position taken by the writer of the letter from the Internal Revenue Service appears wholly without legal foundation and is obviously contrary to the criminal activities prohibited in the Corrupt Practices Act.

I think it's appropriate to call to the attention of the members of this committee the method whereby labor organizations finance the activities of the official propaganda agency of labor unions, that is, the Committee on Political Education (generally referred to as COPE).

COPE is without serious debate one of the most militant political organs in the country. Its publications, ostensibly mailed for "educational" purposes, represent one of the finest examples of pure propaganda to grace the American literary scene.

I repeat again, that COPE or any organization has a right to promote causes which its leadership determines to be in their own best interest. What I do object to is the method whereby funds collected by a tax-exempt organization are used to support political parties and political candidates.

It is the manner of financial support and tax privileges enjoyed by COPE that I consider subject to question.

Each union member supports his local union and national union through dues. Any organization, if it is to function, must have revenue, and union dues are a perfectly legitimate method of financing union activities. Inasmuch as such dues must be paid by union members as a condition precedent to their either gaining or holding employment under union shop contracts, such dues are properly deducted from the union member's gross receipts as a necessary expense to his holding employment.

Each union is assessed each month for its share of support to COPE. This assessment is based on the number of union members belonging to that particular local. The amount assessed against each local is taken from the dues which have been collected from the members of that local.

Any argument that the deduction from the member's dues for uses by COPE is a voluntary contribution is a ludicrous sham. I enjoy the support of the majority of union members in my district because they feel that I am representing their views in Washington. Yet, the union leadership of some unions (but fortunately for me, not all) have opposed my candidacy in direct opposition to the views of the members themselves.

The article referred to above in the Wall Street Journal reveals that union dues were used for the express purpose of propagandizing the union membership on behalf of political candidates for whom a heavy percentage of the membership had no sympathy. Thus the membership was being compelled to pay for the political propaganda designed to change their minds.

What I am seeking to illustrate is this—union leadership can and does use union funds for political campaigns at their own whim in callous disregard for the rights of the members. The Federal government has no right to subsidize through tax privileges such activities. The purpose of my legislation is to prevent the use of union dues for political purposes.

It is essential that we write such prohibitions into the law if such prohibitions are to be meaningful. Efforts by individual union members to prevent such abuses of their union dues have proven to be time-consuming, expensive and ofttimes rendered moot by reason of the delay of court proceedings. For example, see the Streeter-Looper Case 367 U.S. 740 (1961).

The Congress owes a duty to the members of labor organizations to give them protection from the abuses of their earnings which they, as individuals, are powerless to prevent. A recent case which received great national publicity (-- F. Supp. -- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division, September 19, 1968) reveals the stark reality of the degree to which union members can be compelled to contribute their wages for purposes of which they have neither control, knowledge nor sympathy.

In conclusion, the testimony of the previous week, and I assume during the coming days, will continue to reveal instances in which the taxpayers are subsidizing activities which should not be subsidized if our political system is to remain free and operate in the best interests of a democracy. To permit any person or group of persons, whether they be capitalist, philanthropist, or labor leader to have uninhibited use of funds augmented by the indirect subsidy of special tax privileges, presents a hazard to our political system.

I am proposing legislation which will permit groups and organizations to function with tax privileges to promote purposes which they espouse. My legislation, in like measure but in opposite direction, will prevent the real danger of our people finding themselves with legislators who are beholden to sources of great wealth.

I am compelled to observe that under existing law, organizations with similar labels but opposing political views are ofttimes treated differently. For example, we have the National Council of Churches which regularly appears before congressional committees to present the views which they have adopted. On the other hand, we have the Billy James Hargis Foundation which, in equal degree, presents itself as a religious organization but, having opposite political conclusions from the National Council of Churches, finds itself denied equal tax treatment under the law. I think most Americans will say that the fundamental principle of equal treatment under the law is essential to fair play in a democratic society. I say we should permit such groups to adopt "causes" and positions on the issues of our time and present such facts and opinions as they deem necessary in promotion of their interest. But let us draw a firm line of distinction between political and moral causes and political candidates and political parties.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1966.

Hon. SHELDON COHEN,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: As you know, for the past ten months the National Right To Work Committee has been the subject of an intensive investigation by the Internal Revenue Service for the purpose of determining whether the Committee is entitled to retain its tax exemption status under section 501 (c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

During the course of this investigation your representatives have made an intensive effort to find some evidence of political activity on the part of the National Right To Work Committee. They have quite frankly advised us that this is what they are looking for, and in this connection they have scrutinized all of our expenditures for printed material, staff travel, legal services, and membership promotion, have asked us for a breakdown of the activities of staff personnel particularly during the period preceding the 1964 national elections and even subpoened the books of those printers who have done business with us. We have been expressly told by your representatives that if they turned up any evidence of political expenditures or political activities by our staff on paid time our exemption could be cancelled.

We are, of course, well aware that as an exempt organization we cannot engage in any political action, and we have scrupulously avoided any involvement in politics or political activities. The only purpose of the National Right To Work Committee is to promote the principle of voluntary unionism. By reason of this we have incurred the enmity of union officials who have publicly expressed their intent to bury us by one means or another.

This brings us to the point of this letter. Are not labor unions, as tax exempt organizations under section 501(c)(5), subject to the same restrictions on political activities as the National Right To Work Committee and other exempt organizations? And, if this is so, why is it that labor unions can openly and flagrantly use the monies collected from membership dues to make contributions to political candidates, and assign their staff personnel to electioneering activities on behalf of union-endorsed candidates? That they do all of these things on a large scale is, of course, well known and well documented. Just by way of example, in *International Association of Machinists* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740 (1961), the defendant unions stipulated that the dues monies collected from their members under compulsory union shop agreements were "used in substantial amounts to support the political campaigns of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, and for the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States . . . and candidates for state and local offices." 367 U.S. 740, 745, footnote 2. In May of this year the newspapers in Washington reported a public announcement by Charles Della, president of the Maryland-District of Columbia AFL–CIO, that that organization would contribute the sum of $200,000 to support the campaign of Carlton Sickles for Governor of Maryland. Enclosed is an article written for the May 1966 issue of *Commonweal* magazine by Sidney Lens, a long-time union staff official, which points out, among other things, that the United Auto Workers Union recently donated $30,000 to the campaign of Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois. The article goes on to point out:

"Equally important is manpower. Around election time labor mobilized thousands of workers from the shops as well as many full-time organizers. The offices of the auto union, perhaps the most active of all politically, become depopulated by as much as one-half

of the regular staff, all working the hustings for union-endorsed candidates. These are men, it should be noted, with considerable organizational talent, usually far above the caliber of ordinary Democrats. . . . Union-leased autos, painted over with the names of union-endorsed aspirants, plastered with signs, participate in parades and make tours with loudspeakers blaring their message. In small towns especially, such as Peoria, Illinois or Muncie, Indiana, big unions like steel or auto can mobilize thousands of members to fill a meeting hall or listen to an open-air speech. On the first Tuesday in November innumerable union men, paid from the union treasury, can be seen driving voters to and from the polling booths, acting as watchers to assure an honest count, and calling on 'sure' voters who have not yet cast a ballot. Thus by concentrating on marginal areas, by doling out $1,000 to $5,000 for Congressional hopefuls who need just a little push to put them over, labor can make an important contribution."

Also enclosed is a recent article by one of the well known labor columnists, Victor Riesel, who points out that the AFL–CIO has assessed its 13.7 million members at a nickel a head for a special election fund of $850,000 to be spent for campaign activities in this year's national elections.

Since the Internal Revenue Service insists that the National Right To Work Committee must strictly observe the rule against political activity, and since the flagrant political activities of labor unions are largely ignored, it would seem that a double standard is applied under the Internal Revenue Code. As the public becomes more and more aware of this selective enforcement of the law the effect can only be to break down respect for the law, a trend which seems to be rapidly undermining the foundations of orderly society.

We feel that you can quickly restore public confidence in the integrity of the Internal Revenue Service by issuing directives to your agents and offices throughout the country to undertake a sweeping investigation of the political activities of organized labor in this year's state and national elections, and revoke the tax exemption status of any union that engages in such political activities.

Very truly yours,

REED E. LARSON,
Executive Vice President.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1966.

Mr. REED E. LARSON,
NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LARSON: Thank you for your letter of September 2, 1966, with attachment, concerning the political activity of labor unions.

You asked whether labor unions, as tax-exempt organizations under section 501(c)(5), are subject to the same restrictions on political activities as other exempt organizations. Although certain sections of 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code and their implementing regulations contain various definitions, limitations, and prohibitions relative to political and legislative activities, there is no such proscription with respect to a labor organization otherwise qualifying for exemption from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(5).

The qualifying character of a labor organization, as the term is used in section 501(c)(5), is that it has as its principal purpose the representation of employees in such matters as wages, hours of labor, working conditions and economic benefits, and the general fostering of matters affecting the working conditions of its members. *As a matter of law, a labor organization does not lose its right to exemption under section 501 because it engages in political activities,* unless by reason of the organization's improper activities it can be established that the organization is not sufficiently engaged in the union or labor activity to be characterized as a labor organization in the sense that that term is used in section 501(c)(5).

As you may know, contributors to labor organizations are not entitled to a charitable deduction; however, under certain conditions payments may qualify as a business expense under section 162. With respect to the deductibility of dues paid to a labor union or trade association as a business expense, the Revenue Act of 1962 amended section 162 by adding a new subsection (e) which provides for the deduction of ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, for certain activities directly connected with legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to the taxpayer. In no event shall a deduction be allowed for that portion of a special assessment or similar payment (including an increase in dues) made to any organization for any activity which does not constitute an appearance or communication with respect to legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to the organization.

We appreciate your concern in this matter and want to further assure you that the Service is primarily interested in applying the internal revenue laws fairly and uniformly in all cases. We do everything we can to administer the applicable law and regulations without regard to the political leanings of any taxpayer or organization.

We trust this information will be helpful for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

S. B. WOLFE,
Director, Audit Division.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1966.

Mr. F. R. DICKERSON,
President, Roper Industries, Inc., Commerce, Ga.

DEAR MR. DICKERSON: Thank you for your letter of September 6, 1966, concerning the political activities of organized labor and the tax-exempt status of the National Right to Work Committee and the Sierra Club.

The records of the National Office disclose that the National Right to Work Committee has qualified for tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, while the Sierra Club is exempt under section 501(c)(3), and labor unions frequently qualify under section 501(c)(5).

The Internal Revenue Service maintains a program of periodic audit and review of the operations of tax-exempt organizations. If it is determined as a result of the audit program that any tax-exempt organization is engaged in activities to an extent proscribed by that section of the Code under which it has been held exempt, we will take appropriate action to revoke or modify our prior ruling. This is a factual question in each case, and the Service must examine all of the operations for the years involved.

You expressed concern regarding the possible nonuniform application of restrictions on political activities for various tax-exempt organizations. It should be noted that although certain sections of 501(c) of the Code and their implementing regulations contain various limitations and prohibitions relative to political and legislative activities, there is no such proscription with respect to a labor organization otherwise qualifying for exemption from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(5).

The qualifying character of a labor organization, as the term is used in section 501(c)(5), is that it has as its principal purpose the representation of employees in such matters as wages, hours of labor, economic benefits, and the general fostering of matters affecting the working conditions of its members. As a matter of law, a labor organization does not lose its rights to exemption under section 501 because it engages in political activities, unless by reason of the organization's improper activities it can be established that the organization is not sufficiently engaged in the union or labor activity to be characterized as a labor organization in the sense that that term is used in section 501(c)(5).

As you may know, it is the responsibility of the Service to administer the Federal income tax laws enacted by Congress as efficiently and impartially as possible. We have no power to amend the laws or to act contrary to their provisions. Your concern in this matter is appreciated and we want to further assure you that the Service is interested in applying the internal revenue laws fairly and uniformly in all cases. We do everything we can to administer the applicable regulations without regard to the political leanings of any taxpayer or organization.

We trust this information will be helpful in explaining the varying limitations or organizations qualifying for tax-exempt status under different sections in the Code.

Sincerely yours,

FORREST P. NEAL,
Chief, Technical Coordination Branch.

H.R. 7432

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny tax exemption to organizations which endorse political candidates, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) APPEARANCES, ETC. WITH RESPECT TO LEGISLATION.—

"(1) None of the following activities by an organization described in subsection (c)(3) shall be deemed 'carry on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation':

"(A) Appearances before, submission of statements to, or sending communications to, the committees, or individual members, of Congress or of any legislative body of a State, a possession of the United States, or a political subdivision of any of the foregoing with respect to legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to the organization.

"(B) Communication of information between the organization and its members of contributors with respect to legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to the organization.

"(2) For purposes of this paragraph, matters of direct interest to the organization include—

"(A) those directly affecting its exemption under this section

"(B) those directly affecting the deduction of contributions to such organizations under sections 170, 642, 2055, 2106, 2522;

"(C) those directly affecting any exempt purpose or function for which the organization was organized and is operating, in the case of an organization which normally receives a substantial part of its support (exclusive of income received in the exercise or performance by such organization of its charitable, educational, or other purpose or function constituting the basis for its exemption under this section) from the United States or any State or possession or political subdivision thereof, or from direct or indirect contributions from the general public.

"(3) Activities described in paragraph (1) shall not include any attempt to influence the general public, or segments thereof, with respect to legislative matters, elections or referendums."

SEC. 2. Section 170(c) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "For purposes of this subsection, the phrase 'carrying on propaganda, or otherwise

attempting, to influence legislation' in paragraph (2)(D) shall be subject to the qualifications set forth in section 501(e)."

SEC. 3. Section 2055(a) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "For purposes of this subsection, the phrase 'carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation' in paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subject to the qualifications set forth in section 501(e)."

SEC. 4. Section 2106(a)(2)(A) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "For purposes of this subparagraph, the phrase 'carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation' in clauses (ii) and (iii) shall be subject to the qualifications set forth in Section 501(e)."

SEC. 5. Section 2522 is amended by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) CARRYING ON PROPAGANDA, OF OTHERWISE ATTEMPTING, TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this section the phrase 'carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation' in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) and in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) shall be subject to the qualifications set forth in section 501(e)."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this Act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment thereof and to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment thereof.

SEC. 7(a) part 1 of Subchapter F of Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exempt organizations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 505. EXEMPTION DENIED TO ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGED IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—

"(a) PROMOTION OF POLITICAL CANDIDACIES.—Any organization described in section 501(c) which—

"(1) endorses or opposes directly or indirectly, any political candidate, or

"(2) expends directly or indirectly any of its funds to promote the candidacy of any political candidate, or

"(3) provides goods, services or anything of value to any political party or political organization, shall not be exempt from tax under section 501 for the taxable year in which it so endorses or so expends funds, and for the three succeeding taxable years; provided further, that activities prohibited by this section shall not be exempted from these prohibitions by being termed 'educational'.

"(b) CERTAIN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Any organization described in section 501(c)(3) which—

"(1) makes any contributions of goods, services or anything of value to any person or organization when there is reason to believe that part or all of such contribution will be used—

"(A) to promote or oppose the candidacy of any political candidate, or

"(B) to support, directly or indirectly, any political party or political organization whose purpose is to provide candidates for political office or to promote the candidacy of persons for political office.

"(2) has any officer or employee who is actively engaged in a political campaign (within the meaning of section 7324 of title 5 of the United States Code) during his hours of employment by the organization.

shall not be exempt from tax under section 501 for the taxable year ending after the date on which it so endorses, makes such a contribution, or has such an officer or employee and for the three succeeding taxable years.

"(c) POLITICAL CANDIDATE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'political candidate' means any individual whose name is presented for nomination for or election to public office.

"(b) The table of sections for such part I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 505. Exemption denied to organizations engaged in political activities."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by section 7 of this Act shall apply to acts occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

A FLAG FOR ALL TO SEE AND HONOR

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, through the kindness of adviser Sara Davis of the Marie Ostrum Theta Rho No. 33, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, I have received a small but brilliantly colorful American flag and car window seal for display on my automobile.

Like Astronaut John Glenn, I get a funny feeling—of pride, bursting patriotism, devotion to country, and reverential admiration—whenever I see the flag. By displaying Old Glory on my car, I hope to bring this spirit to an ever-growing number of my fellow citizens who may need to be reminded of the significance of this beautiful and inspiring banner.

I salute the sponsors of this campaign to bring greater appreciation to the flag of the United States. I shall display mine with a sense of esteem and responsibility, and I recommend the practice to all who want everyone to know of their devotion to the flag and the principles for which it stands.

LANCASHIRE MINE, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the 22d Congressional District, which is attaining fame as the energy center of the East through its mine mouth generating plants, last week was another monumental occasion.

Two miles north of Barnesboro along the Indiana-Cambria County line, a work force of 12 men began operations to open a drift mine whose demand for skilled personnel will rise to a total of 700 within the next 5 or 6 years.

Unlike a number of the other modern mines that are being opened to feed the spectacularly large electric plants on adjacent property, Lancashire No. 26 mine of the Greenwich Colleries Co. will serve an electric generating station a hundred miles away in Montour County. When Lancashire reaches its capacity of 5 million tons per year, it will supply the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. Montour plant by unit train moving back and forth over Penn-Central lines.

A subsidiary of Barnes and Tucker Co., for many years a member of the vanguard of Pennsylvania coal producers dedicated to efficient mining and to community responsibility, Greenwich Colleries' new facility will spur development of an immense housing project in the Barnesboro area. Lancashire will need an expanding number of men to operate the versatile machines that extract coal, transport it to the surface, and load railroad cars at the rate of 3,250 tons an hour. Because miners' wages are among the highest in manufacturing and processing industries, employees of Greenwich will have an opportunity to invest in the homes already being planned by farsighted and confident business leaders in the area.

To Barnes and Tucker President Richard T. Todhunter, Jr., Vice President John S. Todhunter, and other officials of the company, Lancashire mine is an investment in America's future. They visualize an ever-developing economy based on an insatiable need for more energy. Their optimism is matched only by the dreams of other community leaders who are determined to be ready to handle the immigration of mine personnel and others who will take advantage of the new career opportunities.

The constituencies of my colleagues in Pennsylvania and neighboring States looking to Montour as a dependable long-range source of heat and power can take comfort in the thought that Lancashire has a wealth of vital energy that will supply domestic needs and defense requirements for far into the future.

WHY NOT PRESERVE A FREE SOCIETY?

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects most frequently spoken of these days is the limitation that is being placed upon freedom of choice by our Federal courts, by the administration, and by the Congress. In writing his editorial for the Thursday, February 20 issue of the Palmetto Press, Palmetto, Fla., one of Florida's outstanding weekly newspapers, Editor Jim Gallery makes an excellent presentation on this subject. I hope that everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will heed Mr. Gallery's warnings. The editorial, "Why Not Preserve a Free Society?" follows:

WHY NOT PRESERVE A FREE SOCIETY?

What will it take to convince the social theorists and experimentalists that people are different, always were, always will be, and if there's anything you can count on, it's the perversity, diversity, adversity, and indefinable nature of mankind?

Thing two you can count on is that no amount of legislation, encouragement, education, coercion, bribery, or what have you, will effect a permanent transformation of individual human beings into one great glob of homogenized humanity.

Now, this is not by way of introducing either a pro or con treatise concerning racial problems, although the subject may fit into the picture as well.

Among established facts concerning the nature of the human beast is that he is a gregarian, which is a two-bit way of saying people apparently need and seek out the association, friendship, respect, etc. of other people.

So do all of the beasts in the animal kingdom, but what separates man from beast is the fact that his is a selective process. He does not necessarily associate with other men

just because they are men, but through exercising free will options based on a variety of motives.

We do not accept dogmatic approaches designating, quite simply, common political, social, economic, or cultural interests. This is not to say these factors do not play any part whatsoever in the voluntary association of people. Rather, in themselves, separately, they are only part of the picture.

Now, if you mixed up 100 bankers and a like number of retail clerks in a sack and dumped them out on a table, chances are that in the first 30 minutes or so, the vast majority, maybe 90 per cent would congregate according to profession, with a minority mixture remaining somewhere in between. It does not follow that if the situation remained a permanent one, the proportions would remain the same.

Nor does it necessarily follow that if you legislated all bankers, clerks, physicians, contractors, etc., into individual residential areas based on professions that they would indeed form ideal neighborhoods or, for that matter, get along famously with their next door neighbors.

Most, we submit, would leave their reservations to team up with a fishing, hunting, golfing, or cultural buff with whom a specific common interest is shared, regardless of the latter's economic, social, or political standing or level.

Nor would this be a constant, completely predictable relationship, either, for each of us enjoys a variety of interests which we share with a variety of people who might be completely incompatible in a group.

That is to say, that just because we enjoy playing chess with Friend A, cards with Friends B and C, and general coffee conversation with Friend D, all or each of whom may come from varying backgrounds, that there would be any degree of camaraderie among the foursome.

The causes of human affinities are hardly beyond the test tube stage, according to leading psychologists. In a given, totally controlled situation, behaviour patterns can indeed be predicted with some degree of accuracy. But people don't live in totally controlled laboratory situations, and the decisions they make frequently confound logic and the experts.

Whatever else it may be, democracy is a freedom of choice society in which individuals are permitted, within a growing set of restrictions, to effect their own association by whatever standards and for whatever reasons they may choose.

Among major lessons that scream from annals of history is the fact that any attempt to force involuntary relationships by whatever means, and by a variety of forms of government, is immediately and vigorously contested, ultimately contributing to the downfall of the particular regime and, perhaps, total disaster for the particular society or nation.

We happened to have been born and raised in a northern industrial city of some 200,000 souls. Within that city, and by exercising their own option, separate and distinct neighborhoods of Poles, Italians, Greeks, Irish, Chinese, and non-whites had become established. Within each, of course, were assorted economic, political, and social levels, and it should not be assumed that each was enthralled with his own neighbor per se.

A percentage of second, third, and fourth generations have managed to break down artificial barriers erected by the people themselves, and move more easily and readily into the mainstream of Americana which, in that city, was truly a composite of all elements involved. However, at no time did it then, or now, approach an homogenized status.

And, we will submit that the vast majority, upon moving to another community, or acting in an emergency situation, would deliberately seek out those of similar origin, without giving a thought to things social, politic, economic, or racial, as such.

Should it be thus? Obviously, assorted theorists and government advisors think not, although they are frequently not in agreement concerning the ultimate resultant. Therefore, in recent years, we have endured a variety of laws, directives, recommendations, and admitted "experiments" that, on the one hand would further restrict or limit the basic tenets upon which a democratic society is founded; and, on the other, run absolutely counter to historical evidence and what is positively known concerning the aftermentioned perversity, diversity, adversity, and indefinable nature of mankind.

Peace, brotherhood, and good will among men? Certainly, but it must come as a voluntary, individual expression, else it will fall into the mountainous scrap heap of association by government fiat rejects.

Just as certain social experts have theorized that it may take several generations of concerted effort to raise standards among lower levels of society—notwithstanding the fact that in any free and therefore dynamic society, there will always be levels, high and low and in between, and not always comprised of the same types of people—it may take a like amount of time for many of us to alter personal insights and to act, voluntarily, upon individually arrived at concepts of total civic responsibilities.

Therefore, Mr. Nixon and all Capitol Hill administrators, advisors, and legislators, give us a breathing spell. We are not ALL bad and have made some progress voluntarily with a degree of enthusiasm, while vigorously protesting attempts to inflict unknown and untried social and economic experiments apparently based on "wouldn't it be nice . . ." theories.

We make no claim to this country's having attained a Utopian status, are well aware of discrepancies, deficiencies, and inequities, most certainly those that may tend to restrict any group or individual's opportunity to exercise a true freedom of choice option, be it of social, economic, ethnic, or other origin.

But, we maintain, the only effective solutions, carrying any degree of permanence, must emanate from within the ranks of a democratic society, and not handed down via arbitrary legislation, court orders, agency directives and the like.

As a nation, we are still pioneers of (and coveted around the world for) the concept of individual freedom and its application to the fullest possible extent. This tradition has produced the most powerful and prosperous society in history; and it is almost inconceivable that we have arrived at a point where admittedly minority groups of all kinds, descriptions, and objectives have apparently managed to exert influence beyond all proportion—in many cases, sheer common sense as well—upon governing bodies, that would obviously and deliberately inflict unwarranted restrictions upon the rights of the majority.

This, then, is written from what some might term a naive hope that Mr. Nixon, his new administration, the Congress, and judicial branches will indeed pause, and take the longer, in-depth view with regard to preservation of individual freedom of choice, in whatever area it may fall.

To do less is to forfeit a cherished heritage that has called for the ultimate in individual sacrifice on more than a few occasions in our 200-year history on the one hand; and, on the other, to contribute to the nourishment of internal, cancerous growths that will inevitably lead to terminal stages.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The Honorable, the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 5:25 p.m. on Thursday, February 20, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President concerning Electoral College Reforms.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–78)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

One hundred and sixty-five years ago, Congress and the several states adopted the Twelfth Amendment to the United States Constitution in order to cure certain defects—underscored by the election of 1800—in the electoral college method of choosing a President. Today, our presidential selection mechanism once again requires overhaul to repair defects spotlighted by the circumstances of 1968.

The reforms that I propose are basic in need and desirability. They are changes which I believe should be given the earliest attention by the Congress.

I have not abandoned my personal feeling, stated in October and November 1968, that the candidate who wins the most popular votes should become President. However, practicality demands recognition that the electoral system is deeply rooted in American history and federalism. Many citizens, especially in our smaller states and their legislatures, share the belief stated by President Johnson in 1965 that "our present system of computing and awarding electoral votes by States is an essential counterpart of our Federal system and the provisions of our Constitution which recognize and maintain our nation as a union of states." I doubt very much that any constitutional amendment proposing abolition or substantial modification of the electoral vote system could win the required approval of three-quarters of our fifty states by 1972.

For this reason, and because of the compelling specific weaknesses focused in 1968, I am urging Congress to concentrate its attention on formulating a system that can receive the requisite Congressional and State approval.

I realize that experts on constitutional law do not think alike on the subject of electoral reform. Different plans for reform have been responsibly advanced by Members of Congress and distinguished private groups and individuals. These plans have my respect and they merit serious consideration by the Congress.

I have in the past supported the proportional plan of electoral reform. Under this plan the electoral vote of a State

would be distributed among the candidates for President in proportion to the popular vote cast. But I am not wedded to the details of this plan or any other specific plan. I will support any plan that moves toward the following objectives: first, the abolition of individual electors; second, allocation to Presidential candidates of the electoral vote of each State and the District of Columbia in a manner that may more closely approximate the popular vote than does the present system; third, making a 40% electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President.

The adoption of these reforms would correct the principal defects in the present system. I believe the events of 1968 constitute the clearest proof that priority must be accorded to electoral college reform.

Next, I consider it necessary to make specific provisions for the eventuality that no presidential slate receives 40% or more of the electoral vote in the regular election. Such a situation, I believe, is best met by providing that a run-off election between the top two candidates shall be held within a specified time after the general election, victory going to the candidate who receives the largest popular vote.

We must also resolve some other uncertainties: First, by specifying that if a presidential candidate who has received a clear electoral vote plurality dies before the electoral votes are counted, the Vice-President-elect should be chosen President. Second, by providing that in the event of the death of the Vice-President-elect, the President-elect should, upon taking office, be required to follow the procedures otherwise provided in the Twenty-Fifth Amendment for filling the unexpired term of the Vice-President. Third, by giving Congress responsibility, should both the President-elect and Vice-President-elect die or become unable to serve during this interim, to provide for the selection—by a new election or some other means—of persons to serve as President and Vice-President. And finally, we must clarify the situation presented by the death of a candidate for President or Vice-President prior to the November general election.

Many of these reforms are noncontroversial. All are necessary. Favorable action by Congress will constitute a vital step in modernizing our electoral process and reaffirming the flexible strength of our constitutional system.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1969.*

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–79)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When I took office as President of the United States, the public debt subject to limit was $364.2 billion—only $800 million below the statutory ceiling of $365 billion. Available projections indicated that borrowings needed to provide the Government with minimum cash balances essential for its operations would place the debt subject to limit at or above the legal ceiling by mid-April.

These projections have now been reviewed and updated on the basis of the latest revenue and expenditure flows. They continue to show inadequate leeway under the debt limit to meet all anticipated cash requirements through the middle of April. These facts permit me only one prudent course of action. I must ask the Congress to revise the debt limit before mid-April. The new limit should provide a reasonable margin for contingencies.

President Johnson foresaw the possible need for such action when he stated in his fiscal year 1970 Budget that "It may be necessary . . . within the next few months to raise the present debt limit."

Continuing high interest rates may add several hundred million dollars to the 1969 expenditures estimated by President Johnson. Other possible increases in outlays, including farm price support payments and a wide variety of past commitments in other programs—such as highways—may be greater than was estimated by the outgoing Administration.

All department and agency heads are now reviewing their programs in a determined effort to reduce costs. But we should not let our hopes for success in this effort deter us from the necessary action on the debt limit. Such cost reductions can have only a minor effect on expenditures in the next month or two, and it is in early March and again in early April that the Treasury will be faced with the heaviest drain on its resources.

Moreover, even if the Budget surpluses for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 were to prove somewhat larger than estimated in the January Budget, the present debt limit would be inadequate for fiscal year 1970. Thus even if an immediate increase in the debt limit could be avoided, an increase cannot be postponed very far into the next fiscal year. My predecessor also noted this fact when he presented his Budget for fiscal year 1970.

The apparent paradox of a need for a higher debt limit in years of anticipated budget surplus is explained mainly by the fact that the fiscal year 1969 and 1970 surpluses reflect substantial surpluses in Government trust funds—projected at $9.4 billion in fiscal year 1969 and $10.3 billion in fiscal year 1970. These surpluses in the trust funds provide cash to the Treasury, but only through the medium of investment in special Treasury issues. The consequent increase in such special issues is subject to the debt limit, under present definitions. Hence, *the debt subject to limit will rise even though borrowing from the public will decline.*

In addition, we must acknowledge the seasonal pattern in Treasury receipts. Net cash requirements prior to the mid-April tax date are regularly very substantial, while after that date the Treasury will be repaying a large amount of debt on a net basis.

While a small, temporary increase in the debt limit might prevent the undue restrictiveness of the present limit in the months immediately ahead, I urge that we now direct our attention to the future, and at least through fiscal year 1970.

I believe that the Congress should now enact a debt limit which will serve the needs of our Nation both for the balance of this fiscal year and for the foreseeable future.

In doing so, I also believe that the Congress should take this occasion to redefine the debt subject to limit to bring it into accord with the new unified Budget concept developed by a distinguished Commission that was headed by the present Secretary of the Treasury and included leaders from both Houses of Congress, officials of the previous Administration, and distinguished private citizens. The recommendations of this Commission largely have been adopted in the last two Budget presentations and in the new form of Congressional budget scorekeeping. These have been major forward steps toward better public understanding of the budget. The concept of the debt limit should also be redefined as suggested in the Commission's report.

Under the unified Budget concept, attention is focused on the total receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government, including the trust funds. The surplus or deficit thus reflects the net of revenue and expenditure transactions between the Federal Government and the public, and the net debt transactions between the Government and the public are thus the relevant basis for a proper understanding of the Federal borrowing requirements. To conform fully with this Budget presentation, only those Federal obligations which are held by the public—all debt except that held by Federally-owned agencies and by the trust funds—should be subject to the statutory limit on the public debt. Debt of Federally-owned agencies held by the public would be included as well as direct Treasury debt.

This change would in no way affect the integrity of the trust funds. This Administration recognizes, as the Commission on Budget Concepts emphasized, the firm obligation of the Government to maintain proper, separate accounting for the trust funds. This can and will be done without including obligations held by the trust funds in the total debt subject to the debt limit.

I therefore propose that the Congress establish a new debt limit defined to accord with the unified Budget concept. On this basis, a limit of $300 billion should be adequate to permit efficient and responsible handling of the Government's financing for the foreseeable future. This compares with an outstanding debt on the unified Budget concept of $293.7 billion on January 21, 1969.

On the present public debt limit concept, the debt outstanding on January 21, 1969 was $364.2 billion as compared with the current debt limit of $365 billion. An increase in that limit to approximately $382 billion would correspond in the next fiscal year to the $300 billion limit I am proposing on the unified budget basis.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1969.*

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon has recommended that Congress increase the public debt limit by $17 billion to a level of $382 billion, as computed under the existing concept of debt subject to statutory limit.

Back on October 10, 1967, in an effort to eliminate confusion here in Congress and among the public, the President's Commission on Budget Concepts, of which I was a member, suggested a series of changes in Federal budget compilation and terminology. Former President Johnson endorsed that Commission's recommendations and for the fiscal years of 1969 and 1970, the Federal budget has been submitted to Congress as a single document known as the unified budget.

Most of the recommendations made by the President's Commission on Budget Concepts have been implemented and when budget items are discussed everyone talks the same language. One very important recommendation contained in the Commission's report has not been implemented to date and that is the reporting of the Federal debt which is subject to statutory limitation.

When the Commission reported on October 10, 1967, it recommended that the public debt subject to statutory limit include only the debt held by the public and thereby exclude the debt securities held by Federal agencies and Federal trust funds.

The Commission had the following to say with respect to the debt concept:

> The Commission recommends, in the presentation of figures on Federal borrowing, a debt concept that is consistent with the definitions of budget receipts and expenditures spelled out elsewhere in the Report. Basically, added to the present concept of public debt would be securities issued by those Federal agencies whose receipts and expenditures are part of the recommended new budget—producing a concept of "gross debt outstanding." From this total Treasury and agency securities held by those same Federal agencies and by Federal trust funds would be deducted. The new net concept may be referred to as "Federal securities held by the public," with changes referred to as "net Federal borrowing from the public." Figures on both these new concepts should appear in the budget summary.

In his debt message today President Nixon has recommended that Congress adopt as a measure of the debt subject to statutory limit, the recommendations made thereon by the President's Commission on Budget Concepts. In other words, he is recommending that the present debt limit on debt held by the public be increased from $293.7 to $300 billion, and that hereafter the statutory debt limit apply only to Federal securities held by the public.

As I understand the situation, the Treasury and the Budget Bureau would continue to report the gross debt, which is the combined debt held by the public and Federal agency funds such as the OASDI trust fund. Thus, there would be no attempt on the part of the administration or Congress to disavow the debt obligations held by Federal agencies. It would simply mean that the concept of a unified budget would be more fully implemented. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this change is nothing more than one of definition which should be enacted if we are to operate completely under the unified budget recommended by President Johnson's Budget Commission.

MANY MEMBERS FAVOR A MORE ACTIVE PROGRAM IN POPULATION AND FAMILY PLANNING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of the House of Representatives who are strongly in favor of a more active program in population and family planning. Today, along with 14 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I have introduced a bill to establish a Select Joint Committee on Population and Family Planning that will seek to focus national attention on the domestic and foreign need for family planning. In the Senate tomorrow Senator TYDINGS will introduce a similar bill.

We need to make population and family planning household words. We need to take the sensationalism out of this topic so that it can no longer be used by militants who have no real knowledge of the voluntary nature of the program but, rather are using it as a political steppingstone. If family planning is anything, it is a public health matter. Birth control, often misunderstood, is an answer to our increasingly important hunger problem.

With the pill and other devices, we have made great strides in this field. But even with all the Government programs in the field, all of which to my knowledge are voluntary, I get the feeling we are still tiptoeing cautiously around the edge of the problem.

We are all too aware of the existence of hunger in this country and abroad. It seems to me that at a time when we, as a Nation, are concentrating on the immediate hunger, we should also be looking at the long-term problem. The population of the United States may total between 280 and 360 million by year 2000. A gain of 80 to 160 million in 33 years. A thorough investigation into birth control and a collection of data which would give the Congress the criteria to determine the effectiveness of its programs must come swiftly to stave off the number of future mouths which will feed on an ever-decreasing proportion of food.

For several years now Senator Gruening's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Government Operations Committee has held extremely beneficial hearings that have done so much to increase the public awareness of the population explosion abroad. The word that he began should be continued and the scope of the investigation should be enlarged to include the United States.

I can think of no better vehicle by which to accomplish these objectives than by the establishment of this Select Joint Committee. The purpose of this committee is to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the problems of population growth and the need for family planning in the United States and the world in order to provide the Congress with a comprehensive basis for future scrutiny in this field. The committee should report to the Congress within 2 years after the date of the adoption of this resolution the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The committee will be composed of 10 members—five from each of the two Houses of Congress—with no more than three from each body coming from the same party. Membership to the committee would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate.

We need an emphasis on this critical problem. And we need to have data that will enable the Congress to at the least determine if the funds we have spent have been spent wisely. I have a rather uneasy feeling that they have not been getting optimum results.

In my opinion we need a massive program in the Congress with hearings to emphasize the problem, and earmarked appropriations to do something about it. We need massive cooperation from the White House like we have never had before and we need a determination by the executive branch that these funds will be spent as earmarked. I am extremely encouraged by the recent directive of President Nixon in which he asked Daniel P. Moynihan, Special Assistant to the President, to consult with the Secretaries of State and Health, Education, and Welfare in order to come up with recommendations concerning population growth and family planning.

I do not claim that this proposal will be the absolute answer to the problems of increased population, either in the United States or anywhere else. But I earnestly hope that they will receive the attention of a nation which is as concerned as I am about the spread of poverty, hunger, disease, and human conflict.

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

Mr. BUSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

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

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I personally have felt an increasing concern over the question of the quality of the life that we are going to offer future generations if we continue to expand in numbers. The availability of space for growing purposes, for brooks, trees, and shrubbery, is rapidly disappearing under the crunch of our increasing population.

I believe the gentleman from Texas has done the House of Representatives and the Nation a service through his presentation today.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

The statistics and figures on this matter are available, and are simply amazing. In Latin America the population of every country will double in 23 years, and some of them sooner than that. The population in India will be 1 billion people by the year 2000. Voluntary family planning in conjunction with new methods of agriculture represent the answers to these problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I say that I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Georgia, and the kind remarks he has made about this important subject.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and tomorrow, on account of the death of his sister, Mrs. Harry L. Jackson.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include a letter and extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper article.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLACKBURN) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:)

Mr. BERRY.
Mr. MIZE.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.
Mr. MORSE in two instances.
Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. BRAY in four instances.
Mr. SANDMAN in two instances.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. MCCLURE.
Mr. GUDE.
Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
Mr. SCOTT in two instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.
Mr. SHIPLEY.
Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. MAHON, and to include charts and tables.
Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.
Mr. PATMAN.
Mr. MCFALL in two instances.
Mr. COLMER.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. BURTON of California in two instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.
Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. MEEDS.
Mr. HICKS.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. HAGAN in four instances.
Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.
Mr. OLSEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 25, 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:

530. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, transmitting the 1968–69 annual report of the Council, pursuant to the provisions of section 502 of Public Law 90–35; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

531. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the analysis of estimated and actual costs of certain major research facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

532. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a detailed statement of House of Representatives disbursements for the period July 1 to December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 105 of Public Law 454 of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

533. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to docket No. 65, *The Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioners.* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* an order substituting finding of fact, vacating final award of August 4, 1965, and final award, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055 (25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

534. A letter from the Executive Director, National Commission on Product Safety, transmitting an interim report of the Commission recommending enactment of the Child Protection Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT (for himself and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):

H.R. 7425. A bill relating to the use in good faith by State and local authorities of freedom-of-choice systems for the assignment of students to public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7426. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to the use in good faith by State and local authorities of freedom-of-choice systems for the assignment of students to public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7427. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7428. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7429. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 7430. A bill providing an exception to the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7431. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 7432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny tax exemption to organizations which endorse political candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7433. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7434. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7435. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7436. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7437. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual's entitlement to retirement benefits under the act or the Social Security Act while he or she is entitled to dependent's or survivor's benefits under the other such act shall not operate to prevent any increases in his or her benefits under the 1937 act which would otherwise result under the so-called social security minimum guaranty provision; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7438. A bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide additional grounds for waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement applicable to certain exchange aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7439. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7440. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7441. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7442. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a divorced wife may qualify for benefits on her former husband's wage record, even in the absence of continuing support (or any right to such support) from him, if she received a substantial property settlement upon their divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a liberalized child-care deduction as a trade or business expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7444. A bill to repeal the Naval Stores Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 7445. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7446. A bill to amend title 1 of the United States Code, relating to the structure and amendment of the code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 7447. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 7448. A bill to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7449. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7450. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7451. A bill to liberalize certain eligibility requirements for payment of benefits to widows aged 60 or more of veterans under title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7452. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7453. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to $30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7454. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7455. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans who are 70 years of age or older shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7456. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make certain widows of veterans of periods of war and certain children of such veterans who are deceased eligible for care in Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7457. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to $100 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7458. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize direct admission to community nursing homes of those veterans needing such care for a service-connected condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7459. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a paraplegia rehabilitation allowance of $100 per month for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7460. A bill to provide special encouragement to veterans to pursue a public service career in deprived areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7461. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the base on which dependency and indemnity compensation for widows is computed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7462. A bill to amend section 411 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional dependency and indemnity compensation payments to widows with one or more children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7463. A bill to provide for the granting of national service life insurance to Vietnam conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7464. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increased disability compensation rates; to liberalize income limitations; to exclude certain payments in the computation of income for determining eligibility for pension; to increase amount of spouse's income which may be excluded; to restore entitlement to benefits on termination of a widow's remarriage; to authorize the furnishing of outpatient medical services to World War I veterans; to relieve certain persons from filing the annual income questionnaire; to provide for automatic cost-of-living increases; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7465. A bill to establish a commission to study the organization, operation, and management of the executive branch of the Government, and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7466. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7467. A bill to extend from 2 to 5 years the period of salary protection and pay saving for postal field service and classified employees who are reduced in salary standing or grade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7468. A bill to amend section 837, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain acts involving the use of incendiary devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 7470. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7471. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 7472. A bill to create a Postal Service Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 7473. A bill to increase educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 7474. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7475. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 7476. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service of females sworn in as members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7477. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7478. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7479. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to defer law enforcement officers and firemen from training and service under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7480. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7481. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 7482. A bill to extend the life of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7483. A bill to expedite the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Lewis and Clark Trail Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 7484. 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.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself and Mr. GETTYS):

H.R. 7485. 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. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7486. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7487. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 7488. A bill to amend section 255 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to eliminate epilepsy as an affliction prohibiting employment of aliens on board vessels arriving in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7489. A bill relating to the tax treatment of certain indebtedness incurred by corporations in acquiring stock of other corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 7490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit limited retail dealers of alcoholic beverages to sell distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7491. A bill to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $2,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7493. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7494. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7495. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7496. A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7497. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7498. 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. PERKINS (by request):

H.R. 7499. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize certain pension payable under chapter 15, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7500. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefits payments shall not be considered to be income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H.R. 7501. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7502. A bill to establish an international health, education, and labor program to provide open support for private nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7503. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7504. A bill to authorize the State of Alaska to operate a foreign-registered ferry vessel between ports of Alaska and between ports in Alaska and ports in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POLLOCK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 7505. A bill to amend section 2312 of title 18, United States Code, to permit a person enforcing that section to stop a motor vehicle to inspect the serial number of its body and motor if he has reason to suspect that the motor vehicle has been stolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr MIZE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POLLOCK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIKES, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 7506. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 7507. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that any judge or justice of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior shall retire from regular active service upon attaining the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7508. 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.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7509. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys or other articles intended for use by children which present any electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7510. A bill to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 7511. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7512. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 7513. A bill to provide for the economic development of Indians, Indian tribes, and other Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7514. A bill to provide for the establishment of Indian corporate entities for the economic development of Indian tribes and other organizations of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7515. A bill to permit Indian tribes to have greater management over their property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7516. A bill to temporarily suspend the recent increases in fees for grazing of livestock on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 7517. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 7518. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for health insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 7519. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7520. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Polecat Bench area of the Shoshone extensions unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7521. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7522. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 7523. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. PIKE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.J. Res. 480. Joint resolution creating a Select Joint Committee on Population and Family Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H. Res. 275. Resolution relating to the per annum gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

23. By Mr. BRASCO: Concurrent resolution of the New York Legislature memorializing Congress to act expeditiously on proposed legislation to transfer title to the property known as the New York Naval Shipyard, in the Borough of Brooklyn, to the city of New York for redevelopment as an industrial park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to restrictions on payments made by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

25. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to completion of the Dixie project in Nevada and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

26. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the Tahoe regional planning compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

27. Also, Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to meat imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7524. A bill for the relief of Adelaida G. Tutaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7525. A bill for the relief of Antonio Saladino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonio Saladino and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7527. A bill for the relief of Filippo Di Leonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7528. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 7529. A bill for the relief of Lizette Bhak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7530. A bill for the relief of Fredi Robert Dreilich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7531. A bill for the relief of Edita Agbayani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7532. A bill for the relief of Mario Scotto De Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7533. A bill for the relief of Natividad Miravite Paraiso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7534. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Zingapan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 7535. A bill for the relief of Winston Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7536. A bill for the relief of Augusto Buonapane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7537. A bill for the relief of Pirjo Laine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7538. A bill for the relief of Faro Purpura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 7539. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Rojas-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Sevilla de Soto and her children, Manuel Ricardo Sevilla and Silvia Esther Sevilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7541. A bill for the relief of William H. Tripp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 7542. A bill for the relief of Jacques Urbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7543. A bill for the relief of Eugenia La Grutta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 7544. A bill for the relief of Bak Hon Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 7545. A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren D. Volmer, USAF; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7546. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pernice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 7547. A bill for the relief of Alexander Gerhard Ackermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 7548. A bill for the relief of Joseph Edouard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7549. A bill for the relief of Renauld Florival; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7550. A bill for the relief of Julian Castano Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7551. A bill for the relief of Maurisio Millan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7552. A bill for the relief of Simon Rodas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7553. A bill for the relief of Charles Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 7554. A bill for the relief of Danica Timotijevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 7555. A bill for the relief of Michael Gregory Grammatopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7556. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Manuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7557. A bill for the relief of Diego Zanfei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 7558. A bill for the relief of Van Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Spatero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7560. A bill for the relief of Olive Erminia Bancroft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7561. A bill for the relief of Umberto Verdicchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 7562. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Orecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 7563. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivanka Micic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 7564. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Gilligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7565. A bill for the relief of David D. Melegrito and his wife, Elma S. Melegrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7566. A bill for the relief of Tse Chi Fong, also known as Chez Chu Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7567. A bill for the relief of Bert N. Adams and Emma Adams; 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:

62. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Lawndale, Calif., relative to assistance in abating pollution from offshore oil well leakage; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

63. Also, petition of Charles Francis Vincent Rogers, Pecos, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION REPORT ON FEDERAL MEDICAL-HEALTH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1969

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington office of the American Medical Association has published annually since 1952 a detailed report how Federal moneys are used for medical-health activities. The following table demonstrates the substantial growth in Federal appropriations in the medical-health field:

Fiscal year:	
1953–54	$1,775,882,197
1955–56	2,268,800,000
1957–58	2,541,483,506
1959–60	3,161,151,325
1961–62	4,437,746,072
1963–64	5,508,951,287
1965–66	6,581,372,121
1967–68	15,507,885,089
1969	16,771,182,095

In addition to the $16,771,182,095 appropriation in fiscal 1969, the Federal Government will make payments of $9,388,897,000 to individuals because of disability through programs in which it participates. This makes a total of over $26 billion that the Federal Government contributes to medical-health activities for the current fiscal year.

This objective report has been and is available for Members of Congress upon request. It serves as a valuable reference tool in locating various Federal health programs.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert "Federal Medical-Health Appropriations" into the RECORD, as follows: