

tracts the more promising personnel, it is expected that the ranks of superior officers eventually will be composed of many of these men who have been educated in metropolitan studies and the social sciences. Second, this opportunity for advanced education has increased department morale and has stimulated an interest in the personal development of police personnel. Third, the program acts as a means of attracting a higher caliber of individuals by providing an opportunity to earn a college degree. The fourth effect will be increased prestige for law enforcement in the community and improved social contact with the citizenry.

In the evolving definition of the police function, it is more and more evident that ever-increasing portions of police work will be directed to community service and what were once termed "nonpolice functions." Also, it is becoming more evident that there is no clear line of demarcation between social service and public service. Modern police must, as a result of the desires and demands of society, be involved in social services to some degree. A police department should have the capability of recognizing social problems and be able to serve as a referral agency. The baccalaureate program gives the department personnel the initial educational background to recognize and respond to the needs of the community. This concept in police education and professional development is worthy of careful consideration by both small and large departments.

FUNDING

The program is completely financed and administered by the Municipal Police-Science Institute, Inc., a non-profit corporation dedicated to the advancement and professionalization of law enforcement. The institute's membership is drawn from the business, scientific, legal, educational, and law enforcement professions. The four principal officers of the institute, two of whom are FBI National Academy graduates, are members of the Boston Police Department with an accumulative police experience of over 100 years.

While the institute is funded through grants and contributions from interested individuals and charitable, fraternal, and business organizations, the Boston Police Baccalaureate Program, in its initial stages,

was sponsored by the Permanent Charity Fund of Boston.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES

The Municipal Police-Science Institute accepts the responsibility to:

1. Enter 25 police officers, per year, in a program leading to a bachelor of science degree in one of the social sciences or metropolitan studies.

2. Provide funds to pay full tuition, fees, and academic expenses, including books, at Massachusetts State College at Boston for 4 years.

3. Administer the program in cooperation with State College and the Boston Police Department through the institute's program director.

4. Maintain a close watch on the program to see that all participants are performing satisfactorily, and provide tutoring service when deemed advisable by the college.

5. Provide career counseling to students. The Boston Police Department accepts the responsibility to:

1. Give all participants time, at no loss of pay, to attend college sessions. A 25-hour work week in addition to the academic workload has been determined by State college to be reasonable.

2. Give all participants special consideration in work assignments of broad challenge and interest during their college program. These assignments represent a wide scope of police activities and the participant's rotation through these assignments during his college work will give him a broad knowledge of the department which will benefit him and the department in the future.

3. Encourage the Massachusetts Civil Service Commission to recognize the value of this program to the police department and to the community, and further encourage the Civil Service Commission to use the subject matter from the baccalaureate program as source material in the preparation of future promotional examinations.

The Massachusetts State College at Boston accepts the responsibility to:

1. Select, by a battery of aptitude and motivation tests, the 25 officers who will participate each year from those in the department who desire to do so.

2. Provide academic counseling and program aid for participants.

3. Provide required courses and choice of electives leading to a bachelor of science degree in metropolitan studies or in one of the social sciences.

4. Make available facilities of the Massachusetts State College to the participants as full-time students.

5. Provide the institute and the police department with progress reports on the students and a periodical evaluation of the program.

At the conclusion of the first semester under the baccalaureate program, four of the 25 officers currently attending are on the president's list and six are on the dean's list at the college. All the other policemen have passed their examinations and are students in good standing.

GRADUATE PROGRAM

Although fully recognizing the great benefits that the police department will receive from this baccalaureate program, Commissioner McNamara points out the need for other specialized studies. He explains that there is a growing need for a higher degree of competency among police officials in special technical skills, planning, direction, and management. In recognizing that these areas require abilities possessed by engineers, lawyers, teachers, chemists, systems analysts, statisticians, auditors, and various management specialists, the institute offers the leading student in each graduating class it sponsors the opportunity to participate in a graduate program in the college of his choice.

CONCLUSION

After an examination of the newly developed curriculum, the Boston Police Commissioner and the Executive Director of the Municipal Police-Science Institute agree that an ideal combination of education and training for Boston police officers would consist of (1) completing the Boston police baccalaureate program, (2) accumulating diversified on-the-job experience, and (3) then receiving the training offered by the FBI National Academy. They feel that if a sufficient number of the department's personnel are equipped with this professional experience, then the only additional needs will be for a small percentage of personnel to be trained for the highly technical special services. It is anticipated that, in the future the graduate program will provide these special skills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 21, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord thy God bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.—Deuteronomy 14: 29.

O Lord, our God, whose glory is in all the world and whose goodness shines in all that is fair, we commit ourselves and our country to Thy merciful care: that being guided by Thy spirit we may learn to dwell together in Thy peace and to live by Thy laws.

Grant that the work of this day may be in accordance with Thy will. Give to us health of body, clarity of mind and strength of spirit that we may do what we have to do with all our hearts.

Deliver us from the fear that destroys, from the futility that deadens, and from the frustration that discourages us. Do Thou help us to work to make our dreams come true and to dream to make our work worth doing.

Keep our Nation strong in Thee. Let us walk and work together humbly and

in all good will that in faith and freedom Thy glory shall be revealed in every effort we make to share in the work of the world: through Jesus Christ by whose life we have been redeemed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 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. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

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

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng; and

S. 1625. An act for the relief of Gong Sing Hom.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate Tuesday, April 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared this with the ranking minority member of the committee? If so, he has not communicated with me.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have not communicated with him. However, this comes under an understanding that was had that the committee would again resume its executive session in connection with the electoral college. That is the matter before us.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am in full accord with affirmative action in this important area, but I think it is wise that we always assume when a request is made that there has been no problem about clearing it with the ranking minority member. I would respectfully request that the gentleman defer this until at least I have been notified that there is no problem as far as our ranking Republican member is concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not know if he has any objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have to be sure and positive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Here is Mr. POFF now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And I think it is good policy that we know in advance that we have had this cleared. Therefore I would respectfully request that the gentleman defer his request.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will withdraw my request for the time being, Mr. Speaker.

REPRESENTATIVE FRIEDEL INTRODUCES BILL AIMED AT FOSTERING COMPETITION IN FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill—aimed at fostering competition in freight transportation and thereby easing the grave national small shipment problem—to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize railroads to publish rates for use by common carriers.

Among common carriers, we have freight forwarders, railway express companies, and motor carriers who are intended to serve the small shipment public. To a large extent inequities in present law have inhibited constructive competition for this business and service has badly deteriorated.

This bill will permit railroads to publish reduced rates, that reflect economies resulting from efficient collection, consolidation, and distribution, for shipments directed to railroads for line haul carriage by other common carriers.

Resultant economies should benefit small shipment senders and receivers and thereby serve the national interest.

PELLY URGES INVESTIGATION OF PRO-ARAB EXTREMIST GROUPS IN UNITED STATES

(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 con-

cerned about what is said to be the growth of extremist hate groups in the United States and this, it appears to me, deserves investigation by Congress.

In the 90th Congress, the House Internal Security Committee issued an excellent report on the Ku Klux Klan which was prepared after an extensive investigation. It seems to me that in light of recent activities by some extremist groups in this country in support of the Arab guerrilla attacks on Israel, a similar investigation by the Internal Security Committee is called for.

According to information which appeared in the New York Times, these extremist groups are mobilized throughout our country. For example, in Detroit, a drive on behalf of the Al Fatah is being conducted by the Wayne State University chapter of the Organization of Arab Students, described as "sometimes in concert with the youth group of the Trotskyite Social Workers Party." In Philadelphia, the militant Labor Forum, an arm of the Socialist Workers Party, sponsored a pro-Arab, pro-Fatah program, on March 14. The same thing has occurred in New York City where it is reported that Al Fatah guerrillas received substantial and favorable treatment in the official publication of the Black Panther Party and a periodical of the Black Muslim movement.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve to know the full implications of such extremist support in their country for such a group as the Al Fatah which is admittedly and continually causing death and destruction to the peoples of Israel. In the interest of peace in the Middle East, I urge an investigation as soon as possible so that the public can learn the truth about cooperation between U.S. extremist elements and the Al Fatah.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO INSURE FUTURE U.S. RECONNAISSANCE FLIGHTS ADEQUATE PROTECTION

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur with the President's decision to see that future U.S. reconnaissance flights receive adequate protection. Timidity in responding to such unprovoked, criminal action in not consistent with American tradition. The President's action thus seems a clear affirmation that we will not be blackmailed into terminating these flights.

As the evidence clearly shows, the North Korean downing of our plane was a deliberate attack upon a plane flying in international air space. Because the danger of similar future attacks on American planes does exist, I think the President's recourse is a vitally necessary one.

It is imperative that we afford our men this protection that President Nixon has advocated so that senseless and unnecessary sacrifice of American lives can be avoided in the future.

The President has indicated through protecting our flights, that future aggression against our flights will meet with retaliation. This is as it should be. It is tough to conclude that the outrageous North Korean leaders responsible for this

murderous attack understand anything but force.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S RESTRAINT DURING PLANE INCIDENT LAUDED

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to express my full approval of the way President Nixon has handled the piratical action of North Korea in shooting down an unarmed American reconnaissance plane over international waters last Monday, killing 31 crewmen. The President has responded with calm, reasoned restraint in the face of this new example of aggression by a country which has long flouted international law. He has won the support of foreign governments and Members on both sides of the aisle in this body.

The President said at his news conference last Friday that reconnaissance flights of the type taken by the ill-fated EC121 had been going on for 20 years. Such flights are vital to our national defense interests. Every diplomat or military commander wants all the intelligence he can get and in this critical time, the flights should be continued. But American men in uniform cannot continue to be subject to the mortal risks of such irresponsible harassment. The President wisely decided such flights must be continued under the protection of units of the American Pacific Fleet which he has ordered into the Sea of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the President called North Korea a bandit nation which was controlled neither by Communist China nor the Soviet Union. That country's action in shooting down an unarmed American plane 100 miles at sea was an irresponsible outrage which no nation adhering to the basic tenets of international law could support. Let us hope that by placing North Korea on notice that any future acts of aggression against American forces operating in international waters or airspace will not go unanswered. Hopefully, those with rational common sense will prevail over the hotter heads in Pyongyang and see that North Korea adopts a manner of conduct consistent with civilized practices. Otherwise, America will be required to defend itself and every peace-loving nation in the world will sympathize with that grim necessity.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Nix
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton, Tenn.	Ottinger
Annunzio	Gallagher	Patman
Ashbrook	Gray	Podell
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Powell
Baring	Griffiths	Purcell
Barrett	Halpern	Quie
Bates	Harsha	Reid, N.Y.
Bell, Calif.	Hébert	Ronan
Bingham	Jarman	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Jonas	Rosenthal
Boggs	Karth	Rostenkowski
Brasco	Kirwan	Roudebush
Brock	Landrum	Rumsfeld
Brooks	Leggett	St. Onge
Brotzman	Long, La.	Sandman
Brown, Calif.	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Lowenstein	Sikes
Cahill	McClary	Sullivan
Casey	McCloskey	Symington
Celler	MacDonald, Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Chisholm	MacGregor	Teague, Tex.
Clancy	Mahon	Thompson, Ga.
Cowger	Martin	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	Martín	Ullman
Dawson	May	Vanik
Delaney	Mayne	Watkins
Dwyer	Meskill	Watts
Eckhardt	Mikva	Whalley
Edwards, La.	Mollohan	Wildnall
Fallon	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
Fish	Morse	Wilson,
Flood	Morton	Charles H.
Flynt	Moss	Wylder
Foley	Murphy, N.Y.	Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REFORM OF OUR FEDERAL INCOME TAX SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-103)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Reform of our Federal income tax system is long overdue. Special preferences in the law permit far too many Americans to pay less than their fair share of taxes. Too many other Americans bear too much of the tax burden.

This Administration, working with the Congress, is determined to bring equity to the Federal tax system. Our goal is to take important first steps in tax reform legislation during this session of the Congress.

The economic overheating which has brought inflation into its fourth year keeps us from moving immediately to reduce Federal tax revenues at this time. Inflation is itself a tax—a cruel and unjust tax that hits hardest those who can

least afford it. In order to “repeal” the tax of inflation, we are cutting budget spending and have requested an extension of the income tax surcharge.

Although we must maintain total Federal revenues, there is no reason why we cannot lighten the burden on those who pay too much, and increase the taxes of those who pay too little. Treasury officials will present the Administration’s initial group of tax reform proposals to the Congress this week. Additional recommendations will be made later in this session. The overall program will be equitable and essentially neutral in its revenue impact. There will be no substantial gain or loss in Federal revenue, but the American taxpayer who carries more than his share of the burden will gain some relief.

Much concern has been expressed because some citizens with incomes of more than \$200,000 pay no Federal income taxes. These people are neither tax dodgers nor tax cheats. Many of them pay no taxes because they make large donations to worthy causes, donations which every taxpayer is authorized by existing law to deduct from his income in figuring his tax bill.

But where we can prevent it by law, we must not permit our wealthiest citizens to be 100% successful at tax avoidance. Nor should the Government limit its tax reform only to apply to these relatively few extreme cases. Preferences built into the law in the past—some of which have either outlived their usefulness or were never appropriate—permit many thousands of individuals and corporate taxpayers to avoid their fair share of Federal taxation.

A number of present tax preferences will be scaled down in the Administration’s proposals to be submitted this week. Utilizing the revenue gained from our present proposals, we suggest tax reductions for lower-income taxpayers. Further study will be necessary before we can propose changes in other preferences; and as these are developed we will recommend them to the Congress.

Specifically, the Administration will recommend:

—*Enactment of what is in effect a “minimum income tax” for citizens with substantial incomes by setting a 50% limitation on the use of the principal tax preferences which are subject to change by law.*

This limit on tax preferences would be a major step toward assuring that all Americans bear their fair share of the Federal tax burden.

—*Enactment of a “low income allowance,” which will remove more than 2,000,000 of our low income families from the Federal tax rolls and assure that persons or families in poverty pay no Federal income taxes.*

This provision will also benefit students and other young people. For example, the person who works in the summer or throughout the year and earns \$1,700 in taxable income—and now pays \$117 in Federal income taxes—would pay nothing.

The married couple—college students or otherwise—with an income of \$2,300 and current taxes of \$100 would pay nothing.

A family of four would pay no tax on income below \$3,500—the cut-off now is \$3,000.

The “low income allowance,” if enacted by the Congress, will offer genuine tax relief to the young, the elderly, the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

Our tax reform proposals would also help workers who change jobs by liberalizing deductions for moving expenses and would reduce specific preferences in a number of areas:

- taxpayers who have certain nontaxable income or other preferences would have their non-business deductions reduced proportionately.
- certain mineral transactions (so-called “carved out” mineral production payments and “ABC” transactions) would be treated in a way that would stop artificial creation of net operating losses in these industries.
- exempt organizations, including private foundations, would come under much stricter surveillance.
- the rules affecting charitable deductions would be tightened—but only to screen out the unreasonable and not stop those which help legitimate charities and therefore the nation.
- the practice of using multiple subsidiaries and affiliated corporations to take undue advantage of the lower tax rate on the first \$25,000 of corporate income would be curbed.
- farm losses, to be included in the “limitation on tax preferences,” would be subject to certain other restrictions in order to curb abuses in this area.

I also recommend that the Congress repeal the 7% investment tax credit, effective today.

This subsidy to business investment no longer has priority over other pressing national needs.

In the early 60’s, America’s productive capacity needed prompt modernization to enable it to compete with industry abroad. Accordingly, Government gave high priority to providing tax incentives for this modernization.

Since that time, American business has invested close to \$400 billion in new plant and equipment, bringing the American economy to new levels of productivity and efficiency. While a vigorous pace of capital formation will certainly continue to be needed, national priorities now require that we give attention to the need for general tax relief.

Repeal of the investment tax credit will permit relief to every taxpayer through relaxation of the surcharge earlier than I had contemplated.

The revenue effect of the repeal of the investment tax credit will begin to be significant during calendar year 1970. Therefore, I recommend that investment tax credit repeal be accompanied by extension of the full surcharge only to January 1, 1970, with a reduction to 5% on January 1. This is a reappraisal of my earlier recommendation for continuance of the surcharge until June 30, 1970 at a 10% rate. If economic and fiscal conditions permit, we can look forward to elimination of the remaining surtax on June 30, 1970.

I am convinced, however, that reduc-

tion of the surtax without repeal of the investment tax credit would be imprudent.

The gradual increase in Federal revenues resulting from repeal of the investment tax credit and the growth of the economy will also facilitate a start during fiscal 1971 in funding two high-priority programs to which this Administration is committed:

- Revenue sharing with State and local governments.
- Tax credits to encourage investment in poverty areas and hiring and training of the hard-core unemployed.

These proposals, now in preparation, will be transmitted to the Congress in the near future.

The tax reform measures outlined earlier in this message will be recommended to the House Ways and Means Committee by Treasury officials this week. This is a broad and necessary program for tax reform. I urge its prompt enactment.

But these measures, sweeping as they are, will not by themselves transform the U.S. tax system into one adequate to the long-range future. Much of the current tax system was devised in depression and shaped further in war. Fairness calls for tax reform now; beyond that, the American people need and deserve a simplified Federal tax system, and one that is attuned to the 1970's.

We must reform our tax structure to make it more equitable and efficient; we must redirect our tax policy to make it more conducive to stable economic growth and responsive to urgent social needs.

That is a large order. Therefore, I am directing the Secretary of the Treasury to thoroughly review the entire Federal tax system and present to me recommendations for basic changes, along with a full analysis of the impact of those changes, no later than November 30, 1969.

Since taxation affects so many wallets and pocketbooks, reform proposals are bound to be controversial. In the debate to come on reform, and in the even greater debate on redirection, the nation would best be served by an avoidance of stereotyped reactions. One man's "loophole" is another man's "incentive." Tax policy should not seek to "soak" any group or give a "break" to any other—it should aim to serve the nation as a whole.

Tax dollars the Government deliberately waives should be viewed as a form of expenditure, and weighed against the priority of other expenditures. When the preference device provides more social benefit than Government collection and spending, that "incentive" should be expanded; when the preference is inefficient or subject to abuse, it should be ended.

Taxes, often bewailed as inevitable as death, actually give life to the people's purpose in having a Government: to provide protection, service and stimulus to progress.

We shall never make taxation popular, but we can make taxation fair.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1969.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON INCOME TAX

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is proposing bold steps in response to urgent needs—the need to give the American people income tax relief at the earliest possible moment consonant with sound policy and to eliminate the 7-percent investment tax credit as a fuel currently too rich for the American economic engine.

The President's proposal to extend the surtax at 10 percent only until January 1, 1970, and then to reduce it to 5 percent is clear recognition that income taxes are too high. We all recognize that. We know the burden should be reduced as soon as circumstances permit.

The proposal to reduce the surtax to 5 percent as of January 1, 1970, is—as the President stated—tied tightly to the proposal to eliminate the 7-percent investment tax credit.

The revenue loss from the surtax reduction must be largely offset by revenue gain from elimination of the tax credit.

Elimination of the normal 7-percent investment tax credit will serve several purposes.

It will tend to slow down the overheated American economy and thus help curb inflation.

It will bring an estimated \$3 billion additional revenue into the U.S. Treasury.

It will create conditions under which business and industry will have greater incentive to use the special tax credits Mr. Nixon is proposing for investment in poverty areas in fiscal 1971.

The need for elimination of the normal 7-percent investment tax credit became apparent when all of the other fiscal and monetary tightening actions taken by the Nixon administration and the Federal Reserve Board failed to slow down the economy sufficiently to assure success in the fight against inflation.

The "big news" in the President's tax reform message should not obscure other highly meaningful proposals—elimination of income taxes for Americans at the poverty level, the imposition of what in effect is a minimum income tax for a small group of high-income individuals, and the closing of a number of income tax loopholes.

The President's proposals will move America toward a commonsense and fair tax structure.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the famous slogan of our revolutionary forefathers: "taxation without representation is tyranny." It is indeed tyrannical to ask a man to pay taxes if he has no voice in the halls of the decisionmakers.

We have come a long way since the days when those words inspired the colonists. Today, however, we have a different kind of inequity to deal with. I speak of the fact that there are some Americans who have incomes over \$200,000 who pay no tax at all.

If it is unjust to ask a man to pay taxes and deny him a voice in government, it

is equally unjust to allow a man to pay no taxes and reap the maximum economic benefits of a free and representative democracy.

The President's message on tax reform states quite plainly that such a state of affairs is no longer acceptable. The proposed limit on tax preference is, as the President has said, a major step forward toward assuring that all Americans bear their fair share of the Federal tax burden.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TO AMEND ACT TO INCORPORATE THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4600) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That the said corporation shall further have power to have and to use a common seal, and to alter and change the same at its pleasure; to sue or to be sued in any court of the United States, or other court of competent jurisdiction; to make by-laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or of the Constitution of the United States; to take or receive, whether by gift, grant, devise, bequest, or purchase, any real or personal estate, and to hold, grant, transfer, sell, convey, hire, or lease the same for the purpose of its incorporation; to accept and administer any trust of real or personal estate for any educational purpose within the objects of the corporation; and to borrow money for its corporate purposes, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise."

(b) Section 6(a) of such Act, as amended, is amended by deleting "a Board of Trustees."

(c) Section 7 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) The invested fund now known as the 'Permanent Fund of the National Education Association,' shall be held in such corporation as a Permanent Fund and shall be in charge of the Executive Committee, which shall provide for the safekeeping and investment of such fund, and of all other funds which the corporation may receive by donation, bequest, or devise. No part of the principal of such Permanent Fund or its accretions shall be expended or transferred to the General Fund, except by a two-thirds vote of the Representative Assembly, after the proposed expenditure or transfer has been approved by the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and after printed notice of the proposed expenditure or transfer has been printed in the Journal of the National Education Association at least two months prior to the meeting of the Representative Assembly.

"(b) The income of the Permanent Fund

shall be used only to meet the cost of maintaining the organization of the Association and of publishing its annual volume of Proceedings, unless the terms of the donation, bequest, or devise shall otherwise specify or the bylaws of the corporation shall otherwise provide.

"(c) The Executive Committee shall elect the secretary of the Association, who shall be secretary of the Executive Committee, and shall fix the compensation and the term of his office for a period not to exceed four years."

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption by the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association of amended bylaws to provide for the administration of the property of the corporation and for the selection of the secretary of the Association, section 7 of the Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804), shall be of no further force and effect.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association is an organization which through its local, State, and territorial affiliates represents more than 1,748,000 teachers. The membership includes teachers, administrators, and professors at the primary, secondary, and college level, both public and private. It has had a Federal charter since 1906.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 4600 have been approved by resolutions adopted by the governing bodies of the association: the National Education Association representative assembly, the executive committee, the board of directors and the present members of the board of trustees.

Under the present NEA charter as amended, there exists a cumbersome structure which results in a degree of isolation of the membership from the executive secretary who is the chief administrative officer of the association.

Under section 12 of the charter, the powers of the active members are vested in and exercised by a representative assembly composed of delegates selected by the State and local affiliates of the association.

Between meetings of the representative assembly and subject to the authority and direction of that body, a 90-member board of directors is charged with all general policies and major interests of the association except those entrusted to the board of trustees and the executive committee. The board consists of at least one member from each State, Commonwealth, and the District of Columbia.

An 11-member executive committee considers and acts on general policies and professional interests of the association between meetings of the board of directors. Its membership includes the NEA officers, two members chosen by the board of directors, and four members elected at large by the representative assembly.

Under section 7 of the charter, a seven-member board of trustees has charge of the association's permanent fund, elects the secretary of the association and fixes the compensation and the term of his office. The board includes the president ex-officio and four members elected by the board of directors for 4-year terms.

H.R. 4600 simply amends the Act of Incorporation of the National Education

Association to eliminate the board of trustees and transfer the present duties of that body to the executive committee of the association. The representative assembly wishes to lodge such responsibilities with the executive committee, which body is, for the most part, elected on an annual basis by the representative assembly. Under the existing charter, the assembly can express no direct voice in the selection of the board of trustees.

The bill also will amend the charter to confer upon the association the express powers to sell or mortgage its property. These are powers which were expressly held by the association prior to the act of 1906 and which apparently were inadvertently omitted from that act. Accordingly, the statement of powers has been revised to include all those granted under the general incorporation laws of the District of Columbia relating to educational organizations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL OBSERVANCES AND HOLIDAYS—BILL STRICKEN FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 2171) to establish the Commission on National Observances and Holidays, be removed from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish the bill stricken from the Consent Calendar?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill is stricken from the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8794) to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill does not conform to the agreed criteria for the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8794) to amend the Marine Resources

and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 3 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1102(f)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

SEC. 2. Section 9 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1108) is amended by striking out "\$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,200,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966—Public Law 89-454—to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development for 1 additional year.

In amending the act, the bill would specifically—

First, change the expiration date of the National Council from June 30, 1969, to June 30, 1970. This would provide an extension of authorized existence of 1 year beyond that provided in Public Law 89-454 as amended by Public Law 90-242; and,

Second, reduce the annual authorized appropriation in section 9 of Public Law 89-454 from \$1,500,000 to \$1,200,000.

As has been stated before, Public Law 89-454, which is the citation for the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, sets forth a declaration of policy and objectives for a national oceanographic program, and created the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development to serve as a coordinating body of all governmental activities in the marine science field.

It also created the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, to review existing programs and come up with recommendations for a long-range national program, including an organizational structure for future administration and oversight and administrative implementation of such a long-range program.

According to the statute as amended, the Commission expired on February 9, 1969, 30 days after submission of its report to the President and the Congress.

The original purpose of providing for a specific expiration date for the Council was that it should not exist any longer than a reasonable time after submission of the Commission's report in order that Congress might enact legislation which would establish an adequate organizational mechanism to carry on the long-range program.

The cognizant committees of Congress share the view of the Executive that Cabinet-level councils should be limited

in their purposes and not be allowed to substitute for agencies with more clearly defined responsibilities.

However, in view of the extremely comprehensive scope of the recent report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, the fact that a new executive administration has just begun, and the fact that it is most unlikely that legislation establishing a new organizational structure for a national program in the marine sciences can be enacted during the remainder of this fiscal year, it seemed appropriate, and I think it is essential, that we should extend the life of the Council for a reasonable period.

The splendid work of the Council in the coordination of ongoing marine science programs should not be allowed to fail while a new organizational structure is under consideration.

In the hearings resulting in this legislation the committee considered two bills. One of them, H.R. 5829, would have provided a simple 1-year extension of existing authority relative to the Council. The other one, H.R. 7895, would have repealed the fixed life of the Council and would have reduced the annual appropriation authorization from \$1,500,000 to \$1,200,000.

As stated in the committee report:

After full hearings on the legislation before the Committee, it was concluded that the concept of a one-year extension of the Council's life was more appropriate in the belief that the Congress would be able to take the necessary action within that time to implement the Commission's report to a sufficient degree to make continuation of the Council unnecessary. On the other hand, it was also concluded that the 1966 Act should be further amended to reduce the authorized annual appropriation to carry out the purposes of the Act from \$1,500,000 to \$1,200,000.

This reduction in the authorized figure is not to imply any sense of cutting back on the activities necessary to strongly advance our National Oceanographic Program. It is simply predicated upon the fact that in the original Act administrative expenses of both the Council and the Commission were to be borne out of the \$1,500,000 figure. With the Commission out of existence a cutback in the authorized appropriations for administrative purposes would simply recognize that fact and is not intended to, and would not impair the Council's continued effectiveness.

On the basis of the hearings, the committee unanimously recommended and approved the substitution of H.R. 8794, a clean bill, which is now under consideration.

H.R. 8794 was cosponsored by every member of our Subcommittee on Oceanography.

The Bureau of the Budget, the National Council, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Smithsonian Institution all reported favorably on legislation to extend the life of the Council for 1 additional year.

Finally, our committee has already had an initial hearing concerning the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and we plan to resume full-scale hearings in the

immediate future. With diligent effort, there should be no problem in reporting out legislation in fiscal year 1970 which would make it unnecessary to continue the Council for a further period of time.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yielding, and I appreciate his statement. I have two questions for the information of Members. First, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) knows, at the present time the U.S. Navy chairs the Committee on Oceanography and indeed provides about 76 percent of the support for the Committee or Council or Commission. The distinguished gentleman also serves on the Committee on Armed Services as well as on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is the gentleman convinced in his own mind that the establishment of this National Council would not usurp the functions that lie with the Navy on oceanography for our national defense purposes as now provided, wherein the Navy does furnish this substance and the chairmanship of the said Committee on Oceanography?

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that the statement he has just made can be answered in the affirmative. The answer is affirmative absolutely.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, that is good enough for me, since the gentleman from North Carolina is this positive.

Second, my other question has to do with whether or not there is anything submitted to the committee which the gentleman represents and for which he handles this bill on the floor, which leads to this particular bill, that would in any sense be interpreted as a giveaway to the United Nations or any other international body, of the harvesting of the ocean floor either on the Continental Shelf within our own claims to mileage limits, or that area which we are enabled to exploit with our technical know-how?

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, again I can assure the distinguished gentleman this legislation does not in any way affect in any degree the things the gentleman referred to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response, and I thank him.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what was the previous appropriation for the Commission and Council?

Mr. LENNON. The authorization for both the Marine Commission, and the National Science Council on an annual basis was \$1.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. So with the abolition of the Commission there is only a cut of \$300,000 in the authorization? Is that correct?

Mr. LENNON. That is true. I will say to my distinguished friend that on the first blush the figure of only a \$300,000 cut concerned me. I went back, and the

committee did, in determining the degree to which the National Council was involving itself in all facets of marine science at every level, including its work with the Department of the Navy, as well as our schools and universities and laboratories, and in every facet. We found out that indeed this was the amount of money that was essential for the next fiscal year.

I want to say to the gentleman, we can hardly anticipate that the Commission's report can in any reasonable degree be implemented during this calendar year. It will take at least through fiscal year 1970 to being legislation to the floor which would, with any meaningful degree, implement the Commission's recommendations.

So, to keep together the National Council, with its staff and the work it is doing, the \$1.2 million is a fair and appropriate figure for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I was disturbed by the fact that there was only a \$300,000 cut in the authorization provided in this bill, but knowing of the gentleman's care for the expenditure of public funds I am willing to accept his explanation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. I am pleased by the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in urging that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed; and I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Oceanography, in urging support for the bill, H.R. 8794.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we minority members of the subcommittee, and also of the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, voted unanimously to report H.R. 8794 favorably to the House.

It is imperative that the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development be continued, even though as an interim body, until the Congress determines what final form a more permanent reorganization of the Nation's oceanographic agencies shall take.

In the past 2 years, the Council has performed very effectively and successfully its role of stewardship and prime mover—an extremely important and valuable role for our Nation's best interests—in directing and coordinating the many facets of our activities in development of the uses of the seas.

And incidentally, in all references to the oceans or the seas, we of the great Midwestern States remind you that our vast inland seas, the Great Lakes, are a national resource of incalculable value, and shall by definition be included completely in any and all of our national planning and programs for the productive uses of the seas.

The Council on Marine Resources, under the very skillful professional direction of Dr. Ed Wenk, and with strong personal support from the President and

Vice President, has created a great deal of positive momentum in marine activities vital to this Nation's future.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the momentum of the Council's leadership activities shall not be lost, but shall be maintained and increased, and that requires our favorable action of H.R. 8794 here today.

The Council is performing very well the important and difficult task we assigned to it when in the 89th Congress we took a historic initiative by adopting the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.

By that act of 1966 we intended to chart a much more vigorous, comprehensive course than ever before, and establish suitable new goals for our national effort in the marine sciences and engineering. We recognized that rapidly developing new technology in those areas is opening up opportunities and possibilities of immense value and usefulness, not only for the American people but all mankind. We determined that the United States should take a preeminent lead in developing those new opportunities.

To begin that task immediately, we created two temporary bodies. The Council, which we should renew for 1 more year by today's action, provides the executive leadership role. And the very able Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, chaired by Dr. Jay Stratton, has already completed its report and recommendations for a more permanent organizational structure, to provide the longtime direction needed for developing our efforts in the seas.

Personally, I hope this 91st Congress, after giving them the thorough study they deserve, will act decisively to implement the Stratton Commission's recommendations. Specifically, I hope that we will create the new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency which the Commission recommends, or at least an agency similar to it.

But, in the meantime, the momentum developed by the Council must not be lost, it must be maintained fully during this coming year, while the Congress works on a more permanent reorganization plan.

To do that job, it is necessary to authorize another year's funding for the Council, and the figure of \$1.2 million we are proposing today is entirely warranted, based on the past 2 years' experience. However, we all realize that the actual appropriation for the Council probably will be at a somewhat lower level.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and all the other concerned Federal agencies have officially indicated their approval of H.R. 8794, and it has been unanimously approved by our committee. I urge that it now be overwhelmingly supported by the membership of the House.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8794.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8434) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 4169 (a) (1) of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty; or"

(b) Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of section 4169(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(D) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while in the services with, or in, a unit under operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States; and"

SEC. 2. Section 4303(d) (5) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) (i) first-class letter mail (including postal cards and post cards),

"(ii) sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence,

"(iii) parcels of any class of mail not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined, and

"(iv) second-class publications published once each week or more frequently and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces and the general public.

which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office; and

"(B) parcels of any class of mail exceeding five pounds but not exceeding seventy pounds in weight and not exceeding one hundred inches in length and girth combined, including surface-type official mail, which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office where adequate surface transportation is not available."

SEC. 3. Section 4560 of title 39, United States Code, relating to air transportation of parcels mailed to or from servicemen, is amended by striking out the word "sixty" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-two".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the minority member of the subcommittee and the members of the entire committee who have brought this bill, H.R. 8434, to the floor today. I rise in support of the legislation.

I want to thank my colleagues on the committee, and several other Members of the House, who have evidenced a bipartisan support for my bill, H.R. 8434.

I was joined by eight majority and nine minority members of the committee, either in cosponsoring H.R. 8434 or identical bills. I thank each of you for your support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8434 has three features.

First, free mailing privileges are now provided for members of the Armed Forces in designated combat areas, and for servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in the combat areas. Vietnam is the only designated combat area. Consequently, the free mail services are not available to servicemen in other areas of Southeast Asia, such as Cambodia and Thailand.

Section 1 of H.R. 8434 extends the free mail privilege to all servicemen located outside the 48 contiguous States, including the servicemen in Hawaii and Alaska.

Also, the free mailing privilege for servicemen hospitalized as the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty will not be limited to disease or injury incurred in a combat area. It will be extended by this bill to include servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, regardless of where the disease or injury may have been incurred.

The second feature applies to the airlift of second-class news publications published once each week or more frequently, and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces. Existing law restricts this airlift privilege to servicemen in the combat areas, and to places where adequate surface transportation is not available.

The Department of Defense has established guidelines for adequate surface transportation under this provision as applying to any location which requires transit time of 29 days or more. Surface transit time to nearly all points of delivery overseas, even in Europe, is in excess of 29 days. Consequently, nearly all of the news value publications going to servicemen overseas now are being airlifted in accordance with the administrative determination based on the inadequacy of surface transportation.

Section 2 of H.R. 8434 eliminates the need for such administrative determinations and removes the restrictions contained in existing law on the news value publications airlift. Authority will be

provided by law for the airlift of news value publications to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States.

The third feature of the bill will increase from 60 inches to 72 inches—length and girth combined—the maximum size of parcels that may be mailed to military personnel under the special parcel airlift provision.

It has been found that the limitation on dimensions for parcels is not commensurate with the weight permitted, which is 30 pounds. It is difficult to place 30 pounds within the limit of 60 inches, girth and length combined, unless the density of the object is extremely high. To be truly useful for service people, the length and girth restrictions should be increased to 72 inches, as proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the first two features of this bill, removing the combat area restriction from the free mailing privilege and the airlift of news value publications, were included as a part of H.R. 10226 of the 90th Congress, which was favorably considered by our committee, and passed the House of Representatives on June 5, 1967, under suspension of the rules on a record unanimous vote of 316 yeas and no nays.

Some parts of H.R. 10226 were included by the Senate and the conferees as a part of the Postal Revenue Act of 1967, Public Law 90-206, but the two provisions we are talking about were not included in the final version.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested and an ardent supporter of legislation to improve and provide free mail service to our servicemen overseas. This is our fourth legislative attempt.

Last fall, following an extensive investigation of the U.S. postal systems of the Armed Forces in Europe, I made a report to Congress—House Report No. 91-29—which incorporated important recommendations that will be carried out upon enactment of H.R. 8434.

I am convinced that the servicemen in Europe are entitled to and should have these extended mailing privileges. I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation here today.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the degree of support for Chairman DULSKI's bill, H.R. 8434, is demonstrated by the fact that he had 14 cosponsors among the committee members. In addition, three other committee members have introduced identical bills, making 18 out of 26 committee members who enthusiastically support this legislation.

This is a measure supported almost equally on both sides of the aisle, and with such bipartisan support, I feel confident there will be few, if any, dissenting voices here today.

This legislation will cost \$7½ million but will result in returns of many times that in the efficiency and morale of our Armed Forces overseas.

The bill, H.R. 8434, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee, our colleague from New York, and cosponsored by 18 members of the committee completely rounds out the efforts of Congress to provide servicemen in all areas outside the 48 contiguous States the benefits of improved mail service.

This legislation will, first, extend free mailing privileges for all servicemen overseas; second, provide for increasing the limit on parcels airlifted to or from servicemen overseas from 60 inches to 72 inches, length and girth combined; and, third, extend the airlift for news value publications to any servicemen overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth legislative proposal that has been before the House to improve the mail service for servicemen overseas. Our action in 1965 resulted in Public Law 89-315; our vote in 1966 resulted in Public Law 89-725; and our action in 1967 resulted in Public Law 90-206, sections 102, 117.

Public Law 89-315 authorized: First, free letter mail for letters mailed by a serviceman in the combat area, Vietnam; and, second, airlift at surface postage rates for parcels up to 5 pounds between a combat area and the point of embarkation in the United States.

Public Law 89-725: First, extended the free mailing privileges to include sound recordings mailed by servicemen in combat areas; second, provided airlift between any APO overseas and the point of embarkation in the United States for letter mail, sound recordings, and parcels up to 5 pounds; and, third, provided airlift to a combat area for publications having current news value.

Public Law 90-206: First, added a new category for parcels—PAL—not exceeding 30 pounds or 60 inches, length and girth combined, mailed to or from any APO, including airlift within the United States upon payment of surface rates plus airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General—this fee now set at \$1; and, second, airlift extended to isolated hardship or combat support area overseas, or where adequate surface transportation is not available for news value publications.

H.R. 8434 will round out the efforts of the House to see that all servicemen serving in overseas areas have the benefits of fast, efficient, and less expensive mail service. These efforts are based primarily on the recommendations in the four reports of the overseas trips made by members of our committee—House Report No. 1226, 89th Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces and Certain Countries in Europe"; parts I and II of House Report No. 2198, 89th Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces—Vietnam and Thailand"; and House Report No. 91-29, 91st Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces, Europe, 1968," submitted by Mr. DULSKI.

This legislation contains three major features which are desirable if we wish to bring our military personnel in closer touch with their families and friends at home.

The first section will extend to all members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas the free mailing privileges for letters and sound-recorded communications which currently are authorized only for servicemen in a designated combat area. The first section also will broaden the existing law, which grants the free mailing privilege to servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred in a designated combat area, to

include servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, regardless of where such injury or disease was incurred.

Section 2 extends air transportation for news value periodicals, published at least once a week, on a space-available basis to all servicemen overseas, rather than to just those in combat areas.

Section 3 of the bill amends Section 4560, relating to air transportation of parcels mailed to or from servicemen, by striking "60" and substituting "72 inches in length and girth combined." This extra measurement is provided since it has been found the 60-inch packages were frequently not large enough to contain the 30 pounds of allowable weight in such packages.

The estimated cost of this legislation is \$7.7 million per year, including the loss of postal revenue due to the free mailing privileges.

More than 620,000 servicemen stationed outside the 48 contiguous States in noncombat areas will benefit from this legislation.

The administration opposes the first two sections of H.R. 8434, but on the rather lame excuse that there is no "justification for extending special mail privileges to servicemen not in combat areas." Gentlemen, I submit our fighting men overseas have no choice of their station and they should have these mailing privileges.

Neither the Department of Defense nor the Bureau of the Budget, however, opposes section 3 of the bill which increases the parcel airlift size limitations to 72 inches, length and girth combined.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will join me in support of this meritorious legislation and that we will have a unanimous vote.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman elaborate on the Alaska and Hawaii situation?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the fact that the serviceman in Alaska and Hawaii will also receive the free mailing privilege under this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the bill under consideration, H.R. 8434, and to recommend its prompt and unanimous approval. The features of this legislation round out the efforts of our committee over the past 3½ years to provide for our military personnel efficient and economic postal service.

The steps we take today will provide free mailing privileges for all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas and to all military personnel hospitalized as a result of injury incurred while on active duty. Presently free mailing privileges are available only for servicemen in designated combat areas. This privilege is completely justified, and I believe the same justification applies to providing the same privilege to all our military personnel who serve the cause of freedom at overseas stations.

This legislation makes other changes in the law which I believe are sound. It

will increase the permissible size of a parcel mailed under the parcel airlift service to make the size commensurate with the weight limitation of 30 pounds. The bill also provides for the airlifting, on a space-available basis, of second-class news publications to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bipartisan support of 18 members of our committee in cosponsoring H.R. 8434 or identical bills speaks for itself and is high recommendation for House approval of this measure.

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CORBETT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 8762, one of the bills to provide additional free letter and air transportation mailing privileges for servicemen stationed outside the 48 contiguous States, I urge the House to take favorable action on the bill under consideration, H.R. 8434.

All of us who introduced bills on this subject are, I am sure, convinced that all servicemen overseas, not just those assigned to combat areas, should have free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges.

As will be recalled, the House approved similar legislation in 1967, but the servicemen's mail provision was deleted during the House-Senate conference.

In addition to free letter mail, I believe that the section of the bill which would provide an increase in the maximum dimensions of parcels under the airlift—PAL—program would be of great benefit to our servicemen. This program and the space-available mail program—SAM—are providing efficient and economic mail service. An increase in the present limits on dimensions under the PAL program would result in encouraging and increasing the flow of packages to members of the Armed Forces. As a veteran of World War II, and in my contacts with veterans and servicemen since that time, I recognize that mail to and from home is a tremendous morale factor.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CORBETT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, not only to be a cosponsor of this bill, but also, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, to have taken part in the extensive deliberations that are being culminated here today.

As our chairman indicated to you, this is the fourth proposal in as many years that our committee has brought to the House floor designed to give military personnel, particularly those overseas, the best possible mail service. In this bill we now round out our efforts, and upon its enactment the Congress can be proud of the full program that will be operating to provide fast and efficient communications between servicemen and their families and friends.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is moving the postal service for our Armed Forces overseas into the 20th century. We are, in effect, say-

ing to our servicemen that when we separate them from their homes, families, and friends by great distances in defense of their country, we will give them the means of communicating with their homes swiftly, efficiently, and less expensively. We are saying to servicemen overseas that we are trying to give them mail service as good as we are providing for all the rest of the people back home. We are also telling the mothers, wives, and sweethearts back home that they will no longer have to pay exorbitant sums of money to get fast delivery of a package to their servicemen.

The specific provisions of this bill have already been detailed by the gentleman from New York, so I will only comment briefly.

The privilege of sending letters free that is being extended to all servicemen overseas certainly is not going to save any one serviceman an appreciable amount of money. This is really not its intent. The free mailing privilege is more a convenience than anything else. I think all Members who served during World War II, when the free mailing privilege was enjoyed by servicemen everywhere, will agree that being able to send a letter home without a stamp didn't save much money but certainly did eliminate the worry about always having stamps available. We are establishing the principle that the free mail privilege is being given to a serviceman in recognition of the fact that he has been separated from his home in an overseas area, great distances from home. The fact that he may or may not be in combat is incidental to this principle.

The bill also contains two other desirable revisions in existing law. One will extend to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States the privilege of receiving current news-value publications via airlift service on a space-available basis. The other revises the size limitations on parcels transported under the parcel airlift system to permit parcels up to 72 inches in combined length and girth while retaining the present 30-pound limit. Studies by our committee indicate that this change is appropriate so that the size of PAL parcels is commensurate with the permissible weight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is deserving of the full support of the House, and I urge its approval.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the legislation sponsored by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), and 15 members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to extend the mailing privileges to all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas and to all members hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Since the enactment of legislation in 1965 providing free letter service to servicemen stationed in combat areas, two further measures have been enacted to improve mail service for members of the Armed Forces serving overseas.

Servicemen in Vietnam and their families in the United States have responded enthusiastically as additional mailing privileges have been provided them. The

opportunity for a serviceman in Vietnam to send letters and tapes back home has been most gratifying to him and his loved ones. The opportunity for combat servicemen to receive news publications within a reasonable period of time was also provided by law and has been welcomed by our soldiers in Southeast Asia, many of whom are stationed in isolated outposts with little occasion to keep abreast of world developments.

The legislation proposed today will enable all servicemen on overseas duty and those hospitalized as a result of a disease or injury incurred while on active duty, to share in these free mailing privileges. It also extends the airlift for second-class news publications to servicemen who are located outside the 48 contiguous States of the United States. In an attempt to ease the size and weight limitations on packages traveling to Armed Forces personnel on a space-available basis, the bill also increases the maximum size of parcels from 60 to 72 inches.

The expansion of these mailing privileges will provide efficient and economic mail service for all our servicemen abroad, instead of limiting such advantages to those personnel in combat areas. Every serviceman overseas has experienced delays or loss of mail at one time or another. This measure attempts to alleviate such problems by providing fast, effective, and less expensive mail service for these servicemen. I urge my colleagues to give their support to H.R. 8434.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 8434, we are considering today will give free letter and personal recording mail privileges to 620,000 servicemen overseas who are not in designated combat areas.

But though they are not now under fire, many of them have been in combat. Many others in Thailand, the Sea of Japan, parts of Europe, and cold war areas throughout the world might at any time find themselves involved in actual combat with enemy forces.

Most of these servicemen overseas send an average of 12 letters a month to friends and relatives at home. At today's airmail rate, this is only \$1.20. It is a small amount to you and me, but on the meager pay of a soldier, sailor, or marine, it is an important consideration.

In addition, this legislation provides for free mail for all servicemen hospitalized in any facility of the Armed Forces of the United States, regardless of where located, when the hospitalization is the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

I am only sorry I did not realize this section was not included in previous legislation, or I certainly would have offered such an amendment.

Despite the opposition of the administration to H.R. 8434, I feel we should approve it with all possible expedition. I feel, to draw an analogy, that these men and women overseas have no choice of their geographical location, just as we are obliged to live in Washington. They are, for the most part, assigned to duty and must accept that assignment. They, therefore, should logically have free mailing privileges just as we in Congress have the privilege of reporting free

through the mail to our constituents back home.

This bill is a small, but important gesture that we in Congress can authorize to articulate our concern and our sense of duty and gratitude to those servicemen who serve the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support all three provisions of this bill, these being specifically: First, extend free mailing privileges for all servicemen overseas; second, provide for increasing the limit on parcels airlifted to or from servicemen overseas from 60 to 72 inches, length and girth combined; and, third, extend the airlift for news value publications to any servicemen overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt passage of this bill and hope the other body will give it prompt attention.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8434, a bill which would provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces on overseas duty.

It is only fair that those who are providing the principal defense of our country be granted these privileges. It is my belief that the granting of free mailing privileges to the servicemen would be an indication of our gratitude and appreciation for the daily sacrifices that they undergo. While many might question our involvement in Southeast Asia, no one questions the courage and determination of our troops who are continually involved in the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

It is also my belief that the passage of this bill will help to maintain the high morale of the troops by making it easier for them to communicate with their families here in the United States.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my full support to the bill now under consideration. Passage of H.R. 8434 will do much to improve the morale of our Armed Forces stationed outside the continental United States by improving their mail service.

H.R. 8434 has three major provisions. First, the free mailing privilege on letters and sound-recorded communications, now available only for servicemen in a combat area, is extended by this legislation to include all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas, and to all members hospitalized in any facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States, regardless of where it is located when the hospitalization is the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Second, the airlift privilege for second-class news value publications, now authorized only for servicemen in combat areas is extended by H.R. 8434 to include all servicemen who are located outside the continental United States.

Third, this bill also increases the maximum size of parcels from 60 to 72 inches, length and girth combined, that may be mailed to military personnel under the special airlift provisions of present law.

I am at a loss to explain why the administration opposes the extension of these free mailing privileges. I ask why these privileges should only be available

to servicemen in combat areas? Members of the Armed Forces have no choice about where they will be assigned. Their assignments take them far away from their loved ones and friends and the cost of telephone communication is prohibitive. I believe, contrary to the position of the administration, that the legislation we are considering today is needed. It will go a long way toward improving the morale of our military personnel stationed outside the continental United States. We owe it to them to do whatever we can to see to it that the news from back home gets to them as quickly and as cheaply as possible. Implementation of the provisions of H.R. 8434 require no elaborate machinery and the additional cost is slight in comparison to the service we will make available to our servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues join with me in voting for passage of H.R. 8434.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8434, a bill to improve overseas mail service to members of the armed services. I am happy over its early consideration for I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 9555.

The three major provisions of this legislation would do much to improve mail service to members of the Armed Forces overseas. It would extend the free letter mail privilege, now authorized for servicemen assigned to combat areas, to all military personnel assigned to duty outside the 48 contiguous States. Second, it would increase the length and girth combination from 60 inches to 72 inches for the maximum size of parcels that may be mailed to military personnel under the special parcel airlift provisions of existing law. And, finally, it would extend airlift for news value publications to all military personnel assigned to duty outside the 48 contiguous States.

Presently, free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges are limited to troops in combat areas, and packages being sent to servicemen can be no bigger than 60 inches in combined length and girth.

It may seem a small thing to do, but it seems to me of utmost importance that we take what steps are needed to bridge the great distance that separates our servicemen from their families and loved ones at home. All of our young men in the Armed Forces are performing a necessary service for their country, and it seems inequitable that families of men serving in Germany, for example, should have to pay high postal rates simply because it is a noncombat area. We owe it to these young men and their families to make every effort to boost the morale of servicemen all over the world, and I think that more packages from home and franking privileges for their mail would do just that.

Recent legislation such as that governing parcels being airlifted to combat areas at the surface rate plus payment of \$1, and parcels up to 5 pounds airlifted overseas as space available mail at the parcel post rate to the U.S. port city, was the first step in improving overseas mail service to members of the Armed Forces. Further improvements are provided in H.R. 8434, and the enactment of this bill is clearly the next step we ought to take.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has one simple purpose: to boost the morale of our servicemen. It requires no elaborate machinery to administer, and the cost is slight. The net gains, however, can be very great. If we can more effectively help to combat the loneliness and fatigue of our servicemen overseas by enacting this legislation, it surely is worth many times the cost. I would like to point out the fact that members of the Armed Forces in Hawaii whose homes and families are in the continental United States are just as much subjected to loneliness and fatigue as those who are serving in other areas of the vast Pacific. This legislation recognizes the need for the restorative qualities of mail to and from home among our men and women in uniform throughout the world—yes, even if they happen to be stationed amidst the natural beauty and warm aloha of the Island State.

This is a humanitarian measure that merits a unanimous favorable vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8434.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 514, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 366

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill and read by

titles instead of by sections, and all points of order against lines 10 through 15 on page 13, and lines 6 through 16 on page 20, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee on the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule calls for the consideration of H.R. 514, a bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education and for other purposes. This measure extends for 5 years—through June 30, 1975—all programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The only major amendment included in the committee bill would authorize a new impacted area aid program based on the number of children in each school district living in federally assisted public housing.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs extended by the bill provide funds for the title I program, which will assist school districts with large concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children; library resources, textbooks and instructional materials; supplementary education centers; dropout prevention programs; and special instruction for the handicapped.

The impact aid programs, authorized by Congress provide funds for construction, operation and maintenance of schools in districts which are affected by Federal installations. Impacted area aid provisions for disaster areas are also extended.

Authorizations are continued at fiscal 1970 levels which total approximately \$5 billion for each of the 5 years. The title I and impact aid programs, which do not require year-to-year authorizations because they are based on statutory formulas, are included in this estimated total.

Passage of the bill in its present form is supported by all major education groups, including the National Education Association and the National Association of School Administrators, and the AFL-CIO and other labor organizations, many civic organizations, and the National Conference on Civil Rights.

The House Education and Labor Committee reported favorably, with amendments, by a recorded vote of 21 to 13. The committee report held that 22 days of hearings revealed:

The No. 1 priority education need from the Federal level is a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with timely and adequate funding.

It also states that evidence before the committee shows that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is "doing a successful and effective job in carry-

ing out the congressional purposes for which it was enacted."

The 91st Congress has the responsibility and the herculean task of enacting effective legislation to save the educational institutions of our Nation. One only has to read the newspapers and listen to the television reports regarding the dissension and insurrection of our colleges and universities to realize that the time is short for the Federal Government to take drastic steps to protect and retain our educational system for coming generations.

Members of Congress must realize that the same yardstick of elementary, secondary, and college education methods of 25 years ago will not apply under our present population of 200 million people. Today 71 percent of our population, according to statistics, have moved into urban areas throughout the country. In 1967 over 400,000 farm families left the rural areas and moved into the urban centers. The local taxes on homes in the urban centers have now reached such a high bracket that schools in these urban centers are closing for lack of money in the payment of teachers' salaries, purchasing materials, and the numerous items necessary to carry on.

The various State legislatures are confronted with the almost impossible task of securing enough money to aid these urban localities.

Over the last 20 years the Congress has been negligent and dormant in realizing the financial calamity that hovers over our education system throughout the Nation. As one of the many examples, the 1969 Indiana State Legislature refused to increase the request of Indiana University for additional financial help, but instead lowered their request by over \$1 million. The Indiana State officials claimed present high taxes and scarcity of funds made the curtailment necessary.

Educators throughout the Nation are alarmed at the future of education institutions unless something drastic is done by the Federal Government to save the one segment of our economy from the threat of complete retrogression to the detriment of millions of our American youth in future years. The Congress of the United States cannot be entirely boastful of its cooperation in aiding our expanding education demands during the population explosion over the last 25 years.

In most metropolitan cities throughout the country school construction has completely fallen behind in taking care of the increased demand to accommodate our school population.

I vividly remember standing in the well of this House, along with other Members, who realized the danger to our school system back 15 years ago, asking the Congress to protect us from the critical danger which we are now passing through in our elementary and higher institutions of learning. Back in 1956 a bill on the floor of the House asking for \$400 million for school construction was defeated by 45 votes. In the following year, in 1957, H.R. 1, another bill, asking for Federal aid for our schools was defeated on July 25, 1957, by 208 to 203

votes. Five votes was the margin of defeat. I have often thought since then that had these bills passed, the congested schools, especially in our metropolitan areas, would have had ample money for school expansion, teachers' salaries, and other necessary material to extend to millions of our youth opportunities to secure a basic elementary and secondary education. Had those bills been passed it is difficult to estimate how many grade and high school dropouts would have continued their education instead of following these high-powered agitators who go about the country organizing riots, burning cities, homes, stores, and so forth. It is not very difficult for the professional agitator to organize the uneducated who are not qualified to secure satisfactory employment and who have been denied an education which this great, rich land of ours could easily afford if the Congress would cooperate with this national school emergency.

This bill that comes before you today is asking for a 5-year extension of the pending Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some Members, I understand, are going to favor an amendment to limit the extension of this legislation to only 2 years. This curtailment would be a monumental mistake and detrimental to the future education of millions of our youth. With only a 2-year extension of this bill school officials cannot outline a necessary program for future expansion because they will be uncertain as to what the Congress will decide to do at the end of the 2-year period, and that uncertainty will cripple the expansion program before it can be started on a permanent basis.

By the defeat of the two above mentioned bills back in 1956 and 1957 and the curtailment of Federal aid to education programs during the past 20 years, the Congress of the United States has been indirectly responsible and must share the blame for a great deal of the dissatisfaction and discontentment in our education system in the metropolitan areas of our Nation. The American people, parents and our school age youth are looking to the 91st Congress to act. This week we have the opportunity to tell the parents and the youth of the Nation that we will cooperate in every way possible to provide funds to aid the primary and secondary school systems of the Nation to give to school age boys and girls the opportunity to prepare for their future.

Mr. Speaker, the present legislation is composed of eight titles.

TITLE I

Title I provides for major effort on the Federal Government to help the elementary and secondary education of our American youth. Today there are over 8 million adults in America who have had less than a 5-year elementary school education. Millions of middle-aged in our Nation are unemployed because of lack of school facilities in their younger years.

By 1968 over 9 million children were being served by title I programs in this legislation. This covers over 16 thousand school districts across the Nation. About 500,000 children attending non-

public schools are included in the 9 million.

In 1967 the amount spent on non-public-school pupils rose from \$57 to \$75 per child indicating an increased involvement in title I programs by non-public schools.

Title I of this legislation has sought to reach special classes of educationally deprived children. Over \$45 million is now invested in programs serving some 185,000 children of migratory farm laborers. Approximately \$30 million has been expended for aid to over 1,200 institutions for neglected and deprived children.

In 1967, \$12.9 million was invested in special educational services for over 80,000 children with physical or mental handicaps. Another \$5 million was spent for educational services to some 50,000 Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools.

TITLE II

Title II provides for school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials.

Under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, over 70,500 public school libraries were expanded in 1967. Some 44.6 million children and 1.8 million teachers benefited from title II funds. Over 58 million books have been distributed to libraries and classrooms, besides many other instructional materials. Thirty States have started demonstration programs where school personnel can study, at first hand, library services and instructional resources of the highest quality. Mobile demonstration programs have been instituted for rural areas. From 1966 through 1968, almost \$300 million has been funded for this program. The fiscal year 1969 appropriation is \$50 million.

TITLE III

Title III provides for supplemental educational centers and services.

At the present time there are about 1,800 active title III programs funded for the most part under the State administration of title III. These programs will serve 10 million persons, including 9 million public and non-public-school students.

TITLE IV

Title IV provides educational research and training.

TITLE V

Title V extends grants to strengthen State departments of education. With the help of title 5 over 1,000 positions were added to State education agencies in 1968. Since its enactment, State professional staffs have increased by 4,260, enabling specialized technical services to local educational agencies in new program development.

TITLE VI

Title VI provides for education of handicapped children.

Under this title every effort is made to take care of as many of the 3.3 million handicapped children throughout the Nation as possible.

Title VI extends aid to the deaf and the blind and the amount of money provided under this title has been small compared with the demands of the

much-needed care of these afflicted American citizens.

Title VI also deals with the expansion of teacher education and research and demonstration programs.

TITLE VII

Title VII deals with additional teachers and material to aid the needs of children with limited English-speaking ability in schools having high concentrations of such children. These children number around 3 million of school age and are especially educationally disadvantaged because of their limited communication skills.

TITLE VIII

Title VIII provides for a special program to deal with the prevention of dropout youths in grade and high school categories.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress corrects its mistake of former years.

The youth of our Nation and their parents are asking for your support.

This educational bill should pass for a 5-year period without crippling amendments.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Without any reference to the substance of the gentleman's comments whatsoever, I wonder if he would explain to the House why on page 2, lines 5 and 6, the House resolution waives points of order on the committee substitute as an amendment for specified areas.

I had the time and the opportunity to look up these two areas in the bill proper, those where points of order are waived, and one gives carte blanc without a one-fortieth or 1 percent overall appropriation restriction, to hire "without regard to the civil service laws" or anything else, all personnel for the Council's purposes. This would deny them retirement rights—and cause many other problems, including wages.

First of all, I want to say I appreciate the Committee on Rules specifically saying wherein the waiver of points of order do pertain in the bill. Of course, it is incumbent on all Members to further check the committee, in order to determine if there are other areas wherein points of order might be allowed, within the bill itself. I understand a blanket waiver was prepared but the Committee on Rules limited waivers to these two.

This is an open-ended personnel raid in unspecified classes, and a "backdoor" raid on the Treasury.

The second point is on page 20, and permits transfer of funding. Bad enough, but almost customary enough to require no comment.

I wonder if the gentleman would explain why the Committee on Rules granted the rule waiving points of order, because this is again denying the individual Members of their prerogative and function on the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. I will answer the gentleman's question. Technically, these points in the bill are made on existing law to broaden the use of funds to be

used. Technically, enactment of the legislation at this time would enable funds already appropriated for 1969 to be used for purposes other than that for which they were specifically provided. That is the only reason I know of.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. That is entirely true, as I admitted in my remarks, on the question about page 20; but, it is not pertinent to page 13, lines 10 through 15:

(e) The Council is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws, to engage such secretarial, clerical, and technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and to this end up to one-fortieth of 1 per centum of any appropriations for grants under this title will be available for this purpose.

This completely negates all responsibility under the legislation in violation of Public Law 84-801—section 2953, title 5, United States Code. I see no reason whatsoever for points of order here, being waived.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Missouri that the one-fortieth of 1 percent of any appropriation for grants were funds appropriated in fiscal 1969, and this is an amendment added in committee which proposes to expend the funds for reasons other than the amount would be appropriated. It is for that reason that we seek to waive the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying to me that paragraph (e) on page 13, lines 10 to 15, is applicable only to one-fortieth of 1 percent of 1969 appropriated funds for this purpose and does not apply in the future?

Mr. PERKINS. No, this will apply in the future. This is an amendment to the law.

Mr. HALL. Then the gentleman would agree with me that there is no way of telling what the appropriation might be in the future, and therefore it is on open-ended authorization?

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with your reasoning, but it is something that the committee will continuously review in the future.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is poor legislative policy. The record has not been enhanced here on the floor. For that reason alone the rule should be defeated out of hand. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has consumed 16 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana has explained, House Resolution 366 is a rule providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes. It provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate. The committee substitute is made in order as an original bill for purposes of amendment, and the bill should be

read by titles instead of by sections. The waiver of points of order is provided specifically rather than generally as requested by the Committee on Education and Labor. Points of order are waived against lines 10 through 15 on page 13 and lines 6 through 16 on page 20. In both instances the waiver is necessary because of the transfer of previously appropriated funds from one program to another in the existing act.

Under the rules the normal requirement would be for such transfers to be accomplished by the Committee on Appropriations reappropriating the funds. The waiver removes the necessity for this time-consuming step.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, as the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee explained in a letter mailed to all Members within the last day or two, is a simple 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, it extends the impacted areas program in Public Laws 874 and 815, with considerable expansion in coverage.

The present law does not expire until June 30, 1970, and this bill proposes to extend the authorization for 5 additional years, or until June 30, 1975. As seems to be normal when we are considering bills from the Education and Labor Committee, there is a sense of emergency, but I fail to see the emergency currently existing since this legislation does not expire for over a year.

Total authorized spending contained in the bill exceeds \$26 billion over the next 5 years, with approximately \$15 billion allocated for title I. This title provides for the distribution of funds to the States according to a formula which has been in effect for some time and which has been shown to be very inequitable and unfair, but the committee chose to take the easy way out and continue unchanged most of the program.

The formulas provide that a State shall receive funds according to the number of poor children based on census figures and State assistance under its aid to the dependent children program.

The second determining factor is the per pupil expenditure by States. The per pupil assistance may be based on either one-half the national average or the State average, whichever is higher. This, of course, gives larger payments to the wealthier States who are spending more for education.

Let me give a few examples as contained in the report in regard to some of these inequities: Kansas and Nebraska are neighboring farm States in the Middle West, with very similar economic conditions and income, yet Kansas receives \$157.38 per pupil allotment while Nebraska receives \$117.61. Let us take two of the Southwestern States, Arizona and New Mexico. Arizona receives a per pupil allotment of \$157.34, whereas New Mexico receives \$176.38, a difference of almost \$20. Michigan and Illinois are similar and neighboring States. Both States expend well above the national per pupil average on the education of their children. Consequently, the base rate is practically the same for both

States. Yet, Michigan receives \$138.45 per pupil and Illinois receives \$155.74, or a difference of \$17.29.

Title II covers the Library Assistance program, the total authorization of which is \$200 million. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1970 is \$42 million.

Title VI provides assistance in the education of handicapped children, and again I would like to point out that in fiscal year 1969, although \$162.5 million was authorized, only \$29,250 was appropriated.

Under title VII, bilingual education programs, \$40 million is authorized for each year, but the budget recommendation for fiscal year 1970 is \$10 million.

It appears the Committee on Education and Labor has used extremely high figures that are not realistic as contrasted with the amount that the Appropriations Committee feels should be appropriated for the various programs included in this piece of legislation. I would suggest to the Committee on Education and Labor that they come up with some perhaps more realistic figures in the future.

Now I would like to come to the proposed changes in the impacted areas program. This is a program originally set up for the purpose in 1950 to provide assistance to school districts who had an immediate and large influx of schoolchildren because of the location of a Federal installation in their districts.

Total authorization provided in H.R. 514 for fiscal year 1970 is \$648 million, plus \$235 million to take care of the amendment which will add the children of families living in low-income Federal housing, or a total authorization for Public Law 874 of \$883 million. I would like to call attention of the House to the fact that in 1963 our total appropriation for Public Law 874 was only \$231,293,000.

Mr. Speaker, inequities have existed in Public Law 874 for many years, and corrections have been recommended by various commissioners of education, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, yet the Committee on Education and Labor has refused to come to grips with the problem.

In section 1 of the declaration of policy of the impacted areas program, it states as follows:

The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that:

(1) The revenue available to such agencies has been reduced by the acquisition of real property by the United States.

There are two categories of students under this program.

The "A" students are those whose parents live and work on Federal property, and the school district receives 100-percent payment under one of the following three formulas:

First, the average per pupil expenditure of adjoining school districts within a region; the average per pupil expenditure in the State; or the average national per pupil expenditure, whichever of the three is higher.

The "B" students are those whose parents work on a Federal installation, but

who live in private housing away from the installation. The school district receives 50 percent of the highest average per pupil expenditure in one of the above three categories for "B" students.

An inequity which exists, however, in this area is that school districts that are outside of the location of the Federal installation also receive the same compensation. This type of school district has not been adversely affected through the loss of tax revenues, since the Federal installation is not within its district. As a consequence, this is just a bonanza for these school districts. If there is justification for this type of payment, the same argument could be made for assistance to a community which has a sudden influx of children from a newly established plant in the private sector of our economy.

There are many economic pluses for a community with a Federal installation, and those who work in a Federal installation and live off, pay taxes on their homes and contribute to the welfare of the local economy through the purchase of groceries, drugs, clothing, and so forth.

In regard to the formula which allows the national average of expenditures per pupil to be used in figuring the allotment to a school district, this has no relationship to the intent of the legislation. I quote from Francis Kepple, Commissioner of Education, in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 2, 1963:

Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burden occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, to a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial state aid for these same pupils.

The original bill provided for a 3-percent absorption requirement which was to go into effect the following year which provided that a school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance. The theory behind this provision was that a community received economic benefit from having the Federal installation in its midst. This was repealed, however, at the insistence of school superintendents from throughout the country, and in its place was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility requirement rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance.

A further provision was added in 1958 that if a school district lost a Federal installation that the payment to the school district should continue for the following 3 years.

Commissioner L. G. Derthick testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee on June 9, 1959, stated:

This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the three percent condition of eligibility in a given year, and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility conditions in either year.

Commissioner Francis Kepple on April 2, 1963, in testifying before the House Committee, stated:

Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary, since section 3-F of the law permits a one year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of Federally connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a secession in Federal activities.

Other inequities have been pointed out over the years by witnesses for HEW before the House Education and Labor Committee, but the committee has done nothing to implement these suggested changes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a report published in June 1963, entitled, "The Federal Government and Education," which was a report of a special committee of the House Education and Labor Committee and chaired by the able gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

At that time 111 Federal programs of education were identified in various departments of Government. In the report it was stated that the committee was uncertain as to whether or not they had actually been able to ascertain all of the education programs in various departments as no compilation had ever been made. I quote from page 4 of the report.

In many of the large agencies there is not even, at a central point complete knowledge of all the educational programs they administer.

Another quote from the report dated June 14, 1963:

This report shows that while the Federal Government is involved in many parts of the Educational system, and a major partner in the higher education system, there is little evidence of a well coordinated program.

The committee raised various problems which need attention. I would like to refer only to a few of them.

First. The reimbursement for indirect costs in research grants.

Second. There is no government-wide directory available to colleges and universities indicating which agencies are actively engaged in or interested in developing programs in the various research and training fields. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the House last week added another education program to the Department of Interior with a total authorization of \$62 million over the next 3 years for grants to colleges who will set up a course of study in water pollution and for scholarships to students to take this course.

Education programs should be handled by the Office of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and not spread throughout all of the various departments of the Government. We compounded this problem last week by adding still another program and assigning it to the Department of the Interior to the tune of a \$62 million authorization.

Third. There is no uniformity even within a single agency of the Government in regard to such administrative details as regulations for recordkeeping,

reports on technical accomplishments, and the financial status of projects.

The committee also calls attention to other problems which I will not go into at the present time.

The committee headed by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) asked on page 9 of its report, and I quote:

Should there not be centered in some agency reliable up-to-date information on all existing educational programs of the Federal government as well as information on future planning of all agencies engaged in them? What is needed to provide fuller and more current information on such programs?

And another point which the committee makes, and I quote:

Should there not be centered in some agency more formal coordination among agencies engaged in essential similar programs as for example among: A. The Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Office of Education in foreign language training, the development of language teaching aids and foreign aid studies? B. The Department of State, USIA, AID, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Defense in the teaching of English to foreigners.

Other recommendations are made along these lines.

The report further asks:

Would it be desirable for all student aid programs to be coordinated through one agency?

With 111 Federal education programs which could be identified in 1963, and with the proliferation in this area since that time, there could be as many as 200 different Federal education programs today, yet no one knows for sure.

Instead of turning out legislation such as the bill we have before us today which does not expire until June 30, 1970, it seems to me that the committee should make a major effort to catalog all of the Federal education programs and from this study come up with recommendations to the House to consolidate and make more effective the programs we now have.

With the great proliferation of educational programs, there is an inevitable overlapping and duplication and with the total expenditures at the Federal level now running in the billions of dollars, such a study should have a No. 1 priority, and could eliminate the duplication which currently exists at a saving of substantial sums.

It is a sad reflection on the work of the Education and Labor Committee on the bill which we have before us today that the amount actually appropriated for the various programs is only 30 to 40 percent of the amount authorized. I hope that the House will adopt substantial and major amendments to this legislation, particularly in regard to reducing the 5-year authorization period to a 2-year period and substantial and meaningful amendments to the impacted aid program.

I support the rule, but oppose the legislation as it is currently written.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement and ask if he will yield so that I may ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question. In laying the groundwork for the question I turn to page 13 of the bill wherein the language reads as follows:

(e) The Council is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws, to engage such secretarial, clerical, and technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions.

And so forth, this language being protected by a waiver in the rule of a point of order.

Now, is the gentleman—the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor—aware of the public law which provides that in instances of this kind there must be an explanation on the part of the agency or the department of Government affected by this sort of language setting forth the man-hours of employment, the costs and various other details as to employees to be hired?

Where in the report, or any other statement accompanying this bill, is there a statement meeting the requirements of the public law?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that similar language to this has been placed in many bills that have been brought to this floor. I do not know whether one-fortieth of 1 percent is reasonable for the services. There is nothing wrong, as I see it—

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this straight, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the one-fortieth of 1 percent authorization for expenditure. I am talking about the apparent failure to meet the employment requirement. I am asking if the gentleman can show me anywhere in the report or any statement accompanying this bill where there is compliance with the requirement of the public law with respect to open-end employment and pay. This apparently waives all provisions of the law. If the gentleman can show me any statement, setting forth the required information, the question will be answered. Is there anything in the report?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, in reply to the gentleman, we do not want to tie the hands of the commission, and here we just authorize them, we are waiving the civil service laws to give them authority to employ the necessary personnel.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the public law says you cannot do this, and not be in violation of the law—

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that many bills have been brought before this Congress last year and the year before that made exceptions, and this is one of those exceptions.

Mr. GROSS. To make it more obnoxious, this is protected by a waiver of a point of order against the language.

Mr. PERKINS. It is necessary because they used funds that are already appropriated for the regular programs for this purpose, and for that reason it is a different purpose, and they had to waive points of order.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman with regard to the allocation of funds in the statement the gentleman just made. I would direct the attention of the gentleman to page 69 of the report. The table that is contained at that place indicates that the average allocation for each child under title I is \$154.94, but it indicates that in the State of Virginia that per pupil it is \$140.52. In fact, there are 32 States that received less than the average.

Now, would that mean—and I would ask the gentleman would it be a fair assumption to assume that more taxpayers' money is going to the richer States than to the poorer States? And are those 32 States that receive less than the average actually losing money by this bill?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct, and that is the result of this complicated and unrealistic formula, so that a State which spends more on education than the national average receives more funds under this program.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I noticed that the gentleman's own State of Nebraska is right at the end of this list.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.
Mr. SCOTT. And that the State of Virginia is not far from it.

In other words, this bill is going to cost the States of Virginia and Nebraska money rather than to bring money into those States?

Mr. MARTIN. It would bring money into the State, but I still believe the basic formula is unfair and inequitable. I am sure an amendment will be offered on the floor within the next day or two to change this formula in title I.

Mr. SCOTT. But it will take more money out of the State than it brings in, where they are less than the average; would that be a fair statement?

Mr. MARTIN. Not necessarily; no.
Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.
The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Anderson, Ill.	Eckhardt	Moss
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.
Annunzio	Fallon	Ottinger
Ashbrook	Findley	Podell
Ashley	Fish	Powell
Barrett	Flynt	Pucinski
Bates	Foley	Purcell
Bell, Calif.	Ford	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	William D. Frelinghuysen	Ronan
Blanton	Green, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Griffiths	Rosenthal
Boggs	Hanley	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Harsha	Rumsfeld
Brasco	Hébert	St. Onge
Brock	Jarman	Sandman
Brooks	Jonas	Scheuer
Brotzman	Keith	Sikes
Brown, Calif.	Kirwan	Smith, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Landrum	Sullivan
Cahill	Lipscomb	Symington
Carey	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Casey	Lowenstein	Thompson, Ga.
Celler	McCloskey	Tunney
Chamberlain	Macdonald, Mass.	Ullman
Chisholm	MacGregor	Vigorito
Clancy	Mahon	Watkins
Clausen, Don H.	Maillard	Watson
Clay	May	Watts
Cowger	Mayne	Whalley
Davis, Ga.	Mikva	Wilson, Bob
Dawson	Monagan	Wilson, Charles H.
Diggs	Moorhead	Wylder
Dwyer	Morse	Young
	Morton	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 514, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that we come before this Chamber today with one of the most important pieces of legislation the House has ever considered. I know we have some sharp differences of opinion, but in the committee, the record will show that we gave H.R. 514 as thorough consideration as any piece of legislation that has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Every paragraph of existing law was reviewed carefully and every amendment offered was given the most thorough consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that during these proceedings, the minority were most attentive and they gave invaluable assistance in our work on H.R. 514. As will become obvious in this debate, the major point of contention during our consideration in the committee is the length of the extension proposed for elementary and secondary education programs. I believe the committee acted properly in proposing a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Based on the extensive hearing record compiled, the committee could not have acted in any other way. The four volumes of hearings on H.R. 514 make it abundantly clear that the Federal dollar for education can be more effectively utilized for the improvement of education if local school administrators can be assured that the program is more than a temporary venture of the Congress. The hearings this year confirm what we know to be the case from the hearings conducted in 1965, 1966, and 1967—that short-term authorizations preclude long-range planning by school officials. By authorizing elementary and secondary school programs for 5 years, we will permit local educational agencies across the country to give maximum effect to Federal funds by planning their uses in advance.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the reason for a 5-year extension is basic to the effective implementation of the essential programs we seek to extend by this legislation. If we believe in this program—and I think the membership of this House does believe in it—a 5-year extension is most reasonable. If we want to obtain the maximum benefits from the Federal dollar—if we want our local educational agencies to be able to secure qualified personnel—and if we want local educational agencies to interrelate and coordinate Federal funds with local and State dollars—a 5-year extension is essential.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill reflects the advice and judgment of the best authorities in the Nation. A 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act responds to the unanimous request of school officials, principals, and administrators. H.R. 514 is a reflection of what local educational agencies personnel know to be the need from their experience working with these programs on a day-to-day basis. It is not as will be alleged here today, an attempt to deprive the new administration of an opportunity to amend or revise the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The record shows that the Committee on Education and Labor has always actively given consideration to legislation improving or modifying programs where needed. It is a matter of public record, in response to the testimony presented by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in April this year, that at any time the present administration wishes to be heard on legislative proposals to revise programs carried on under the ESEA, I would initiate such proceedings promptly.

Mr. Chairman, there is more than adequate precedent for long-term authorizations for education programs. When we originally enacted the impacted areas legislation, we provided a 3-year authorization. Last year, by virtue of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, we authorized some 30 programs for a 3-year period. When we originally enacted the National Defense Education Act during the Eisenhower administration, we authorized a 4-year program.

Long term authorizations have been enacted for other significant and effective programs. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946 contained permanent authorizations, as did the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. For an extended period of time, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act contained a permanent authorization. When we have permanent legislation, such as we do with the Vocational Education Act, we are not under extreme pressure of an immediate termination date for authorizations, and we are able to deliberate at great length and to carry out our oversight function in a more meaningful fashion.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor has amended the ESEA every year of its existence. I venture to say we will amend it in 1970 and in 1971, even though it were to be given a 5-year extension, as is proposed by H.R. 514. That we will consider legislation to amend the ESEA even though there is no immediate termination date is perhaps best demonstrated by reference to what took place in 1965. It was shortly after President Johnson signed Public Law 89-10, that the Congress enacted Public Law 89-313, which contained extensive amendments to the original act.

Let me describe briefly the purpose of each title of the act which we propose to amend, and why it must be continued in the coming years.

TITLE I

Title I provides for grants to local educational agencies, through State departments of education for programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children—the children of urban slums and remote rural areas. It is the single largest effort to focus funds or perhaps the single most pressing problem in American education, educational deprivation resulting from poverty. Federal funds are apportioned to school districts using uniform national statistics on the number of children in low-income families plus those in families receiving more than \$2,000 under the program of AFDC. It is the most effective means of distributing funds uniformly throughout the country where educational deprivation exists. Programs are conducted in school attendance areas having high concentrations of low-income children. Children attending eligible title I schools are qualified to participate in the program regardless of their family income if they are in need of the special educational assistance provided by the program.

Since the beginning of the title I program, almost \$3 billion has been used to meet the special needs of millions of edu-

cationally deprived children. In 1968, about 9 million children are being served in over 16,000 school districts, including 400,000 children attending nonpublic schools.

Title I funds also support programs for other special groups of disadvantaged children: \$45 million is currently being used to strengthen educational services for some 185,000 children of migratory agricultural workers; \$14 million to serve 32,000 neglected and delinquent children in State institutions; \$29.8 million to support 96,000 handicapped children in 900 State institutions receiving special and improved services; and \$9 million to support special programs for 50,000 Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

The committee is recommending a 5-year extension of the existing title I program. No significant change is being made in the title I formula for determining allocations except that children in all types of correctional institutions will be counted, rather than institutions for neglected and delinquent children only. The count of children will be extended to include children in county and local reformatories, prisons, and jails.

To assure that children in such institutions participate in the benefits of title I programs, provision is being made to allow a State educational agency to assume responsibility for providing these services if the local education agency is unable or unwilling to do so, in which case the allocation on behalf of these children will be made to the public agency providing the service.

The method of payment to a State for programs for migratory children of migratory workers will be changed to the number of children served in the State rather than on the number of children residing in the State so that maximum utilization will be made of the migrant funds available.

An amendment is included to assure that grants can be made to local school districts on a timely basis under the advance funding authority by permitting the Commissioner of Education after April 1 to use the most reliable and recent data available to him on numbers of children and the use of the most recent per pupil expenditure data, rather than the second preceding year's data as presently required. This amendment is needed in order to take full advantage of the advance funding provisions of the act.

Other amendments which will improve the administration of the program place requirements on the reporting of evaluation data by the local education agency to the State; and requirements upon the States to include in their reports to the Commissioner the results of research and replication studies carried on in the State.

A new provision will require the establishment of State advisory councils broadly representative of the educational resources of the State and of the public to advise on policy matters in connection with title I. Another provision will make changes with respect to the title I National Advisory Council: staggered terms for the members to help guarantee con-

tinual turnover in the membership; the authority for hiring an independent staff; and authorization for approximately \$300,000 for the expenses of the Council—up to one-fortieth of 1 percent of any appropriation for grants for title I—to carry out its evaluation activities; and a requirement for the Council to submit an annual report on successful compensatory education programs.

Another clarifying amendment eliminates reference to Wake Island with respect to administrative funds since Wake Island has no title I program.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES

Title II provides State allocations for the purchase of school library resources, textbooks, periodicals, films, video tapes, and other printed and published instructional materials. An estimated 44 million of the Nation's public and private school children have benefited from this program since fiscal year 1966. In addition, title II has helped to stimulate the establishment of thousands of new public school libraries throughout the country.

H.R. 514 would extend title II for 5 years at the present annual level of authorizations, \$200 million. Although the appropriations made for this program have been inadequate, considerable progress has been made in meeting the needs of children. The authority for the Commissioner to provide library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for children and teachers in States where the State agency may not do so is also extended through 1975.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Title III provides nonmatching grants to State and local education agencies for supplementary educational centers and services to stimulate and assist in the development of exemplary elementary and secondary education programs. In fiscal year 1970, the States assume administrative responsibility for all title III funds except those necessary to complete projects begun in prior years when the Office of Education was administering the program.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 provided for a shift in the authority for approval of individual projects from the Commissioner of Education to State education agencies under a State plan program.

The title III program has been in operation since November 1965. During this period nearly 7,000 project applications were received and as of June 30, 1968, about 2,500 projects had been approved. Of these about 1,500 title III projects are currently in operation. Approximately 10,000,000 students have benefited over the last 3 years through the exemplary educational projects developed under title III.

The committee amendment would extend the program for a 5-year period, through 1975. In addition, another amendment would give the Commissioner of Education authority to arrange for the effective participation on an equitable basis in title III programs by children and teachers in the schools in the area to be served, where such provision is not being made. The cost would be

paid from the State's allotments. This provision is similar to the provision in title II of the act.

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Title V authorizes grants to State education agencies to help them identify needs in elementary and secondary education and to strengthen the role of the State educational agencies in the development and administration of new programs to meet complex and urgent educational needs. With the help of title V, over 1,000 professionals were added to State education agencies in 1968 alone. Since its enactment, State professional staffs have increased by 4,260, enabling the giving of additional specialized technical services to local educational agencies in new program development. Title V funds, together with the administrative funds authorized under the title I, title II, and title III programs have enabled State departments to play an effective role in the administration of the Federal programs.

The committee bill would extend the provisions of this title for a 5-year period, through 1975.

TITLE VI—EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

H.R. 514 extends for 5 years the program for handicapped children. Part A of title VI, the State grant program for the initiation and expansion of special program for the handicapped has made an impact both in terms of short-range and long-range objectives and programs in many States. It has stimulated increased State and local expenditures and programs for handicapped children, their needs, and methods to meet these needs on the part of the general public, administrators, both regular and special education teachers, and personnel in various nonschool agencies working with the handicapped. It is estimated that 182,000 handicapped children will receive benefits this school year under this program.

Part B of title VI authorizes the establishment of regional resource centers. Four such centers will be selected for establishment this fiscal year at a cost of \$125,000 each. These centers will provide the backup resources to enable the teacher of handicapped children to do more effective teaching. They will handle the work of the diagnostician, curriculum development specialist, educational evaluator, and media specialist.

Part C of title VI authorizes centers and services for deaf-blind children, 8 to 10 which will be established this year and next year. These centers will serve the large new population—an estimated 1,250—of deaf-blind children struck by the German measles epidemic of 1964 and 1965 who are now 3 and 4 years old. Currently, only about 100 of approximately 500 school-age, deaf-blind children are enrolled in special classes with the instruction designed for their dual handicap, and preschool programs are almost nonexistent. The new centers will be located strategically to serve a population and geographic region, rather than an area within State boundaries.

Part D of title VI authorizes a program to establish and support special information centers and to recruit young

people for the special education professions.

H.R. 514 also extends through 1975 the appropriation authorization of Public Law 85-926—Grants for teaching in the education of handicapped children—and provides for training for subprofessional personnel and other staff who do not require professional or advanced training.

Title V of Public Law 88-164—Training of physical educators and recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children—is extended through 1975; authorizes training for subprofessional personnel or other staff who do not require professional or advanced training; and conform section 502(a)(1) to a recent amendment to section 302 of Public Law 88-164 by allowing research grants and contracts with any public or private agency.

TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

This program is designed to meet the special education needs of children with limited English-speaking ability in schools having high concentrations of such children. Approximately 3 million children are deprived of equal educational opportunity because of their limited communication skills. In fiscal year 1969, 78 proposals serving 139,000 pupils, were selected for funding at a cost of \$7,500,000.

The committee recommends the extension of this program through 1975 with annual authorizations of \$40 million, and the inclusion of Indian children on Indian reservations as eligible participants in bilingual education programs.

TITLE VIII—DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM

The dropout prevention program authorizes programs to develop and demonstrate educational practices for the reduction and prevention of dropouts in urban and rural schools having a high concentration of children from low-income families and a high dropout rate. The first year of the program is 1969. Planning grants were made to 20 local agencies for comprehensive program planning. About 10 programs will become operational this year under the limited appropriation of \$5 million.

H.R. 514 extends this program for an additional 5 years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1970.

TITLE VIII—DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

H.R. 514 does not contain an extension of section 806 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 because the activities authorized in this section are included in the more comprehensive provisions for collection and dissemination of information and technical assistance in section 303 of title III of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary through 1972. Section 806 by law becomes ineffective when section 303 is funded.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Grants are made to States for programs to increase and expand basic education programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations and to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training, more profitable employment, and more responsible citizenship. Many

positive results have accrued as a result of this program and the committee recommends its extension for 5 years.

H.R. 514 also extends the benefits of titles I, II, III, and VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools. It also extends the benefits of titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to children in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Other amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act recommended by the committee include:

A requirement for the adoption of effective procedures by the States and local agencies to involve parents and community representatives in the development and operation of the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and to insure adequate dissemination of program plans and evaluations to parents and to the public at large;

A requirement that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report to the appropriate committees of Congress a description of each contract or grant for evaluation of programs, any part of the performance of which occurred during the preceding fiscal year, together with the name of the firm or individual with whom the contract was made and the amount paid under the contract;

Permit the single packaging of a local program for funding by several agencies under which anyone of the Federal agencies may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. This is limited with respect to a project funded in whole or in part under a statute for which the Commissioner of Education has the responsibility for administering;

Authorize local educational agencies to use systematic approaches in determining cost data required in the administration of the program authorized by the act with the proviso that such approaches conform in principal to the concept of reimbursement procedures which have been prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. AL-21 as in effect on March 1, 1969.

Requires that no standard, rule, regulation, or requirement of general applicability prescribed for the administration of this act or any act amended by this act may take effect until 30 days after it has been published in the Federal Register.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

H.R. 514 extends the legislation for the maintenance and operation of schools and the construction of schools in federally affected areas contained in Public Law 81-874 and Public Law 81-815 for 5 years.

H.R. 514 also amends Public Law 81-874 to provide for payments to school districts of one-half of the local cost of education for each public housing child, less the share for education of the amount paid in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to the local governing agencies. The amendment contains a separate authorization of appropriations for public housing children.

H.R. 514 also amends Public Law 81-815 to provide that a local school district may be compensated for school construction costs by the Federal Government for a sudden increase in enrollments caused by the presence of large numbers of children from public housing projects. There is also a separate authorization of appropriations for this purpose.

The purpose of the public housing amendment is to recognize the burden placed on local school districts as a result of housing legislation which authorizes the construction of low-rent housing with the assistance of the Federal Government. Since the Federal housing acts exempt all low-rent public housing from State and local taxation, school districts serving children from public housing are severely limited in providing an adequate education for these children.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let me state again, when this program was first enacted in 1965, Congress took a major step in assuring quality and equality in the education of our Nation's children. Testimony presented before the committee confirms that the programs authorized by the 1965 act are doing a successful and effective job in carrying out the congressional purpose, but that maximum effective use of Federal funds has been impaired by delays in continuing authorizations and untimely funding. I feel it will be a grave mistake if we fail to tell the American people that we have confidence in this program. Our indication of confidence should be the enactment of H.R. 514 and the extension of these programs for 5 years. This will mean a continuing Federal commitment which will permit effective planning and program implementation.

I am confident that the Members of the House know that the Committee on Education and Labor will carry out its oversight responsibility and that we will consider and report out legislation in the future to make any changes in the law which are deemed and proven necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ayres).

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issues before us are simple enough. I doubt if we will require the 4 hours of debate under the rule. The main issue is whether we shall extend the Elementary and Secondary Aid to Education Act until 1975 without significant change, as our distinguished chairman wishes, or whether we shall extend it only to 1972, as many of us think the wiser course. That is the issue.

This act does not expire until June 30, 1970. The only reason for extending it this year is to make it possible to appropriate funds this year for fiscal year 1971. Why, then, Mr. Chairman, should we not simply extend it 1 year, to June 30, 1971, which is all that is needed?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to clarify this. We have advance funding authority in the law and we have to extend this legislation now

in order that the authority may be exercised for fiscal year 1971. That is the reason we decided, all of us on both sides of the aisle, to take up the bill early this year.

But a 2-year extension, in my judgment, would mean that we would be back next year so as to avoid an expiration crisis in the first session of the 92d Congress. In my judgment, we would have to go through this whole extension process again next year. Let us assume the Secretary has a lot of amendments, in which case we may take a considerable length of time to consider them and bring a bill to the floor.

It may take a whole year to do it. It may even drift over into the next year. Meanwhile our delay would prevent school agencies from doing the job we expect this legislation to do. I cannot visualize how one can justify only a 2-year extension under these circumstances. During this 5 years we would be in a better position, I think, in a more deliberate way, after we establish the continuity of this program, to consider suggestions from the administration and others with respect to improving it.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the chairman for telling us about the advance funding.

I should like to remind the members of the committee, as to his statement it might take a year to get this bill out of the committee, if he were to continue operating the next year under the same provisions as this year, I do not believe it would take a year. I believe he could have it back, in the manner in which the votes were counted on the committee, in ample time.

Why a 2-year extension as the minority on the committee propose?

The answer to that question will also tell you why we are opposed to a 5-, or 10-, or 20-year extension of the act.

If we extend this act only 1 year we shall have to bring it up again next year—in 1970—for another 1-year extension in order to have forward funding into 1972. And next year will be too early to have the results of the 1970 census so that we can make intelligent changes in the distribution formula in title I of the act.

If we extend this act for 2 years—until 1972—we can take it up in 1971 with all the census data in front of us and make the changes that will have to be made.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I am always happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe if the gentleman were to check with the Department of Commerce, if I recall correctly, the data we need will not be available until 1972. I should like for the gentleman to check that out. I do not believe we are going to have the new data until 1972.

Mr. AYRES. We have, Mr. Chairman. We have been so advised, that the information would be available.

If we extend this act for 2 years until 1972 then we can take this up in 1971 with the census figures available.

Now this formula, Mr. Chairman, will have to be changed.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The new census figures, when they become available, under this present act, automatically fit into the picture. The Congress does not have to do anything under the formula, unless we intend to change the formula. We can change the formula this year or the next year or the next year. The bill provides for the use of the latest statistical information on the AFDC, and the census. This data may be used without a change in the law.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate those observations, because they are leading right into the very points I am trying to prove.

And this formula will have to be changed because it is the most confused, unfair, mixed-up thing in the history of Federal aid to education. Three-quarters of the money under this act is distributed according to the title I formula—and nobody can make much sense of it.

I am going to talk about that formula a little bit—and when you have the facts of how it operates I think you will agree that we should change it at the first opportunity, which will be in 1971 when we have new census information.

But first, I want to set one thing straight right now at the beginning of this debate. The chairman has said that we have to extend this act for 5 years to assure educators that we intend to continue Federal aid. That just is not the issue. The vast majority of Members in both parties in both Houses of Congress favor continued Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, and everybody knows it. There is not any question about the aid continuing. The questions are about the details—how it will be distributed, for example. I think a substantial majority also favors increasing appropriations for the schools as soon as the Federal budgetary situation will permit it.

If this big majority in favor of Federal aid melted away, then a 5-year extension, or 10 years, or 20 years, could not save it. There just would not be any appropriation made for it and that would be that.

But I do not think anything like that is going to happen. Practically all of us recognize that Federal aid for our schools is high on the list of legislation in the national interest.

The thing most likely to hurt this program is to continue indefinitely with parts of it that do not make sense, and that is the only thing I can say about this distribution formula.

Now this will be discussed at length by other Members, but let me give you a few examples. Let us look at what your local schools actually get this year for each child counted under this formula.

Nebraska, Utah, Idaho, and New Mexico; all have their money figured on the basis of one-half the national average per pupil expenditure—which is \$277.65. Nebraska schools actually get \$117.61 for each poor school child counted.

Utah schools do better with \$122.40.

Idaho does better still with \$136.03.

New Mexico tops them all with \$176.38.

Now why in the world should New Mexico schools get \$50 more per poor child than Nebraska schools when they are both figured on the same base?

Or take Michigan and Minnesota;

Minnesota is figured on a base \$12 higher than Michigan—but Minnesota actually receives \$24 more than Michigan for each poor child counted.

This title I program is supposed to be aimed at concentrations of poor children—particularly in big cities where the problems are most severe. And here again, there is no rhyme or reason in the amount each city school system actually gets this year for each poor child counted.

Of course, the schools in New York City get the most—\$200.01 this year for every child counted. That is \$68 more per child than the schools in Cleveland or Akron; \$52 more per child than in Philadelphia; \$45 more than in Chicago; \$62 more than Detroit; and \$56 more than Los Angeles.

Wilmington, Del., is a rather small city of less than 100,000 population with a lot of Du Pont property to tax for their schools—but Wilmington schools get more per child than eight of the 10 largest cities in the Nation—all except New York and Washington, D.C.

In fact—if there are any poor children counted in the schools of Paradise Valley, Ariz., Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's hometown—and I suspect there may be—the schools in Paradise Valley get \$157.34 this year for each child counted—and that is \$13.51 more per child than in the Watts section of Los Angeles.

As a matter of fact, the schools of Paradise Valley, Ariz., get more per child this year than the schools in eight of our 10 largest cities.

The chairman tells us that all of these wild discrepancies would just go away if this formula were fully funded for about \$3 billion.

Well, this year, Los Angeles schools get \$56 less per poor child than New York schools. If this title were fully funded, Los Angeles schools would get \$180.56 less than the New York City schools for each poor child.

The thing gets worse as more money is poured into it; not better, as the chairman claims.

Mr. Chairman, if we extend this act only to 1972 we shall have to reconsider it in 1971. By then we will have the new census data to help us make better sense of this formula.

An extension of more than 2 years, as proposed by the committee bill, would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor yield to me at this point?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the bill the committee has adopted a new section 8 to Public Law 81-874 to provide payments to school districts because of the impact of public housing in the district. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether or not such payments are protected from the State's action to reduce State aid to the district because of the Federal payment?

Mr. PERKINS. Under section 5(d) (2) of Public Law 81-874 the State would be precluded from taking into account the payment to the district under the section 8 public housing provision under

penalty of denial of the Federal funds to the district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The same rule applies?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, the same rule that now applies to section 3(a) and section 3(b) payments applies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They cannot take into consideration any additional funds that come from the Federal Government as an offset against State funds.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I now want to respond to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES). There is a difference why New York received more money than California.

In California the State per-pupil expenditure is \$574.64. In New York it is \$935.76. So you would take one-half of that \$935.76, and multiply it by the number of disadvantaged children in New York. Naturally it comes out more per pupil than one-half of \$574.64.

And that is just what happens in the case when you compare New York and California. I might add that paying 50 percent of the State average per pupil expenditure, not only takes into account the higher cost of education in some States but also operates as an incentive for States to increase per-pupil expenditures to improve education.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not the truth that the adjoining suburban areas in New York—let us take Westchester County, for example—receive more per child than they do in the Watts district of Los Angeles?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct but is being misleading. Westchester County receives more money per poor pupil than does Watts but payments to the Los Angeles schools per poor children in Watts are far greater in amount. Per-pupil costs of education in Westchester County are much higher than per-pupil costs in Los Angeles County.

Mr. AYRES. Do not such communities receive more money than a child in the Watts area of Los Angeles?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly. But they do not have as many disadvantaged children, and they do not receive as much money as Los Angeles County, and the ghetto areas, where we have heavy concentrations of disadvantaged children. I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that we ignore the special educational needs of a child simply because he happens to live in Westchester County.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if the committee made any effort this year to cure the defect which has been brought out by the gentleman from

Ohio (Mr. AYRES), where the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is predicated upon the theory of giving Federal aid to disadvantaged children?

As I understand the explanation made by the gentleman from Ohio, we actually have the Federal act operating in a way that wealthy districts receive more than the poorer districts do under the act. Was there any effort made by the committee to cure this defect?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that that statement is not borne out by the record. We certainly do not pay poor school districts and States less than the more affluent districts. To the contrary, the title I formula focuses money into the crowded cores of our urban areas and into poor rural districts where educational needs are greatest as no other formula ever proposed has done.

Let me say to the gentleman that many efforts have been made in the past to devise an equitable formula for the distribution of educational funds. While there has been much criticism of the ESEA title I formula, no other formula proposed has been demonstrated to be more equitable in the distribution of funds uniformly throughout the Nation to school districts having the greatest education disadvantages. While the incidence of poverty is the basic criteria employed in the distribution of funds, we have never been concerned with poverty per se in the educational uses which may be made of title I funds. We have been primarily concerned in title I with low educational attainment. Recent studies have adequately shown the positive relationship between educational attainment and income. If uniform national data were available on educational attainment, it would be possible to distribute Federal funds on this basis directly and achieve our title I purposes, for title I seeks to improve opportunities for a student to achieve his maximum educational potential wherever he might live.

Thus, the equitable impact of title I formula can be seen from the following tables. In the first table, it can be seen that title I funds are concentrated in the cores of large metropolitan areas heavily impacted in recent years with swelling numbers of disadvantaged students. The first table shows the large cities' share of title I funds of the State allotment as contrasted with the large cities' share of other Federal fund distributions.

The second table takes the poorest two counties in each State of 28 States studied and compares those counties' share of other Federal education fund distributions with those counties' share of title I funds.

It should be noted that in both tables, in programs other than title I, funds are distributed within the States by the State educational agency under a State plan. It should be emphasized that the entitlements established by the title I formula are fixed by law and administratively cannot be affected either by the Office of Education or State departments of education. I submit that it is desirable that the Congress establish the distribution to assure the attainment of congressional objectives in improving edu-

cational quality and educational opportunity in the Nation.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The 50 largest cities of the Nation have 21.3 percent of the total school enrollments and 26.4 percent of the disadvantaged title I-ESEA children in their combined 28 States.

Yet, in 1967 these 50 cities received only: 15.9 percent of their States vocational education funds; 16.2 percent of

their States NDEA title III funds for purchase of instructional equipment; 18.1 percent of their States ESEA title II funds for purchase of textbooks and school library resources; and 20.5 percent of their States ESEA title III funds for supplemental centers and services.

Only in the ESEA title I program did these cities receive funds proportional to their educational burdens—29.9 percent of their States funds.

Some specific examples:

[In percent]

	Total enrollment	Title I count	Vocational education	NDEA title III	ESEA title II	ESEA title I
Birmingham	15.56	5.40	4.27	2.34	5.06	4.92
Los Angeles	14.59	20.60	14.35	.21	7.58	20.03
Denver	19.38	29.10	12.74	7.81	17.02	26.02
Baltimore	24.31	50.81	7.90	19.62	10.51	49.67
Louisville	18.88	4.64	7.55	3.11	6.73	4.79
St. Louis	13.94	18.90	9.35	3.69	18.43	19.44
Kansas City	10.39	7.78	5.41	4.33	14.56	7.58
New York City	33.31	63.80	10.74	34.30	29.58	61.39
Rochester	1.43	1.60	0	1.52	1.84	1.59
Columbus, Ohio	4.57	6.09	1.04	3.84	4.04	6.25
Oklahoma City	12.55	10.49	0	15.38	11.67	9.96
Philadelphia	12.65	25.37	10.88	17.79	8.51	24.60
Pittsburgh	7.58	6.93	22.83	7.04	1.84	6.62
Memphis	14.74	9.33	0	0	13.94	9.25
Houston	10.93	5.23	4.04	5.20	8.34	5.13
Milwaukee	13.34	18.37	10.09	11.92	10.26	17.84

2 POOREST COUNTIES IN 28 SELECTED STATES—COUNTY AS PERCENT OF STATE

[In percent]

State and county	Fiscal year 1967 obligation for—			
	Vocational education	NDEA III	ESEA I	ESEA II
Alabama:				
Lowndes	0.28	0.08	1.50	1.42
Greene	.15	.08	1.37	1.32
Arizona:				
Apache	2.03	.09	9.27	2.41
Navajo	3.92	.27	8.88	3.89
California:				
Lake		.13	.10	.03
Madera	.09	.16	.58	.15
Colorado:				
Costilla		.02	1.46	.22
Custer			.08	.02
Florida:				
Gilchrist	.06	.11	.16	.10
Holmes	.07		.93	.55
Georgia:				
Baker	.03		.35	.10
Webster	.04		.31	.08
Hawaii:				
Hawaii	41.06	18.01	14.18	7.94
Ksuii	2.75	9.31	3.87	3.18
Illinois:				
Gallatin	.10	.26	.27	.04
Pope	.13	.04	.10	.02
Indiana:				
Crawford	.02		.66	.07
Orange	.22	.57	.75	.28
Kentucky:				
Breathitt	.47	.08	1.67	1.18
Owsley	.43		.61	.27
Louisiana:				
Red River			.73	
Tensas			1.28	
Maryland:				
Garrett	.35	1.38	1.38	.95
Somerset	.18	.38	1.54	.55
Massachusetts:				
Dukes			.18	.04
Nantucket		.05	.09	.03
Michigan:				
Lake		.04	.17	.02
Montmorency		.04	.16	.03
Minnesota:				
Cass	.01	1.38	1.20	.38
Todd	3.02	1.10	1.88	.56
Missouri:				
Douglas	.22	.19	.75	.47
Ripley	.11	.23	.84	.98
Nebraska:				
Boyd		.08	1.58	.33
Pawnee	.41	.17	1.04	.22
New Jersey:				
Atlantic	2.11	1.85	4.69	2.03
Cape May	1.38	.53	.94	.53
New York:				
Hamilton		.09	.01	
Schoharie	.09	.13	.16	.12
Ohio:				
Adams	.03	.19	.76	.18
Vinton	.01	.09	.40	.09

2 POOREST COUNTIES IN 28 SELECTED STATES—COUNTY AS PERCENT OF STATE—Continued

[In percent]

State and county	Fiscal year 1967 obligation for—			
	Vocational education	NDEA III	ESEA I	ESEA II
Oklahoma:				
Adair	.18	.33	2.05	.60
Pushmataha	.03	.25	1.00	.35
Oregon:				
Malheur	3.22	.75	2.44	1.06
Yamhill	1.61	3.67	3.11	1.91
Pennsylvania:				
Fulton		.11	.20	.10
Somerset	.13	1.04	1.31	.65
Tennessee:				
Fayette	.10		2.53	.96
Hancock	.10	.22	.65	.25
Texas:				
San Jacinto	.34	.01	.20	.01
Starr	.45	.05	.74	.19
Virginia:				
Gumderland	.07	.02	.51	.15
Lee	.50	.23	2.61	.58
Washington:				
San Juan		.02	.11	.04
Stevens	.41	.34	1.29	.51
Wisconsin:				
Burnett	.03	.26	.74	.16
Menominee			.40	.06

I should like to further comment on the Kansas-Nebraska comparison. The allocation to Kansas in 1969 is disproportionately greater than the allocation to Nebraska because of the floor established in the 1967 appropriation language, which reads as follows:

The aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants within states shall not be less than the amounts expended under the fiscal year 1966 appropriations by local educational agencies in such states for grants.

The appropriation language in 1968 establishes a floor based on 1967 allocations to States on behalf of local educational agencies.

Now if you look at the authorization in 1966, here is what locks Nebraska in at a lower rate than Kansas.

The authorization for Nebraska was \$6,929,812. They only expended \$4,948,000 and this amount became the floor for Nebraska. Because Kansas expended

more of their allocation, its floor was locked in at a higher per pupil rate.

The Kansas authorization was \$10,595,000 and they spent \$9,608,706. That is the reason for the inequitable result in this case.

I think in all fairness we ought to appropriate more money in order that the poor districts can receive their full payments.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important questions we have to decide is the length to which we will extend this program. It is interesting that this would be the most important issue before the committee in considering the elementary and secondary education bill, especially when we remember the controversy that has existed in some previous extensions, as well as the first enactment of this bill.

Let me say, first, that I favor the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I have supported every extension. I did not support ESEA the first year it was enacted because the formula was so completely inequitable at that time. When my amendment was adopted, which gave the poorer States an amount up to the national average, I have supported ESEA. The formula is not equitable, but at least it is greatly improved over the inception of this act.

But now we look to the future, and the question is, Shall we extend this for another 5 years?

All of you know that, just as in the past, it will be in the future, we will only give major changes in this act serious consideration when it comes up for extension or the bill is about to expire. This bill comes up 1 year before the expiration of the act because of the forward funding, as the previous speakers indicated. We had to move this year, even though the act will not expire until June 1970, in order that the Appropriation Committee can appropriate not only for the next year but the year thereafter.

I think it would be a terrible mistake for this Congress to wait 5 years before it took another look at this legislation. The Congress, by setting a shorter expiration date, will not endanger the future of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. One of the most certain things we have is that impact aid is going to be extended. The reason for that is so much is expended in each Member's district. In fact, by far a majority of this Congress has a substantial amount of impact aid expended in their congressional district. The same thing is true of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I especially. There is so much being expended in each congressional district now that no Member would want to deny his schools the opportunity to make that expenditure of funds. So, about as certain as anything is in government and politics, we will have a continuation of this legislation, a continuation of Federal aid to education at the elementary- and secondary-school level.

In order that again you might know what my views are, I think as soon as this Federal Government can afford it,

that is, the budget can be loosened up, I believe we will be increasing, and I believe we should increase the Federal Government's assistance to elementary and secondary education. I think we ought to do it substantially. But if we did it under the formula of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it would be the biggest mistake we could make. It would continue the unfair distribution of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education schools.

A little while ago the chairman of the committee said that it is the most equitable formula, even if we studied it for another 5 years. It is hard for me to conceive how we could do it more inequitably than in the way prescribed, unless we went back to the original formula. Now the richest States receive the most amount of money and, when the bill was passed, the poorer States received the least amount. Now the poorest States are lumped together at the national average. But it is still true that the Federal Government is not equalizing educational assistance in order that every State can receive about the same amount of money, or at least give their children an opportunity for an education equal with those in another State. The amount of money that is authorized per poor pupil under this bill in title I ranges from \$467.88 for the State of New York to \$277.65 for the poorest ones. As the years go on, and the cost of education increases under this present formula, New York and all the States that are above the national average will continue to receive an increase in the amount that is authorized for them. But the poorer States would remain down there at the national average. The national average increases slower than the richest States, and therefore the rich will get richer and the poor will stay poor.

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

Mr. QUIE. I will yield to the gentleman if he has anything else to bring up on this point, but otherwise I would suggest that he wait until the end of my statement.

Mr. Chairman, with that then I will continue my statement. When we compare the amount each State receives per poor child under the 1969 appropriation, we can see the situation is different from the authorization. If we look at this table—and I will ask later for permission to include this with my remarks and it will be in the RECORD tomorrow—we can see what each State receives compared with other States.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, AS AMENDED—TITLE I, ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN, LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (FISCAL YEAR 1969)

State	Rate per pupil authorized	Rate per pupil appropriated	Appropriation as percent of authorization
Alabama.....	\$277.65	\$138.87	50.0
Alaska.....	426.22	230.22	54.0
Arizona.....	277.65	157.34	56.7
Arkansas.....	277.65	139.42	50.2
California.....	287.32	143.83	50.8
Colorado.....	277.65	134.88	48.6
Connecticut.....	334.94	147.45	44.0
Delaware.....	346.26	159.99	46.1
District of Columbia.....	342.96	191.54	55.8

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, AS AMENDED—TITLE I, ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN, LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (FISCAL YEAR 1969)—Continued

State	Rate per pupil authorized	Rate per pupil appropriated	Appropriation as percent of authorization
Florida.....	277.65	166.39	62.0
Georgia.....	277.65	139.56	50.3
Hawaii.....	305.18	132.31	42.4
Idaho.....	277.65	136.03	49.0
Illinois.....	302.72	155.74	51.4
Indiana.....	277.65	136.27	49.0
Iowa.....	277.65	153.64	55.3
Kansas.....	286.70	157.38	54.8
Kentucky.....	277.65	136.69	49.2
Louisiana.....	277.65	140.52	50.6
Maine.....	277.65	137.31	49.5
Maryland.....	306.82	134.87	43.9
Massachusetts.....	303.73	141.83	45.4
Michigan.....	302.29	138.45	45.7
Minnesota.....	314.32	162.38	51.8
Mississippi.....	277.65	139.45	50.2
Missouri.....	277.65	145.11	52.3
Montana.....	277.65	155.18	55.4
Nebraska.....	277.65	117.61	43.8
Nevada.....	295.18	147.43	49.9
New Hampshire.....	277.65	129.68	46.7
New Jersey.....	354.38	160.90	48.0
New Mexico.....	277.65	176.38	63.5
New York.....	467.88	200.11	42.5
North Carolina.....	277.65	138.53	50.0
North Dakota.....	277.65	134.46	48.5
Ohio.....	277.65	132.01	47.5
Oklahoma.....	277.65	137.89	49.7
Oregon.....	315.94	162.61	51.4
Pennsylvania.....	294.86	148.64	50.4
Rhode Island.....	\$291.24	\$141.81	48.6
Rhode Island.....	277.65	139.34	50.2
South Carolina.....	277.65	137.34	49.5
South Dakota.....	277.65	139.28	50.2
Tennessee.....	277.65	148.48	53.5
Texas.....	277.65	122.40	44.0
Utah.....	277.65	125.34	45.0
Vermont.....	277.65	137.39	49.5
Virginia.....	299.92	145.95	48.0
Washington.....	277.65	130.50	47.0
West Virginia.....	300.86	150.20	49.9
Wisconsin.....	297.82	158.55	54.1
Wyoming.....			

Each poor State receives the authorization of \$277.65—but there is a great variety that each State receives under the appropriation.

The chairman again indicated this was caused by the language in the appropriation bill, which requires every State to receive not less than the amount they had in previous years. I also show the percentage that the appropriation is of the authorization, and we can see it varies tremendously. New York has an extremely high authorization, the highest amount of money for every poor child. Except for Alaska, it also received the highest payment per poor child for 1969. However, New York is one of the lowest States in the percentage it receives of the authorization. It is at 42.5 percent. Hawaii is another low State, just a little bit lower than New York, at 42.4 percent. They receive \$132.31 out of their \$305.18 authorization, while New York is receiving \$200.11 against their authorization of \$467.88.

If some Members are wondering what these figures in column 2 are, these are amounts each local education agency receives per poor child. It does not count the amount the State receives for the handicapped children in State institutions. But that 42.4 percent that the State receives per poor child against its authorization in Hawaii should be compared with New Mexico, which was mentioned before. They receive 63.5 percent of their authorization.

If we look through the States, we will see them ranging from 42 percent and 43 percent up to 62 percent and 63 percent. That on its face shows the formula

is inequitable. It is not fair treatment between the States right now.

But if we look at the other side of the table, we will see how inequitable it would be if we had full authorization. That would be even worse. So we must do something about that formula, and we cannot just wait for the census information to be available to us. We had better begin right after the work on this bill has been completed and start doing a thorough study and revision of it. When I say "we," I mean both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with its Office of Education, and the Congress with the authority given to the education committees.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman on this part here.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to call to the attention of the gentleman that he took a very active part in improving the formula in the committee when we permitted the States to receive payment on the basis of one-half the national average per-pupil expenditure if such would be greater than the State average. The gentleman from Minnesota, as I did, supported that approach.

I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will admit we have considered formula after formula in the consideration of this legislation, and every time we considered other approaches we came back to this as the most equitable approach. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that we have done a far better job in helping the needy District under the title I formula than we have under the Hill-Burton formula.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would have to disagree with the chairman there. Under the Hill-Burton formula, the poorer States would receive more.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with that.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, we did the same thing under the vocational education formula.

Mr. PERKINS. Under the vocational education formula, it would be worse. With the same amount of money the poorer States would not receive as much as they are now receiving under the ESEA formula.

Mr. QUIE. The chairman has that backward. The wealthier States receive less than the national average under the Vocational Education Act and the poorer States receive more than the national average per child.

Mr. PERKINS. One of the difficulties we have had in the vocational education is that we have not insisted in the legislation that the neediest areas be given any priority.

Mr. QUIE. I disagree with the chairman. If we did as well under title I of ESEA as we have done with vocational education it would receive much greater praise than it is receiving now, because the poorer States do receive more money per child under vocational education than the wealthier States do. Here it was just reversed.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. QUIE. The only place where

money in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is concentrated in the largest cities entitlements, where they concentrate on the schools that have the greatest impact of disadvantaged children. But so far as the States are concerned there is no concentration within the States; it is only the concentration within the school districts that are large enough to have more than one school within the school district.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA. I believe the difficulty between the gentleman from Minnesota and the distinguished chairman of the committee results in some misunderstanding as to what one would apply the Hill-Burton type formula.

Now, under a Hill-Burton formula which would simply count the number of children of school age within the State and then make a grant for the purposes of title I based on the number of children and the relative per capita income of the citizens of that State, based on the personal income, as we do in the Hill-Burton formula, if we did that the poorer States would get less, would get a smaller percentage of the total pie than they get under the title I formula we are now using. Of course, that is the only way one could apply the Hill-Burton formula.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is leaving out a part of the Hill-Burton formula which gives more assistance to poorer States.

Mr. O'HARA. If we wanted to put in a factor for poverty; that is, first to vary the amount per child based upon the relative wealth of the State, and only count the poor children in determining how many children there were in the State, then the rural poorer States would receive more than they do under the present formula.

I might suggest to the gentleman that the present formula is as much the product of the work of the gentleman from Minnesota as of anyone. I am very much aware of its weaknesses, although I do not see them the same way the gentleman does, because I fought that formula when it was proposed.

I might suggest that in the committee I do not recall the gentleman from Minnesota offered a new title I formula.

Mr. QUIE. I say to the gentleman on that, I am not asking that we change the formula now. I am asking that we extend this law for 2 years so that we can change it in this period of time. I recognize we cannot spend the necessary time on changing the formula in this session of the Congress. I knew it was unwise to ask the new administration to come in with a recommendation of a change in formula before Easter, as was the time schedule we were aiming for.

What I am saying is with this formula as inequitable as is, and considering the fact that anybody can see we can make improvements and changes in it, let us extend the act for 2 years instead of 5 years so that we do not get locked in for a long period of time.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman does not have any worry about anybody being locked in on this committee. Any time the gentleman from Minnesota wants a hearing he is going to get a hearing.

I have some figures here, which came from the Office of Education some time ago—I will say before the administration changed.

Mr. QUIE. At times that makes a difference.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 5 additional minutes.

THE INTERSTATE DISTRIBUTION EFFECT OF TITLE I CAN BE ILLUSTRATED BY THE FOLLOWING TABLE WHICH IS BASED UPON THE ALLOCATION OF EACH OF THE DESCRIBED PROGRAMS BY A HYPOTHETICAL \$1,070,000,000

[In millions of dollars]

	Title III— NDEA: Hill- Burton formula (\$1,070,000,000)	S. 1021—President Kennedy's 1961 general aid bill (\$1,070,000,000)	Title II—ESEA: Population basis, no economic weighting (\$1,070,000,000)	S. 3400—NEA's 1958 general aid bill (\$1,070,000,000)	Title I— ESEA in fiscal year 1969 (\$1,070,000,000)
Alabama.....	27.182	27.689	19.990	20.294	37.091
Mississippi.....	19.005	21.099	13.937	14.189	38.896
South Carolina.....	20.668	21.873	15.193	15.431	31.627
New York.....	60.445	59.656	91.069	90.269	116.092
Illinois.....	44.413	44.303	55.853	57.576	46.231
District of Columbia.....	2.551	1.909	5.001	3.810	5.397
Connecticut.....	10.437	10.410	15.620	15.115	7.907
Delaware.....	2.383	2.376	3.837	2.926	2.087
Oregon.....	10.738	10.710	11.271	10.715	6.983

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the chairman that he can put the rest of the information in the RECORD, but when you begin with a fallacious assumption, you can prove things to the point where it looks like this is the better formula. They start with the fallacious assumption that we will provide aid to all children—all children—who are counted in a school age population 5 to 17. This is a program for disadvantaged children. If we can zero in on the disadvantaged children themselves, we will have the best formula possible. A preliminary study that the U.S. Office of Education made—and I guess we can quote them on any kind of information you want to—and I will submit this table also for the RECORD when we go back into the House.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF PARTICIPATION BY DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN TITLE I ACADEMIC COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS, 1967-68 (GRADES 2, 4, 6)

[Tentative and subject to change]

Type of disadvantaged pupil	Percent of total enrollment (not additive) in title I schools who are disadvantaged	Percent of all participating pupils in title I schools who are disadvantaged	Percent of disadvantaged pupils in title I schools that participate in title I academic programs
Poor (\$3,000).....	15.4	21.9	54.8
Near poor (\$3,000 to \$6,000).....	35.6	42.2	45.7
Poor and near poor...	51.0	64.1	48.5
Low estimated ability.....	18.1	24.9	53.1
Neglected.....	.9	1.1	48.3
Delinquent.....	.2	.2	42.0
Migrant.....	1.2	1.9	59.9
Total.....	100.0	100.0	38.6

This table shows here that less than half of the children who are in title I

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

Mr. QUIE. I will be glad to yield to the Chairman, but I hope he will kind of speed up his questioning a little bit, because I would like to finish the rest of my statement.

Mr. PERKINS. The table I have here came from the Office of Education several months ago showing how the States of Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, New York, Illinois, the District of Columbia, Connecticut, Delaware, and Oregon would be allocated funds under various formulas. This table illustrates, I believe, the more equitable distribution of funds under title I as contrasted with other means:

schools are actually poor, 21.9 percent of the children in title I programs are from families below \$3,000 income. So we see we are not really zeroing in on the children who are in the greatest need. When you begin counting children this is another reason why I believe the program is inequitable. In the State of New York you not only count all of those children who in the 1959-60 census were from families earning \$2,000 or less but you count those also who receive AFDC payments in families receiving more than \$2,000. Under the 1959-60 census information it was estimated in New York that there were 174,475 children from the \$2,000 to \$3,000 families, but instead of 174,000 additional children actually being counted, 338,776 were being counted.

When you take a look at the chairman's State of Kentucky or a number of other States you see that there are either very few or else no children from families that received AFDC that are counted in this formula. If you want to take your State and add to them the estimated number of children between \$2,000 and \$3,000 and add them to the ones presently counted and then multiply that by the amount of money that New York receives, then you can get an estimate of the amount that you would have received if you were treated the same as the State of New York. To me it proves that there is a fantastically inequitable arrangement under the formula we are using now. Because in some States you count certain poor children and in other States you do not. In the poorer States of the Union you do not count individual children of families having incomes from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the most uniform and equitable formula as far as concentrating funds in areas of greatest need.

Mr. QUIE. I would ask the gentleman to look at his own State of Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. In the State of Kentucky you count the children from low-income families under the census figures which show 193,559.

Mr. PERKINS. Correct.

Mr. QUIE. Then you added to that 22,000 from AFDC families, 696 students under the AFDC program, 1,588 under the category of neglected or dependent children and 786 foster children. Those are the numbers that are counted in the formula.

In the 1959 census information the State of Kentucky had 88,386 families within the income level of \$2,000 to \$3,000. So, you see that you are counting about one-fourth of the children between that income level of \$2,000 to \$3,000.

If you compare that with the State of New York, you will see that they are counting more than the number—more than between \$2,000 and \$3,000 in that State than they are counting in the State of Kentucky. You are not counting all of the children who reside with families which receive an income below \$2,000. In fact in a lot of the States such as Alabama and Mississippi and States of that category, it is absolutely zero as to the number of children that are counted, because in those States they do not pay the amount of AFDC at the level at which some of the wealthier States pay.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say that there is absolute equity and uniformity all the way through this bill.

Mr. QUIE. If that is uniformity, surely I am surprised.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the counting of AFDC children on very recent years data takes care of the great migration into large urban areas of large numbers of children from low-income families which has taken place since the 1960 census.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) that these factors in the formula take into account special needs which cannot be reached with census data.

Mr. QUIE. How can the gentleman say that there is absolutely no discrepancy, when in New York you count the children, and in Kentucky or Louisiana or Mississippi or Alabama you do not count the children, just because their parents do not receive AFDC, because the State decided they would set a different level or a different standard than the other States, because of a certain law which permits some States to set a higher level on AFDC than other States. Thus, Mr. Chairman, the poorer States are penal-

ized in two ways. They do not receive the money for those children coming from families with incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,000 or they are not covered by the AFDC program. In other words, you have two penalties involved here which means that the wealthier States get more money than the national average and then you let them count children to be covered by the provisions of this bill, children which are not counted in the poorer States. Therefore, on two counts it is inequitable and they are not on a par or at the level of the wealthier States, and I say to the members of the Committee that 2 years is long enough to let this practice stand.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that the formula also includes children from families with incomes of more than \$2,000 from AFDC takes into account high cost areas where the \$2,000 factor might not portray an equivalent level of poverty.

Although I did not support the AFDC amendment at the time it was adopted in 1965, I believe now there is a lot of equity to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Forty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]		
Anderson, Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Podell
Annunzio	Fallon	Poff
Ashbrook	Fish	Powell
Ashley	Flynt	Purcell
Baring	Foley	Rallsback
Barrett	Ford,	Reid, N.Y.
Bates	Gerald R.	Rivers
Bell, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Ronan
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Blanton	Griffiths	Rosenthal
Boggs	Gubser	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Harsha	Rumsfeld
Brasco	Hébert	St. Onge
Brock	Jarman	Sandman
Brooks	Jonas	Schauer
Brown, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Burton, Calif.	Keith	Sisk
Cahill	Kirwan	Sullivan
Camp	Landrum	Symington
Casey	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Celler	Lowenstein	Teague, Tex.
Chisholm	McCloskey	Thompson, Ga.
Clancy	MacGregor	Tunney
Clark	Mahon	Ullman
Corbett	May	Wampler
Corman	Mayne	Watkins
Cowger	Mikva	Watson
Davis, Ga.	Monagan	Watts
Dawson	Moorhead	Whalley
Derwinski	Morse	Whitten
Diggs	Morton	Wilson, Bob
Dingell	Moss	Wilson,
Dwyer	Murphy, N.Y.	Charles H
Eckhardt	Ottinger	Wydler
Edwards, Calif.	Philbin	
Edwards, La.	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 514, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting. The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER assumed the chair. The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

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

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the time of the gentleman from Minnesota had expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, trying to recap the comments that I made during the colloquy that we had, I am making the point that we should not extend this act for a period of more than 2 years because in that time this Congress, together with the administration, can come up with recommendations for plans and improvements and expansion of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for our schools.

Mr. Chairman, one of the biggest reasons for the inequitable formula that we have—and I am not recommending a change in the formula now; we do not have to worry about how this might be changed—but men of good intentions can come up with a much more equitable formula.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the formula is inequitable because if you compare the authorization, if it is fully funded—and that table will be in the RECORD tomorrow for all Members to see as to what the individual States receive—one can see that it is inequitable.

The table follows:
STATE POPULATIONS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TITLE I DISTRIBUTION FORMULA [5-17 population]

	In families of less than \$2,000 income, counted for title I formula, 1959	In families with between \$2,000 and \$3,000 income, 1959	In AFDC families, 1968
Alabama.....	242,522	106,386	0
Alaska.....	4,796	3,180	1,569
Arizona.....	38,851	25,920	8,635
Arkansas.....	148,158	68,274	0
California.....	206,572	151,675	270,200
Colorado.....	33,581	26,131	17,583
Connecticut.....	20,731	16,040	24,840
Delaware.....	7,422	5,269	3,860
Florida.....	142,533	111,631	0
Georgia.....	239,789	139,273	0
Hawaii.....	8,832	7,676	6,303
Idaho.....	12,257	11,453	4,165
Illinois.....	147,518	108,747	112,791
Indiana.....	76,386	56,672	15,831
Iowa.....	71,789	50,517	17,694
Kansas.....	40,263	32,751	14,853
Kentucky.....	193,559	88,386	22,001
Louisiana.....	201,090	108,155	774
Maine.....	18,408	19,246	2,812
Maryland.....	53,716	43,512	38,865
Massachusetts.....	47,065	41,257	54,831
Michigan.....	124,712	88,547	73,886
Minnesota.....	77,280	56,831	25,246
Mississippi.....	254,903	82,700	0
Missouri.....	125,199	80,888	18,025

STATE POPULATIONS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TITLE I DISTRIBUTION FORMULA—Con.

[5-17 population]

	In families of less than \$2,000 income, counted for title I formula, 1959	In families with between \$2,000 and \$3,000 income, 1959	In AFDC families, 1968
Montana.....	14,106	10,989	2,832
Nebraska.....	34,417	28,219	8,134
Nevada.....	3,238	2,392	1,688
New Hampshire.....	5,932	6,367	2,085
New Jersey.....	59,845	46,424	64,696
New Mexico.....	37,554	25,159	11,209
New York.....	200,060	174,475	338,776
North Carolina.....	323,096	164,579	11,948
North Dakota.....	23,346	16,621	3,615
Ohio.....	151,895	106,511	73,849
Oklahoma.....	84,779	56,200	27,631
Oregon.....	23,933	18,666	12,473
Pennsylvania.....	175,394	147,676	97,515
Rhode Island.....	12,083	9,651	9,710
South Carolina.....	206,638	89,918	0
South Dakota.....	30,712	16,729	4,557
Tennessee.....	220,048	114,541	0
Texas.....	398,224	248,802	0
Utah.....	11,680	9,781	8,119
Vermont.....	7,208	8,088	2,646
Virginia.....	167,874	100,691	13,282
Washington.....	33,072	29,010	24,624
West Virginia.....	106,406	46,632	12,203
Wisconsin.....	58,446	51,883	23,295
Wyoming.....	5,408	4,238	1,502
District of Columbia.....	14,854	12,366	10,362

You look at the amount you receive now under the present appropriation and you can see that it is inequitable but in a different way. I do not say that it is more inequitable, but is inequitable in a different way because of the percentage of authorization you receive. Really it is inequitable when you consider the children counted, because in every State the same poor children are not counted.

In fact, what it does do is permit the wealthier States on the amount of money they receive as that part of the formula, one-half of the State average, of the children that are counted, to get a greater amount of money than the poorer States.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also place in the RECORD a table which will compare the number of poor children, total number of near-poor children, with those who are not poor, to entitlement under the program.

The purpose of the act is to provide educational assistance to the educationally disadvantaged children, and they only count the poor children as a means of determining in some way or other where those concentrations exist, but it has not turned out that way because there is no requirement on the local schools that they remit the money to the poor children who are counted under the formula.

Some of the States are starting to make some changes. For instance, California now has written in its rules that the same number of children will be benefited as the number that are counted. This will not mean the identical ones counted will be the ones that will be benefited, but the same number, so that there will be a concentration of title I funds.

Most of the studies of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act indicate that there ought to be more of a concentration of the programs than presently is the case. Remember, this is categorically aid money to help the educationally disadvantaged, but it is not utilized entirely that way. It has some appearance

of what one could call a general aid program.

For instance, the National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stated in its report to the President and the Congress this last January:

Disadvantaged children invariably suffer from a number of forms of deprivation, not just one; they do not need new textbooks or medical care or adequate nutrition or a reduction in class size; but all these and other educational remedies together. Success with these children, in sum, requires a concentration of services on a limited number of children.

One of the amendments that we offered in the committee and propose to offer here is that any appropriations over the amount that was appropriated in 1968 be utilized not according to the entitlement formula here, but as the State education agency determines will go to the areas of greatest need, where the educationally deprived poor families are concentrated and where there is an economic depression in an area. And that amount of money will gain some experience from utilization just in those areas, and nowhere else.

We note from the recommended appropriations in the budget message that we will not have any increase to that extent for title I for fiscal year 1970, but I have the hope that there will be some additional money recommended and appropriated in 1971, and we will see an expansion at that time in the Federal Government assistance to education at the elementary and secondary school levels.

In fact, what I hope we can do in the next 2 years is lay the plans for substantial change and improvement and an increase in the Federal Government's participation in education so that there will be a greater opportunity for education in all areas of the country, because it is important to consider all areas as well as the ones where the poor or deprived children might reside, so that a good education is available for them no matter where they are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 514, extending the authorization for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the impacted area aid programs for 5 years.

Thomas Jefferson charged a young Nation to "enlighten all our people," and we can set ourselves no more worthy goal. But I think we are agreed on the importance of education and on the fact that the Federal Government must assume a role in assuring to all our citizens an equal opportunity to learn. It is on exactly what that role is and how it can most effectively be played that we differ.

The degree to which ESEA, through its compensatory education programs, has been able to help the disadvantaged child has been emphasized throughout the hearing held by the House committee. Recognizing the handicap suffered by children who lack verbal and language skills, who may be in poor health and lacking adequate nutrition, and whose

parents generally have a deficient educational background, these programs have been focused on compensating for these failings and on closing the education gap between these children and their fellow students.

The programs have not been uniformly successful, but we have learned much. We find underscored repeatedly, in the evaluations which the legislation itself requires, that important progress has been made.

In my own State of California, \$78 million was received for compensatory education under title I, and 281,865 regularly enrolled students participated in its activities during the 1967-68 school year. Helpful evaluation reports have been made by the California Office of Compensatory Education. Dr. Wilson C. Riles, its director, in submitting his annual report, expresses gratitude to the Congress and the hope that the compensatory aid will continue to receive our priority attention. I would like to share with my colleagues the following excerpt from Dr. Riles' very objective and constructively critical evaluation of the programs:

The evaluation reports of the school districts also led to these conclusions about Title I in the 1967-68 school year:

As in previous years, the greatest gains continued to be made by students in the elementary grades. However, the gains appeared to be shifting more toward the middle elementary grades, as compared to the primary grades. In the third year of Title I, many students in the middle elementary grades had participated in Title I programs in the primary grades. Also the increased concentration of activities on academic skills tended to favor the older children whose academic deficiencies were more noticeable and thus were more likely to be treated.

While junior high and senior high students continued to show less growth than did elementary students, the differences were less marked. There were indications that some school districts were beginning to concentrate their secondary grade activities on limited, selected students to a greater degree than they did the first two years.

Characteristic of the most successful programs was their concentration of services on a limited number of objectives and a limited number of specifically identified children. These projects focused on two or three activities, adequately funded. On the other hand, there were widespread examples of ineffective projects which (1) attempted to carry out too many, often unrelated, activities with insufficient funding, and (2) scattered the activities over too many children so that the concentration of services was inadequate to improve student achievement level significantly. Dilution of funds and services plus failure to identify and serve specific children with educational deficiencies, was particularly apparent in the big cities and the rural areas. The evaluation results suggest that for optimum effectiveness, the average student expenditure must be more than \$300 over and above the regular school program. Title I projects with expenditures of less than \$250 per student generally failed to produce substantial results.

The most successful reading projects were those in which students received reading instruction from a reading specialist. These were the "pull-out" programs in which the specialists worked with small groups of children away from the regular classroom on a regular basis. Each child's learning difficulty was carefully diagnosed, and an instructional program tailored to his needs. Records were systematically maintained on his progress in the special reading program, and there was a

close working relationship between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher. Projects which merely reduced class size or employed teacher aides to enable the classroom teacher to spend more time on reading instruction generally did not result in improved student achievement.

Generally school districts are not providing longitudinal programs for Title I students, but are using a "turnstile" approach. They are serving a new group of students each year, with no assurance that students who participated in the previous year's activities continue to receive the concentrated services needed to maintain their improved growth rate. This school district practice compounds the continuity problems already existing because of the high mobility rate of students in poverty areas. Consequently, while the academic achievement of the participants improves markedly for the period of time that they are in the Title I program, too often the gains are not cumulative and are not maintained.

The use of the "turnstile" approach is related to the problem previously discussed—the failure of the districts to identify specific children for Title I services. Districts which have maintained longitudinal programs for the same students since the inception of Title I show the best results, with many students achieving at grade level.

In some cases, the districts' attempt to serve all children in the target area led them to change participants not only from year to year, but often several times during the year. In this extreme variation of the "turnstile," students may have received Title I services for only several weeks during the school year.

Late Congressional action on appropriations for Title I continued to have an adverse effect on the quality and continuity of programs. Congress did not determine the amount to be appropriated for Title I until the school year was already underway. School districts were not informed of their official entitlement until February, 1968. Consequently, for most of the school year, school districts operated scale-down programs at a funding level considered to be "safe."

The sporadic, uncertain nature of Title I funding was particularly critical because of the California school districts' emphasis on curriculum programs requiring specialized personnel. School districts were hesitant to commit themselves to year long contracts with teachers because of the uncertainty of funds. By the time the funds became available, the qualified personnel were not available. This resulted in emergency revisions of programs and budgets which were often reflected in quickly planned and poorly implemented end-of-year programs. It also resulted in many children being deprived of services which they would have received had the programs been in operation continuously for the entire school year.

The last point made by Dr. Riles refers to the importance of advance authorization and funding. This was recognized in 1968, when we provided funding through fiscal year 1970, and I feel that H.R. 514, in authorizing a 5-year extension of the program acknowledges anew the urgent need for leadtime in planning programs, securing equipment and supplies, and assigning qualified personnel in advance of school opening each year. I earnestly hope that it will be the pleasure of the Congress to approve this provision.

A second feature of the bill to which I want to call special attention is title VII, for bilingual education. The programs being conducted under this title are having a dramatic impact on educational opportunity for children who enter school speaking only a foreign language, the language of their homes, and unable to

understand even basic instructions in English. The majority of the projects are for students from Spanish-speaking backgrounds, but Portuguese, French, and Indian students also are benefiting.

Those of us who have watched children go off to school, filled with that wonderful mixture of joyful anticipation and dreadful fear, can only imagine the handicap a child suffers who cannot understand the welcome of his teachers, the chatter of his playmates, and the simple instructions he will be expected to do. Nor can he convey to non-English-speaking parents the many school messages they are expected to heed. Think how welcome greetings and instructions in his native language will be to him and how greatly enriched the other pupils will be to have exposure to bilingual discussion and instructions.

The Office of Education reports that it has received 312 proposals dealing with this special language problem. Of these, only 78 were funded, to serve 139,000 children. But this only begins to develop an area which we should actively cultivate. As we perfect our skills and methodology in introducing a new language and features of a different culture, youngsters will be greatly enriched, and so will our educational institutions.

There is a third, and in my view a most important, feature of H.R. 514 which I want to discuss. This is the inadequacy of its proposed budgets. Great care has been given by the House Committee on Education and Labor to understanding the magnitude of the Nation's educational needs as they have been outlined and defined by school authorities. These needs are real, they are urgent, and the authorization levels reflect their magnitude. But the administration's proposed budget is tragically inadequate for the program as defined by the authorizations, for both ESEA and the Impacted Area Aid Act.

I will append a table showing (A) the authorization for each program in the fiscal year 1970; (B) President Nixon's proposed budget for fiscal 1970; and the difference between (A) and (B) for each program.

To me, it is shocking, given the wide-

spread recognition of the obvious needs—needs apparent to anyone who will visit an inner-city school or talk with an urban school administrator—that the budget for title I, for educationally deprived children, is almost \$2 billion less than the proposed congressional authorization. This is totally unacceptable.

If, instead of columns of figures, we would review these budget proposals in terms of what we deny a single child—a child who does not pass an achievement test, who cannot read a colorful book, whose attention span never lengthens, whose daily attendance falls off, who is too hungry or too often ill to go to school, or who does not have adequate clothing—and if we were to multiply these disappointments and failures by the millions of children who will be denied title I services, we would have a better measure of the administration's budget inadequacies.

In total, the budget is \$2,879,107,000 below the House committee's suggested 1970 authorization. I appreciate that today we are not considering the appropriations for these programs. I mention them in the hope that the Congress will be aware of the inadequacies of the budget proposals now being submitted to us.

Our distinguished colleagues on the committee, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), have stressed this point in their supplemental views to the committee report, that—

The best effort of the Congress and those who support education must be to secure full funding for the ESEA and the impact aid programs.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 514, I especially applaud the 5-year extension of this authorization and the added focus it gives in the impacted area aid programs top public housing areas. I call special attention to the progress in title I programs in low-income school districts and to its title VI bilingual education programs. And, finally, I urge that we pledge ourselves to seek full funding when, in the near future, these programs are again before us for appropriations.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Title	(A) Fiscal year 1970 authorization	(B) Fiscal year 1970 budget request	(A—B) Difference
ESEA, 1965 (89-10):			
I. Educationally deprived children.....	\$3,142,000,000	\$1,226,000,000	\$1,916,000,000
II. Library resources textbooks.....	206,000,000	0	206,000,000
III. Supplementary educational centers and services.....	566,500,000	116,393,000	450,107,000
V. Grants to strengthen State departments of education.....	80,000,000	29,750,000	50,250,000
VI. Education to handicapped children.....	224,000,000	33,250,000	190,750,000
ESEA, 1966 (89-750): Adult education programs.....	84,000,000	50,000,000	30,000,000
ESEA, 1967 (90-247):			
VII. Bilingual education programs.....	40,000,000	10,000,000	30,000,000
VIII. Dropout prevention programs.....	30,000,000	24,000,000	6,000,000
Total.....	4,368,500,000	1,489,393,000	2,879,107,000
Impact Aid:			
Public Law 91-874: Maintenance and operation.....	622,000,000	187,000,000	435,000,000
Public Law 81-815: Construction.....	80,407,000	15,167,000	65,240,000
Total.....	702,407,000	202,167,000	500,240,000

Source: House Committee on Education and Labor; Bureau of the Budget.

(Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I favor continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because, in my view, there is no domestic priority of

greater importance than education. As a result, I plan to support the extension of ESEA, but believe this should be limited to 2 years rather than the 5-year continuation as provided in H.R. 514.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs, which originally were authorized with my support in 1965, have been landmarks in our country's path toward a more fully educated society. By passing that measure 4 years ago, we in Congress made a commitment to the effect that every American child should have the opportunity to obtain proper education. Our reaffirmation of that pledge is represented in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1969.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided local educators throughout the country with \$3 billion to make possible more effective ways to educate the poor and educationally deprived children of America. It has enabled 16,000 school districts to face the difficult task of educating the underprivileged with something more than good intentions. It has made possible the development of new and more relevant teaching methods and brought food and medical care to those who need it the most. Despite its successes—which have been numerous—it has also highlighted current limitations to the making of giant strides in the education of the poor overnight. Thus, it has helped us to accurately observe that we have much more to do and more to learn about this particular problem before we can ever hope to solve it. Accordingly, it would be unthinkable to now abandon this program.

Yet, I do not favor the 5-year extension of ESEA because I believe the Nixon administration should be afforded the opportunity to outline a program of its own which may or may not indicate other approaches than those contained in this legislation. While I am committed to the proposition that we cannot substantially reduce the education budget, I am not wholly committed to ESEA in its present form as a panacea for America's educational ills. I am concerned, for instance, about the so-called "Youngstown phenomenon"—where entire school systems have to cease all operations due to a lack of operating funds. If this continues to any degree, we may have to reconsider the entire rationale of ESEA's emphasis on categorical funding. Also, we should not be so committed to one approach to a very changing problem that our response to it is obsolete even before it has an opportunity to operate.

For many years I have been vitally interested in Public Law 874, the impacted areas program. This program is important to me, not only because it has a direct and material effect on thousands of schoolchildren in my congressional district, but because it is a program of proven worth, which has contributed significantly to the educational system of this Nation.

Despite the fact that this program of noncategorical aid to school districts has been a model as far as derived educational benefit is concerned, administration after administration has attempted

to reduce its funding level. The approaches have been many and varied, but the end objective has been the same—eliminate the impacted areas program. Fortunately, for the schoolchildren in impacted areas, these attempts have repeatedly failed. Congress supports the concept of Public Law 874. Again this year, we are faced with a battle on Public Law 874 due to the decreased allotment to this program in the fiscal year 1970 budget. I am confident that, as before, the Congress will reject the proposed reductions.

I have never been entirely clear as to why the executive branch is opposed to Public Law 874, but I do recognize that there is some merit in the assertion that changes in eligibility may be required. I have taken the position that if revisions are needed—and I think some are in order—they should only be made after a thorough study and hearings by the Education and Labor Committee at which all interested parties will be offered the opportunity to testify. In contrast to this procedure, succeeding administrations have advocated severe appropriation cuts as the mode of change. In my view, such a course is totally unacceptable because it is the prerogative of the Congress to determine which programs are desirable and necessary.

As I previously indicated, several schools in my congressional district are dependent upon Public Law 874 for operating funds. In the Rome, N.Y. School District, for example, over one-third of the students qualify for Public Law 874 designation. Its operating budget is nearly \$12 million, of which less than \$1 million—or 6.5 percent—is from Public Law 874. Interestingly enough, of the 4,000 federally affected students in Rome, approximately 2,800 are in the "B" category—parents who live off—but work on Federal property—with the remaining 1,200 in the "A" category—parents who live and work on Federal property.

This is important because most of the efforts to cut Public Law 874 funding have been directed at the "B" category in which about 85 percent of the Nation's federally affected students are classified. In Rome, the figure is 70 percent. The fact that most of the impacted area students are in the "B" category and that the major reduction proposals have been directed against this category, merely serves to reinforce the view that the efforts to cut Public Law 874 are, in reality, designed to eliminate the program.

I read with great interest HEW Secretary Finch's statement to the Education and Labor Committee on all the Federal elementary and secondary education programs, and share with him the view that our educational system is in a "crisis." I applaud his support of "the concept of advance funding for education programs in order to assure more orderly planning and expenditure of funds by State and local agencies." Also his endorsement of "long-term authorization of proven programs to give greater flexibility to efforts to strengthen the educational system" is noteworthy.

In light of these remarks and the general philosophy of education he ex-

pressed, I was shocked to read of his proposal to amend Public Law 874 relative to funding in total the "A" category students before granting funds for "B" category students whenever less than full funding was appropriated. It should be recalled that former President Johnson took a similar position last July when he refused to allow \$91 million appropriated by the Congress to be used for Public Law 874. In response, the Congress merely reappropriated the funds and excluded them from the expenditure reduction. I am confident that it will do so again if necessary.

However, I am also concerned about this amendment for substantive reasons. It is not only discriminatory to those school districts having a larger concentration of "B" than "A" students, but it is completely inconsistent with the Secretary's remarks regarding advance funding and long-term authorizations. On the one hand, HEW advocates these progressive concepts and, on the other, proposes the exact opposite. It should be noted that as far as Public Law 874 is concerned, the practice is also opposite to the theory. For example, during the 90th Congress we appropriated \$505.9 million for Public Law 874. This amount provided about 90 percent entitlement for all the impacted school districts in America. In previous years, the initial payment of these districts has been around 75 percent of entitlement, and it comes at a time when the districts need it—usually in late January or early February. This fiscal year, however, a decision was made to allow only one-half of that \$505.9 million Congress appropriated to be allocable to fiscal year 1969, with the rest to be forwarded to the districts in early fiscal year 1970. As a result, the initial payment this year averaged about 35 percent for most of the districts—40-percent less than the amount anticipated. In my district, the situation was somewhat better because of the severe impact of the Rome district which received an initial payment of nearly 45 percent. Nevertheless, the situation for the Rome School District is critical because the money is needed now in order to continue to meet payrolls and operating expenses.

There are other arguments against the proposed amendment upon which I would like to touch briefly. As Secretary Finch indicated, the Battelle Memorial Institute is now conducting a study of the impacted areas program. It is scheduled for completion at the end of the year. As I understand it, this inquiry is directed at reviewing the concept and practice of Public Law 874 and will include recommendations for change. In light of this development, I see no reason to make authorization changes at this time when, in all probability, additional alterations will be in order in about 12 months.

I think this same rule should be applied when considering the amendment adopted by the committee to establish a new authorization under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of Federal payments to school districts for the children of families living in public housing projects. This very proposal is one of the items contained in the Battelle study, and we should await the recommendations of

that inquiry which will be made available late this year. I hasten to add there is doubtless considerable merit in this amendment in light of the educational crisis in our cities. However, in my view, we should not adopt this or any other new educational programs until the ones which have proved worthwhile have been funded adequately.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the House is scheduled to take up one of the greatest pieces of educational legislation yet seen in this country.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 already has proven itself as a program which, perhaps as much as any other single program, can and does work to raise the standards of many of our underprivileged youngsters, with a corresponding improvement in teaching techniques and methods to serve all our school-age citizens.

This is a program in which I have been most interested. It was one of the first major pieces of new educational legislation on which I voted after coming to Congress, and it has been a source of inspiration to follow its progress.

At this point, I believe Chairman PERKINS and the members of his committee are due a special word of praise for the diligence with which they have pursued this program and its goal of improving the level of education across the board. This program works to assure that each student, no matter what his background, is given the opportunity to have the kind of schooling which will enable him to enter college or to pursue other educational activities. This is a worthy goal, and it is one most in keeping with the spirit of free American education.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I conducted a small survey of many of the leading ESEA educators in my district to get their reactions to this program. A questionnaire went out to every school board member, superintendent, and school principal asking, generally, their reactions to certain features of the ESEA program.

Since I was more interested in their general reactions than in responses to specific items, the questionnaire was quite general in nature, and the five questions asked dealt with: First, whether they felt the program has been operating well; second, whether they felt the program was properly oriented to reach its goal of improving the overall standard of education across the country; third, whether they felt they had been impaired by excessive influence in operating under ESEA programs; fourth, whether they felt title I had brought significant results; and fifth, which portion of the program was most important.

The responses came in great number and the weight of the opinions expressed was overwhelmingly favorable. Completed answers were received from about 175 educators and administrators and better than 145 of them indicated strong, unhesitating approval of the general goals and operations of the program. This is better than 92 percent, and I would note that the opinions reflect the

views of people working with the program in every phase, and at every level—in the classroom, in administrative offices, and at school board policy meetings.

So, in general, the single strongest message registered from this questionnaire was that the program has been good.

I would like to touch on several other items that were included in the questionnaire, and I feel it might be helpful to the membership if we could review them in light of our consideration of the proposed 5-year extension.

Probably the single specific aspect of the program which brought greatest comment was title I. Over 110 of the responses, or about 62 percent indicated specifically that this title has brought significant results in improved teaching techniques of educationally deprived children.

In addition, some 40 educators, or about 22 percent, indicated specific favorable comment on Headstart and preschool programs, even though the questionnaire did not call for specific comments on those or similar programs. The opinion was expressed on several returns that the Office of Education could probably do a better job with Headstart, and there was strong support for the preschool programs, especially among the elementary and secondary educators—those who should know most about them.

Probably the most widely voiced complaint about the program dealt with the fact that too much paperwork is involved. In response to the inquiry as to whether the educator felt he had been "impaired by excessive influence in operating under ESEA programs," only about 28 indicated that they had, but a sizable portion in this group—about 22—indicated that one of the major reasons for this was that the paperwork and reports were too time consuming and restrictive. Also, there were several comments to the effect that the controls were not restrictive in the operating stage, but were somewhat restrictive in the planning.

Perhaps one of the reasons for the number of comments along these lines is seen in the so-called consolidated application system followed in Texas. Under this arrangement, each independent school district will work up its own program and prospective entitlement for the various titles and submit its application to the Texas Education Agency. I understand that strong efforts are underway to improve these procedures, and I feel encouraged that once this is done, we will see more expeditious arrangements. Hopefully this will also result in greater attention to one of the goals of title I to allow each local district its own free choice in selecting the kind of program needed to respond to its educational needs.

The uncertainty of funding is still a source of considerable concern to many of those who responded. From reading the answers, I noticed that those expressing this concern generally were the school board members and others in positions requiring advance planning on budgets. In all, 17 indicated a specific and usually strong concern about the lateness and uncertainty of funding, and I believe this indicates that either the

impact of the 1967 amendments have not yet been felt, or else that a greater effort is needed to get school districts informed early of their funding levels. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, title IV of the 1967 amendments authorized appropriations 2 years, rather than 1, in advance in an effort to solve precisely this problem.

As I indicated earlier, there was a great deal of favorable comment on Headstart and preschool training. In addition to these topics, I would note that there was a measurable amount of support on the need for wider application of vocational training at the higher levels, and the possible inclusion of vocational training programs in every school district.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my report to the House on this necessarily must be on such a methodical basis. If you had the opportunity to read through all of the comments I received, I believe you would feel a much deeper sense of the meaning these programs are having.

At this point, I would simply like to repeat several of the representative comments I received on the major topics. On title I:

"Small districts such as ours have reaped vast benefits from the Title I programs."

"Title I has helped our school more than anything in which we have become involved."

"Definite results from Title I are noticeable. Even though not measurable by tests, the greatest improvements are probably in attitudes and feelings of personal worth among students."

"As a result of Title I programs, our attendance has increased, our health problems have decreased, our drop-outs have lessened and the achievement level of our students has increased."

On where greater emphasis is needed in the future—on Title I and II:

"More money should be placed here. If necessary, sacrifice other titles."

"Early childhood education (preschool) and the health programs have proven most valuable in our district. We would like to see these two programs, especially, given top priority."

"The fact that educators have learned the importance of identifying those students with learning disabilities regardless of the cause has been the one most important phases of ESEA. Evaluation has shown a marked improvement as a result of identifying learning disabilities and designing programs to deal with the individual case."

On title I:

"The reason is that under Title I, there is a broader service level. Because of these broader services, this area should be given greater emphasis."

"I especially like Title II since textbooks, library books and other tangible instructional materials were made quickly available. Increased support could be utilized in this case. Also, I feel that Title I has been of great value, but its effectiveness could be better realized if the guidelines of its use were focused more on the individual school."

"Each area has merit which is unique to a given situation. Perhaps increased allocations for food and medical care would be an area needing emphasis. Para-professionals to aid the teachers would enable more individual help."

Two final general comments, I felt, summed up more than any others, the needs seen in the programs by educators at various vantage points. The first comes

from a school superintendent and the second from an elementary school principal.

"There seems to be a tendency to over-emphasize the importance and subsequently the required quantity of supporting, evaluative and other types of data. Reports and applications are now voluminous. It is difficult, if not impossible, to implement the program with personnel allocated under the programs. More freedom in usage of clerical help would help the local district a great deal."

"I am sure there is possibly some waste in the various programs, but I feel that we have and are continuing to make the best use possible of these funds. Our programs appear to be making a difference in the attitude of the public in general not just school-age children alone. It is my sincere desire that these and other programs yet to be initiated will continue so that each child may achieve and grow to his greatest potential and become a productive citizen in our 'land of plenty.'"

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and commend the gentleman from Kentucky for bringing it before the House.

Four years ago when this legislation was first presented to the House of Representatives, there was grave concern about the wisdom of this legislation. But today, as we look at the financial crises in school district after school district in America, we can only say thank God that Congress had the wisdom to bring some meaningful assistance to school districts of this country 4 years ago, particularly in the respective titles that we have in this bill.

Today we are facing the situation of the school districts across the country being faced with the prospect of being shut down. In my own city, the school superintendent announced over the weekend that he will be forced to lay off 7,500 teachers after Labor Day; that he would have to increase the size of the classrooms to 47 youngsters per classroom; and most probably would have to eliminate the summer schools this year; and reduce all other services.

So we can fully appreciate that if it were not for this program, any compensatory education now being given to youngsters who need it the most would be out of the question.

In school district after school district in the country, local communities and the local school superintendents are faced with the crisis of keeping their school plants going, and can give absolutely no thought to funding of any programs that would help disadvantaged youngsters in this country so they can have some sort of respectable and appreciable norm in education.

Even though we have heard a great deal of criticism and I am among those who has recognized that this has not worked as well as it could have worked in every school district in the country, and I am well aware of the fact that in many communities a better job could be done with the money we send them, the fact of the matter is that when we look at the overall situation most youngsters are getting very desperately needed compensatory education such as remedial reading, assistance in mathematics, as-

sistance in spelling and we can take pride in this legislation.

This legislation has also brought a great deal of assistance under title II. During the Easter recess I had occasion to visit many schools in my district. It is rather significant to see the enthusiasm that the teachers show for this title now that help from this title is starting to reach them.

Certainly, under title III we have seen some dramatic breakthroughs in new educational techniques. All across this country, Mr. Chairman, we find a very carefully laid out program of assistance to the local communities.

One of the things that I am particularly pleased with is when we first debated this bill and first presented this concept of assistance to local communities, there was substantial fear—legitimate, valid fear—on the part of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that this Federal assistance might mean also some Federal controls.

It was encouraging, as witness after witness came before our committee and as we asked these local school administrators whether or not there was any effort at controls from the Federal level that the testimony showed clearly that there was not.

I am hopeful that the Commissioner of Education, when he takes over his duties on May 1, will heed the plea of the witnesses before our committee and reduce the amount of paperwork and reduce the amount of reporting that they have to engage in.

But basically the testimony incorporated in our hearings on this bill clearly indicates that superintendent after superintendent has come before our committee and has pleaded with the Congress to continue this program basically in its pending pleasant form.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement the gentleman from Illinois is making.

The gentleman's statement reflects very, very much the sentiment of the school people, as you might call them, in the district I represent.

Visiting in northeastern Oklahoma during recent weeks, I have heard over and over again from teachers and from school board members and from superintendents the substance of what the gentleman has so well said here on the floor of the House today—in other words, that this committee plea for timely and adequate funding of the Government's program is the most urgently needed.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know when I have read, in two or three paragraphs, a better statement of what seems to me to be a very strong grassroots feel-

ing about a program than I have found here in the general statement which appears at the start of the report of this committee. I wish to compliment the committee upon really reporting to the House what seems to be as solid and as universal a feeling about a program as I have found in connection with any program of our Government in a long time. There is urgent need for long-term planning and for knowing well in advance what kind of program we will have in education. We are seeing serious delays and serious breakdowns in this machinery by reason of our failure to give long-term authorization to this program in the past.

I wish to state my support for H.R. 514 and to compliment the committee, its chairman and members, for an excellent job on this report.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman on the funding of this program. The only weakness we have found in this program has been underfunding. It does occur to me somewhat incongruous that when a committee of the Congress, such as the House Education and Labor Committee, after holding exhaustive hearings on a subject such as the needs of our schools, and brings before the House a bill that is endorsed and supported overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle, and supported overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle in the other Chamber—it does seem somewhat incongruous to me to see the Appropriations Committee reduce the authorization through the appropriation to the extent they have.

This bill has been carefully put together. It does meet the needs of this country, and it does provide the tools for local school administrators to bring these youngsters out of disadvantaged areas to a norm and a par at which they can compete in the educational spectrum the rest of their lives. But I say that for the Appropriations Committee not to fund this bill, to a great extent, in my judgment, makes a mockery of the legislative process.

I hope that this debate will elicit and will show the tremendous contribution that is available to school districts if we can get this bill funded. Witness after witness has supported the bill. The only complaint we have had from witnesses before us is that they did not get it sufficiently funded.

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

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman in the well for a splendid statement. I agree with him completely. The only complaint I have ever heard about this program is contained in the question, How can you plan without an extended term? It seems to me it makes as much sense to have this program limited to 2 years as it would to limit the Post Office authorization to 2 years. We have to give the professionals in the teaching field time to plan. That is the only complaint about this program.

I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and all members of the committee for the splendid work they have done and, together with the gentleman in the well, I urge that we extend the authorization for at least 5 years, and that we plan for longer extensions. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman has pointed out the problems schools are now having in trying to meet their financial needs with their own resources. It does compound the situation considerably when they cannot make appreciable long-range planning with these funds. I am mindful that the problem is not with the authorization; the problem is with the appropriation. The authorization must be made here, and I hope we will be able to approve this bill for a term at least long enough to give the school districts some opportunity to engage in long-range planning.

Finally, I would like to reiterate what I said earlier. It is my sincere hope that this good bill, a bill that holds out so much promise for the youngsters of America, is not going to be buried in an avalanche of reporting and redtape. If there was one thing the witnesses testified to—it had nothing to do with the validity of the bill—it was criticism of the length of time and the tremendous amount of effort they had to give to filling out reports. It is my hope that the Commissioner of Education will cut through all that redtape.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I think the timing is exceedingly fortuitous, since my colleague from Illinois just talked about the avalanche of redtape and reports that the school administrators around the country have to go through in order to get this Federal aid to education, because I am going to address my remarks to this very problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think that every Member of this House would agree that the task of applying for, accounting for, and administering Federal grants has become a major concern of State and local governments. I imagine that almost every Member would agree that the multiplicity of Federal grants for a vast variety of purposes imposes an increasing burden on these governments which we should try to alleviate to the extent possible. Certainly many of us feel that the Federal Government and the Congress in particular should be making a really major effort to combine similar Federal grant programs and to eliminate unnecessary duplication and overlapping.

While the details of such efforts may well produce considerable disagreement, I think that the principle of program consolidation has very wide support in both political parties and from the general public. One objective should be unanimously endorsed—the achievement of the maximum effectiveness of Federal expenditures in producing the desired results. Nobody defends an outright waste of funds.

Yet Federal educational funds are being wasted today in needless duplica-

tion of paperwork in making separate applications and separate accountings in very closely related programs for local schools.

The February 1969 issue of the official publication of the U.S. Office of Education, "American Education," lists 118 separate Federal-aid programs administered by that Office. Many of these are State grant programs for the improvement of elementary and secondary schools—the very subject we are dealing with in the bill before us—and each requires a separate administrative process from beginning to end. A number of them are so similar in purpose and procedure as to be virtually indistinguishable.

In my judgment the time has come to begin putting some of these programs together and to simplify their administration. Local school administrators, particularly, are beginning to drown in a veritable sea of Federal redtape.

The problem with efforts at consolidation of these programs in the past has been too much was attempted at one time. Thus the 1967 Quie amendment—which I supported and would support again—attempted to reform the distribution formula in title I of ESEA at the same time that consolidation was attempted. The amendment made perfect sense, but it was open to attack from all sorts of special interests who feared any major change in the pattern of this assistance.

One of these special interests was the U.S. Office of Education—which fought the amendment largely because it removed title III—supplemental centers—from direct Federal administration and turned the responsibility over to the States. The amendment was defeated—but the very next amendment to be offered was that of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), which related only to title III and turned its administration over to the States. The Green amendment was adopted and is now law.

Mrs. GREEN demonstrated that important steps in this field are best taken one at a time.

I shall propose an amendment that takes one additional step; the combining of four State-grant programs into a single State-grant program for the same purposes.

These four programs are: title III-A—instructional equipment—and V-A—guidance and testing—of NDEA; and titles II—school library materials—and III—supplementary educational services—of ESEA.

Each of these programs involves grants to the States for elementary and secondary schools;

Each is administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education and at the State level by the State educational agencies;

In each program the distribution within the State is determined by the State agency in accordance with a plan approved by the Commissioner;

The distribution of Federal funds between the States in each program is figured on the basis of population.

My amendment will combine these programs for the same purposes, with a single simple distribution formula on

school-age population, a single State plan, a single local application, and a single accounting requirement. If we ever to take any step at all toward program consolidation in education, this is the most modest step that could be taken and have any meaning. If we cannot take this modest first step, then we cannot hope to simplify these programs and reduce the burden of paperwork.

The amendment would make only two really substantive changes in the existing four programs.

First, it would eliminate the matching requirements from the two NDEA titles. For the most part, matching is something of a fiction for accounting purposes in which normal expenditures are written off as State or local matching. Unfortunately, where it has real effect is in the poorest school districts, where participation is either eliminated or curtailed because of the requirement. Moreover, since school expenditures have been rising in every State without regard to the existence of Federal matching funds, such requirements appear unnecessary as a stimulous to State and local spending for schools. The Elementary-Secondary Act has no matching requirements, so this makes for more consistency between the various aid programs.

The second substantive change is to make the NDEA programs consistent with the ESEA programs in the treatment of nonpublic school pupils and teachers. One of the great breakthroughs of ESEA in 1965 was the development of means of breaking the public school-private school impasse. In title II of the act this is accomplished by making available to nonpublic schools a wide variety of school library resources on a loan basis, with title to the material and books remaining in the public schools.

Under title II over 90 percent of the funds have gone for the purchase of encyclopedias, films, film strips, microfilm materials, and reference works for school libraries, public and private. Only about 4 percent of the funds have been spent for textbooks which were directly loaned to children.

This has been a very successful program, but it has created an anomalous situation in the law—private school libraries can borrow a film or filmstrip for instructional purposes, but cannot borrow a movie projector or overhead projector to show the material; they can borrow a set of science encyclopedias but not a microscope for the laboratory. There is no legal distinction possible between these types of materials and equipments, and I know of no educational justification for loaning one but not the other.

Accordingly, my amendment would make instructional equipment purchased with NDEA funds available to nonpublic schools on a loan basis in exactly the same way that library materials are made available under title II of ESEA.

I think that our committee made a tremendous mistake in rejecting this amendment. I shall ask the House to correct that mistake. This is an extremely limited step in the direction of consolidated overlapping Federal programs, but we must start somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr.

PEPPER). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute, and ask the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me 1 minute, and I am happy to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I take it the gentleman intends to offer the same amendment he offered in the committee in connection with the consolidation of titles?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman makes a correct assumption.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe I am correct in stating that in the Nixon budget there are no funds for title III of the NDEA Act, part A or part B, and no funds for title V, guidance and counseling.

Also, there are no funds for title II of the ESEA and we only have in the Nixon budget \$116 million for title III. However, I am most hopeful that the Democrats on this side will not vote for that amendment because it is a face-saving amendment to get the administration off the hook if we go ahead and enact your amendment, because then there are no funds in these different titles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Is it not also true that your amendment will have no effect on 1970 for which the Nixon budget was proposed?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is exactly correct. The authorization for 1970 is already on the books. We are now dealing with a period beyond the 1970 fiscal year. So the gentleman is exactly correct. It will have no effect on the 1970 fiscal year.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. There is no worry about a hasty change from the four titles to the consolidated title, either, because we have longer than a year for the administration to prepare a way for that kind of program.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I think it is obvious that we will have at least a year's lead-time to prepare for this.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. As to anyone who is concerned about title III(b), which was adopted in the last Congress but never funded, it is not proposed to be consolidated, either, because that stood by itself.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is correct. Only III(a) is intended to be consolidated by this amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I promised to yield to the gentleman from New York, and I will yield to him.

Mr. CAREY. I appreciate the gentleman's reference to title II, which was my contribution to the act of 1965 and which helped to bring it into existence.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I am really humble and proud at the same time that so many of my colleagues now see the virtue of this particular amendment. If the gentleman from Minnesota has read it correctly and as the gentleman in the well has spoken to the amendment, as I see it, it would spring into life with your amendment in 1970 and restore some glamor to title II which is not now seen by the Bureau of the Budget of the incumbent administration. So if I may say so, from here on in, in terms of putting money into title II, it would be stillborn for this year and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) would bring it back to life in 1970. I would rather see it kept alive now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) 15 minutes.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, again, to pay my deep respect to the chairman of this committee and to all of my colleagues on the majority side. I give as much respect as is their due in the light of my long experience to my colleagues on the minority side. Again we bring forth to great prominence and preeminence in this Congress a matter which is of utmost importance to all of the people of our country; namely, the bill that does the most for the most Americans, our 65 million schoolchildren. This is the key bill of our times. I think our President save one indicated that he counted this bill as the landmark legislation of his lifetime. We are here today not heralding any new venture, but carrying on our common commitment. We are simply recognizing that what we deal with here is the most popular bill with the most people in its present form. The schoolmasters want the bill, the children want the bill, the parents want the bill, the cities need the bill, the rural areas must have the bill, and the only thing we do here today is to give them reassurance and built-in confidence in their purpose and ours—to deliver upon our promise of excellence, equality, and opportunity in education for all children according to their needs.

I have been away from the committee just a little while out in the environs of the cities and I can tell you the first thing that we need today in urban America and rural America is a sense of public confidence in our Government; that we say what we mean and mean what we say. We must say that.

We are not here today with Federal programs and gone tomorrow. This bill is the basic undergirding of the school systems of our country. For the first time in our history in 1965 we legislated a program of Federal, national interest in the children of our schools. If everyone knew what a school man had to go through in order to grope for money and grapple for pennies today with which to meet the budget we would not dally with this bill. The school administrator must cope with the needs of the teachers who want to keep pace with other professionals in terms of salaries with which to pay the advancing cost of living in every section

of America. They are as similarly affected with inflation, and with every other item of living cost as are other Americans. The very least we can do for them is to tell them that this program is going to be here tomorrow, that it is going to be here in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974. The problems with which the superintendent has to deal have taken his whole lifetime to prepare him to contend with the challenge of today's education. Therefore, to suggest that a 2-year bill is enough for now is to tell him that he cannot go beyond next year's budget in terms of counting on the Federal share of the educational coupling that he needs to keep the movement going in terms of quality. The 5-year bill is the only bill that really expresses itself in terms of public confidence.

What we have already done has earned us the gratitude of all men because we had the courage to do it just 4 years ago. Now let us live up to the responsibility given us by going forward for 5 short years.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard much about the formula. I was one of those who dealt, inside and outside, with the formula when it was first compounded. I recognized that my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), was not entirely satisfied in the early days of this program with this formula and that the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, was not entirely satisfied with the items contained in the formula. Nor was I, coming from the State of New York, nor were many others including the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM), entirely satisfied. But this bill is an essential compromise and the formula has this great virtue in that it commends itself to all and satisfies none. Yet when we compare it with other formulas that have been worked out and put into use in this country with great effect, it is at least as good and in many parts much better than the other formulas which have been long hailed and saluted by the Congress as really doing the job that needs to be done with Federal money.

I shall select my own home State, the State of New York, and compare this formula with the Hill-Burton formula as I compare the formula contained in this bill with the Hill-Burton formula which has long been called inviolate and as a real good method by which to disburse Federal money. I find that under title I, of \$1 billion my home State would receive \$116 million under this formula, but under the Hill-Burton formula it received only \$60 million. For New York that is a good formula. As I look at the merits of the formulas involved I find that under this bill of \$1 billion disbursement, at least the State of South Carolina would get \$31 million of the allocation. But under the proposed formula of the Hill-Burton Act, it would only receive \$20 million of a given \$1 billion.

If we go to State after State we will, of course, find some variations. I feel sorry for the great State of Connecticut because the State of Connecticut drops down and under the formula as contained in this bill Connecticut would receive only 7 percent of a given \$1 million while

under the Hill-Burton Act it receives 10 percent.

Poor old Connecticut.

But I would predict to you that every Connecticut legislator who comes down the aisle when the formula is debated and is voted on by tellers, will probably vote for the formula that is in this bill because they know, as good legislators, that this formula was carefully calculated and very carefully contrived, and therefore should not be tampered with for this very, very significant reason: I have learned in my 9 years here in this body that you had better respect at least one segment of the House. When the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means comes to this well he defies us all and impresses us with his perspicacity and his knowledge of his bill, it usually deals with the very complex items of taxation, welfare, social security, and other key matters that deal with the quality of American lives. He knows his work so well that he always comes here secure in the knowledge that he needs a closed rule—a closed rule—because if you try to tinker with the mathematics that are involved you will so completely confuse the money supply of the country that we will be left in chaos because a rash of amendments would be unthinkable. We always have a closed rule therefore because of the complexity of the system with which we deal.

The same principle applies here due to the complexity of this formula, which deals with the very lives of the poor children of our country. Nonetheless we are told that we can write a new formula upon the floor.

I suggest this: that given the 5 years' advance funding of this bill, we can consult with the good minds who are bound up in the Committee on Ways and Means, and other places, and we can computerize the House, we can computerize the Committee on Education and Labor, we can gain from the experience in the field of the schoolmasters, and we can come back to here to write the best formula ever conceived by the mind of man. But let us not try to change the formula from the floor. It is not done by the Committee on Ways and Means, and it should not be done by the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Who is proposing to change the formula on the floor?

Mr. CAREY. The substitute, of course, would call for a complete change of the formula because it would introduce some kind of a systematic block grant. I suggest this: A systematic block grant is in reality a new disbursement of funds in different directions according to what the gentleman from Minnesota feels would be best for the country, but I do not believe that on his side there is any group of schoolmen who really believe we should change the formula at this time, because the key to this bill is this—that for the first time we have taken advantage of the impact theory, and have used the impact theory to drive the Federal dollar into the target districts where the

disadvantaged and deprived children are found. And the money has been going there, I can testify to this, because in my county there are more poor children than there are in the whole State of Minnesota, and the money has been going in there and they are entitled to it.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am really interested in that substitute. I believe I have seen all the amendments that have been proposed on this side, and the substitute that will probably be offered, and I have not seen one yet that proposes a change.

Mr. CAREY. Then the gentleman agrees that the formula is all right, and so we might as well stay with it for 5 years.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman does not so agree, but the gentleman wants to know what the gentleman from New York is arguing against.

Mr. CAREY. I am arguing against the theory that you can rewrite this bill on the floor, when all we should really do—

Mr. QUIE. Not rewriting the formula, rewrite the bill. There is nothing wrong with rewriting the bill.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman and I have been down the road on block grants before. We have been down that road so many times that in a sense I think we sometimes meet each other at intersections occasionally. And one intersection that I recall was when the gentleman found that possibly the people from the non-public-school areas could not buy his block grant idea because it put them right back where they were in 1965 before we had this bill.

Mr. QUIE. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CAREY. In the Erlenborn substitute—

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, regular order. I decline to yield further until I finish this statement.

The Erlenborn idea now seems to be that we will expand title II and we will put more things in title II, and that will be such a beautiful title that everybody will applaud it. It will make everybody happy because title II is the block grant or State plan system—and becomes the ideal vehicle for multipurpose categorical and noncategorical aid, whatever that may mean.

I would like to go along with such good ideas, but there is one rule I have learned in this House; if you want to advance an idea, put your money up first and then back it up with the idea.

You know very well that the administration which you support, and which I support now, because it is my administration as well, has told us and forewarned us that they do not intend to fund title II. You cannot put the schoolchildren of this country into a title with an empty basket and say, "Eat" because there is nothing there for them to eat. The administration is not going to fund the title into which you want to crowd new programs in your substitute. Is that not true?

Can the gentleman answer that question?

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. There is no proposed change in title I that the gentleman has been arguing about.

Mr. CAREY. Then we might as well go along with the 5-year extension of the title.

Mr. QUIE. No, no; read my remarks.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to hear them now. If there is no change, then why not go along with the 5 years?

Mr. QUIE. All right; I will tell you why. Because the formula is inequitable and cannot be permitted to run for 5 years—because some States receive so much more per poor child than other States. Some States count so many more poor children than other States.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further at this point. The greatest inequity of all that is visited upon the school districts of this country is this: You talk about changing the formula; 2 years hence you propound an unknown quantity which they cannot grind into their computers. When you tell them the school formula that we have now will be changed in the near future and you are building up a quandary and instability that the children and the schoolmen cannot tolerate.

I live in a city where the biggest problem is the changing school system. We are subdividing into possibly 30 new districts. Local school boards that never have had to contend with a formula may be grappling with the level of Federal input. If you are going to tell them that this is subject to change tomorrow, or on short notice, they will be confused and confounded.

At least give them the sustenance that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be around here 5 years from now still working on their problems on the present basic minimum formula.

After that we can add increments or increase over the basic minimum and for 5 years we can talk about that.

Do not convey a lack of confidence in the school system at this counting by short-term funding of a long-term problem.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he endorsed the procedure by the House of Representatives to consider tax bills under a closed rule.

Mr. CAREY. No, no, I was just recognizing the inevitable.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was recognizing the inevitable? What is inevitable about it?

Mr. CAREY. There has always been a closed rule, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not accept that as being inevitable. I hope the House someday would come to its senses and stop this business of considering tax bills under a closed rule.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman and I have had some fine colloquies here over the years. I think I recall the last change on the social security and welfare bill

that came to the floor of the House. Before it came here I went to the Committee on Rules and asked for a modified closed rule—or a modified open rule, whichever way you care to phrase it—in order to see if we could get a little daylight into that bill.

I was very much alone—a few people came behind me but the gentleman later I think, told me that this was a good opportunity to do so.

But as long as that kind of situation does exist in the House of Representatives, the gentleman does recognize that the reason for such a situation existing is because of the nonfeasibility of writing a complex formula on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. All I am suggesting here is that we recognize the reality of the situation. Under the stress of current difficulties abroad and at home we know that no more money is going to be put into this bill. We know that no additional support is in the offing. We are doing the best we can with what we have. We know that if this bill had expanded and moved in the direction its authors first had anticipated, we would not be dealing with the minimal support we have to contend with now. We would be dealing with a bill which would be at the point of \$3.5 billion or more in title I alone. Then we could invite all the new and good ideas that we are hearing from all sides. But at this time what our minority friends are saying to us is, "Let us transform the bill in every form. Let us change it in every function. Let us redirect it in this title and that. Let us change the approach. Let us go in terms of block grants. Let us try something in terms of local autonomy. But not one more dollar or small change in money while we make big changes in language.

I say that the school people of this country will tell us, yes, form is important and adjectives are important. But substance is the order of the day. How much more money can we get for this bill? Why are we taking 4 hours here today to talk about the very same technical language that we passed 4 years ago? Why are we not talking about what you and I are going to do, I hope, I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, when the appropriation bill comes before this House. Will you join me to do all we can in any way to preserve title II, which the administration has said is not worth one single dollar in its esteem? Will the gentleman help me on that day to get the money back in the appropriation?

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer that question.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman, the security he wants to give to the local schools will not be there, because there is a census coming up in 1970, and that will change the formula completely.

Mr. CAREY. I am going to be right with the gentleman in 1970, I hope, be-

cause when the census comes forth we will have a new basis for recomputation, and, hopefully, we will have some more money coming in from Mr. Arthur Burns or Mr. Paul McCracken to back up the census. The census will tell you a number of things. It will tell you that there are 1 million more poor people in New York, but not one additional dollar will there be for them under this present administration unless you put it there. The census will show us where the people are, and we will see that enough money has not been reaching the children. The gentleman has seen that every single dollar of title I money has been taken up like a drop of water in a scorched desert in the school districts of the big cities. There is no waste there. There is great want there. If we try to redirect the Federal school aid stream at this time, I have to ask you this question: How many times can you divide a drop before it evaporates? How many times can you retrace a trickle before it is parched on the scorched earth of the big cities?

Please do not talk about changing this bill except in one direction: Put more money where you want to help the children. Get the authorization forward 5 years. Get to the Appropriations Committee with a sense of confidence. Tell them we will accept nothing less than the authorizations we have enacted for 4 long years. This is where we need help in the reformation of this bill. If all the guile, and I say if all the intelligence and dedication of my good friends on the minority side were directed toward the Appropriations Committee as we will direct our advice to the Appropriations Committee on our side, we may say there is heralded a great day for the school systems of this country. We are going to put the money in this bill that belongs there.

I remember how well the present Secretary of Defense, our former colleague Mel Laird, and how well the gentleman from Minnesota stood up in this well and said to me and convinced me that we cannot afford guns and butter. How often they said it and how well they said it. We cannot afford guns and butter. Now you are telling me we cannot afford guns and books. I suggest that we agree on that now. I am one of those who believe that we must cut back in many ways on defense appropriations. But we cannot afford to cut back on the books, the media, and the support of the schools of this country.

Admiral Rickover has told us that education is our first line of defense. Do not drop back from the defense of our schools by short-term authorizations or short change appropriations.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) such time as he may require.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago it was my honor and pleasure to vote "aye" on the question of reporting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 from the Education and Labor Committee.

Three weeks later we passed this great bill.

These were the halcyon days of con-

gressional insurgence against the multitude of social ills.

And this was the act that lifted a million hopes.

Today, as we prepare to take up H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, we might ask whether these hopes have been fulfilled.

We know that by 1968 more than 9 million American children were being served by title I programs in 16,000 school districts.

But has promise equaled performance? Quality education, especially for disadvantaged children, is a delicate commodity not easily measured by statistics.

Hearings before our committee and outside reports indicate that the act is succeeding. But these same sources also convince us that the dimensions of poverty and inadequate education are far larger than any education budget ever approved by Congress.

What concerns me more than the question of 2-year versus 5-year extension is the continuing and depressing gap between what the Congress says should be invested in education and what we actually spend. On one hand we encourage people with promises of deep commitments to quality education, and then we push these hopes into a chasm of despair with inadequate funding.

By this process we are creating an "aspirations gap" in education.

For the current fiscal year Congress said that it was going to invest \$3.85 billion in programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Yet, we are spending only \$1.46 billion.

What is happening to specific programs is even more cruel. Title II of ESEA authorizes funds for school libraries and instructional services. Schoolchildren everywhere have benefited from strengthened libraries and additional teaching materials.

The current authorization for title II is \$162 million. But we are funding it at only \$50 million. And now President Nixon has recommended that not a single penny be spent on title II for fiscal year 1970.

Title III of ESEA furnishes money for supplemental educational services, such as remedial reading programs and cultural enrichment projects. The Office of Education reports that this program is badly-over-subscribed, for they are deluged with more requests than they have funds to meet.

The authorization for title III is \$527 million. President Nixon has requested that another \$56 million be slashed from the already-meager budget, leaving a grand total of \$116 million for title III.

Last year the Congress enacted legislation which I helped develop, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. What made this almost unique was the fact that the bill was passed unanimously.

Under the George-Barden Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the total Federal investment was roughly \$248 million. The new legislation attempts to make vocational education more relevant to the

changing patterns of the economy and of the desperate conditions in our ghettos. We set aside 40 percent of the new funds for disadvantaged youngsters, created several new job training approaches, and authorized investments of \$812 million for the fiscal year beginning this July 1. This was all done unanimously, Mr. Chairman.

But the budget request is only \$297 million.

For the poor, for the parent, for the educator, and for the concerned citizen this yo-yo attitude can only generate a crisis of confidence. And history suggests that dashed hopes are the seed of turmoil.

The promise of a new day cannot be met with lofty rhetoric and then a pallid performance. The domestic budget contributes as much to our national security as does the military budget. A progressive country solving its own problems may do more for peace than a phalanx of antiballistic missiles. Full funding of education and the fulfilling of man's hopes must command a high priority.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, enactment of H.R. 514 is vital to the educational advancement of our young people. H.R. 514 would extend for 5 years, until June 1975, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the impacted area aid programs, authorizing approximately \$5 billion annually for a variety of academic programs.

Testimony heard by the Committee on Education and Labor from academicians, parents, community officials and educational experts throughout the country stressed the urgent need for a 5-year extension and adequate funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. We in the Congress cannot overlook the tremendous need for proper education and academic advantages for our youngsters. Maximum effective use of Federal funds in support of educational programs is being impaired by delays in continuing authorizations and untimely funding.

Persons in management capacities in the private sector will readily concede the necessity of forecasting business earnings and spending levels several years in advance to maintain the economic stability of their companies. The Congress normally allocates funds no more than 2 or 3 years and sometimes only 1 year ahead of time. A successful business venture could never be expected to operate on an annual funding basis, never knowing what moneys will be available for operating costs. It is our responsibility to see that the Federal Government's education program proves to be an outstanding business venture by the cultural reward it reaps for our young. A superior educational assistance program becomes a more tangible possibility with the provision for adequate planning, staffing, and coordinating of people and programs. This provision is the 5-year extension.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs extended by the bill provide funds for local school districts with large concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children, library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials; supplementary education centers; dropout prevention programs;

bilingual education and special instruction for the handicapped.

Over 60 million youngsters have benefited from these programs since the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act was approved in 1965. In fact, earlier this year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the preliminary proposal of the Cleveland public school system to establish a bilingual education program. Under the law, this program is designed to meet the special educational needs of non-English speaking children who are at particular disadvantage because of their limited communication skills. H.R. 514 expands the present bilingual program to include children living on Indian reservations.

In drawing up this legislation, the Committee on Education and Labor was particularly cognizant of the fact that parents often desire to participate in the formation of their children's education. In an effort to acquire increased parental interest, H.R. 514 requires adoption of effective procedures by the States and local agencies to involve parents and community representatives in the development and operation of all programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another area of considerable significance is the impacted aid program, which, as amended, will provide for payments to local school districts of one-half the local cost of education for each pupil in the school district who lives in a public housing unit. At the present time, there are over 670,000 families residing in low-rent housing constructed with the financial aid of the Government. Since the Federal Housing acts exempt all low-rent public housing from State and local taxation, school districts serving children from public housing are severely limited in providing adequate education. Recognizing this inequity, the Federal Government presently makes a payment in lieu of taxes to the local school district. The national average payment is a mere \$11 per child, however, a grossly inadequate allocation, and not nearly enough to offset the loss of tax revenue.

In my district alone, the proposed payments to local school districts would channel \$2,850,484 to 15,622 children who reside in low-income housing and attend public schools in Cleveland. Approval of this amendment would be tremendously advantageous to the children as well as to the community residents within the school districts affected.

A genuine commitment to the education of our young people can be achieved with an enthusiastic vote of support for this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for Elementary and Secondary Education, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1968 OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Annual Report for 1968 of the National Capital Housing Authority. During the past year, the jurisdiction of the Authority has grown to include over 10,000 public low-rent housing units. But the housing needs of low-income families in the Nation's Capital still exceed the supply.

I am pleased to report that the Authority is beginning to place greater emphasis than it has in the past on working with the private sector in building and acquiring decent housing for the people of the District. It is pioneering in the use of the "Turnkey" method, in which a private developer builds or acquires a project and later turns it over to the Authority. It is also placing new emphasis on offering social services to the residents of these dwellings—often in cooperation with groups of volunteer citizens—and on managing and maintaining the properties in an enlightened manner, sometimes through private management firms.

These and other initiatives—many of them still in their trial stages—will help the Authority make important progress toward its goal of providing safe, clean, and economical housing for the low-income families of this city.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1969.

DESIGNATING THE YEAR 1969 AS "DIAMOND JUBILEE YEAR OF THE AMERICAN MOTION PICTURE"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 165, designating the year 1969 as the "Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Whereas the motion picture, now the most popular and pervasive art of the twentieth century, was born in the United States seventy-five years ago; and

Whereas, from the beginning, the motion picture proved such a success that in the intervening seventy-five years it transformed the popular arts, communications, entertainment, dramatic and literary expression, education in the United States and the world over; and

Whereas during these three-quarters of a century some of the achievements of significant value by the American motion picture include:

(a) An indigenous American art form that has become a global medium which calls upon the talents of many nationalities in its

creation, and which is shown in all the world's countries with which the United States has diplomatic relations;

(b) An occupancy of more than 50 per centum of the total time on the screens of the world's theaters which means that on an average day ten million three hundred thousand individuals in foreign countries see a film released by an American company, a figure that adds up to seventy-two million admissions weekly and three billion seven hundred million annually—no other American medium regularly reaches such massive numbers of persons in foreign countries;

(c) A direct link for millions abroad with the United States, its history and character, its spirit and its ideals, through American film stars who are household names and who are themselves ambassadors with whom millions abroad can identify with American life;

(d) A business engaged in an art but which contributes each year a large surplus balance of payments that is of urgent importance to our country's economic and fiscal health;

(e) A business that in the United States keeps thirteen thousand seven hundred theaters showing American and foreign films, an industry that employs some one hundred and ninety thousand persons in production, distribution, and exhibition, an activity that has so engaged the interest of young people that courses on motion pictures in high schools and colleges have expanded with more than eighty thousand students enrolled in three thousand graduate and undergraduate courses on films offered in two hundred colleges and universities throughout the country; and

Whereas, for these achievements and others as pertinent, the seventy-fifth anniversary year offers an opportunity for all Americans to salute the American motion picture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States do hereby designate 1969 as the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the House concurrent resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no fault to find with the concurrent resolution, especially insofar as the resolution portion is concerned, but may I inquire, is it the intention of the gentleman from Colorado to strike the paragraph (c) of the whereas clauses on page 2?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, it is. If my request to dispense with further reading is granted, then I will offer an amendment, a copy of which the gentleman has.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to strike all the whereas clauses?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS
OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On pages 1 through 3 strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the concurrent resolution to designate 1969 the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture, and I think it is fitting that the American public, which has derived so much enjoyment from motion pictures, take note of the industry's 75th birthday.

It was in a converted store on Broadway, in New York City, just 75 years ago this month, that the Holland brothers opened the first "movie house." They had installed 10 kinoscopes, invented by Thomas Edison, and their first showings received a warm welcome in the makeshift theater.

The motion picture is a uniquely American art form, but now flourishes in numerous other countries as well. Still, our U.S. film products account for more than half of the viewing time on the world's screens, and they are a very considerable export item in our foreign trade.

An exciting means of communication that has served as an ambassador of goodwill for the United States, the motion picture also is the basis for a flourishing industry, employing some 190,000 persons in production, distribution, and exhibition and attracting more than 80,000 students in film-related college courses throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, in our recognition of the film industry, it is appropriate, too, to acknowledge the work of the Motion Picture Association of America, which has contributed so much to higher quality films and responsible performance standards for the flourishing industry it represents. Its officers, President Jack Valenti, Executive Vice President Ralph Hetzel, and Vice President Edward Cooper, have earned the respect of the public and deserve our thanks and recognition.

As an enthusiastic film fan, I am personally most appreciative of and grateful for the enjoyment motion pictures have brought to me. And on behalf of the Seventh District of California, it is a pleasure, on the occasion of their diamond jubilee, to wish the industry, its officers, its artists, and its employees "many happy returns." I hope it will be the pleasure of the Congress to designate 1969 the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 165, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SELF-SUSTAINING FUND TO MAN-
AGE NATIONAL FORESTS

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to create a self-sustaining fund that will make it possible to manage our national forests to their fullest potential as sources of timber for our Nation's present and future needs.

The bill, entitled the National Timber Supply Act of 1969, would allow the managers of these federally owned commercial timberlands to exercise their skills to the fullest by plowing back receipts from timber sales into forestry practices that would result in vastly increasing the yields from these lands.

The bill calls for the creation of a "high timber yield fund" that would provide adequate financing to bring Federal forest management practices up to date and to provide for development of new practices in the future.

Our national forests are administered by the U.S. Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture under an outmoded financing system that is frustrating the skills of highly trained and devoted public servants.

My bill would make it possible to develop the fullest possible extent one of our country's greatest natural resources. It would help to improve the quality of life for all of our citizens by assuring a growing and perpetual supply of materials for all of the products based on wood—especially the sorely needed housing that has become a pressing national responsibility.

And by expanding and refining the practice of forestry on the national forests, my bill would guarantee better conservation of these assets, with all the desirable benefits of beauty, recreation, wildlife, water supplies, and grazing.

Finally, it would change our Nation's status as one of the backward lands of the world in a critical area of agriculture—a science in which we rightly believe ourselves to be preeminent.

The rich and productive land of America, tilled with the care and imagination that have been unequalled by any other people, has made this a land of plenty.

The national forests are a substantial percentage of the lands that we must count on for our future. In total, they comprise an area twice the size of the entire State of California.

But, unlike our farmlands, we have neglected them. And because we have, we are in danger of becoming a nation a well-fed and ill-housed people.

Because of my responsibilities on committees of the Congress, I have a special concern for the well-being of our people in regard to both nutrition and housing.

One of the important responsibilities

of the Committee on Agriculture is making sure that food is available in ample quantities. The Forestry Subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman has the additional and special responsibility to make sure that our national forests produce the largest supplies of timber of which they are capable.

My Committee on the District of Columbia has further committed itself to the task of seeing that this food and timber are properly used in alleviating the problems of poor nutrition and inadequate housing in one of America's great cities.

Last month the distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency conducted hearings on the shortages of skyrocketing prices of lumber and plywood and the detrimental effects on our housing goals.

I have carefully studied the record of those hearings and consulted with experts both in government and private industry.

Testimony before that committee established that there is a current annual shortage of 2 to 3 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood, even at the present inadequate level of homebuilding starts. As a result, frenzied competition for the building materials available had driven lumber prices up by as much as 50 percent and plywood prices by 100 percent.

Even worse, homebuilders said they were finding it almost impossible to get assurances of delivery even at those prohibitive prices.

The price situation has changed in the last few weeks, and it is tempting to sigh with relief and suggest that the problem is solved.

But the plummeting prices have simply added another element to the chaos. The distribution trade, and many builders, now have supplies of lumber and plywood that were bought at high prices and now are worth far less, according to the market. But the pressures that set off the first price rocket still are at work, and it is only a matter of time before another goes up.

The prices for raw material—logs—had climbed even higher than the prices for finished goods. Like the price spiral for lumber and plywood this price spiral was caused by a shortage. That shortage still persists, and the high prices for raw material still persist.

So manufacturers are saddled with expensive raw material that can be converted only at a loss, at the present price structure.

I am told that many manufacturing plants are in real danger of financial insolvency. In my own area of the country, the Southeast, production of lumber and wood products is an extremely important industry. Yet, over a 15-year period—from 1950 through 1965—the number of producing sawmills in the South declined from 25,000 to 5,000.

The situation we are facing is both incredible and intolerable.

On the one hand, the Congress last year committed this Nation to a 10-year building program that we said must produce 26 million new units.

Now, we are faced with high prices and shortages of building materials that make this goal virtually impossible to achieve. Last year we built only 1.5 million new homes. This year we probably will not do much better.

In his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney said we could meet our housing goals only by producing 15 billion board feet more of lumber and plywood per year. By 1978, he said, we must double the amount of lumber going into residential building.

As things stand, we cannot do it because the logs to produce this lumber are not available to the mills. And because this shortage of logs has driven timber prices to impossible economic levels, we are faced with the possibility of losing even more manufacturing capacity and making the job even more impossible.

The actions taken by the administration and announced by Secretary Romney will help alleviate the immediate problem, I am told. But they will only put off the ultimate day of reckoning for a little longer unless action is taken, and taken now, that will provide a long term solution.

A long term solution means that we must have more timber available for conversion into lumber and plywood, along with all of the other products that we find so necessary for the life we live in America.

And, Mr. Speaker, that timber exists. It is unavailable because of a situation that can be changed by the adoption of the National Timber Supply Act I am introducing today.

Almost two-thirds of all the softwood timber in the United States is on Federal lands.

This is almost four times as much timber as the forest industry owns.

Yet the forest industry harvests, from its own lands, more timber than is harvested from the Federal lands.

The industry is able to do this with no danger to future yields. Its forest management practices assure a perpetual supply of timber for future needs.

The situation is comparable to a pair of adjoining farms, one four times larger than the other, but each producing almost the same amount of the same crop.

It is tempting to say that the small, private farmer is more than four times as efficient as the big farmer. And, in one sense, this is true.

But the Forest Service cannot exercise even a major share of its skill at silviculture, because the Federal appropriation process deprives it of the regular, dependable funds necessary to any ongoing program of agriculture, whether the crop is trees, cotton, or corn.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate committee on November 26, 1968:

Studies . . . of investment opportunities on National Forests . . . show that allowable cuts could, in time, be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of in-

creased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs.

He said, however, that he could not in good conscience sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of the National Timber Supply Act to create a fund that would provide this necessary investment, in adequate and dependable amounts. I hasten to add, however, that the bill has the further purpose of maintaining congressional control over the funds.

I have spoken of the need for additional housing materials and for additional wood fiber required in other uses. At this point I want to emphasize that the bill emphatically does not direct or permit any changes in management of forest land set aside for recreational use or changes in policy involving the recreational uses to which commercial forest lands may be put.

To the contrary, the National Timber Supply Act will make more recreational sites available and accessible to the public, without in any way altering areas presently set aside as parks or wildernesses.

The achievements of private industry in this regard are of great interest to me.

In the State of South Carolina there are three national forests, although none of them is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress. There are many others in the South.

But the important lumber industry in my district is supplied almost entirely with timber grown on private lands and, in the South generally; 70 percent comes from private lands.

On a national basis, American Forest Institute took a survey, just last year, of recreational opportunities on industry-owned forest lands. Almost all are open to recreational uses. Practically all encourage hunting.

Slightly over 90 percent of private lands are open to berry pickers; 93 percent are available for picnicking; 72 percent to hiking; 82 percent to camping. And so on.

Even if all of the national forest land were, in theory, open to the public, it still would not be accessible in percentages even approaching those I have just cited.

The private forest industry has made its land accessible by investing money in roads.

The Forest Service has not because it could not. It does not have the funds.

So, in addition to more timber, we can expect a bountiful amount of recreational opportunity as a bonus.

Another bonus would be the harvest and utilization of timber that is otherwise lost to fire, disease, insects and over maturity. The Forest Service estimates that 10 billion board feet of timber is lost annually to these causes. This is nearly as much as the additional harvest we must have to meet our housing demands a decade from now.

Private industry, of course, has done much to call this situation to the attention of the Congress. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fair to

ask private industry if it is doing all it can to provide the necessary timber from its own lands.

So far as the companies who produce timber for their own conversion are concerned, I am satisfied that they are doing a good job and making every effort to do a better one. Industry owns only 17 percent of the national inventory, yet it contributes 25 percent of the cut and 36 percent of the annual growth. Surely this is a good record.

There is one portion of the private sector that is not doing its share.

In the South, 60 percent of all the timber harvested comes from land not owned by the producing industry. Owners of small plots, some 3 million individuals and companies, own this timber. Because holdings are small, any forestry that is practiced is rudimentary, at best.

But I am proud to report to the House that the industry of the South has just completed a major project to help the small private landowner improve both the quantity and quality of timber growth on his land.

This study was described to the Banking and Currency Committee by M. C. Colvin, president of Holly Hill Lumber Co., of Holly Hill, S.C. Mr. Colvin is also president of the Southern Pine Association representing lumber manufacturers in the Southeastern States.

Mr. Colvin told the committee that this project, the southern forest resource analysis, has just been completed after 2 years, and was entirely financed by forest farmers, Southern Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers, American Plywood Association, and the Southern Pine Association.

Under the program recommended in this analysis, 10 million acres in the South would be replanted with genetically improved stock, and 90 million acres in all would receive some form of timber stand improvement.

The total result would be the creation of a forest, Mr. Colvin said, that would be far more bountiful and genetically superior to its predecessors and serving a broad range of esthetic, recreational, and material needs.

It also is true that the timber from this new forest of the South is some years away. The timber in our national forests exists today, and it is from this source primarily, that we must fill our present pressing needs.

We can do this only if we are prepared to assure ourselves and posterity that a timber supply will be available in perpetuity.

The Forest Service has estimated that timber sales from the national forests will provide more than \$300 million in receipts next year to the Treasury.

No Member of this House is more interested than I in a responsible fiscal policy.

At the same time, no one in this House knows better than I that you cannot continue to reap the benefits of the land indefinitely without returning a portion of those riches as an investment to improve the quality of the land that produced them.

I believe it is time to create a national

policy that will do just that and I believe that the National Timber Supply Act, if approved by Congress, will satisfy this need.

The basic premise of this act is that, once the funds are made available and the Forest Service embarks on an intensive management program, the allowable cut can be increased immediately.

We will have the timber we need, right now.

The high timber yield fund, incorporated in the act, gives assurance of financing for the silviculture practices that will provide the timber for the future. There are several safeguards built into the act.

The high timber yield fund, itself, by being tied directly to receipts, make it certain that forestry practices will stay apace with needs. As timber becomes more valuable—as it must—more funds will become available for intensifying its production.

The fund has a life of 25 years, long enough to produce significant results. However, a limit to its life will require a full review by some future Congress and prevent the automatic perpetuation of a program that it may be possible to improve later on. However, nothing prevents a congressional review at an earlier date.

Section 5 permits expenditures only after appropriation of moneys from the fund, thus assuring regular reviews of progress and practices, and keeping control of these large sums in the hands of the Congress.

Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within 2 years be transferred to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, to prevent unnecessary and unauthorized buildup of the fund.

The act does not in any way alter the present system of assigning portions of timber sale receipts to the States and to the building of roads and trails in the national forests. Together, these allocations account for 35 percent of receipts. This would not be changed.

Finally, section 6 specifies that allocation of the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to the contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding 2 fiscal years. Since the amount of income from each forest varies somewhat from year to year, a 2-year period was selected to even out fluctuations.

By providing for slight variation in this formula, the act recognizes that it may be necessary to vary allocations in isolated cases to justify a larger proportion going to areas with outstanding potential for increased yield, but which produce little or no present income.

There were 50 forests with receipts under \$100,000 in fiscal 1967; 40 of them are in eastern Montana, the Rocky Mountain and intermountain States, in southern Arizona and New Mexico. All have a low proportion of commercial forest land, and the lands that exist are relatively arid and low in productivity.

The opportunity for intensive forest management on these lands is roughly proportionate to the level of receipts.

In addition to these 40 forests in arid areas, the group of 50 is rounded out by

a group of five where timber production is incidental to watershed and recreation management; there are two others with the smallest areas of commercial timberlands in the national forest system, and a Missouri forest where growth rate is extremely low because of heavy overcutting in the past.

The final two are in Alaska. One of these, the Chugach Forest, has only limited potential for intensive management in the near future. The other, the Tongass Forest, is a special case because receipts must be held for dispersal until Indian claims in this area are settled.

The act does not permit unlimited discretion by the Forest Service in the use of the fund, but the nine broad purposes outlined in the act provide adequate application of judgment in the areas of concern. These include:

First. Regeneration of growth at the earliest practical date after harvest, and reforesting high quality lands that are unsatisfactorily stocked now. This would allow the Forest Service to plant or seed harvested land in the first season after slash disposal or after harvest, in areas where slash is not a problem.

The objective is to get the land back into production without delay. Improvement of lands would be limited to sites where there is a good potential for commercial growth.

Second. Precommercial thinning. This is desirable to control the spacing of trees and encourage growth, but also to dispose of undesirable species and give more useful species a chance to reach their full potential.

Third. Semicommercial thinning. This controls spacing and composition of stands, but also produces marketable timber with a value roughly equal to the cost of removing it. This is a step between precommercial thinning and commercial thinning.

Precommercial thinning deals with material that is unusable because of its small size.

Semicommercial thinning produces material acceptable for such uses as pulpwood, but full production and delivery costs often exceed its value.

Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it—minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization—does not exceed its value.

Fourth. Pruning, if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable.

Some useful trees keep what are called juvenile limbs low on their trunks for long periods. When this occurs, it often is necessary and justifiable to prune the limbs to obtain logs that will be suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

Fifth. Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage, and under-story removals. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for normal harvest sales, and sales of this type never have been financed beyond the lowest levels possible. This is necessary to reduce the substantial timber volumes now lost to insects, disease, and overcrowding.

Sixth. Road construction into areas

where thinning, salvage and under-story removal sales—as well as fire and insect protection—is contemplated, but only to minimum standards necessary for this activity.

This type of activity can rarely support road construction, so thinning and salvage is largely ignored except where roads currently exist.

This provision would permit minimum standard road construction necessary in unroaded areas, and would provide access for protection activity.

It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

Seventh. Fertilization. Several major industrial landowners in the Northwest and South and certain States have demonstrated that fertilization of good sites is an effective way to increase yields and shorten rotations. As knowledge in this technique improves, it would be logical to devote portions of the fund to fertilization on suitable Federal timberlands.

Eighth. Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. The Forest Service already is at work in this field, and private industry has made substantial progress, which will be accelerated even more when the Southern forest resource analysis recommendations are implemented.

The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

Ninth. Implementing of other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common goal of all nine of these practices is to improve the timber yields on the national forests, now and in the future. The high timber yield fund is intended to provide the means for reaching optimum yields.

The fund is not expected to replace regular financing of federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests or the forest development road program.

Implementation of these programs will provide, as I mentioned earlier, substantially more recreational opportunity, but regular recreation activities of the Forest Service, along with reforestation for scenic or watershed purposes, would continue to be financed by the current method.

Preparation for thinning, salvage, and understory removal sales, an authorized high timber yield fund activity under section 6 of the bill, can now be financed from regularly appropriated funds for national forest timber sales. A small volume of these sales are now being made by this means, but these sales unavoidably have a poorer ratio between cost and returns than regular harvest sales. For this reason, it has been difficult to obtain appropriations.

Large salvage sales should continue to be financed by this method, with the high timber yield fund reserved for those small sales where such financing is uneconomical.

The same distinction should be made between use of regularly appropriated funds and the high timber yield fund for road construction in advance of harvest.

Such advance road construction is essential for full scale operation of thinning and scattered tree salvage sales. Use of high timber yield funds for this purpose will generally be the only practical means to get advance roads built. These funds should not be used to construct access roads into large salvage sales areas.

Two final points, Mr. Speaker.

First, it is not feasible, I am told, to put a strict cost/benefit check on expenditures into the bill at this time. Expenditures are limited to those that will increase timber yields. The Appropriations Committee will oversee these expenditures and their experience is needed to translate the expenditures into goals that we can expect to reach in terms of timber production.

Secondly, the value of the National Timber Supply Act would be destroyed if there were any significant broadening of the purposes for which the high timber yield fund may be used. The amounts that would be available appear to be adequate to do the job. They would clearly not be adequate if portions were diverted to other uses, and all we would have would be a slush fund for activities not supported by normal appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this bill to be of the utmost importance to this country, to our national housing goals, and to the preservation of our natural resources.

I intend to schedule hearings by my subcommittee at the earliest possible time so that this House may have an early opportunity to consider the National Timber Supply Act.

A newspaper in my district, the Dillon Herald, published in Dillon, S.C., recently commented on the present price and supply problems of lumber and plywood, in an editorial. The conclusion of that editorial was this:

One of the soundest projects to preserve the economy of a country, we believe, is to make it possible for the hardworking, law-abiding, self-sustaining people to build homes, or buy them, and establish their families in a permanent abode, but rising costs of materials and money, in addition to other deterrent matters like taxes, high labor costs, etc., serve to discourage what might be a bonanza for the building trades.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to those sentiments and, while it is possible that a bonanza, in the form of better housing, better recreation, and a better life, lies in front of all of the people of the United States if this Congress passes the National Timber Supply Act.

AUTOMOBILE FATALITIES HAVE INCREASED AT AN ALARMING FIGURE

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, automobile fatalities have increased at an alarming figure. Last year, 55,000 people were killed on our streets and highways. Most any day of the year, there are 155 persons killed. You are all familiar with the National Safety Council's figures for holiday weekends, when

600 to 800 are killed. And on an average day, there are more than 12,000 persons injured, many of these persons injured permanently.

The Insurance Information Institute has estimated the cost of these accidents and fatalities, well in excess of \$14 billion. Insurance companies pay out almost \$40 million every 24 hours in claims, and this is only the dollars—it does not take into consideration the tragedy, the loss of life, the pain, suffering, loss of time and earning power.

But I rise today, not to review these tragic figures. I am sure you are all aware of them and feel as I do—a human desire to do something positive to reverse the trend of highway tragedies.

I want to briefly describe to you the application of a relatively simple, inexpensive, engineering principle—which I am confident will go a long way within a few years toward drastically reducing the death toll. We have tried many of the "intangibles"—speed limits, education, radar, and enforcement—all kinds of steps—yet the toll continues to rise. We have, in more recent years, turned to the more positive physical things we can insist upon, through a set of national standards to provide positive physical protection to the occupants of automobiles.

Imagine, if you will, being seated in a car, traveling down the highway. Think of the protection you would have—to say nothing of the feeling of security—if an extremely sturdy hoop of steel and absorbing rubber extended around the front end of the car underneath the hood and fenders. A hoop of steel at just about the level of your belt, some 30 inches or so above the roadway. In a crash with an oncoming car, this sturdy band of steel, with its rubber facing, would deflect your automobile and allow the forward energy to be expended on down the road giving you a reasonable chance to regain control. Compare this with what usually happens when two cars meet nearly head on. The two crash—welding and biting together and—worst of all—coming to an almost instant halt, hurling the occupants against the dash and windshield. Would it not be so much better to have the two cars deflect from each other—rather than an instant crunching halt?

Such a hoop—or safety bar—can be installed easily and inexpensively underneath the hood and fenders. As many of you know, one of our major automobile manufacturers has installed what they call impact bars in the side doors. Why not carry this sound principle around the front of the car where its value can be of much greater benefit? About 90 percent of our automobile collisions involve this front 160-degree area. Therefore, the safety bar with its resilient facing, installed at the belt line, would prevent vehicle penetration. Put the protection out in front where it will really do more good.

The bumpers on today's cars, as we know them, are mostly decorative. They offer little or no protection to the passenger. Edmond R. Ricker, chief of the Pennsylvania Highway Safety Group, recently said:

I believe we could all readily agree that the present bumper system gives little or no protection in automobile crashes, and something better is needed.

Our present bumpers are at various heights and much too low to the road for occupant protection. The principle I describe to you would be the heavier steel hoop extending from the side doors around the front at the belt line of the automobile—approximately 30 inches off the road. This steel bar, with its rubber or resilient facing, is installed underneath the outer skin of the car and securely anchored to the frame. It is out of sight and does not change the appearance or styling. The resilient facing on this hoop of steel—about 4 to 6 inches wide—will serve tremendously in helping to absorb the initial impact of collision.

Let me be perfectly clear. This idea is not going to avoid crumpled fenders or smashed headlights. That is not the principle. Its value is to deflect two cars traveling at high speed away from each other instead of allowing the sudden stop with its tragic consequences.

Carry the idea a step further. Visualize this same kind of a hoop of steel and rubber—mounted at approximately 30 inches off the road—on the back of a large truck or trailer. In this case the energy absorbing bumper would be built so that it would move forward when struck, to help absorb the shock and further deflect—off to one side—a car striking the rear of the truck or trailer. Here again, cars with the safety bar at the same 30 inches above road would coincide with the underride guard on the rear of the truck. If this rear underride guard is installed too low, there would be too much leverage and defeat the very purpose of the protection.

Such a "safety bar" as I describe has been devised. A good many years of study and patient research have gone into its modifications, to such a point that I now stand on this floor to bring it before you with my sincere hope it will receive further consideration by this body in relation to the establishment of national standards. And further consideration by the automobile industry and their considerable research and development facilities.

May I point out that this "safety bar" was first envisioned by a man in my congressional district. He lost a close personal friend more than 20 years ago in a near head-on crash. In the years that followed, this man patiently developed the idea of some sort of protection out around the front of the car. He refined the plan through trial and error, evaluating and testing, defining such details as the 30-inch height from the ground, the rubber facing on the steel bar. He determined the strength of that bar and how it could be fastened underneath the hood and fenders. Through the years, he has consulted with the manufacturers of materials and they have contributed facts concerning the strength of the tubular steel bar and the use of rubber or resilient material to aid in that critical moment of impact. This is in part to prevent the welding and biting of metals together, as well as reduce shock. The statistics of insurance companies, safety councils, and others interested in highway safety—as well as consultation with

State and Federal safety personnel—have all gone into the ground work of this safety device. And the total cost is less than the cost of a car radio.

It is now ready for positive consideration. And if it has the merit I think it does, should be considered for every new car as quickly as possible.

I would like to send each of my colleagues and others in the government and industry a copy of these remarks and some further information and sketches describing this "safety bar" in greater detail. In addition to a more detailed description of how a similar safety bumper can be easily installed on the rear of trucks and trailers. And I ask the permission of the Speaker to place these extended details into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Further, I request the administrator, Federal Highway Safety, Department of Transportation, to consider the life-saving values of this safety device. I suggest that the old concept of bumpers and bumper heights be changed and a standardization of these protective safety measures be forthcoming.

NEED FOR FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread belief that the nuclear power reactors which are being built to generate electricity are safe, reliable, and all of its pollution is invisible. But, a rapidly growing number of physicists, biologists, and engineers have been expressing serious misgivings about the planned increase of these nuclear powerplants.

Distinguished members of the scientific community have stated that nuclear power generates a new type of pollutant, radiation, and that its hazardous effects upon the environment have not yet been taken into account. They cite the potential dangers of a malfunction of a nuclear plant, with the consequent release of large quantities of radioactive particles into the atmosphere, the constant emanation of radioactive substances from nuclear power production into the air and the water of streams used for cooling the nuclear plants, and the centuries long threat of the escape of radioactively poisonous nuclear wastes which must be stored in perpetuity, and in amounts in the millions of gallons, as a result of nuclear plant operations.

Six years ago, David E. Lillenthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned that we have moved too fast and without proper safeguards into an atomic power age. He stated:

I am gravely concerned about the potentially catastrophic dangers to human life and public safety from the radiation produced by the splitting of the "peaceful atom" . . . If present plans to construct atomic electric plants within and near large population centers from coast to coast are permitted to proceed, this process will live among us on a scale never before attempted and pose the threat of contaminating large sections of our cities. I believe that the existing plans are

irresponsible, because the safe functioning of these power plants would require the solution of crucial problems that are still unsolved.

Yet, despite this grave warning that radioactive pollution poses a great threat to man's survival on earth, little national attention has been focused on the potential environmental hazards associated with peaceful atomic power. In the meanwhile, there are about a dozen nuclear powerplants now in operation through the country and about 100 or so more are now being considered. Plans call for approximately 25 percent of our electric power to be generated by the atom by 1980, and half by the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the statements issued by highly qualified individuals about the incredible and unique danger that nuclear powerplants represent for human life, and that Congress has been remiss in focusing attention to the entire question of the safety of these nuclear reactors. Thus, I am introducing today a joint resolution calling for a thorough reappraisal of the Federal Government's participation in the atomic energy program and an assessment of the potential impact of atomic development upon the health and safety of the American public, with particular emphasis on the effects of waste disposal, radioactive air and water pollution, and possible losses caused by malfunction of nuclear plants.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKBURN INTRODUCES JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the privilege of introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President. The House Judiciary Committee has held extensive hearings on this subject and after examining all of the evidence, I believe the congressional district plan would be the best possible reform of the electoral college.

A statement which I submitted to the Judiciary Committee completely outlines my position on this matter, and for the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this statement into the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE BEN B. BLACKBURN BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

During the last election, there was a real possibility that the Presidency would be given to a man who did not receive a plurality of the votes cast. The candidacy of Governor George C. Wallace raised the probability that the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives if neither of the major political parties' nominees received the requisite number of electoral votes. Uncertainty and apprehension justifiably preceded November 5; the Electoral College was severely criticized.

In our history, *thrice* the outcome of the

presidential election has been subject to criticism and uncertainty due to the Electoral College. In the election of 1824, when Jackson received a plurality of the popular and Electoral votes, John Quincy Adams became President when the election was decided by the House. The Hays-Tilden affair has many similarities to the situation caused by the recalcitrant 1968 elector in North Carolina. The Harrison-Cleveland election demonstrated how the mechanics of the Electoral College can elect a minority President.

When the Constitution was drafted, the framers debated various proposals for the election of the President. During the course of the debate a vote taken on the idea of having direct popular elections for President and Vice President was defeated by a vote of two states for (Delaware, Pennsylvania) and nine states against.

The Election of 1800 presented a new nation with the first Constitutional crisis. The formation of political parties had injected an element into the political system which had not been foreseen by the founding fathers. The Twelfth Amendment was born as a result, and both the President and Vice President are now elected by the same successful Political Party.

The need for further reform has created proposals over numerous years. Three plans have been urged (with slight variation) over the years: (1) the direct popular vote; (2) the proportional plan, and; (3) the district plan.

The proposal for a direct popular vote has superficial appeal. Those who are anxious to ignore, if not abolish, the identity of the states in the federal system see the direct popular vote as another step toward the accomplishments of their purposes. Furthermore, a direct popular vote has a ready appeal to political kingpins in the heavily populated areas of our country. Indeed such a system would give big city "Bosses" an influence in national affairs even greater than they enjoy today. Those of us who represent states of large rural areas and states not having the heavy concentrations of population which exist in some areas of our country would soon be rendered politically sterile. I would anticipate that under a direct popular vote, Presidential candidates never would be seen visiting the states of the thinly populated Midwest and the South and would seldom be seen in the rural areas of the more populous states. Thus, the traditional balance of influence between the urban and rural populations would no longer exist.

No small consideration should be given, when discussing a direct election plan, to the potential danger of vote frauds in areas completely dominated by over-zealous political leaders. Publications in national news media of evidences of fraud in the 1960 Presidential election (which could have well determined the outcome of the election) have been too frequent and too well documented to be dismissed casually. A direct popular election of the President would tend to encourage vote frauds wherever the opportunity presented itself, and the efforts of such misconduct would have direct repercussions beyond the political subdivisions in which such activity occurred.

Aside from the above considerations in opposition to the direct election plan (admitting that those who favor such a plan would dismiss these considerations as being nebulous political philosophy) there is a very practical and politically real justification for opposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to authorize direct popular vote elections of the President. We are all aware that a substantive change in the method of electing our President and Vice President requires the formality of a Constitutional Amendment. This formality means that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the states, through their legislatures must approve of any proposed change. Any political pragmatist should recognize without belabor-

ing the point that only a relatively small number of states would receive political advantage from a direct popular vote. Indeed, the majority of states stand to lose considerably in their political influence at the time of the Presidential election. Under such circumstances, it is unrealistic to propose a change which will never become law by reason of the political facts of our nation's life.

I need not be redundant by continuing to express the reasons for my opposition to direct popular election of our President. Let it suffice that in the face of both political philosophy and the unyielding realities of political opposition from the states, the arguments in favor of such a proposal cannot survive.

President Nixon himself has spoken as an advocate of the proposal under which the electoral votes in each state would be apportioned so as to reflect the percentage of the popular vote cast in each state for the contending Presidential aspirants. While I am confident that the President and his advisors have given the matter of electoral reform great thought, the President in his proposal has suggested further that the office of elector be abolished and that the votes which would otherwise be cast by an individual elector should be credited to the proper political party which would automatically be credited to the respective Presidential candidates.

I would have no reluctance in abolishing the office of elector. While the office of elector served a purpose in colonial America, with its disadvantages in communication, transportation, and education, the system is an anachronism in the light of modern technology.

I do confess, however, to reservations about the proposal for abolishment of the electoral votes. I feel that the same problem of disproportionate influence by political party leaders in major metropolitan areas would exist under this proposal to almost the same degree as under a direct election plan.

I also fear, again, that vote frauds in a few precincts could have repercussions throughout the state and ultimately the nation. In short, I fear that the proposal is only a short step away from the direct popular vote proposal and that the same objections are valid for both.

I note with some interest that while candidate Nixon was a strong advocate of the proportional election plan, he has not seen fit to press such a proposal upon the Congress. I suspect that further thought has given the President cause to reconsider his position taken during the campaign, and I doubt if he would have strong opposition to a district election proposal.

I have become an advocate of the system which some refer to as the district election plan as first advocated by Senator Karl Mundt of South Dakota. Under the Mundt proposal the Presidential candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in a Congressional District would receive the electoral vote which that Congressional District represents. I am assuming that everyone is aware that at the present time one electoral vote is authorized for each Congressional District in a state plus two electoral votes for the Senators of that state. The electoral votes allowed for the two Senatorial seats under the direct election plan would be credited in accordance with the plurality of the popular vote cast throughout the state.

Presidential aspirants would be compelled to show interest and give attention to the less heavily populated states and areas of our country, thus preserving the balance of urban vs. rural influences.

In the event of vote frauds, the effects of such frauds would generally be confined to the Congressional District within which such occurred, although it would have a bearing on the credits allowed for the state at large electoral votes.

Many of our colleagues are unaware that

the district election proposal, in substance, was in effect for many years. In the early 1800's each Congressional District did elect its own elector and each elector was beholden only to the voters of his district. The strongest argument for the reimplementation of the district plan is a repudiation of the motives which led to its demise.

It became increasingly apparent to the political bosses of the political party having a predominant power in their respective states that the most practical way of continuing political control of the White House was to abolish the district plan and to adopt a "winner-take-all" method of casting the electoral votes for a particular state. Thus, the political party having the dominant statewide influence began forcing through the state legislatures (over which they likewise held political control) legislation to permit the presidential candidate receiving the plurality of the popular vote cast in the state to receive 100% of the Electoral vote. Thus, we arrived at the indefensible position we are in today whereby a Presidential candidate could receive as little as 34% of the popular vote in a state and yet receive 100% of the electoral vote. When we consider that the successful candidate receiving 34% of the vote might well have received 90% of his votes in one heavily populated area of his state, while other candidates receiving approximately $\frac{1}{3}$ of the popular votes cast (and possibly more realistically reflecting the wishes of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the voters in the state) would receive absolutely no electoral votes, one can be left with a genuine sense of disbelief. That such a gross inequity is possible in a society which prides itself on fair play for all of its citizens, makes the system intolerable.

The need for reform in our electoral system has been with us for many years. The public sentiment for reform is greater today than at any time in my memory. We are facing today the first opportunity for meaningful action that has existed for possibly 100 years. Such an opportunity may not present itself again within the lifetimes of anyone of us. The possibilities for gross injustices, and perhaps tragedy, under our present system continues unabated. In the light of the continuing possibility of tragedy we cannot permit this rare opportunity to pass without action.

I sincerely urge the members of this committee as well as the members of this Congress to give the thoughts which I have presented today their most sincere consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE STUCKEY'S POSITION ON INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

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

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, I have become increasingly concerned with developments relating to the minimum commission rate structure now in effect on the New York Stock Exchange. In *Silver v. New York Stock Exchange*, 373 U.S. 341, 357, the Supreme Court of the United States has indicated that it believes that the minimum commission rate structure relies upon an antitrust exemption which "is to be regarded as implied only if necessary to make the Securities Exchange Act work, and even then only to the minimum extent necessary."

Last year in connection with the Securities Exchange Commission's proposed rule 10b-10, the U.S. Department of Jus-

tice filed a memorandum questioning whether the New York Stock Exchange's minimum commission rate is essential to its functions under the act. The rules of the New York Stock Exchange dealing with minimum commission rates date back to the celebrated "Buttonwood Tree Agreement" in 1792. Basically, the minimum rate structure results from rules prescribing a flat rate fixed minimum commission to be charged by the New York Stock Exchange members on all exchange transactions. A rate preference is given to New York Stock Exchange members as opposed to nonmembers—both nonmember broker dealers and the public—for the service of clearing and executing securities transactions.

As I understand it, as early as 1913 the famous Pujo Committee recognized the importance of the New York Stock Exchange's minimum commission rate, and stated the philosophy of this rate to be that the New York Stock Exchange should be protected against any kind of price competition between members that would lower the service and threaten the responsibility of members.

I believe that a minimum commission rate is essential to the operation of an effective exchange market and is in the public interest. By limiting ruinous business competition it necessarily fosters vigorous competition in the quality of service rendered. Also, a reasonable minimum rate removes a major threat to the continued solvency of member organizations. Any breakdown of investor confidence in the securities brokerage community would send shock waves through the national economy which could trigger a financial disaster. This matter is of importance. I do not believe it can be left as a continuing controversy between the Department of Justice, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the New York Stock Exchange, and non-member broker dealers. I believe it involves policy considerations which should be determined by the Congress.

Therefore, I have introduced a proposed amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which would clearly exempt a New York Stock Exchange reasonable minimum rate structure from the antitrust laws, provided bona fide nonmembers are given reasonable access and are not subjected to discriminatory rate differentials.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION THAT VISITED PRAGUE FOR MEETINGS WITH CZECHOSLOVAK LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 I was a part of a congressional delegation that visited Prague for meetings with Czechoslovak legislative leaders. Since then the U.S.S.R. whose military forces led a massive invasion of Czechoslovakia on last August 20, has tightened its grip. The country is now firmly under the control of the U.S.S.R.

Today, I salute the Czechoslovak people who reminded the world after two decades under communism that their desire for freedom still burns brightly.

While we salute these victims of Soviet aggression, let us urge them to meet their trials with a calm determination for open revolt at this time could lead only to a futile bloodletting.

The most tragic figure in Czechoslovakia today is the deposed Alexander Dubcek. In the classic Communist pattern, it is likely that Dubcek will be moved down, step by step, until he disappears from the scene.

One of the more ominous developments in the suppression of Czechoslovakia has been the role of the marshals of the Red army. It has been reported that Marshal Andrei Grechko, the Soviet Defense Minister, personally presented an ultimatum to the President of Czechoslovakia that resulted in his final capitulation to the Soviets.

If the Red army, as reported, is now a dominant part of the political summit in the U.S.S.R., this has serious implications for the United States. More than ever, it means that the men who count in the Kremlin are men who understand and respect only force and the willingness to use it, not wishful thinking, no matter how sincere, and unilateral disarmament.

In view of Marshal Grechko's brutal confrontation with Czechoslovak President Ludvig Svoboda last week, I, for one, would not care to base the security of the United States on the charity and good will of the present leaders of the U.S.S.R. Today, more than ever, President Nixon's decision to move forward with a limited safeguard ABM system is shown to be a prudent step to acquire a measure of insurance that our nuclear deterrence will continue to give pause to any would-be aggressor and protect our country from the threat of nuclear blackmail.

ANARCHY ON CAMPUS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, anarchists and subversives are making an all-out effort to destroy education in America. We must meet this grave threat with calmness, but with firmness. It is a diabolical, sinister threat to our private enterprise system, to public education, and to the very security of this Nation and that of the free world. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this is an effort by a very small trained group to destroy this Nation and its great institutions. It is aimed at the heart of America. It is well financed and trained in subversion. It is an important part of the cold war design and aggression against the free world and against America, particularly, as the heart and core of freedom and arsenal of democracy.

No thinking American wants to see our Armed Forces, or the National Guard, or the local law-enforcement agencies, deployed on the campus; but Mr. Speaker, this will come as a last resort to protect our great basic fundamental institutions.

Government property must and will be protected on the campus if it becomes necessary to save our ROTC program and our research programs on defense, space, and nuclear energy. Those of us in the

Federal Government prefer to see our school authorities take the necessary action to preserve their right of administrative authority. We would like to see the school authorities make the firm decisions and take the stand necessary to protect life and property in the academic community. Unless school administrators take a firm stand to prevent anarchy, government—local, State, and National—will have to enforce law and order with armed might. Government—local, State and National—has an obligation to protect the 95 percent of good loyal American citizens who want to attend college, if this protection cannot be accomplished by school administrators.

It is incredible and unbelievable to see armed anarchists capture administration buildings, kidnap the presidents, deans, and trustees, occupy ROTC buildings, and hold the officials of colleges by force until their demands are met. This is un-American activity. This is anarchy. It is the method of dictators and enemies of democracy and academic freedom. Taking over the administration of our educational institutions by force until irrational and bizarre demands are met is the same principle as taking over Congress or the State legislatures or the city councils until their memberships agree to pass certain legislation. It is the same principle as taking over a bank by force and holding officials until certain loans or demands of money are met. This use of force in administration buildings by hard-core trained anarchists must be met by a counterforce which will protect the majority and assure the continuance of education.

Lawbreakers, gangsters, and anarchists on the campus must be dealt with as lawbreakers elsewhere. They should be expelled and then prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. If not actually enrolled in the university or educational institution, they should be immediately arrested and prosecuted for violation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Adolph Hitler's birthday. It might be well for us all to remember that this raving racist took over the most literate nation in the world on a wave of book burning, riots, anarchy, and even the burning of the Reichstag, the German congress. Good and educated people at first thought him better than anarchy. When they woke up, it was too late. The German people were enslaved with concentration camps, liquidations, elimination of educational freedom, and stark slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will demand that those in authority protect our right of trial by jury, freedom of assembly, all of our basic freedoms, and yes, the right of young America to an education.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON TAX REFORM

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in President Nixon's message to the Congress on the reform of our Federal tax system. He stated

that this reform is long overdue. All America agrees. In his long message he made only one specific recommendation to the Congress and that was the repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

For a number of years I have been one of the Members who has consistently fought in the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House calling for the elimination of fantastic and fraudulent loopholes and I am happy to hear words come from one of the Republican leaders that his party is awakening to the necessity of tax reform.

The President's message of today was merely a repetition of a statement made by Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS some weeks ago, "that the 7-percent investment tax credit be repealed." The American public will be anxiously waiting for a message from the White House recommending the repeal of the major tax loopholes, which if curtailed or repealed, will bring upward of \$15 billion annually into the Federal Treasury.

I do hope in his next message on tax loopholes, the President will take the initiative and cooperate with the Members of Congress who have been advocating curtailment or complete repeal of the 27½-percent oil depletion bonanza along with the reduction of many other fantastic credit exemptions and other tax-dodging legislation which the highly financed oil tax lobbies have succeeded in placing on our Federal statute books during the last 25 years.

In order to be brief, so that the public may understand what the situation is, I am herewith resubmitting a statement which I and others Members have made, setting out from the comparative Federal tax payments made by two major segments of our economy which make their profits from beneath the ground.

The powerful oil lobbies over the years have succeeded in securing congressional enactment of depletions, credits, exemptions to such a degree many large companies with a net income of multimillions are, in some cases paying taxes as low as 1 percent on net annual income. One large company with profits ranging from \$61,110,000 in 1962 and similar increased amounts of income in 1963, 1964, and 1965 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever.

Standard Oil of New Jersey in 1962 with \$1,271,903,000 annual income paid six-tenths of 1-percent tax on their fabulous profits. In the following 4 years their percentage tax on similar profits ranged as follows:

Year	Net income before tax	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Standard Oil (New Jersey) 1962	\$1,271,903,000	0.6
1963	1,584,469,000	4.3
1964	1,628,555,000	1.7
1965	1,679,675,000	4.9
1966	1,830,944,000	6.3
Atlantic Oil 1962	61,110,000	0
1963	56,747,000	0
1964	61,081,000	0
1965	105,299,000	0
1966	127,384,000	0

I could go on and name other large companies who are in the same category as the above two mentioned.

On the other hand, as a comparison as to what some large companies paid in taxes, I might mention three coal companies. Evidently the coal companies do not have the powerful lobby in Washington as "big oil." These statistics follow:

Year	Gross profit	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Consolidation Coal Co. 1964	\$44,863,073	26
1963	39,568,573	28
1962	32,918,065	26
Pittston Co. 1964	13,721,024	30
1963	()	
1962	14,699,420	35
Island Creek Coal Co. 1964	7,713,060	18
1963	5,149,930	24
1962	3,459,563	21

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS HELP FOR WATER AND HOUSING

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of concern the fact that the President is recommending substantial reductions in funds for rural water and sewer systems and for very low-income housing in rural areas. I am extremely disappointed in the President's action in this regard because it had been my impression that he realized the importance of these programs to rural America. Apparently he does not.

In his acceptance of the Republican nomination for President, Mr. Nixon said:

I see a day when life in rural America attracts people to the country, rather than driving them away.

Personally, I can think of nothing which will drive away people from rural America faster than denying them the water and sewer systems and the housing they so vitally need. The action of the President in proposing a reduction in funds for rural water and sewer projects borders on a callous disregard for the welfare of rural Americans.

I shall oppose these reductions and will do all I can to see that funds for these important programs are made available at least in the amount recommended by President Johnson.

During the 8 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations over 260 water and sewer projects were financed for small towns in Oklahoma by the Farmers Home Administration. If President Nixon goes through with his proposal to cut back funds for such projects, it will mean a substantial reduction in the number of water and sewer systems which can be built in rural areas.

I believe that construction of rural water and sewer systems lays the basis for the industrial development and growth of rural towns and communities and that without an up-to-date water and sewer system a community cannot expect to attract a substantial industry.

The President does not seem to realize that industrial development in rural areas can be a major factor in reducing the many problems faced by our

great urban areas with their rapidly expanding populations.

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation is faced with a critical shortage of softwood lumber and plywood needed to build our housing requirements of 26 million units within the next decade. Redwood is classified as a softwood and is widely used in construction. Redwood timber is in fact, intermingled with construction timber species such as Douglas-fir.

Douglas-fir is the preeminent construction material from the West and constitutes a high percentage of both the softwood lumber and plywood production in the United States.

It is not my purpose today to discuss the recurring question of parkland in preference to producing forest lands which has come to mark conservation thinking in the United States.

My purpose is, rather, to urge the Congress to clarify in its own minds the difference between "commercial timberlands" and "land reserved for other purposes." This differentiation has become critical as a consequence of the unprecedented demand for housing and the tight supply of timber to provide the materials necessary to meet that demand.

Recent hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee for 5 days investigated the root causes of softwood lumber and plywood short supply and historically high prices. It became manifest early in those hearings that the Federal Government, which owns the predominant share of softwood sawtimber inventory, was not making that timber available for manufacture. Neither has the Forest Service, which administers 54 percent of that inventory, been able to apply modern forestry techniques to realizing the maximum yield from those forest stands.

The Chief of the Forest Service testified that with assurance of continuous investment money and development funds to maximize the yield and growth of our national forest, it would be possible to increase the present annual harvest by as much as two-thirds, or roughly the 8 billion board feet which building experts say we are now deficient.

Chief Cliff, the industry witnesses, the private and State forestry professionals, and other highly qualified spokesmen for various groups, including conservation organizations, made clear that they were concerned only with applying modern management techniques to lands which the Federal agencies themselves had classified as "commercial forest lands."

There is no intention on the part of anyone to invade the parks, the wilderness or primitive areas, or other reserved lands, where timber harvest is already eternally barred.

A witness for the Sierra Club testified, in fact, that he would support increased appropriations for the Forest Service to practice intensive forest management

techniques and consequent increased allowable cuts so long as these measures were undertaken with full consideration of the other values of the forests such as recreation, fish and wildlife, forage, and watershed. All of these values are obligatory concerns of the Forest Service under the Multiple Use Act of 1960, and must be honored.

The Sierra Club witness explained his radical departure from previous club expressions in this regard by pointing out that better management of "commercial forest lands" by the Federal Government would serve to relieve pressures against parks, wilderness, primitive, and other scenic areas.

Today I am joining the distinguished chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), in introducing legislation, entitled the "National Timber Supply Act," to enable the Forest Service to apply maximum modern management to the commercial forest lands in its charge so that all of the people can realize the full timber benefits available from these replenishable timberlands.

Passage of the Housing Act of 1968 took cognizance of the national obligation to provide adequate housing to all Americans. Its goal of furnishing 26 million units of housing over the next decade is a worthy one.

Accomplishment of this public objective, however, will impose increased demands upon suppliers of building materials to gear production to increased market requirements.

Lumber and plywood are two basic commodities required in construction. Both of these items have been in short supply during the second half of 1968 as the direct result of an increase in the rate of new home construction. That shortage resulted in rapidly increasing prices and delivery delays which upset construction schedules and accelerated rising construction costs. It is clearly evident that the impact of fulfilling the market requirements of the Housing Act of 1968 will require, over the next decade, maximum responsible utilization of available timber resources within the United States.

Almost two-thirds of the Nation's softwood timber is on Federal public lands. Industrial and other private timber holdings are already being harvested at close to maximum justifiable rates compatible with sound forest management. This is not true of national forest commercial timberlands, principally because the Federal appropriation process does not provide a system for assured investment of funds for the purpose of improving timber growth and yield, and partly because timber management policies are not firmly and permanently oriented to improvement of timber growth and yield.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate committee on November 26, 1968:

In addition to the Douglas-fir Supply Study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on National Forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more pro-

ductive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of increased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs.

He further stated that he could not sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of this bill to create a responsible and continuing method for the Federal Government to provide the competence necessary to increase timber growth so that forest products can be harvested at rates that will meet public requirements for building and other needs.

The national forests contain an estimated 1,121 billion board feet of sawtimber, which is more than half of the Nation's present supply. The national forests therefore merit intensified scrutiny to insure that they are managed for high level effectiveness in meeting the Nation's timber needs. They were reserved from the public domain almost three quarters of a century ago largely because of concern generated by the false premise of an immediately impending national timber famine. With projected demands for wood product consumption showing a steady rise, the national forests must play an increasingly important role in growing and supplying the necessary timber. Despite ownership of more than half of the Nation's present timber resources, only about one out of every three logs made into lumber or plywood now comes from the national forests. Although large volumes of timber are sold for receipts exceeding \$200 million, it is nonetheless true that the commercial timberlands of the national forests are an underutilized and underdeveloped resource. With a wood product scarcity now at hand, the Nation can no longer afford the luxury of semimanagement for more than half of its softwood sawtimber supply.

The proposed National Timber Supply Act is intended to ameliorate the present situation of inefficiency. It would provide congressional directives for creating and implementing more effective management of national forest timber for the purpose of assuring increasing supplies of wood to meet increasing demands. The act contains three broad directives upon which harvesting rates are to be premised.

These three statements would require taking into account: first, tree size requirements of markets and industrial techniques which can reasonably be anticipated by the early part of the 21st century as these market requirements and techniques become apparent; second, comparisons of gains and losses caused by withholding the harvest of overmature timber with the gains and losses resulting from conversion of the acres now serving as storehouses for overmature timber into growing new timber crops; and, third, the effects of intensive management measures for which financing provisions are made in the act.

The proposed National Timber Supply Act would establish a special fund to as-

sure long-term financing of the management and development measures essential for optimum timber productivity on the national forests. The fund would be called the "high timber yield fund" and would be financed from national forest timber sale receipts.

Establishment of such a high timber yield fund in the Treasury to finance optimum timber productivity on the commercial timberlands of the national forests is necessary for assuring continuity of effort and objective. The intensive management measures necessary to increase timber yield must, to be effective, be applied continuously, and not on a stop-and-go basis. If harvest-rate determinations are made on the premise that future yields will be those obtainable from intensive management there must be assurance that intensive management will occur. The high timber yield fund supplies this assurance.

The plan to finance the high timber yield fund from timber receipts assures that expenditures will be kept in step with the significance of national forest timber to the economy. Other safeguards in the proposals are:

First. The life of the fund is limited to 25 years. This limitation will force a review based on accumulated experience before the fund is renewed; otherwise a full-scale review might never occur.

Second. Section 5 of the bill requires that expenditures from the fund be made only after appropriation. This insures regular congressional review and approval of the program of activities to be financed from the fund.

Third. Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within 2 years be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This provision insures that deposits in excess of needs will not be accumulated in the fund.

The portion of national forest receipts which under existing law are paid to the States or other special funds would not be disturbed by the enactment of the National Timber Supply Act. This, the 25 percent of national forest receipts payment to States—16 U.S.C. 500—and 10 percent of national forest receipts for roads and trails—16 U.S.C. 501—would not be changed.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allotments from the fund will be made by national forests in substantially the same proportion as the contribution to the fund originated from each forest. There are eight listed broad purposes for which allotted funds could be used. These purposes are:

First. Obtaining regeneration at earliest practical date after harvesting and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands. This would permit planting or seeding of cutover lands in the first planting season after slash disposal or after termination of harvesting operations where slash disposal is unnecessary. The objective is to establish full stocking with a minimum delay in regeneration. Reforestation of unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands is also included. Such seeding or planting of unsatisfactorily stocked areas would be limited to timberlands of good potential for commercial timber production.

Second. Precommercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition. Such thinnings are the primary means to accelerate growth at an early age. They are also an effective means to favor production of desirable species.

Third. Semicommercial thinnings both to control spacing and composition and to produce material with value for commercial utilization in excess of additional costs required for its production. Semicommercial thinning is a step between precommercial thinning and commercial thinning. Precommercial thinnings deal with material that is unusable because of its small size. Semicommercial thinnings produce material acceptable for commercial utilization especially pulpwood but for which full production and delivery costs exceed its market value. Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it—minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization—does not exceed its value.

Fourth. Pruning if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable. Some desirable tree species retain juvenile limbs on the lower bole for excessive periods. In such circumstances pruning at an early age is a necessary and justifiable activity to obtain logs suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

Fifth. Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for harvest sales. Such sales have never been financed to the extent of their full potential by regular timber sale appropriations. Financing of sale preparation for thinning and salvage sales from the high timber yield fund is needed to market the very significant timber volumes now being lost through overcrowding or deterioration.

Sixth. Road construction in advance of planned harvesting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales and for protection against ravages of fire and insect. Thinning and salvage sales alone can rarely support road construction. Hence, thinning and salvage cutting is now generally limited to roaded areas.

This provision would finance road construction to standards necessary to facilitate thinning and salvage cutting in unroaded areas, and would incidentally supply access needed for protection purposes. It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

Seventh. Fertilization of good sites to increase timber growth rates is now being undertaken by several major industrial timberland owners in the Northwest and the South. Fertilization is a promising avenue to increase yields and shorten rotations. As further knowledge of costs and return develop, it is logical that the high timber yield fund be used for fertilization on suitable Federal timberlands.

Eighth. Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth

characteristics. Work is underway by both the Forest Service and industry to identify superior seed sources and develop seed orchards for volume production of superior seed. The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

Ninth. Implementing other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common purpose of all eight of these listed cultural practices is to increase timber yields on the national forests above those yields presently attainable from the regularly financed activities. The high timber yield fund is designed to provide the additional effort to work toward optimum yields. It is not expected to displace the regular financing of Federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests, or the forest development road program.

I believe that every resource in America must be fully developed to meet the needed housing challenges of America. There is no greater challenge than providing a suitable home for everyone. We cannot meet that challenge without our forest resources realizing their full potential yield and productivity. I am persuaded that the Forest Service has the skill to accomplish this undertaking and that the National Timber Supply Act will provide the means.

It is my earnest hope that every Member of this distinguished body in considering this legislation will keep clearly in mind that it does not alter in any way the clear separation between "commercial forest lands" and other reserved lands and does not therefore constitute a threat of any kind to the preservation of beauty and the joys of the spirit resident in our national parks, wilderness, and primitive areas. This bill deserves total support of the Congress and I intend to work for its passage as hard as I know how.

OVERSEAS EDUCATION

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill entitled "The National Overseas Education Act of 1969" to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to transfer responsibility for the American overseas dependent school system from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I had the opportunity, in 1965, to visit many of these schools and to learn firsthand of the problems confronting both students and teachers. Many of these problems stem from the fact that education is not a primary mission of the Department of Defense and is therefore given a much lower priority in that Department than should be the case. Any American school system should rightly be entrusted to an agency whose primary concern is education; an agency whose members are oriented toward education and its needs. Other of the problems, such as those concerning housing as-

signments, tenure and commissary privileges, stem from DOD's proper orientation toward military needs and military prerogatives. The problems in this second category pose a particularly difficult situation for the civilian teachers since, when they feel themselves aggrieved, they must seek redress from the same authority which caused the grievance in the first place. These problems would be greatly ameliorated by placing the schools, the teachers, and the students under an agency whose direct and primary responsibility they are; an agency oriented to their needs and charged to act on their behalf.

Such an agency would be created under the provisions of my bill. This agency would be the National Overseas Education Board, appointed by the President, operating within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on a direct appropriation from that Department.

The President would appoint to the National Overseas Education Board, eight members, five of whom would be civilians and three military members. The Board would make all decisions relating to curriculum, all personnel policies—pay, tenure, hiring and firing, transfers, assignments and grievances—use of facilities and the opening and closing of the schools.

American dependent children in overseas areas are presented with a unique and exciting educational opportunity. To truly capitalize on this opportunity, we should provide them with a school system run by educators who are aware of the special overseas opportunities and dedicated to the profession of education. The overseas school system should be something far more and far better than merely an extra, and often undesired, housekeeping chore for our busy military commands.

My bill is designed to bring about that highly desirable change, and I urge its enactment.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S COMMITMENT TO TAX REFORMS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon has made clear the commitment of his administration to providing the Nation with a fair and equitable tax system; a tax system which will insure that all citizens will bear a fair share of the burden of supporting our Government, and that none will be taxed excessively.

The President's call for a complete overhaul of our tax structure is commendable and deserves the support of every Member of this Congress. Only through extensive reform can we remove the archaic inequities built into the tax structure over the past decades. Thus the President has directed the Secretary of the Treasury to thoroughly review the entire Federal tax system and make

recommendations for basic changes by November 30.

In the interim, President Nixon has recommended a number of reforms which will bring a great deal more equity to our system of taxation than now exists. In the past many individuals with substantial incomes have successfully avoided paying any taxes. Many of the provisions in our tax laws which permitted this to occur have now outlived their usefulness. The administration's proposals will correct this situation by levying a "minimum income tax" setting a 50-percent limitation on the use of special tax preferences.

Enactment of the proposed "low income allowance" will exempt more than 2 million low-income families from Federal income taxation, insuring that families living in poverty do not have to bear the additional burden of inequitable taxes while others with substantial resources escape taxation altogether. The proposal, if enacted, will raise the minimum levels of income subject to taxation. Thus a family of four with an income below \$3,500 will not have to pay any Federal income taxes. At present such a family with an income in excess of \$3,000 is forced to draw upon their already meager resources to contribute what for them is a substantial sum. These provisions will constitute genuine relief for the elderly, the young, the disadvantaged, and handicapped.

In addition, the President has called for reforms affecting nonbusiness and charitable deductions, exempt private organizations, and the practice of using multiple subsidiaries and affiliated corporations to take undue advantage of the lower tax rates on the first \$25,000 of income.

All of these proposals are reasonable and take into account the fact that any sweeping reforms must be carefully thought out. The point is not that all tax preferences are unwarranted, but rather that some have been abused, and others have outlived their usefulness to the Nation. As President Nixon stated in his release of April 21:

When the preference device provides more social benefit than Government collection and spending, the "incentive" should be expanded; when the preference is inefficient or subject to abuse, it should be ended.

I applaud the President's firm stand on behalf of a fair and equitable tax structure and hope that my colleagues in both the House and Senate will give their wholehearted support to these vital proposals.

THE EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM IN ACTION IN SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation establishing the Emergency Consumers Small Loan Act of 1969 which would make the emergency small loan program a separate program under the community action program. Separate appropriations would

be provided under the Economic Opportunity Act thus returning the program to its pre-1968 status. In the 1968 fiscal year separate funds were provided; subsequently, the program was made a discretionary function of the community action program and primarily limited to the initial 15 "demonstration programs." The programs were continued, despite the complete allocation of the initial funds, through loan repayments and limited administrative funds. My proposal now has some urgency since OEO's authorization for the program expires in June.

In order to better understand the nature of the emergency loan program and assess its success, I have surveyed the local programs. The results have been encouraging and a word should be said so that some of the efforts will not go unnoticed. In San Antonio, Tex., the San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organization, Inc., operates a credit union, the SANYO Federal Credit Union, through which applicants of the emergency loan program are processed. The residents of San Antonio, Tex., are ably represented in Congress by the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ whose credentials concerning the problems of the poor are among the most distinguished in Congress. The SANYO Federal Credit Union is owned by the residents of the Neighborhood Councils of San Antonio and by the employees of SANYO. Those applicants who are unable to meet minimum collateral requirements of the credit union are automatically referred to the emergency loan program. The coordination of efforts involved in the attack upon the problems of the poor is quite extensive as indicated by the fact that 50 percent of the loan recipients are on welfare. The concept of providing emergency family loans for the poor as well as the solvents has apparently been adopted by other groups not funded by the emergency loan program thereby giving our program that much greater leverage.

As of January 31, 1969, the emergency loan program in San Antonio had made 741 loans, amounting to \$103,016.71. Of these loans, 101 have been completely repaid, returning \$20,410.99 to the loan fund. In all, \$37,917.77 has been repaid along with interest of \$616.12; the interest is forwarded to the U.S. Treasury. Forty-seven loans, amounting to \$6,430.74 have been refinanced and 456 loans, or \$54,939.74 in loan funds, are considered delinquent; no moneys have been charged off but \$13,523 is anticipated to be uncollectable. The amount delinquent has to be considered within the context of the type of program we have established and the nature of the clientele it serves. The program has no legal provisions for collection and seeks to avoid undue harassment of the poor; rather, a great degree of flexibility is allowed the administrators in dealing with the loan recipients so that they can attempt to instill the dignity, confidence and other basic ingredients requisite to productive citizenship.

I have detailed the workings of the emergency loan program in San Antonio as I did earlier for the programs in St. Louis and among the Indians of the Rosebud, S. Dak. reservation, in order to

emphasize the national magnitude of the problem of poverty while at the same time not losing sight of the particular circumstances in which poverty occurs. I hope I have been able to show how responsive the poor are to a little encouragement and how integral are the factors of pride and dignity to the composite of personal resources necessary for successful extrication from the morass of a poverty-ridden life. Consequently, the emergency loan program should be extended so that the poor, not only in San Antonio, Tex., but in all parts of the country, might be given the opportunity to help themselves.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CARE-TAKER GOVERNMENT IN GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, April 21, marks the second anniversary of the caretaker government which during the past 2 years has brought progress and stability to Greece.

It was 2 years ago today that Premier Papadopoulos, Deputy Premier Patakos, and Minister of Coordination Makarezos, themselves at the time colonels in the Greek Army, led a group of their fellow Army officers in a bloodless revolt against the forces of Greece which had brought that nation to the brink of ruin and anarchy.

After the coup, the reaction of the Greek people was: "What kept you so long in coming?"

During these 2 ensuing years, these three Greek patriots and their fellow officers have restored to Greece a tranquility which that nation has not known for more than 21 years during which this ancient citadel of democracy lived in constant turmoil.

The United States showed sound judgment when it recognized this new Government and during the past 2 years has been working closely with this Government to restore parliamentary rule as quickly as possible.

Two years ago when the Greek Army Colonels saved their nation from a collapse which would have delivered her unquestionably into Communist hands, they promised they would restore order out of chaos in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, today on the second anniversary, it is obvious they have kept their word.

Since the coup d'etat, the caretaker government promised it would move toward restoration of a constitution and election of a Parliament to manage Greek affairs in the spirit of democracy.

The former colonels had kept their word in giving the Greek people an opportunity to vote on a constitution which has been hailed by students of political science as an outstanding document spelling out and guaranteeing freedom and human dignity for the people of Greece.

Last night in Athens more than 60,000 people jammed into the national stadium, and during a colorful 2-hour performance of folk dancing, singing, and

patriotic demonstrations, the citizens of Greece honored the second anniversary—and they gathered there from their own free will with no compulsion.

The caretaker Government held an election in which 92 percent of the voters approved the constitution.

Premier Papadopoulos and his associates have taken direct steps to implement the constitution as quickly as possible. Last week Premier Papadopoulos announced that three of 12 key articles of the new constitution were being placed into effect. These articles restored the rights of the people to peaceful assembly, lawful association, and the inviolability of the home.

In my most recent discussions with the leaders of the Greek Government, they have indicated their strong desire to effectuate the other articles in the constitution establishing freedom of the press, freedom from arbitrary arrest, organization of political parties, and parliamentary and local elections as quickly as possible.

Mr. Papadopoulos, according to the New York Times of this morning, said last night in Athens in a radio broadcast:

The revolution of April 21 represents the greatest and most serious effort of rehabilitation, reorganization and cleansing made since the beginning of national independence.

He added:

Our friends have convinced themselves that a great task of a broader nature is being accomplished here and our enemies must come to realize that they labor against us but sadly in vain.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the attacks against the caretaker government in Greece have come mostly from the same people who have very little confidence in the survival of our own American institutions of democracy. These are to a great extent the same people who have always had a ready apology for the Communists but a quick denunciation of anyone who dares speak out in strong terms against Communist oppression.

I have personally visited Greece and I have talked to the people of that nation during the last 2 years. One could not deny that the ancient traditions of democracy which first found expression on the historical lands of Greece are not being fully practiced in that nation by the caretaker government today.

To some extent, martial law still prevails.

But I sincerely believe that this caretaker government, headed by Premier Papadopoulos, is making an honest and sincere effort toward restoring constitutional government to Greece as quickly as possible.

Premier Papadopoulos and Deputy Premier Patakos, and their associate, Minister Makarezos, as well as all of the Greek soldiers who participated in the coup, are fiercely patriotic Greeks. Their Greek nationalism is overwhelming and there is no question in my mind they know better than anyone else that the indomitable spirit of freedom which has been a part of Greek heritage since the beginning of time cannot be suppressed indefinitely. It is because of this knowledge that Premier Papadopoulos is sin-

cerely and honestly today trying to move his nation in the direction of restoring full parliamentary rule to Greece as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this second anniversary of the Greek Government shows the great progress that has been made in that nation. Perhaps the most impressive measure of progress and confidence in Greece is the fact that foreign investors are investing in Greece now as never before.

Greece today stands as America's most reliable ally in Europe. The Greek caretaker Government is the only government of Europe that can make a promise to America and make good on that promise.

Greece today stands as our great source of defense in the Mediterranean and on this second anniversary, it is safe to state that as a member of NATO, America needs Greece a great deal more than Greece needs America.

Recently Deputy Premier Patakos visited Washington. It was reassuring the extent to which he was greeted by the most important leaders in our Government. Deputy Premier Patakos assured our leaders of his country's continuing desire to remain a faithful ally of the United States and I was pleased to see that mutual expressions were made to him that America wants to continue her historic ties with Greece.

As fellow members of NATO, it was apparent the mutual cause of freedom we both as nations defend in Europe makes America and Greece the warmest of allies.

Deputy Premier Patakos represented his nation well while visiting Washington and won for his Government's efforts to save Greece from the Communists, the most inspiring and warmest appreciation.

During these past 2 years, progress in Greece has been impressive and I would like to review some of that progress.

Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report from Premier Papadopoulos and Deputy Premier Patakos, which outlines the progress made during the past 2 years in Greece. I should like to include this memorandum in the RECORD today as a review of progress as seen through the eyes of these two Greek leaders and patriots.

The memorandum follows:

REPORT FROM MR. PAPADOPOULOS

A. PART ONE

Having become firmly established in the People's conscience as an event that was both necessary and right in its aims and purposes, the National Revolution of April 21, 1967, is now a historical fact duly recorded in its proper place in the modern history of our Nation.

1. Generative causes of the national revolution

The Revolution of April 21st, the second anniversary of which we are now celebrating under the most auspicious signs, came in direct response to a national command predicated primarily on the following vital needs:

(a) The need to neutralize the spread of communism, which had infiltrated all sectors of Greek life and was threatening a new "round" in its continuing drive to implement its plans for subjugation of our country to Red totalitarianism.

(b) The need to check the headlong downward course of our economy resulting from the corrupt self-interest of the politicians; resulting also from the dwindling of public confidence due to continued political instability and social unrest; from the wasteful spending of public funds; from the trading of favors serving party interests; from the lavish enjoyment of privileges by those friendly to the party in power; and from the failure, arising out of complete indifference in responsible quarters, to organize the economy along sound lines adapted to contemporary international standards.

(c) The need to raise the standard of living of the People; to reduce and, if possible, to eliminate unemployment; and to create new employment opportunities for the Nation's labor force.

(d) The need to reorganize Greece from the roots up, both as a State and as a political economic and social entity, by revising the National constitution and thereby providing the foundation for legislation introducing new, modernized institutions.

2. Objectives successfully attained

The Revolution of April 21st was bloodless because, in effect, it came in response to the desire of the Greek people for an end to the ills with which the country had been cumulatively burdened by inefficient and often unscrupulous politicians, and it attained its objectives in full, notably:

(a) Within hours of its assumption of power, it dislocated the red conspiracy with devastating rapidity.

(b) It averted economic disaster at the eleventh hour through rigorous implementation of a spirit of thrift and careful husbanding of the public funds.

(c) It effectively neutralized the old-line party politicians, who were deprived of the possibility of any further activity harmful to the national interest.

(d) It transformed Greece from a country governed by mob-rule into an oasis of calm and order in a turbulent Europe. Greece is internationally recognized today as a force for peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and as a strong outpost in the defensive structure of the West.

3. The new constitution

It was evident from the very first that the Revolution of April 21st was here not merely to demolish the corrupt and barren past; it was here to build too. Thus began a new, truly creative era for Greece; it began, from the very first days of the Revolution, with the erection of the framework:

(a) A new Constitution. The supreme law of the land. A modern Charter adjusted to the facts of Greek life. Its first and foremost aim: to lay the foundation of a Democracy, not only in name but in fact.

(b) The creation, in broad perspective, of a new Greece based on Greco-Christian ideals, enjoying a sound democracy and with its enemies disarmed; a parliamentary system free of the shortcomings of the past; an efficient and active state machinery; citizens who abide by the laws and respect their fellow-citizens; a Government untainted by party politics and paternally inclined toward the young and the weak; and a true social awareness of the freedom of the individual.

(c) The production of a Five-Year Economic Development Plan designed to overcome the barrier of poverty and to bring Greece into the company of developed nations.

4. Strengthening the economy

A strong and sound economy is the essential prerequisite of progress and prosperity. Accordingly, the National Government turned its efforts in this direction, and within a very short period could point to the following achievements:

Monetary stability.

Strong inflationary tendencies checked.

Thrift and restoration to health of the Nation's public finances and its balance of foreign payments.

Restoration of a balanced economy, both internally and in relation to foreign exchange.

The following facts bear witness to the success of the economic policy of the Revolution:

(a) The Drachma is now recognized internationally as the most stable European currency, as noted by the Economic Committee of Europe and by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (O.E.C.D.).

(b) The cost of living index is stabilized today at a level lower than that of April 1967. This is a phenomenon unique in current times, when the cost of living is on the rise in all the countries of the world according to the published comparative figures of the O.E.C.D., the Economic Committee of Europe and the United Nations Organization.

In effect: During the 10-month period from January to October 1968, there was a 0.1% fall in the Greek consumer prices index as against the corresponding 10-month period of 1967. While in the same period there was a cost of living rise in other countries, including some of the most economically advanced (Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, France, U.S.A., Norway), ranging from 1% in W. Germany to 9% in Denmark.

(d) Foreign capital is flowing into Greece in growing amounts for productive investment, a fact that bears witness to the consolidation, on an international scale, of confidence in the country's economic stability and its economic future. The net influx of foreign capital funds in 1968 was \$270 million, and approval was granted, under Law 2687/53 for the importation of investment capital amounting to \$229 million. In addition, special contracts were signed providing for the importation of hundreds of millions of dollars.

(e) At home, too, the confidence shown in the Revolution of April 21st and its economic policy was impressive. Proof is to be found in the increase of private bank deposits, especially small savings accounts; the latter depositors reflect the feeling of the mass of the people. (This increase amounted to Drs. 15.4 billion in 1968—more than three times the 1967 increase).

(f) Figures published by the O.E.C.D. for the increase in industrial production in its 15 member-nations during the period from October 1967 to September 1968 list Greece in third place, with a 12% rise in production.

(g) The volume of bank notes in circulation showed a decreasing trend throughout 1968; it finally fell 300 million (for the first time in the post-war era, during which it had risen steadily). In January 1969 there was a new reduction of Drs. 2,027 million.

(h) The favorable trend in bank deposits and the simplified procedures adopted with regard to credit regulations permitted a substantial increase in the total financing of the economy in 1968: Drs. 12.5 billion, as against Drs. 10.5 billion in 1967 and 9.5 billion in 1966.

Since the Revolution, bank financing of the economy has increased by approx. Drs. 22 billion.

(i) In 1968 the Nation's foreign exchange reserve increased by approx. \$36 million as against an increase of \$13.5 million in 1967. In the period from April 1967 to the end of 1968, the foreign exchange reserve increased by \$57 million to reach a total of \$297 million—an all-time postwar high. This amount does not include Greece's share in the International Monetary Fund, nor does it include the regulatory reserve, in gold pounds, of the Bank of Greece.

In the sector regulated by the Ministry of Finance, the following substantial accomplishments were noted:

(a) A large number of fiscal cases which had been pending for a long time and which cost the State millions of drachmas in lost revenues were processed and settled (approx. 800,000 unverified income tax cases, 450,000 real estate transfer cases, 80,000 cases pending before the tax tribunals).

(b) A fair allocation of the tax burden and effective restriction of tax evasion. (In 1968 the number of personal income tax returns filed by citizens amounted to 450,000, compared with 328,000 in 1967 and 299,000 in 1966).

(c) Simplification and easing of income taxes.

(d) A timely and realistic compilation of the 1969 State Budget, with a surplus of Drs. 2,500 million.

(e) Allocation of Drs. 520 million in 1968 and Drs. 910 million in 1969 for civil service pay increases; allocation of Drs. 1,590 million (total) in 1968 for increases and readjustments of pensions.

(f) Exemption of more than 300,000 small businessmen from the onerous obligation of fiscal bookkeeping.

(g) Cancellation of Drs. 316 million in debts owed by some 1 million needy breadwinners.

5. Support for industry

The Government's policy and activity in the industrial sector has been most fruitful and beneficial to the national economy. Specifically:

(a) Loans granted to industry in 1968 by the National Bank for Industrial Development amounted to Drs. 2,124 million, as against Drs. 1,167 million in 1967 and Drs. 750 million in 1966. Approximately Drs. 1,000 million in investment loans were issued by the other two investment banks.

(b) Permits were issued for the establishment of new industries and the expansion of existing industries, amounting to Drs. 1,389 million.

(c) The drive for the exploitation of mineral deposits was intensified (drilling for offshore oil in the Thermaikos Gulf and research to ascertain the exploitability of uranium deposits); and progress was made in the development of industrial zones.

(d) Electric power was brought to 1,420 villages and settlements at a cost of Drs. 650 million; the number of villages supplied with electric power in 1967 was 1,100. At the same time, 240,000 new consumers were connected to the Public Power Corporation grid. Another 1,400 villages and settlements are scheduled to receive electric power in 1969, for which the necessary appropriations have been allocated. This brings the total to 2,820 villages and settlements receiving new power in a two-year period.

It is worthy of note that from the date of the Revolution to the end of 1968, 2,453 settlements received electric power, and a further 200 in January and February 1969, bringing the total to 2,653, whereas in the 12-year period preceding April 21st, 1967, the number of settlements which received electric power was 2,657.

(e) Progress was made in organizing fishing docks; related industries were established.

(f) A total of Drs. 4,138, 000, 253 of new investments were submitted to the beneficial provisions of Law 4171/61; the compound interest on financing of new investments totalling Drs. 483,318,000 was subsidized.

(g) Financing of the conversion industry benefitted from the new, more flexible regulations for the financing of the economy; on December 31, 1968, this financing amounted to Drs. 34 million, i.e., an increase of Drs. 4.6 billion.

(h) Small industries enjoyed special treatment. In 1968, they received Drs. 600 million worth of financing from the special capital funds reserved for this purpose, mostly with the Government supplying guarantees.

(i) The institution-establishing measure requiring greater participation by domestic industries and small producers in the supplies programs of the State and semi-governmental agencies will contribute to a further increase in production and turnover.

6. Large number of public works projects

Correctly planned, unimpeachably executed and geared exclusively to the national interest, the projects in the Public Works program drawn up in the healthy spirit of April 21st give evidence of exemplary organization.

Some facts and figures from the plentiful 1968 schedule:

(a) Some 1,000 kilometers of new or reconstructed roads, on the national highway level, were opened to traffic (expense: Drs. 2,100 million) and 1,200 kilometers of provincial roads (expense: Drs. 700 million); at the same time, extensive improvements were carried out on all networks.

(b) A contract was concluded with an overseas firm for a loan to cover 70% of the financing of the construction of the major Egnatia highway project (760 kilometers) which will cost \$150 million.

(c) Extensions and renovations of bus routes totalling 150 kilometers (expense: Drs. 230 million) were made.

(d) 2,200 meters of breakwaters and 1,800 meters of piers were constructed in the country's ports.

(e) Drs. 168 million were spent on airport construction, enlargement and facilities.

(f) Land improvement projects covering an area of 485,000 stremmas (121,000 acres) and costing Drs. 900 million were completed; also flood-control projects protecting 266,000 stremmas and consisting Drs. 188 million.

(g) The Pinlow River dam was inaugurated. This is the largest earthen dam in Europe. It was built at a cost of Drs. 3 billion and provides irrigation for 240,000 stremmas.

(h) The problem of the capital's water supply was solved. The waters of the Mornos River were used; this project eliminates once and for all the threat of water-shortage in the Athens area. The Kithalron aqueduct, a Drs. 200 million project, is already under construction.

(i) Drs. 150 million were appropriated for drainage projects in the Athens Valley and for decontaminating the shores of the Saronic Gulf; and a further Drs. 75,000,000 for water-supply and drainage projects in various towns in Greece.

(j) City zoning ordinances were radically revised in line with modern city planning concepts. Suitable housing projects were constructed in execution of the housing program for earthquake victims and slum dwellers.

7. Trade enjoys favorable conditions

Noteworthy progress was made in the sector of commerce, despite unfavorable international economic conditions. The accomplishments were specially evident in foreign trade and increased exports. Specifically:

(a) The exportation of products increased substantially (industrial products: 33%).

(b) The conclusion of new trade agreements and the renewal of existing ones will result in an expected \$20 million increase in exports. In 1968 exports totaled \$456 million. There was an additional benefit to the State of \$90 million in foreign exchange accruing from the replacement of imported products by domestic products in State supplies alone, under the uniform supply program of 1968.

(c) Thanks to the increased influx of foreign exchange, the balance of payments was completely balanced.

8. Greek merchant marine prospers

Thanks to the National Government's maritime policy, Greek merchant shipping, which is rapidly gaining first place in the world, made substantial gains.

(a) Under the Government's policy of financing shipowners up to 80% with the State guaranteeing the loans, orders placed in 1968 totaled 52 ships (total tonnage: 232,000) to be built in Greece, a further 33 passenger vessels, and 41 ships (170,000 tons) to be purchased.

(b) Thanks to the confidence with which the shipping world regards the National Government, the influx of foreign exchange from shipping (freight, repairs, remittance) totaled \$243 million in 1968, as against \$214 million in 1967 and \$182 million in 1966.

(c) An additional 1,165,661 tons of shipping joined the Greek registry, i.e., the highest annual increase to date. On December 31, 1968, there were 1945 ships (total tonnage: 9,215,650) flying the Greek flag. By February 28th, 1969, the number of ships had increased to 1982 (total tonnage: 9,591,087)—an addition of 37 ships, representing 375,437 tons, in the first two months of the current year.

(d) Thanks to facilities made available in Greece, numerous foreign shipping firms have turned to this country, a development of substantial benefit to the national economy. By the end of February 1969, 125 foreign shipping companies had established operation in Greece.

(e) There was a 15% to 22% increase in the pay scale of ship's crews, and further measures have been taken to improve their incomes.

(f) Deposits in foreign exchange by Greek merchant seamen are increasing at an impressive rate (20% to 25% per month); other remittances by sea-going personnel totaled \$50.5 million in 1968—an increase of 23%.

9. Modernized transportation and communications

The results accomplished by the National Government in the field of transportation and communications were on the same high level as its achievement in the other sectors of our national life.

(a) The domestic airline network was further developed, with air service established between Athens and several resort islands; and progress was made in the construction of new facilities at Athens Airport.

(b) The postal services (known in the past as the "slow post") were re-organized along exemplary lines.

(c) The installation of 140,000 new automatic telephone connections was completed (as compared with 110,000 in 1967 and 59,000 in 1966); and in the first two months of 1969, 1300 small provincial exchanges were completed and 4,900 new telephones connected.

(d) A sum of Drs. 610 million was spent on the procurement of new railroad material and rail service improvement projects. New modern coaches and locomotives have been added to existing rolling stock, as well as 400 refrigerator cars to serve the growing requirements of commerce. By February 1969, a further Drs. 7.6 million had been made available for improvement of the railroads' rolling stock.

(e) There was an increase of Drs. 2,780 million in Post Office Saving deposits in 1968.

In addition, the Post Office Savings Banks approved 13,800 housing loans amounting to Drs. 2,730 million (in 1968).

In the first two months of 1969, an additional Drs. 696 million, representing 985 housing loans, were allocated.

10. Benefits for the farmers

Under the slogan "All for the farmer, through a healthy policy", and with an annual increase of 5% in farm incomes as its target, the National Government can point to serious achievements in the agricultural sector.

(a) Drs. 7,764 million worth of farm debts were cancelled.

(b) In 1968, Drs. 2,374 million were allocated in support of farmers' incomes.

(c) A sum of Drs. 4 billion (as against Drs. 1.5 billion in 1966) was allocated through the Agrarian Social Security Fund (OGA) for farmers' pensions and health services.

(d) Farmers' pensions rose 70% and full hospital care was received by 300,000 farmers.

(e) Reforestation reached an all-time annual high in 1968 (473,000 stremmas in 46 village districts).

(f) 26,000 stremmas of land were allocated for the rehabilitation of landless cultivators, and 29,000 ownership titles on farmland provided by the State were issued.

(g) Decent and healthy housing was made available to 56,604 farm families. In 1968, Drs. 1.5 billion were allocated for this purpose, as against Drs. 866.5 million in 1967 and Drs. 94 million in 1966, i.e. more was spent on farm housing in one year than in the entire 20-year period preceding the revolution.

(h) In 1968 the sum total of grants made to agriculture was Drs. 14,600 million, as against Drs. 11,491 million in 1967 and Drs. 9,000 million in 1966.

(i) A sum of Drs. 3,392 million was allocated in 1968 (as against Drs. 2,457 in 1967) for the development of the agricultural economy, and for the improvement and modernization of the farming system through modern technological methods.

(j) Land improvement projects were completed at an increased rate; Drs. 495 million were spent on 45 such projects, and 150,000 stremmas of land covered by the projects were irrigated.

(k) Approval was granted for geo-hydrological studies covering 1,350,000 stremmas (1 million in the Thessaloniki Valley and 350,000 in the Aria Valley). In Crete, the Mesara project will make 200,000 stremmas suitable for cultivation.

(l) Drs. 50 million were allocated for the protection of olive crops from disease, and the necessary airplanes and helicopters were purchased.

(m) Drs. 177 million were allocated in 1967 and Drs. 260 million in 1968 for forest development. These sums were in addition to the \$934,000 allocated by the United Nations special fund for development of the forest economy.

(n) Ten up-to-date new fruit and garden product processing plants were established in 1968; eight fruit-packing plants (the first in Greece) are under construction.

(o) The nationwide refrigerator chain was placed in operation, and refrigerated transportation was made available.

(p) Drs. 70 million were allocated for financing new food processing businesses.

(q) Exports of agricultural products rose substantially, e.g.: canned tomato products, 15,000 tons; fresh fruit, 29,000 tons; citrus fruits, etc. And following the re-opening of the Soufil silk factory, Greece's first silk exports (3,000 kgs) were effected.

(r) 160 new agricultural engineers were appointed in 1968 to man the district services of the Ministry of Agriculture.

11. Support for the workers

The long-standing problems affecting the working class were dealt with boldly, resulting in: harmonious co-operation between capital and labor, better working conditions, improved output by the workers, and an end to the explosive and crippling strikes which had plagued the economy.

(a) Unemployment fell 28% in 1968, while at the same time some 100,000 new workers joined the labor force.

(b) 381,902 persons were placed in jobs by the Employment Bureaus in 1968, as against 349,709 in 1967, i.e., an increase of 10%.

(c) There were 77,339 unemployed, in a labor force of more than 2 million, in 1967. In August of 1968, the number of unemployed had fallen to 56,897—a drop of 20,442 within the span of a few months.

(d) More than 40,000 new employment opportunities were created in 1968.

(e) With continuing price stability, minimum wages gradually rose 15%. Thanks to collective contracts and arbitration, workers' pay rates increased between 10% and 50%.

(f) Drs. 220 million were spent on workers' housing in 1968. 1524 dwellings of the workers' housing organization were allotted by ballot and 1504 housing loans were granted to blue- and white-collar workers.

(g) An additional Drs. 25,652,610 were allotted in the first two months of 1969 for self-housing loans to workers, purchase of building sites for the construction of workers' apartment houses and other projects in the housing program.

(h) Studies were completed for the buildings and mechanical equipment of five educational centers (cost: Drs. 103 million), and an appropriation of Drs. 77 million was made available for the construction of accelerated adult education centers.

(i) In 1968, Drs. 6 million were allocated for needy girls' dowries, Drs. 4.5 million for workers' recreational projects and Drs. 35 million for aid to 145 organizations.

12. Education at the state's expense

The Revolution of April 21st established the principle of equal educational opportunities for all Greek children, regardless of economic background. It implemented that principle by assuming the total expense for national education. In Greece today:

(a) No tuition fees are paid.

(b) Free schoolbooks and textbooks are issued to schoolchildren and university students (11,500,000 schoolbooks, valued at Drs. 105 million, were issued to schoolchildren and 2,500,000 copies of textbooks, valued at Drs. 42 million, were issued to 66,000 university students).

(c) Large numbers of scholarships are granted.

(d) Loans are granted to enable students to complete their studies.

(e) 2,013 elementary and secondary school teachers were appointed, all university professorships were filled, and 3,986 new positions were added to the existing 2,275 posts of auxiliary university staff.

(f) 852 new schoolrooms were constructed in 1968; 1,058 school buildings were repaired, and Drs. 504 million worth of projects for education were adjudicated by auction (as against Drs. 10.5 million in 1965, Drs. 55 million in 1966, and Drs. 70 million in 1967).

(g) The problem of a University City for Athens was definitively solved, and construction is scheduled to commence shortly. Twenty laboratories and other buildings of the University of Patras are under construction, and work has progressed on the construction of the new buildings of the University of Ioannina.

(h) Up to February 28th, 1969, Public Investment Budget funds appropriated for national education in 1968 and 1969 totaled approximately Drs. 2 billion.

(i) State Budget funds appropriated for national education in 1968 and 1969 totaled Drs. 9,743 million.

(j) For 1969 alone, education appropriations amount to a total Drs. 5,931 million, i.e., Drs. 4,891 million in State Budget funds and Drs. 1,040 million in Public Investment Budget funds.

13. A sound social policy

(a) Housing

Following were the results achieved in the housing sector during the past year:

(1) Under the Urban Refugees housing program, the construction of 494 dwellings was completed, and another 1,235 dwellings were rapidly nearing completion, 2,400 slum dwellings were razed. An emergency program for the construction of 1,719 houses was placed under way with the demolition of slum and substandard dwellings in Athens (Tavros and Peristeri districts), Karditsa and Trikala), budgeted at Drs. 270 million.

These housing developments include basic infrastructure projects as well as the necessary community service buildings, such as schools and day nurseries.

A further 172 dwellings for refugee housing were completed and 238 are under construction, under an appropriation of Drs. 11,125,000.

(2) 6,090 dwellings were reconstructed under the earthquake relief program. 5,492 of these were constructed through the self-housing system, 381 through the National Reconstruction Service, and 217 dwellings at Aghios Efstratios and Pedinon (Limnos) through the contractor system. A further 548 dwellings, partially damaged by earthquakes, were repaired. Drs. 325,100,000 were appropriated for these programs.

In addition, funds totaling Drs. 52,250,000 were appropriated for infrastructure projects in the new settlements and for road construction in the earthquake-stricken areas.

(3) Under the housing program for the relief of families living in unsuitable conditions or families whose dwellings were destroyed by fire, lightning, etc., 158 new dwellings were completed. Drs. 30,701,000 were appropriated for this purpose and for the continued implementation of the rehabilitation program for slum-dwellers in Crete, Axios (Thessaloniki) and elsewhere.

(b) Child Welfare

(1) An extensive child welfare program was implemented, at a total cost of Drs. 345 million. The program produced:

(a) 287 day nurseries, in which 15,000 children of preschool age (predominantly workers' children) are cared for daily.

(b) 65 orphanages, now caring for 6,000 unprotected children.

(c) 81 home economics schools, at which 2,000 girls received training.

(d) 10 preventive child sanatoria, which dispensed care and treatment to 3,000 children.

(e) 55 children's camps, which catered to 37,500 children during the summer.

In addition, through the co-operation of the Ministry's services, the Patriotic Foundation for the Protection of Children, and collaborating foreign organizations, some 30,000 unprotected children received financial relief.

(2) Under the program for the protection of disabled persons, rehabilitative treatment was given to 6,100 disabled children and elementary schooling to 78 disabled mobility cases, the appropriation for this purpose totaling Drs. 68,000,000.

Specifically, through the National Foundation for the Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons, 1800 handicapped persons received therapeutic treatment and social adjustment aids; 250 disabled persons attended elementary and trade schools; 1,339 persons received assistance in the form of artificial limbs. Drs. 12 million were appropriated for this purpose.

Deaf-mute foundations dispensed assistance to 300 deaf-mute children, under an appropriation of Drs. 3.7 million; and 170 blind children were aided through the Foundations for the blind. In addition to the assistance provided through the foundations, 9,000 blind persons received subsidies under an appropriation of Drs. 31 million.

Under a separate program, 900 mentally retarded children received aid, the appropriation for this purpose amounting to Drs. 150 million.

(3) State Welfare programs dispensed aid to those cases not protected by social security agencies or other programs. Thus, 1,574 individuals received Drs. 8.5 million in aid for the temporary relief of refugees from abroad; and Drs. 1,285,000 were appropriated for relief and first aid to victims of natural disasters.

Other subsidies included:

(a) Four Schools for Social Workers (Drs. 2.4 million).

(b) Seven foreign organizations aiding the State Welfare Programs (Drs. 3.7 million).

(c) Six Homes for Incurables, in which 815 incurable cases were cared for (approx. Drs. 5.1 million).

(d) 11 foundations for the protection of working youths and needy persons (Drs. 5.7 million).

(e) 80 Homes for the Aged, in which 3,600 aged persons were cared for (Drs. 11.6 million).

Drs. 30 million were allocated for the operation of students' messes, which catered to some 12,000 students.

(c) Health

1968 was a pioneer year in the public health sector; for the first time, the protection of the health of the Greek population was established by constitutional provision.

A total of Drs. 2.16 billion was spent on health protection and hospitalization.

A far-reaching program of hospital construction was established, ensuring that in the future hospitals will be created on a regional requirement basis to cover the needs of each area throughout the country.

Moreover, every effort was made to ensure that the hospitals were staffed with the necessary medical and scientific personnel and equipped in accordance with modern technology.

In the upcountry areas, 1,230 Rural Dispensaries and 90 Health Stations operated; these facilities were re-distributed nationally to ensure that all farm workers received adequate medical care.

Protection of the public health was the object of sustained efforts.

Two and a half million persons were inoculated with polio vaccine and 510,000 persons received other inoculations. One thousand counseling stations for the protection of mothers and children operated in an exemplary fashion.

Emergency Act 300/68 established, for the first time in Greece, the compulsory pre-marital health certificate, for the protection of the race.

To provide better service for the public, the pharmaceutical profession (which operated very much on "closed shop" lines) was the subject of regulatory legislation (Emergency Act 517/68) opening it up and thereby providing opportunities for young pharmacists.

Insofar as the country's medical personnel potential is concerned, conditions were created whereby young doctors serve in the upcountry areas, staffing the Rural Dispensaries and provincial hospitals.

More than Drs. 20 billion were allocated in 1968 for social security (all sectors).

14. New horizons for sports

From the very first, the Revolution of April 21st turned its attention with energetic zeal to the sector of sports and athletic facilities for the Greek people. The results achieved are impressive:

(a) An end was put to the uncontrolled and arbitrary activity of the individuals in charge of sports, who consistently served the athletic and financial interests of a handful of large and powerful sports associations rather than the athletic interests of the nation as a whole.

(b) Once that ill was corrected, there was a rise in the standards of Greek sports, and conditions were created which made it possible to attain the levels required for international competition. In terms of competition on the international level, the results are well-known and most satisfactory for our national colors.

(c) Public confidence in the PRO-PO (Football Pools) has been consolidated thanks to the measures by the Government to ensure an honestly organized championship. This is borne out by the fact that whereas between January 1, 1960 and April 20, 1967 (7 years and 4 months), 457,813,627

PRO-PO entries were filled in, the number of entries for the 30-month period from April 21, 1967 to December 31, 1968, totaled 482,147,098.

(d) The success of the PRO-PO resulted in Drs. 924 million in revenues in 1968. Most of that sum was allocated for a program of large-scale sports projects—the foundation for the development of physical education in our country—and for the support of Athletic associations and organizations.

15. Large-scale tourist development

One of the National Government's primary aims was to raise the volume and quality of Greek tourism.

Some of the Government's accomplishments since April 21st, 1967:

(a) Complete re-organization of the National Tourist Organization of Greece, the agency responsible for the planning and execution of Greece's tourist policy.

(b) Radical improvement of tourist facilities, i.e.: a 20% discount on hotel rates for hotels in the A, B, and C class; simplification of customs formalities; minimum restrictions on charter flights; uniform hotel rates; ease of entering the country and moving within its frontiers; improvement and up-grading of recreational centers.

(c) Expansion of the infrastructure of summer tourism: beaches, tourist camps, motels, local roads, etc.

(d) Allocation of Drs. 150 million in short-term loans to furnish operating capital for travel agencies and hotel companies.

(e) Support of loans (totaling more than Drs. 5 billion between April 21st, 1967 and December 31st, 1968) for private investment in tourist development projects.

The Five-Year Economic Development Plan (1968-1972) provides for the allocation of Drs. 15 billion for tourism, i.e., Drs. 12.6 billion from private business sources and Drs. 2.4 billion from State investments.

Plans provide for a 100% increase in hotel accommodations (from 100,000 beds available today, to 200,000 in 1972). Between April 21st, 1967 and December 31st, 1968, hotel accommodations increased from 80,000 to 100,000 beds (in 200 new hotels).

16. Sounder local government

In the two-year period of the Revolution, the Ministry of the Interior, responsible for regional development, has accomplished major aims:

(a) Unimpeachable organization and execution of the Referendum on the Constitution.

(b) Restoration of the institution of local self-government to a sound and healthy footing.

(c) Economic support totaling Drs. 1.8 billion allocated to local government agencies for public utility projects designed to improve the standard of living of the population; also, loans totaling Drs. 300 million to 49 municipalities and communities.

(d) Establishment of numerous municipal and community libraries, gymnasiums, civic bands, etc.

17. Order and security

The spirit of April 21st has been especially beneficial in the area of Public Security. Unburdened by the influence of the past, the Nation's police departments are functioning efficiently in their appointed tasks. In 1968:

(a) Members of the Police Forces were trained and re-trained in schools and seminars.

(b) The Police Forces mechanical and technical equipment was modernized.

(c) The Emergency Squad sections in several cities and towns were expanded; the number of patrol cars was increased; and an Emergency Service of the Fire Department was established, with salutary results.

(d) Citizens sense of security has been consolidated thanks to a 19% drop in the crime rate

(e) Preventive action has resulted in a 15% drop in traffic accidents.

18. Archaeological treasures cared for

In the area of Greece's antiquities, noteworthy results have been accomplished thanks to the Government's policy. From the very first, the Government gave recognition to the important role of the Archaeological Service, which in the pre-Revolutionary period played a very minor role, both in excavation projects and restoration work. To this end, adequate funds were provided and the Archaeological Service was enabled to fulfill the requirements of its function. Since April 21st, 1967, the following accomplishments have been made:

Museums.—Construction and maintenance work was completed on the Museums at Olympia, Ioannina, Vravron, Corfu, Chios, Polygyron, Kilkis, Piraeus, Pyrgos, Herakleion, Florina, Kavalla, Thasos, Samothrace. Expansion and repair work was done at the Museums of Almyros, Poros, Paros, Mykonos, Gortys, Rethymon, Pylos, Skyros and Gournia.

Monuments.—Restoration work has been done on the monuments of the Acropolis, on old houses dating from the Turkish occupation, on Medieval and Byzantine fortresses; and considerable real estate was purchased or expropriated for purposes of conservation or excavation.

Excavations.—Excavations conducted by the Archaeological Service were expanded: in the Athens area, in Attical Nafplion, Thebes, Sparta, Olympia, Corfu, Delphi, Volos, Thessaloniki, Mykonos and Chania. Concurrently, the Archaeological Society carried out maintenance and restoration work on monuments, restoration of pottery, and conducted 16 diggings in Peloponnesus, Central Greece, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, the Cyclades Islands and Crete, which have yielded valuable contributions to the country's archaeological heritage.

B. PART TWO—PLANNING

(Selected facts and figures, in summary form, from the planned programs for 1969)

The accomplishments of the National Government in 1968 were brilliant; but even greater things are promised by Prime Minister George Papadopoulos for 1969.

Planning for the current year covers all sectors of the Nation's life.

First and foremost among the projects for 1969 will be the legislative edifice to be erected on the framework of our new Constitution. Legislation, in general, will be the object of a concerted modernization and codification effort, so that "all Greeks will know the laws and abide by them."

1. Administration

The Ministries' scope is greatly expanded. Proliferation of semipublic agencies (legal entities of public law) necessitates basic tabulation and re-classification thereof. The same applies to government departments; their number will be restricted and they will be reclassified, by geographical area, in order of their true importance to the machinery of state and the needs of the citizens. At the same time, a stepped-up program of refresher training for civil servants will begin. Finally, work will commence on the development of the agrarian and urban real estate registry.

2. Education

The necessary appropriations are available for a filling of the vacancies in elementary, secondary and higher education. The construction of Drs. 920 million worth of school buildings is being auctioned. Technical education is undergoing reform. New life is being imparted to scientific research, and higher learning is being re-organized along modern lines.

3. Arts and letters

The National Art Gallery is being inaugurated this year; objectives include the opening of new horizons for the Greek spirit and

the Greek intellect, through development of letters, of the representational arts, of the theatre and cinema.

4. Sports

Drs. 415 million are allocated for the completion of the 1968 projects and the development of new athletic facilities.

5. Justice

Personnel is being brought up to strength. An effort is being made to abolish the so-called correctional prisons which, instead of rehabilitating the individual tend to annihilate it as a social entity.

6. The church

Under its new Charter, the Church is engaged in finalizing the task of developing and organizing the clergy and its flock.

7. Economic policy

With all fiscal and development programs in readiness; with continuing monetary stability, foreign exchange balance and a policy of free imports and support of private enterprise, the drive is for steadily increasing turnover, improvement of the tax laws, establishment of a modern public accounting code, and abolition of the system of price controls.

8. Investment

The public investment program totals Drs. 14.5 billion, an all-time high in Greek economic history.

9. Electric power

Under the power supply program, construction is ending or commencing on the electric power projects of Kastraki, Edessaion, Megalopolis, Aliveri, Keratsini, Rhodes, Lavrion, Ptolemais, Polyfyton; 1400 settlements and 260,000 new consumers are being connected to the grid.

10. Transportation

Drs. 5.5 billion are allocated from the public investment program for roads, airports and ports, and the Greek State Railways are being modernized.

11. Agriculture—forests

Irrigation of 250,000 stremmas; construction of refrigerating plants, wine factories, canning plants; reforestation of 600,000 stremmas; development of forest roads and new forest industries.

12. Shipping

There is a project to establish a Maritime Credit Bank; to develop maritime industries and maritime training; and to attract as many ships as possible under the Greek flag.

13. Tourism

Investments totaling Drs. 1 billion in tourist development; financing of tourist projects and businesses in the amount of Drs. 4 billions; and a 25% increase in hotel accommodations.

14. Trade

Development of the export trade; arousal of public awareness of the national-interest need to consume domestic products.

15. Social services

Restoration of justice in the operation of the social security organizations so as to ensure that all citizens enjoy protection and insurance of their health. Continuation, at a faster pace, of the program of rehabilitation of 28,000 earthquake victims. All possible despatch in the construction of the 1,500 planned workers' housing units. The aim is to ensure that no Greek shall remain without shelter and to create model settlements with multi-storied buildings conforming to modern standards of sanitation and comfort.

Mr. Speaker, this is an impressive record of achievement and I hope those who have been quick to criticize will at least read the efforts being made by this nation. What Greece needs from America today more than anything else is under-

standing. I suggest we give the rulers of Greece an opportunity to show they do indeed intend to restore parliamentary government in Greece as soon as possible.

In the meantime, I extend my best wishes for continued progress to the people of Greece on their second anniversary. I am sure all Americans join me in a prayer that the progress will continue until Greece again assumes her rightful place as one of the great nations and leaders of the world.

EX-AMERICAN LEAGUE UMPIRES DESERVE JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 13, 1968, American Baseball League umpires Al Salerno and Bill Valentine sent letters to their fellow umpires advocating the creation of an American Baseball League Umpires Association similar to the National Baseball League Umpires Association.

On Monday, September 16, 1968, the president of the American Baseball League, Joseph Cronin, summarily "fired" both umpires from their positions on grounds of incompetency.

Salerno and Valentine had both umpired in the American Baseball League for 7 and 6 years, respectively.

On September 19, 1968, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS joined us in sending a telegram of concern, shock, and dismay about this summary "firing" to the president of the American Baseball League.

On September 20, 1968, Mr. Cronin responded in a telegram merely reiterating his earlier statements on September 16—both statements without evidence—that Salerno and Valentine are incompetent.

If Salerno and Valentine are incompetent, what were the grounds for judging their incompetence?

If Salerno and Valentine are incompetent, are 7 or even 6 years required to judge their incompetence?

If Salerno and Valentine did not meet certain competency standards and, indeed, if 7 or even 6 years are required to determine the competency of baseball umpires, why were these men summarily "fired" in two stunning telephone calls only 3 days after they sent letters to their colleagues supporting the formation of an American Baseball League Umpires Association?

Baseball sportswriters and baseball managers have decisively answered these questions.

Al Dark, veteran American League manager:

I don't know the whole deal, but I'll tell you these guys were two pretty good umpires. I'll take both of them on the field every game and feel I'm going to get a good, honest, hustling effort—and that's all any manager can expect.

Dick Williams, manager, Boston Red Sox:

I had several jams with them, but I consider both of them good umpires and I'd like to see them have their jobs back.

Shirley Povich, Washington Post:

When asked what qualifications his two unfrocked umpires lacked, Cronin said they were "just inefficient, that's all." To Cronin's credit, this was not a snap judgment. In Salerno's case, it took the AL President seven years to arrive at it; in Valentine's case, six years.

Red Smith, syndicated columnist:

If they were never good enough, as Cronin says, it took him a hell of a while to find out. Joe has to be one of the least perceptive or most indulgent employers this side of Utopia.

Milton Gross, New York Post:

Salerno never said whether Cronin said, "Keep in touch." It would have been such a nice touch. Taft and Hartley would have appreciated it. Or maybe Rowan and Martin. It's a laugh-in, but not for Valentine and Salerno.

Bob August, Cleveland Press:

Cronin . . . draws his ideas from the philosophy of William McKinley. Someone should tell him what has been going on in the last 40 years. The battle for the right to organize unions was won so long ago that most people have forgotten about it . . . today Cronin looks foolish, a baseball dinosaur lumbering through the 1960's. He made a mistake and it was a beaut.

Victor O. Jones, Boston Globe:

Cronin says it's pure coincidence that the two arbiters were fired on the very day they had completed arrangements for the unorganized American League umpires to meet with the already organized Nationals . . . if Cronin is right and these two umpires never were any good why did it take Cronin six and seven years to find this out?

Dick Young, New York Daily News:

In view of the timing of their firing, it would occur to an outsider that this has to be the greatest coincidence since Adam stumbled on Eve under the old apple tree.

That was September 1968. It is now April 1969. And Salerno and Valentine are still unemployed umpires.

In the meantime, American League umpires have joined with National League umpires to form a Major League Umpires Association. National League umpires had organized their own association in 1963. The benefits of this association to National League umpires prior to organizing the new Major League Baseball Umpires Association is quite clear.

Offers have been made to the president of the American Baseball League that Salerno and Valentine be reinstated on a provisional basis. He has rejected these and similar offers.

Mr. Cronin, through an intermediary, contacted Al Salerno to offer him a position as an American League umpire scout in the minor leagues. Salerno, wishing to continue his career goal as an American League umpire, wisely refused this offer. How pungent could irony be? A man is told he is incompetent to umpire in the American League, yet he is told his incompetency qualifies him to scout for competent American League umpires.

Reluctantly, and only as a last resort, Umpires Salerno and Valentine presented their cases to the National Labor Relations Board. This case is pending before the regional board in Boston. Even assuming the NLRB hears their case and decides favorably, a baseball season will probably have long since

passed. Precedents in similar labor union organizing cases do not offer good omens. Indeed, chances are that the NLRB will not hear the case. It should be clearly noted, however, that "pandora's box"—antitrust laws and regulations—could be opened by the NLRB, and if not there, by the U.S. Congress.

Neither Salerno and Valentine nor those of us interested in their futures want baseball to have a "black mark" because these men have been unjustly treated. We believe very deeply that the wise course of action is for these men to be reinstated as American Baseball League umpires.

Justice warrants and the image of baseball dictates such action. Justice delayed is justice denied. Justice either delayed or denied is a mote in baseball's eye.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR COMMANDER BUCHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week the North Korean Communists shot down an unarmed American reconnaissance plane which was considerably outside North Korean airspace.

The United States is responding to this harassment by the Communists which apparently took the lives of all 31 members of the plane's crew.

President Nixon has said that these reconnaissance missions will be continued and the planes that fly them will be protected. I applaud his action.

It was a little more than 1 year ago, on January 23, 1968, that the Communists seized the *Pueblo* in international waters off North Korea. The 82 survivors of that ship's crew of 83 were released by the North Koreans on December 23, 1968, 11 months later.

The captain of the *Pueblo* was Comdr. Lloyd Bucher, one of this Nation's most courageous sons. It was the loyalty and leadership of this man that we Nebraskans claim as our own that sustained these men through months of mental and physical torture.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the millions of Americans who applauded this man for his leadership against overwhelming odds, I am today introducing a bill calling for the award of the Medal of Honor to Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher.

Commander Bucher's great loves are his country, his family, and the sea. I hope that it will not be long before he is again in command of a Navy vessel, fulfilling a dream that he has nurtured since childhood.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, early in February of this year the activities of the United States in chemical and biological warfare were brought to my attention by a disturbing documentary

shown on NBC television. I recognized that I knew almost nothing about this aspect of our military capability and decided to inform myself. My main interest was in the public policy questions relating to chemical and biological warfare. Why do we need a capability? What sort of capability do we have? What are our policies governing the use of these weapons? What do these activities cost us each year? What are the safety precautions taken to protect the public against accident? Are our academic and private institutions being improperly involved in chemical and biological research?

In order to inform myself about our CBW program I asked the U.S. Army to brief those Members of Congress who were interested in his field. On March 4, 1969, the Army presented a briefing, most of which they insisted on classifying. I did not find that briefing satisfactory; it did not answer the public policy questions. So I then prepared a comprehensive set of policy questions which I sent to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Smith, Ambassador to the United Nations Yost, and Dr. Henry Kissinger of the White House staff. While waiting for replies I have made a rather extensive study of the information that is available in public; I have received assistance from several organizations that are involved in a study of chemical and biological warfare, and I have consulted a number of individuals who are very knowledgeable in the field.

I have now received replies from all of the departments and agencies that I contacted with the exception of Dr. Kissinger. His office said that they had hoped to prepare a reply to my March 20, 1969, letter by last Friday but had not had time to do so, which is perhaps as much a comment on the priority placed on CBW policy in relation to other matters as it is on the pressures of the Executive Office. I would like to comment at this time on the nature of the information that I have received.

Chemical and biological warfare activities are shrouded in secrecy, unnecessarily so in my view. The Army's unclassified briefing was perfunctory at best; the classified presentation was not much better. I get the impression that the security curtain is parted only when it serves the interests of the advocates of the program. I found the replies from the departments heartening in some respects, but more deeply disturbing in most others. By far the most revealing information appears in sources available to the public such as occasional statements by public officials, open publications, and press reports, both domestic and foreign.

Perhaps the most immediately disturbing aspect of the replies that I have received from the departments is the contradiction between some of the replies and the information that is available to the public. These contradictions should be resolved; both the Congress and the American public deserve a full explanation if the credibility of our public officials is to be maintained. Some of these contradictions are—

First, Defense states that we maintain a limited offensive capability in chemi-

cal weapons; that the carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response.

Yet we have in storage about 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas at Rocky Mountain Arsenal and Tooele Army Depot. Col. S. J. Efnor stated that the gas from a single bomb the size of a quart fruit jar could kill every living thing in a cubic mile. The inventory of nerve gas seems to be more than that required for an adequate tactical response.

Second, General Hebbeler in the unclassified briefing stated that biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Yet Defense says:

Although the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely.

There appears to be a contradiction between the Army's estimate of the threat and that of Defense.

Third, Defense states that the U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device.

Yet I am informed that the Navy only purchases one-tenth of the quantity of atropine, the nerve gas antidote, needed for their total number of personnel.

Fourth, State and Defense say that review has shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage, no significant permanent damage, to the ecology of Vietnam due to defoliation. Both Departments cite the work of Dr. Fred H. Tschirley as an authority; Defense cites a report prepared by Midwest Research Institute.

Yet Dr. Tschirley's report itself says that the mangrove tree, a source of food in Vietnam, is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangroves, a tree taking about 20 years to grow. He goes on to say that a single treatment with the defoliants orange or white would not be expected to have a lasting effect but that a second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect. Press reports state we spray more than once in the same growing system.

Even more damaging, Dr. Tschirley, their authority, reviewed the Midwest Research Institute report for Ecology, a professional magazine, and said:

Reading the MRI Report before visiting Vietnam left me with the feeling of having read a literature review that resulted in accurate general conclusions, but told me nothing about the ecological consequences of using herbicides in Vietnam. In summary, the MRI Report is a literature review of a subject for which there is a great deal of literature relating to temperate zones, but little relating to tropical vegetation. The MRI Report is disappointing because its direct applicability to Vietnam is so tenuous.

Similarly, Profs. Egbert W. Pfeiffer and Gordon H. Orians, professor of zoology at the University of Montana and professor of zoology at the University of Washington, respectively, made the following report on April 3, 1969, after a 2-week visit to Vietnam.

They described in grim terms the effects of leaf-killing chemicals on Viet-

namese plant and animal life. They made a 65-mile trip by armed boat down the waterway linking Saigon with the sea. They scarcely saw a living plant. Bird life, apart from fish-eating birds, has virtually disappeared. The justification for the program, one reminiscent of the colonel's remark at the time of the Tet offensive last year that "we had to destroy the village in order to save the village," was also given by Professors Pfeiffer and Orians. They said that it was completely unrealistic to expect military commanders to forgo such measures. There is no question about it; they save American lives.

Fifth, Defense states that each use of herbicides or defoliants is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Yet this must be a recent policy change if it is true because in February 1967, Secretary McNamara told congressional committees that the decision on when and where to use chemicals had been turned over to commanders in the fields. Commanders in the area of South Vietnam can defoliate any time they think it will open up avenues of fire that are otherwise unavailable to them. Unless there has been a change in policy, this is a direct contradiction.

Sixth, Defense and State say that the only gas used in Vietnam by U.S. forces is CS, a powerful teargas; Defense says that CN, a milder teargas was also authorized some years ago. Both Departments justify its use by pointing out, that it is often used as a riot control agent, State saying:

The fact that teargas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

Yet in 1965 Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance and Secretary McNamara said that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CN, CS, and DM. DM, otherwise known as Adamsite gas, was not classified as an incapacitating gas but rather as an irritant gas until relatively recently by the Army. Both Defense and State point out this gas often allows the Army to accomplish its aims with the minimum violence required, citing the case of civilians mixed with Vietcong that are subdued with gas rather than with explosives. Secretary Rusk spoke of the use of this gas as the attempt to use the minimum level of violence required.

Most disturbing, the New York Times reports that in 1966 helicopters dropped hundreds of teargas grenades on a fortified Vietcong area in preparation for a B-52 bombing raid. Defense spokesmen are then quoted as saying that the purpose of the gas was to drive the Vietcong out of their fortifications so that they could be killed with bomb fragments. Gas has also been dropped prior to artillery attacks according to press reports. This clear use of gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons is chemical warfare. The extent of the use of this technique can be speculated upon when we find Defense procuring \$81 million worth of riot control munitions—teargas—in 1969.

Seventh, Defense states that strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which work with CBW agents.

Yet Defense's overall safety record during the past two decades is poor. Fort Detrick, the Army's biological warfare research center has one of the poorest records among major biological institutions for infections. There were 3,300 accidents at Detrick between 1954 and 1962 according to the Phillips report. Half of these occurred in the laboratory, involving broken test tubes, accidental scratches from needles, and so forth. About 400 men were infected as a result of these accidents. And infections among its workers pose some danger to neighboring communities. In 1959 one worker caught pneumonic plague, a highly infectious disease. He also happened to be a lifeguard at a swimming pool and had been in contact with many people. Local residents that might have come in contact with Detrick personnel who could have been infected were not warned of the danger. Nor did the Public Health Service promptly report this to the World Health Organization as required by agreement. In 1951 an Army bacteriologist working at Detrick became ill at his home in Frederick, Md. He was placed in the local hospital where his disease went unrecognized. He was taken to the base hospital shortly thereafter and died of deadly anthrax. The dangers of failing to warn local populations so that the most careful observation can be made is clear to any health authority.

At another installation, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, where chemical agents are stored and produced, the Army has failed to prevent accidents. In the early 1950's, leakage of toxic material from the arsenal began to kill crops and animals on surrounding farms. Vigorous complaints led the Army to drill a deep disposal well to store waste products from their activities. This resulted in the first series of earthquakes that Denver had experienced in 80 years. In the immediate period after the well was drilled and used for storage, there were over 1,500 earth tremors in the Denver area, some reaching up to 6 on the Richter scale. Some tremors destroyed property. As a result, the Army discontinued using the deep well and began pumping material out.

At the Dugway Proving Grounds, used for chemical and biological warfare testing, despite a recent order emphasizing the importance of safety, more than 6,000 sheep in nearby Skull Valley were killed when nerve gas was carried from the testing grounds onto their pastures. I am informed that tests of sheep in a number of areas around Dugway showed low-level exposure to nerve gas. In another disturbing report, I learned that the local sheriff is occasionally asked by Dugway authorities to patrol the roads that pass the proving grounds to insure that motorists don't slow down or stop beside the road. Candor is not the mark of the Army's treatment of these problems; they have refused to confirm that the sheep died of nerve gas although they paid over \$300,000 to the farmer for his loss and only last Thursday, awarded him an additional \$198,309 in damages.

At the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas, production center for biological weapons, contamination of a local stream leading into a nearby river with toxic material led the Army to buy up the land along the stream. Presumably the toxic material is diluted when it feeds into the river.

I do not find this safety record very reassuring.

Eighth. Defense states that gases are transported according to rules established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service: that an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and absorb any leakage; that all shipments are accompanied by a trained escort; that routes are planned to avoid populated areas and to minimize time in populated areas; and that transported agents are not volatile.

Yet in the incident reported in the Denver railyards, these statements appear to be contradicted. I rechecked the facts with Dick Kruse, the reporter for KBT-TV/KBTR in Denver and found that the gondola cars carrying large tanks of nerve gas that he filmed in the Denver railyards on a siding had no sand under them; they were on a siding in the center of Denver for most of the night; that he had spent about 1½ hours filming the tanks both from the ground and up on the gondola cars and had seen no guards. General Hebbeler also stated that GB, presumed to be the agent in the tanks, is relatively volatile.

The movement of these agents by rail is fraught with danger; the Transportation Safety Board of the Department of Transportation has reported on the alarming increase in derailment and other forms of railroad accidents, up 85 percent between 1961 and 1967. As the Dunreith accident illustrated, the accident need not occur to the train carrying the gas; it might be caused by a passing train. If the accident were similar to that which occurred in Laurel, Miss., the explosion of the adjoining train might scatter nerve gas over a 10-block area of a city. Furthermore, the Transportation Safety Board will shortly announce some major revisions in transportation safety regulations because of their inadequacies, I am led to understand.

I also do not find Defense's reply that the statistical probability of a gas transportation accident is very difficult to determine because we have never had one. Certainly the art of safety and reliability analysis, as practiced by NASA and the AEC for example, has proceeded far enough to give some fairly good indications of the dangers involved.

I have also come across information available to the public on the transportation of biological agents that causes me grave concern. In a December 1967 publication issued by Fort Detrick, procedures for the careful packaging of biological agents were described, including a crash of an aircraft with biological agent containers aboard. The packages are designed to protect the biological agents that are being shipped; the report concludes:

Any number of such packages is now acceptable in one aircraft for shipment by commercial airlines under the Official Air

Transport Restricted Articles Tariff No. 6-D. Technical escort is not required. However, current regulations of the Armed Services require technical escort for any shipment in which the total volume of etiologic agent in all packages in one conveyance exceeds 3 gallons.

Although the containers survived a crash of an aircraft going 120 knots from about 40 feet up onto desert soil, it is highly questionable whether they would have survived a midair explosion with metal fragments being blown about or a crash at greater speeds into a mountain cliff. The biological agent might well have been vaporized, wind conditions might carry the vapor to a nearby community with disastrous results. As one expert has said, a fraction of a gram of purified bacteria or virus in aerosol form could be sufficient to infect anyone in a square kilometer.

The publication goes on to indicate that agents may be shipped to Fort Detrick, Md.; Pine Bluff, Ark.; Edgewood Arsenal, Md.; Dover, N.J.; Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Dugway, Utah; Deseret Test Center, Utah; Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Oakland, Calif.; China Lake, Calif.; U.S. Naval Base, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Crane, Ind.; Fort McClellan, Ala.; and possibly to Canada, Britain, and Australia.

Ninth. Defense states that we have a CBW budget of \$350 million for 1969. That budget includes \$139 million for napalm, incendiary weapons, and the like, weapons that I will accept as not normally falling in the definition of CBW. It contains \$81 million for tear gas or riot munitions. It contains \$5 million for herbicides.

Yet I find it difficult to accept this budget figure. It is generally admitted that the United States spent about \$100 million for defoliants and herbicides last year. I cannot believe that we will buy only \$5 million this year. A McGraw-Hill investment newsletter states that Edgewood Arsenal would spend about \$420 million in 1969 for CBW materials. And this is only one center.

Tenth. Defense states that the Army does use discretion in placing CBW research contracts with academic and private institutions.

Yet it is reported to me that a number of biologists have been approached by an individual asking them to undertake certain specified research projects without identifying the source of the funds that would pay for the work—presumably the Army. Academic biologists have also indicated that they would not undertake research for the Army on CBW projects if it weren't for the great shortage of support funds in this field of science.

I also find use of the Smithsonian, even if not on CBW itself but rather in determining what areas might be suitable for CBW tests, of questionable discretion in view of the Institution's international reputation and need to keep clear of any doubt as to the nature of its work.

Going beyond the immediate contradictions which I have listed, some general comments should be made. First, the unnecessary secrecy surrounding our CBW activities from both Members of Congress and the public should be

stripped away. A policy of evasiveness in responding to public inquiry only arouses more suspicion than already exists. I found Mr. Foster's reply an improvement over the information provided by the Army but even his reply has contradictions that require clarification. I believe that an inquiry calling on informed and expert opinion is required to resolve these contradictions. I am exploring with my colleagues in the House and Senate the possibility of an ad hoc committee of inquiry or a possible investigation by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. I expect to make a recommendation on this shortly.

Second. In comparing the replies of the departments I found a more thorough and comprehensive definition of policy in the reply received from Defense than I did from State, Defense at least says that we have a "no-first use" policy for biological warfare and implies that we have the same policy for lethal gas. The State Department says that it is up to the President to decide national policy and does not mention "no-first use" in reply to these questions. In contrast with Secretary Rusk's rather careful exposition of a no-first use policy in 1965, and a justification of the use of tear gases on humanitarian grounds, State now just says that it is the President's decision, almost an abdication of their responsibility in this aspect of foreign policy.

Third. Although General Hebbeler defended use of incapacitating agents such as tear gas by saying they were not invented at the time of the Geneva protocol in 1925, it is well documented that tear gas and adamsite were extensively used in World War I. The records of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference meeting in 1931 which I placed in the RECORD on April 1, also clearly show that the British, the French, the Spanish, the Yugoslavs, and others stated that they considered tear gas and other noxious gasses, even if nonlethal, to be included in the wording of the Geneva protocol. Significantly, neither the Defense nor the State reply justified the use of tear gas by saying that it is not included in the Geneva protocol—a change in policy from General Hebbeler's statement and Defense and State's earlier justification for use of tear gas.

Fourth. I find the use of incapacitating gas in conjunction with B-52 raids and artillery attacks, and the use of defoliants as an antifood weapon not "the minimum use of force required" or a herbicide or defoliant used for agricultural or industrial purposes in the United States and Russia, but rather chemical warfare. This is a change from our policy in World War II when President Roosevelt said:

Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

Following World War II Adm. Chester Nimitz was asked about the toughest decisions he had to make. He replied:

There were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines.

Similarly, in the Korean war we went to extraordinary lengths to refute Communist charges that we were using germ warfare. We recognized the grave impact that belief of this charge would have on world opinion.

Yet today, although we state that we adhere to the principles of the Geneva protocol, we are using tear gas to aid in the killing of the enemy and we are using chemicals as an anti-food weapon and in a way that may well have long-term destructive effect on the Vietnamese countryside. This latter policy seems unlikely to win the battle for the minds of the uncommitted in Vietnam.

I ask, Who is responsible for this change in our chemical and biological warfare policy? Did the President decide? Has Congress agreed to this change? Do the American people accept this new policy as one in keeping with the principles and moral precepts of our Republic? This question demands the most thorough review and debate. I therefore ask President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva protocol of 1925 to the U.S. Senate for ratification so that this review can be made. I, for one, would like to know where the United States stands on this issue today.

Fifth, I find it inconceivable that the United States would knowingly use biological warfare even as a matter of retaliation. Defense admits that we have no warning system to tell when and if such an attack were used against us. Biologists tell us that the purpose of biological warfare research is to develop vaccine-resistant strains of disease. Defense tells us there is no specific therapy available for most BW agents and that vaccination against the more than 100 agents is not practical and would probably harm the health of the individual.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel laureate biologist, warns that losing a biological agent on a nation might well result in a worldwide epidemic raging out of control with new mutant strains of the disease developing that might not respond to a vaccine even if one were initially available.

Dr. James D. Watson, Nobel laureate biologist at Harvard who served on a Presidential Chemical and Biological Warfare Advisory Panel from 1961 until 1964 said in an interview that he thinks CBW programs should be discontinued because they are not a good way of winning wars—militarily they are a waste of time. He went on to say that the top people in the Department of Defense never gave a damn about it—it becomes dangerous with a suspicious, hostile military who are losing a war, so will try it to win.

With these comments in mind, I urge the United States to give full support to the proposal of the British to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference that biological warfare research and use be fully banned. Research on vaccines

against diseases can be conducted, openly, with the results available to everyone. An open inspection system has been suggested, one in which all biologists would report by word of mouth any suspected violation of the ban on biological weapons research or manufacture. We would have little to lose and much to gain.

Sixth, I urge that a top-panel of Department of Transportation, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Defense, and independent academic experts be convened to review transportation policies for chemical and biological agents and to establish the strictest transportation standards for their transportation, if indeed such transportation is needed.

Finally, I intend to comment further on our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices for I regard them as one of the benchmarks of our moral and ethical principles. There are those who say that it makes no difference how a man dies. I disagree, let me draw from General Hebbeler's briefing; there is a principle of proportionality, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon, and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. I believe that chemical and biological warfare are not necessary for military purposes. Let the United States take the lead in seeing that they are banned from use. And let the United States refrain from using those chemicals which begin to break down the thin dividing line between the long-standing principle of no first use and chemical warfare.

The text of the answer from the Department of Defense follows:

APRIL 15, 1969.

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of March 7, 1969, concerning chemical and biological warfare.

Answers to each of your questions are attached. Copies of reports and other materials which are relevant to the questions are included. It is believed this information responds to your inquiries on an unclassified basis. There are areas which could be extended and amplified by classified discussion.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. FOSTER, JR.,
Director of Defense
Research and Engineering.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 1

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological (CB) capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop

and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind; and to continue a program of research and development in this area to minimize the possibility of technological surprise. This policy on CB weapons is part of a broader strategy designed to provide the U.S. with several options for response against various forms of attack. Should their employment ever be necessary, the President would have to authorize their use. The U.S. does not have a policy that requires a single and invariable response. Deterrence is our primary objective.

Chemical weapons, in many tactical situations, are more effective than conventional (high explosive and projectile) weapons. Accordingly, it is believed wise to deter their use. If two approximately equally effective military forces were engaged in combat, and one side initiated a CB operation, it could gain a significant advantage even if the opposing side has protective equipment. Neutralization of this advantage could not be achieved with conventional arms.

QUESTION 2

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

The U.S. policy and its rationale with regard to biological warfare is generally the same as that for chemical. As a matter of policy the U.S. will not be the first to use biological weapons, but we are aware of the capabilities these weapons place in the hands of potential adversaries. For this reason it is important to carry on our R&D program in BW, not only to provide necessary equipment such as detection and warning devices, but to define and quantify more fully the potential threat to the U.S. from these weapons, and the hazards involved if they are ever used against us.

QUESTION 3

If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fall-out shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

Answer

The threat to the U.S. civil population from CB attack has been studied by the Department of Defense, and these analyses are periodically up-dated. It is clear that the threat of CB attack is less significant than that of nuclear attack. For this reason, more emphasis has been placed in civil defense on the nuclear threat.

For logistic reasons chemical agents do not appear to pose a major strategic threat against the U.S. For example, it would require many tons of nerve agent munitions to carry out an effective attack against a city of a few million people. This may appear inconsistent with the high toxicity of the nerve agents, but for many technical reasons such as the difficulty in disseminating the agents in vapor or aerosol form, the dilution of the agent in the atmosphere, and their impingement on ground and vegetation, it is correct. For this reason, the U.S. does not maintain stockpiles of therapeutic materials for nerve agents. Although the pos-

sibility of the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely, it does not presently warrant the priority given to defense against the affects of nuclear weapons. Research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing, as is the review of the magnitude and nature of the threat.

The Office of Civil Defense has developed an inexpensive but effective protective mask for civilian use, and a limited production run was made to test production quality. No large scale production was undertaken because of the low estimate of the threat as described above. Should the threat to the U.S. population increase, this mask could be produced quite rapidly and, together with other necessary defensive measures, would afford protection against both chemical and biological attack. Filtration systems have been designed and tested, and these could be added to fall-out shelters to afford collective protection for groups of people. In addition, many of the emergency plans developed by the Department of HEW for post-nuclear attack medical support would be applicable. The emergency packaged hospitals, for example, provide for expansion of hospital facilities by the equivalent of 2500 hospitals of 200 bed size.

The U.S. does not maintain large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most BW agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible BW agents, and production and administration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures.

QUESTION 4

We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

Answer

The U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device which is under development. U.S. soldiers and sailors generally have masks and protective clothing; and collective protection equipment for vans and Communication centers is being developed and supplied. U.S. troops in Vietnam are prepared for possible enemy uses of chemical weapons.

QUESTION 5

Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer

There are no herbicidal chemicals used in Vietnam to destroy vegetation which have not been widely used in the United States in connection with clearing areas for agricultural or industrial purposes.

The term "defoliants" is used because it properly describes the purpose of its use; that is, to remove leaves from jungle foliage to re-

duce the threat of ambush and to increase visibility for U.S. Forces. This use of defoliants has saved many American and South Vietnamese lives.

There are several distinctions between a chemical herbicide and a biological plant disease. The biological agents are living plant pathogens, and may be spread beyond the area of attack by winds, insects or animals. Chemical herbicides do not spread in this manner beyond the area of attack. Further, more is known about the effects of chemical herbicides because of their widespread use throughout the world. Each use of herbicides or defoliants in Vietnam is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

QUESTION 6

Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer

The U.S. has a carefully limited operation in South Vietnam to disrupt the enemy's food supply. It is limited to the attack of small and usually remote jungle plots which we know the VC or NVA are using. Usually these plots are along trails or near their base camp areas. Each such operation is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam. Enemy caches of food, principally rice, are also destroyed when it cannot be used by the South Vietnamese. These limited Allied activities have never, in any single year, affected as much as one percent of the annual food output of South Vietnam.

To date surveys have shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage from the viewpoint of the future development of South Vietnam, attributable to the defoliation effort. The Department of Defense has supported the Department of Agriculture in studies of herbicides in analogous areas, and I am attaching a copy of their report "Response of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Woody Plants to Chemical Treatments." The Department of Defense also had a base line study of the forests of Vietnam prepared entitled "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico, and Texas," a copy of which is attached. More recently a study "Assessment of Ecological Effects of Extensive or Repeated Use of Herbicides" was done by Midwest Research Institute, a copy of which is attached. This study was reviewed by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and judged by them to be an accurate and competent report. Last fall, the Department of State, with Department of Defense participation, made a survey of the ecology of defoliated areas. One of the scientists who made this survey, Dr. Fred Tschirley from the Department of Agriculture, published his report in *Science*. A copy of his report is attached.

At the end of active combat, it appears probable that there will be agricultural and forestry activities and other programs which will aid the South Vietnamese people. The Department of Defense would cooperate with the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development as necessary in accomplishing these. The Department of Defense supports the concept of a comprehensive study of the long-term effects of the limited defoliation program, and has endorsed, in principle, proposals by the American Association for the Advancement of Science for such a scientific study.

QUESTION 7

Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam, from the chemical warfare cate-

gory? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently, we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer

The only "incapacitating gas" in use by U.S. Forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent called CS, although CN was also authorized some years ago. Both are tear gases. There is no known verified instance of lethality by CS, either in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where it has been used to control disturbances by many governments.

Efforts to find the statement you attribute to the former Deputy Secretary Vance have been unsuccessful. A copy of an excerpt from his testimony two years ago before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (February 1967) is attached. The distinction he made is that the U.S. has never used biological weapons, nor have we used lethal chemical weapons since World War I, and that it is against U.S. policy to initiate their use, but that the U.S. has used riot control agents and herbicides. It is believed these distinctions are still valid.

QUESTION 8

What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

Answer

Strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which do research on CB agents. Elaborate systems of airtight hoods, air filtration and waste decontamination are employed. These precautions and procedures are reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service as well as by Department of Defense safety experts. The equipment and building designs developed at the U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, for example, have been generally accepted throughout the world as the ultimate in safety for the investigation of infectious diseases.

With regard to the extremely unfortunate Skull Valley incident, the exact chain of events is still not completely understood. A freak meteorological situation was probably a major contributing factor. This matter had been carefully reviewed by a special advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army and chaired by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. A copy of this report is included for your information. This committee has made a number of recommendations concerning test limitations toxicological and environmental investigations, added meteorological facilities, and a permanent safety committee. All of these recommendations are being followed.

Movement of chemical agents is governed by rules and procedures established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service. The material is shipped in special containers; these con-

tainers are put on pallets if necessary and fully restrained, and an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and to absorb agent in the highly unlikely event of leakage. All shipments are accompanied by a trained escort detachment equipped with decontaminating and first aid equipment. Routes are carefully planned to avoid populated areas to the greatest extent possible; and, where they cannot be avoided to move through them carefully and with as little delay as possible.

The precautions taken—the use of special trains, careful routing, controlled speeds and other measures—make a train wreck extremely unlikely. However, even further steps are taken to minimize any hazard that might result from an accident. Buffer cars are included in the train, the escort detachment is distributed in different cars to provide prompt full-train coverage in emergencies, and transit time through populated areas is minimized. Although the agents are not inert, it is important to note that transported agents are neither volatile nor in the gaseous state. They are liquid, and the most volatile is about eight times less volatile than water. The containers are not under pressure, and nerve agents are rapidly rendered harmless by fire.

The comparison of statistical probabilities of a railroad accident and subsequent discharge of chemicals or accidental explosion of a nuclear device is very difficult because of the differences between them. Extensive precautions are taken to provide safety in both. There has never been either an accidental nuclear explosion or an accidental discharge of chemical agent during shipment. This absence of data makes it impossible to calculate the respective probabilities of accident.

In the unlikely event of accidental discharge in a city or town, the first steps would be to secure the area; to decontaminate the liquid material, and to provide first-aid to any individuals who came in contact with the liquid. Supplies are carried in the train to accomplish this. Any alkaline material, such as bleach or quicklime, will rapidly decompose nerve agents. Because the agents have low volatility, there is little vapor hazard, however, people should not be allowed in the downwind vicinity as a matter of precaution.

QUESTION 9

What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields? Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and research programs in ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

Answer

Total U.S. expenditures in the CB field, including smoke, flame, and incendiary weapons, is \$350 million for Fiscal Year 1969. There is no procurement of lethal chemical agents or of biological agents. (Details of expenditures are given in the table below.)

CB expenditures, fiscal year 1969

Procurement:	Million
Smoke, flame, and incendiary.....	\$139
Riot control munitions.....	81
Herbicides.....	5
Defensive equipment.....	15
Total.....	240
<hr/>	
R. D. T. & E.:	
General and basic R. & D.....	9
Offensive R. & D.....	31
Defensive R. & D.....	30
Test and evaluation.....	20
Total.....	90
<hr/>	
Operation and maintenance.....	20

QUESTION 10

Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nation-wide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the field of chemical and biological warfare?

Answer

The answer to the question, as stated, is no: the U.S. could not launch an immediate, massive, chemical and biological attack. The U.S. has the technical capability to do this, but it has not been judged necessary or desirable to procure and install the weapon systems for "immediate massive" attack. The carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response against enemy military forces; not for strategic or "nation-wide" attack.

QUESTION 11

Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

Answer

The U.S. has developed chemical detection and warning instruments which could provide the components for a national alarm system. They have not been deployed to build such a system. However, as noted above, it is believed that the threat of strategic chemical attack is not great. Warning against biological attack is much more difficult technically. Recently, there has been success with a prototype instrument which would provide some biological warning capability. R&D efforts in this area will be continued.

QUESTION 12

Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

Answer

The Army certainly uses discretion in selection of all of its contractors. The advice of the Smithsonian Institution was sought in identifying a suitable institute to do this work. As a result, they submitted a proposal, which was accepted. As a direct consequence of this work, there have been 45 papers written by Smithsonian scientists and published in the scientific literature. This has been a remarkably productive scientific investigation brought about by a coincidence of interests in the fauna of the area.

The Smithsonian Institution was never asked to do, nor did they do, any "military" chemical and biological warfare research. It carried out scientific investigations appropriate to its charter and objectives, and published the significant findings in the scientific literature. These results are available for use by the Army, by any other government agency, or by any nation or scientist wishing to do so.

QUESTION 13

Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer

It was pointed out in the discussion of Question 1 that CB weapons are, in many military situations more effective than conventional weapons. Thus, a nation which lacked CB weapons and could not deter or counter their use would have to consider more extreme measures. Unilateral CB disarmament would adversely affect a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability. The U.S. is committed, as President Nixon wrote recently, to "exploring any proposals or ideas that could contribute to sound weapons." The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of the Department of Defense will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meeting in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

ment would adversely affect a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability. The U.S. is committed, as President Nixon wrote recently, to "exploring any proposals or ideas that could contribute to sound weapons." The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of the Department of Defense will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meeting in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

QUESTION 14

Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Answer

It is difficult to answer this question without knowing the context in which Dr. Lederberg stated his conclusion, nor the rationale he used in arriving at it. There are a number of technical uncertainties about the effects of biological weapons, but this does not reduce the vulnerability of the U.S. to them, nor does it negate the potential hazard they pose. Until such time as it can be proved that they are of little value to any nation, if that is indeed the case, or until reliable mutual arms control agreements are reached, it would be imprudent to dismiss them lightly.

The text of the answer received from the Department of State follows:

APRIL 7, 1969.

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: The Secretary and the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have asked me to reply to your letters of March 10 and March 20, respectively, in which you inquired as to our national policy with respect to chemical and biological warfare.

The answers that follow reflect those aspects of your questions that come within the responsibilities of the Department of State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For ease of reference, I have repeated the questions. Questions 3 and 7 can best be answered by the Department of Defense.

QUESTION 1

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

Should the nation be attacked with either gas or biological weapons, the President would decide upon an appropriate response. As you indicate, there are a number of responses available to the nation.

QUESTION 2

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

My comment on Question 1 is equally applicable to this question.

QUESTION 4

Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agri-

culture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer

In 1966, at the United Nations, Ambassador Nabrit defended United States use in Vietnam of herbicides which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those domestically used in the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries, on the basis that such use was not prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 ("Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare"). Although not a party to the agreement, the U.S. is pledged to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol. The Protocol is not without ambiguity as to the range of prohibited chemical weapons. For example, few nations, if any, consider the use of smoke, flame and incendiary agents, all of which involve chemicals and are asphyxiating at times, to constitute chemical warfare or to be prohibited by the Geneva Protocol. Similarly, League of Nations records indicate that, in prohibiting poison gas warfare, the Protocol's drafters did not intend to prohibit the use of chemical anti-plant agents. While some nations believe that the use of chemical herbicides in war is prohibited, we have been candid about our use of these materials, and I see no credibility gap between our statements and our current practices.

In regard to your question on the use of chemicals to destroy enemy crops as compared with the use of plant diseases for the same purpose, the distinction is one of scale and control.

Herbicides can be employed with some precision and since they do not spread, in the sense that plant diseases spread, they can be controlled. On the other hand, plant diseases are living organisms capable of causing epiphytotics (plant disease epidemics). Moreover, naturally occurring plant disease organisms have been known to be carried by winds and cause destruction of food crops many hundreds of miles from the original source of infection. This is not possible with chemical herbicides.

The U.S. has never used plant diseases, or any other form of biological weapon, as a weapon of war.

QUESTION 5

Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-forest policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer

There are two purposes served by the use of chemical herbicides in South Vietnam: one is to clear jungle foliage in order to increase visibility on the ground and from the air; the other purpose is to destroy only those specific food crops being grown by Viet Cong forces, thereby increasing the logistics burden on the enemy by causing him to divert human and other resources to non-combat activities. The same chemicals are used for both purposes.

With regard to the effect of the use of herbicides on the Vietnamese environment, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker established a

special inter-agency committee in 1968 to make a comprehensive review of the program. The committee's task was to assess the military benefits of the program in relation to its costs, and to study its effects upon the ecology of the country. The review indicated that, in general, herbicide operations in Vietnam have been accomplished without significant permanent damage to the ecology of the country. In this regard, I am enclosing an article from the 21 February 1969 issue of "Science," which was written by Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Tschirley served on the review committee.

There is certainly much merit in a long range study of the ecological effects of herbicides in Vietnam. Such studies in combat are obviously difficult at present but should be initiated as soon as practicable.

QUESTION 6

Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer

The only anti-personnel agent used by the U.S. forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent CS, better known as tear gas. This chemical riot-control agent has been widely used by governments around the world for the control of domestic disturbances. We have no verified reports from Vietnam of any occasion in which this gas has been lethal. To the contrary, we have many reports of lives being spared by the use of tear gas. The fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

QUESTION 8

Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer

The potential risk, if any, posed to the security of the U.S. and other states by dispensing with these weapons altogether continues to be a matter for our consideration. It will require particular study in our consideration of the proposed ban on all biological weapons introduced by Great Britain at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) last summer. It is expected that the results of the current study being undertaken by the United Nations Secretary-General, especially with regard to the security implications of these weapons, will provide additional insights into this problem.

QUESTION 9

Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmament as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

Answer

The very nature of the threat posed by nuclear weapons required that the U.S. join with other nations in achieving agreement in this area on a priority basis.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament

Agency has long been concerned with the problem of controlling lethal chemical and biological weapons. To this end ACDA has undertaken a comprehensive program of research on the verification aspects of possible arms control measures relating to these weapons. While the results of these studies have been encouraging, the research is not yet at the point where specific measures for international consideration could be recommended.

QUESTION 10

Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

Answer

We would agree with you that it may be advantageous to focus new arms control arrangements on these weapons, beginning with biological weapons. Accordingly, the U.S. has expressed its willingness to give serious study to the British proposal banning microbiological methods of warfare which would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Submitted to the ENDC in 1968, the U.K. proposal called for a prohibition on the production, possession and use in any and all circumstances of microbiological agents.

QUESTION 11

What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Answer

The U.S. has on numerous occasions expressed its interest in participating in discussions which may promote progress in achieving effective arms control measures in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Most recently, on March 18, 1969, President Richard M. Nixon instructed the U.S. Delegation to the ENDC to "join with other delegations in exploring any proposal or ideas that could contribute to sound and effective arms control relating to these weapons." President Nixon's message hopefully will lead each delegation to undertake new and productive approaches to the problem of controlling chemical and biological weapons. It should be recalled that the U.S. in 1966 co-sponsored the operative part of a UN General Assembly resolution which called upon all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Moreover, just last year the U.S. played a leading role in the creation by the UN Secretary-General of a consultant experts group to study the effects of CB weapons. (The U.S. is one of fourteen countries represented in that group.) The results of that study, expected by July 1969, should contribute to the ENDC's consideration of the problems associated with the control of chemical and biological weapons.

I hope that the above answers will help to clarify some of the policy issues about which you have expressed concern. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

The text of the reply received from the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Charles W. Yost follows:

MARCH 28, 1969.

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: I have read your recent letter on the subject of chemical

and biological warfare with great interest. Frankly I must say that many, indeed almost all of the questions you raise relate to national policy matters which do not come within the purview of my office. I have therefore taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to the Department of State so that an appropriate response can be prepared in the near future.

You ask about the degree to which the U.S. has shown initiative in this aspect of disarmament and you ask what our plans are at the UN for bringing up limitations on the use of these weapons. I am attaching to this letter a copy of Resolution 2454 which was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1968 with our support. Although the U.S. was not itself an original co-sponsor of this Resolution we worked actively behind the scenes in its drafting and along with 106 other members of the General Assembly voted for it (none voted against it, only Guinea and Malawi abstained). You will note that by this Resolution the General Assembly condemns all actions contrary to the objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and calls for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives contained therein. It also asks the Secretary-General to appoint experts to prepare a report on the consequences of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and to transmit this report to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva by July 1, 1969, and to the members of the UN in time for consideration of the report itself at the next session of the General Assembly in September.

The Resolution further recommends that governments give the report wide distribution through all media in order to acquaint public opinion with its contents. Since the adoption of this Resolution the Secretary-General has designated the following consultant experts to assist in the preparation of this report:

Dr. Tibor Bakacs, Chief Director of the National Institute of Public Health, Budapest.

Dr. Hotse C. Bartlema, Head of the Microbiological Division of the Medical-Biological Laboratory, National Defense Research Organization, Rijswijk, Netherlands.

Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Former Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President of the United States, Washington, D.C. Currently Deputy Director, New York University Medical Center.

Dr. S. Bhagavantam, Scientific Adviser to the Ministry of Defense, New Delhi.

Dr. Jiri Franek, Head of the Military Institute for Hygienic Epidemiology and Microbiology, Prague.

Dr. Yosio Kawakita, President of University of Chiba, Professor of Bacteriology, Chiba City, Japan.

M. Victor Moulin, Ingenieur en chef de l'Armement, Paris.

Dr. M. K. McPhail, Director of Chemical and Biological Defense, Defense Chemical, Biological and Radiation Laboratories, Defense Research Board, Ottawa.

Academician O. A. Reutov, Professor at the Moscow State University, Moscow.

Dr. Guillermo Soberon, Chief of the Department of Biochemistry, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City.

Dr. Lars-Frik Tammelin, Chief of Department of Medicine and Chemistry, Research Institute for National Defense, Stockholm.

Dr. Berhane Tiumelisan, Bacteriologist of the Imperial Laboratory and Research Institute, Addis Ababa.

Colonel Zbigniew Zoltowski, Professor of Medicine, Director of the Institute of Epidemiology, Warsaw.

Sir Solly Zuckerman, Scientific Adviser to the Government of the United Kingdom, London.

These experts held their first, organizational session in Geneva in late January 1969

and adopted their terms of reference as well as an outline for their study. It was further decided by the group that they would reconvene in Geneva on 16 April for a period of approximately two weeks.

I am sure you will agree with me that the background and expertise assembled in this group give grounds to expect that their report will contribute significantly to the further consideration of this subject at both the ENDC and the General Assembly.

I hope you will find this letter not only responsive to your request but encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. YOST.

WHY NOT TURN THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LOOSE ON THE PROBLEMS OF WATER POLLUTION?

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce H.R. 10316 to expand the responsibilities, and I hope also the imagination, of the Army Corps of Engineers for water quality improvement. Instead of putting all their resources and skilled manpower into increasingly marginal navigation, flood control, and power projects, let us turn the Corps loose on building the sewerage systems and waste disposal plants which the Nation so desperately needs if we are ever to enjoy clean water again.

The Corps of Engineers is a splendid organization. It was founded by George Washington. Its civil works program began in 1824 when the Corps received a small sum to begin the improvement of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. This peacetime responsibility was placed on the Army Corps of Engineers because at that time it was the only body of men in the Federal service with appropriate training and skill to perform works of internal improvement.

The corps' civil works program was expanded, on a tentative and experimental basis, to flood control in 1917. In 1936 it was given nationwide flood-control responsibility. At the present time, the corps also generates hydroelectric power, provides water storage for municipal and industrial use, conducts beautification and recreation activities, and carries on extensive research and development. It constructs works of beach erosion control and hurricane protection; it is studying the possible rebuilding or replacement of the Panama Canal; it has full responsibility for the water supply of the city of Washington.

In addition to the direct benefits the civil works program confers on the Nation, the fact that this function is performed by the Army Corps of Engineers is an important advantage to our national defense. It serves to maintain within our Military Establishment the largest engineering force in the world, thoroughly experienced in all types of heavy construction, and already organized, geographically dispersed, and immediately available to fulfill urgently and rapidly fluctuating military requirements in the event of a war emergency.

The corps also has a water quality program. Frequently, this has taken the form of building an upstream dam to store seasonal high water and releasing it later to augment low flow. This, of course, is dilution, not solution of pollution. In some cases, and I am thinking particularly of the Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania, the corps' flow augmentation program has meant making a mud flat in a beautiful mountain area, in order to achieve a scarcely noticeable reduction of stench in waters a hundred miles downstream.

In aid of navigation, the corps dredges out harbors and ship channels annually around the shores of the Great Lakes. Sanitary and industrial wastes concentrate in these harbors and channels, and form a large part of the dredge spoil which the corps removes. Then the corps dumps the spoil in the open water of the lakes. The corps pollution abatement program here is concerned with abating pollution caused by its own dredging activities.

The corps is responsible for enforcing section 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which makes it unlawful to discharge any refuse other than sanitary sewage into navigable water of the United States. The corps is making commendable progress in identifying industrial solids, such as fly ash, mill scale, and wood fibers, which are being discharged into our navigable waterways by neighboring industries, and is also making a half-hearted attempt to stop these industries from using navigable streams as their trash dumps, or at least to make them pay for the privilege of doing so.

The corps has pioneered in installation of sewage treatment plants in watercraft. It has experimented with numerous types in its own vessels, and is getting experience which will be invaluable to the entire shipping industry.

But, like many old agencies with splendid records in war and peace, the Corps of Engineers suffers from hardening of the arteries. It tends to limit itself to tried and true old solutions to new problems. All too often its solution to a navigation, flood control, water quality problem is—build a dam, and the bigger the better. Its historic mission continues, even though nearly all the feasible dam sites on major rivers have already been used, flood plain zoning is increasingly a cheaper method of flood control, more irrigated land merely results in more agricultural surpluses, and more dredged river-channels for navigation further demoralize our railroad industry. Worse, the Corps of Engineers' passion for construction threatens to destroy the ecological balance of some of our most beautiful rivers and estuaries.

H.R. 10316 will give the Corps of Engineers an alternative to big dams. Let the fight on water pollution become for the Corps the moral equivalent of war. Instead of fighting man and nature, let the Army fight the enemies of man and nature—sewer sludge, coliform bacteria, fertilizer and pesticides washed off farm land into lakes, industrial poisons, all manner of waterborne muck and slime.

Let the Corps of Engineers expand its

research and development for water quality improvement. Let it go forward with pilot projects of the same massive scope and irresistible momentum as its high dams. For example, let there be a project to collect, purify, store and reuse storm waters of some great city now awash with sewage in its combined storm-sanitary system every time it rains. Let there be a basinwide project to collect all the sanitary and industrial waste water of a watershed, before or after primary treatment, purify it, store it in a reservoir, and use it for downstream navigation and water supply. Let there be pilot projects for storing such waters underground and dispersing them to depleted aquifers.

The navigation and flood control activities of the Corps of Engineers, unlike the sewage treatment construction grants of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, are all Federal programs. They do not ordinarily require matching funds from the States and local communities. Uncle Sam pays the bill to protect business and property. Should it not do the same, at least for pilot projects, to protect the public health and environmental amenity of all the people?

H.R. 10316, therefore, would provide for the new, massive water pollution abatement activities of the Corps of Engineers to coexist side by side and in healthy competition with the more timid partial grant-in-aid sewage treatment program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The FWPCA program, even if it were adequately funded, gives only fractional—30 percent or so—grants for water purification works, leaving to the locality the impossible task of soaking the homeowner through the real estate tax for the lion's share of the cost.

Furthermore, the program is grotesquely underfunded. Though Congress has authorized \$1 billion for fiscal 1970 for antiwater pollution grants, the actual budget request is a miserable \$214 million. Fortune magazine estimates that at least \$3 billion a year is, in fact, what is required.

So let the Corps, pursuant to H.R. 10316, cease its big-dam fetish, and instead turn its talents to the job it ought to be doing—an all-out attack on water pollution.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 10316

A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of America in Congress assembled, That the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, is authorized and directed to include in its civil works program projects for research, development, demonstration, and construction of works for the collection, purification, storage, and/or reuse of storm waters, sanitary sewage, waterborne industrial wastes, and other liquid wastes. Its civil works program shall give priority to those projects which reflect the most favorable ratio of environmental benefits to costs. The projects authorized by this Act shall be governed by the provisions of Title 33, United States Code, Sections 701-701C, relating to flood control projects.

THE JULY 1968, REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL—A CONSTRUCTIVE DOCUMENT

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in February 1968, the Presidential Commission on Travel submitted to the President, through the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, its preliminary recommendations for increasing travel to the United States.

In March 1968, the President requested the Commission to develop long-term recommendations. Those long-term recommendations were submitted to the President by the Commission on June 29, 1968.

Because the recommendations of the report are in my judgment sound, and should be promptly implemented, I include herewith the letter of transmittal and the text of the report, with less important matter omitted:

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL,
June 29, 1968.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This final report of the Commission on Travel describes positive actions—principally by the private sector—taken during the past six months at your request to increase foreign travel to the United States. It also summarizes necessary further actions—principally by government—which must be taken to reduce the travel deficit and meet U.S. long-term balance-of-payments objectives.

Many travel incentives have been developed since January 1. The foreign visitor to the U.S. can obtain sizable discounts on everything from plane fares to hotel accommodations. His entry is faster and smoother; his reception more hospitable. Travel to the U.S. is possible for thousands of foreign families who could not have entertained the thought before.

However, civil disorders are discouraging travel to the U.S. by foreign tourists. Legislation and voluntary restraints will not reduce travel abroad by Americans to the degree originally expected.

The spread between our travel expenditures and receipts is projected to grow to \$4 billion by 1975 unless far-reaching measures are adopted. The only feasible solution is a tremendous increase in inbound travel—an enormously difficult challenge. To reduce the U.S. travel deficit below \$1 billion by 1975, annual travel receipts must be double the annual percentage increases of the past eight years.

There is a solution.

Industry and government must expand on the start initiated by the Commission to repackage and reprice travel to the U.S. and ensure that potential foreign travelers are made aware of these new developments. Unless the 90th Congress enacts pending legislation waiving visa requirements, our 1969 foreign visitor promotions will go to press with a vital element missing.

Government efforts of a nature and scale far different from those previously mounted should be put into motion, emphasizing innovation and leadership in achieving a strong and permanent commitment from private industry to federal objectives.

The scope and emphasis of federal programs must be altered drastically. The U.S. Travel Service has been a major disappoint-

ment. It has not built support with Congress and private industry or substantiated its effectiveness. Its reputation gravely inhibits its ability to hire and hold effective personnel and obtain necessary appropriations from Congress. Revamping USTS within the same mold stands little chance of changing its reputation and strengthening its personnel soon enough.

I believe USTS should be replaced by a new independent agency, oriented to balance-of-payments objectives. Unlike the USTS, the new agency should concentrate on engaging the resources of private industry. However, as there is insufficient time for action by the 90th Congress, there is no alternative but to go with the USTS during the balance of 1968. If, over the next six months, it performs no better than in the past and fails to follow the lead now established, a reorganization bill should be submitted when the 91st Congress convenes.

There also exists a pressing need for a new private, non-profit organization which would orient all U.S. travel-related firms toward balance-of-payments objectives. This organization could be called the International Travel Institute. Its membership would include the spectrum of travel enterprises, and state and local organizations which have cooperated so effectively with the Commission. Its activities would encompass the many operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program—from convention solicitations to the preparation of multilingual guidebooks, to advertising and promotion.

It is essential that the government agency and the private Institute be separate entities. Firms, states and municipalities must be directly involved in the Foreign Visitor Program, but they find it difficult to justify contributions to federal programs not subject to their control. They will, however, support a private association which becomes the instrument through which federal objectives can be programmed.

Private support for the Institute would come from dues, joint advertising programs, grants for market research, and subscriptions to and advertising in Institute publications. Discussions with state travel organizations and a cross-section of travel-related firms convince me that significant non-federal financing would be available to the Institute—provided that the private sector is convinced of the government's serious commitment to the Foreign Visitor Program.

—Government support for the Institute would be by contracts of the USTS (or its successor). Appropriations for the government agency should be from a special fund derived from 30 percent of the taxes to be levied on international travel tickets.

—I recommend that you appoint a preparatory commission to obtain the private sector financial support for the proposed International Travel Institute, and then to incorporate it as a private, non-profit organization.

Respectfully,

ROBERT M. MCKINNEY.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL

A. IMMEDIATE PROGRAM

1. Accomplishments

Actions which could be implemented quickly and have an impact on inbound travel during 1968 have been accomplished, ensuring a smaller U.S. travel deficit in 1968 than would otherwise occur. These and other measures under way will also have longer-term impact.

1968 has witnessed the following significant developments, initiated by the Task Force and the Commission:

February

The Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel submitted to the President

its recommendations for increasing travel to the U.S.

U.S. airlines increased 1968 budgets for advertising outside the Western Hemisphere to \$16.5 million, up \$5.5 million from 1967.

The Civil Aeronautics Board authorized six international and ten domestic air carriers to bring 2,000 travel agents, tour operators and travel editors to the U.S. for familiarization tours in 1968.

Major car rental companies offered 10 percent discounts to foreign visitors.

March

At the President's request, the Commission began implementing recommendations of the Task Force and developing further long-term recommendations.

A nation-wide campaign to enlist the support of private firms for 1968-69 Foreign Visitor Program was launched.

April

Transatlantic air carriers adopted special round-trip family rates for residents of Europe and the Middle East traveling to the U.S. in 1968. The new directional fares represent a reduction of between 11 and 38 percent on trips to the U.S. which originate in Europe or the Middle East.

Domestic air fares for foreign visitors traveling within the continental U.S. were reduced 50 percent.

Special new railway fares reducing the cost of round-trip tickets by 25 percent became available to foreign visitors.

The travel industry and the USTS began promoting stopovers in the U.S. by visitors to the Olympic Games in Mexico City.

State governors issued proclamations urging all citizens to encourage visits by friends to the U.S. and to receive foreign visitors hospitably.

May

The Foreign Visitor Hospitality Card Program, providing a wide range of attractive discounts, became operational. The card makes available a variety of discounts, ranging from 10 to 50 percent, offered by 6,000 establishments throughout the nation. Included are over 300,000 hotel rooms.

The Hospitality Card became a major theme of the \$16.5 million advertising campaign mounted by U.S. airlines abroad.

Round-trip sea fares to the U.S. on trips originating in Europe were reduced 20 percent.

The Secretary of Commerce asked U.S. international corporations to assist generally with, and to provide incentives for, travel to the U.S. by their foreign employees.

June

Experimental one-stop entry procedures commenced at international airports in New York and San Antonio. The new system is enabling most inbound travelers to clear immigration, customs, health and agricultural inspections in about 15 minutes.

The Department of the Interior eliminated admission fees for foreign visitors at national parks and other recreational areas.

Major international ports of entry adopted broader usage of standard multi-lingual signs and directional symbols.

The Commission's recommendations on a long-term Foreign Visitor Program for the U.S. and the organizational structure required for its implementation were submitted to the President.

July

A 144-page pocket-size booklet listing all discounts available to Hospitality Card holders was distributed worldwide.

The Advertising Council launched a \$5 million nation-wide public service campaign urging Americans to invite friends from abroad to visit the U.S., and to receive foreign visitors hospitably.

Other Actions Underway

An amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act which would waive visa requirements for business and pleasure visits of up to 90 days has been reported out by House Committees. It is scheduled to be voted on by the House in July. Senate action is pending.

The motion picture industry delivered the first of a series of one-minute television commercials designed to promote travel to the U.S. These are to be distributed overseas this fall.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield has developed low-cost medical insurance for foreign visitors and is attempting to solve marketing problems.

The U.S. began negotiations with Canada to increase duty-free allowances granted Canadian residents returning from the U.S.

A bill has been drafted to exempt from federal excise tax foreign visitor purchases of cars, for eventual export.

2. Actions not taken by Government

The Department of Commerce has not accepted the recommendation that the USTS appropriation for 1969 be programmed and substantiated at \$30 million. USTS requested only \$4.7 million for FY 1969, and is considering requesting a supplemental appropriation of only \$1.3 million. Justification of its request was based merely on expansion of existing programs.

Recommendations urging implementation of "Bernstein Report" suggestions to improve Department of Commerce balance-of-payments travel statistics have not been acted upon.

Recommendations concerning Customs pre-clearance and oral declaration procedures have not been acted upon.

3. Outlook for 1968

Although considerable progress has been achieved, the Foreign Visitor Program will not reach full effectiveness in 1968. The unfavorable impact abroad of our civil disorders, the time needed to implement recommendations, the further delay before actions become fully effective, and the continuing inadequacy of U.S. Government efforts, preclude immediate accomplishment of goals established for the U.S. Foreign Visitor Program.

Important design and structural elements of the 1969 program, including enactment of visa waiver legislation, must be ready by November, 1968, five months from now. Therefore, major U.S. efforts should now be concentrated on 1969 and beyond.

B. LONG-TERM PROGRAM

1. Recommendations

The following summarizes the Commission's long-term recommendations.

(a) A new Foreign Visitor Program should be adopted with the objectives of: (1) an annual growth of U.S. receipts from foreign travel of 15 to 18 percent, double the average annual increase of the past eight years; and (2) a redirection of industry toward the international travel market.

(b) The scope and emphasis of federal programs must be altered drastically, concentrating on actions that will demonstrably strengthen our balance of payments. The programs should emphasize innovation and leadership in achieving the permanent involvement of private industry.

This will involve the creation of new programs aimed at increasing expenditures by foreign visitors. For example: promoting visits by Canadians, and more affluent travelers from other primary markets; devising programs to encourage the purchase of U.S. products by visitors; and designing tours and conferences of special interest to the emerging class of technocrats in Europe, Japan and Latin America.

Effective market research, which government has deferred, should be guiding current programs. USTS has dissipated a limited travel budget by undertaking too many promotional activities itself—activities which private industry could have carried out more effectively.

(c) Two organizations should be established to implement the Program: a reoriented, vitalized government travel office; and a new private organization, created with full government support, broadly representative of travel-related firms and state and local organizations.

(d) As there is insufficient time for the 90th Congress to consider alternatives, the Commerce Department should reorient U.S. Travel Service objectives and programs. The national interest requires that in January, 1969, a hard look be taken at the degree of success attained. If USTS continues to prove unequal to the task, a reorganization plan should be submitted early in the 91st Congress creating a new National Travel Office as an independent agency.

(e) There should be created immediately a separate, private organization, to be known as the International Travel Institute, with which diverse private enterprises could identify, and through which they could collaborate with the government. It would carry out operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program; for example, advertising, promotion, convention solicitation, tour operator relations, and visitor reception services. In its method of operation the Institute would follow the example of the British Travel Association and the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

(f) Government's commitment should be increased to annual appropriations of \$30 million. It should seek commensurate commitments from industry and state and local tourist organizations.

(g) Appropriations for the USTS or its successor (including funds for contracts with the Institute) should be from a special fund made up of amounts equal to 30 percent of the revenues from the ticket tax on international travel. (As a precedent, 30 percent of U.S. Customs receipts is set aside for the disposal of agricultural surpluses.)

Support of private, state, and local travel organizations for the Institute should come in the form of dues, joint programs, grants for market research, and subscriptions to and advertising in Institute publications.

(h) A preparatory commission should be appointed to obtain private sector financial support for the proposed Institute and then to incorporate it as a non-profit organization.

2. Long-term outlook

Economic and social forces are causing Americans to travel more and spend more abroad. U.S. disposable income, and the proportion of it spent on foreign travel, are increasing; more Americans want to travel abroad; new airplanes with larger capacities and greater speeds will soon bring lower fares. Unfortunately, the disposable income base from which foreigners finance their travel is smaller than that of U.S. residents. As a result, the U.S. lost \$2.1 billion in its travel account last year, and unless there is a basic change in the factors involved, the spread between U.S. travel payments and receipts will widen—probably reaching \$4 billion by 1975.

Legislation to motivate deferment of non-essential foreign travel has not been enacted. Voluntary restraints will wear thin with the passage of time. A government-sponsored "Fly American" campaign could result in a net reduction of our foreign earnings through: reduced exports of U.S. airplanes, reduced foreign airline promotion of the U.S. as a tourist attraction, and foreign government counter measures.

It is evident that the larger part of any significant reduction in the travel deficit

must come from the Foreign Visitor Program. Given projections of U.S. expenditures abroad for travel, achieving the President's request for a reduction of the travel deficit will require a 15 to 18 percent annual increase in travel receipts through 1975—a difficult challenge. An all-out effort by private enterprise to attract foreign visitors to this country is not likely without government leadership. The U.S. travel industry is fragmented, sells primarily to the domestic travel market, and is little concerned with inbound international tourism. At the same time, government programs are inadequate. They do not concentrate on balance-of-payments objectives or needed priorities. They provide no leadership to the private sector. Prior to the Task Force and the Commission, government and private efforts had not been cross-fertilized or coordinated. The travel deficit will continue to deteriorate unless countering steps are taken at once.

Fortunately, many foreigners put heavier emphasis on travel in their budget priorities than do Americans. Potentially rich, untapped markets are emerging abroad as a result of improving world-wide standards of living. The size and importance of the United States, and its influence on many aspects of life in other nations, place it in a unique position in terms of potential tourist interest. The U.S. remains at the top of the "want to visit" list of most European nations. These factors, if properly capitalized, make the goals of the Foreign Visitor Program feasible. If foreign travelers are to be attracted away from alternative destinations, the U.S. must become more competitive and invest larger sums in advertising and promotion. Foreign travelers must be made aware of new developments which make the U.S. less expensive and more attractive as a tourist destination. A concerted program to improve the domestic travel product will be needed to: establish reception centers; coordinate host programs; create multi-lingual guide services; develop a nation-wide hostelting system; lower costs selectively; increase purchases of U.S. goods by foreign visitors; and expand the scope of travel by foreigners.

3. Organizational rationale

A government agency operating alone has the advantages of: responsiveness to Administration policy; operating without the constraints of conflicting private viewpoints; availability of services and facilities of other government agencies; access to public funds; and prestige. It faces, however, the inherent difficulty of a government entity engaging in promotional activities. But more basic, it precludes active participation by the private sector in the government's program. It is not sufficient for involvement of industry to be limited, as in the past, to participation in advisory groups; there must be a partnership involving goals, programs, and use of manpower.

As an alternative, the Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by a private industry association. This has the advantage of flexibility of operation. Promotional activities could be conducted for which government agencies are not particularly suited. This form of organization would provide identity and association for the diverse private organizations, and create a format for a cohesive interaction of efforts within the travel industry. If it does not succeed, activities can be terminated without statutory revisions, and personnel changed without civil service restrictions.

However, private industry currently does not have sufficient interest in the international travel market to launch the Foreign Visitor Program by itself. It also is questionable whether a private corporation should be given sole responsibility for a task which is of such importance to the future of the United States.

Our recommendations for implementing the Foreign Visitor Program—through a government travel office and a private Institute—provide a unique system involving two organizations with complementary roles, each responsible for what it does best, but with a single purpose. The dual structure could help remove the basis of distrust in the relationship of future Congresses to new government programs.

The system also provides a basis for direct cooperation with regional associations of the states. The wide variations in geography, climate, and man-made attractions across the United States make such regional grouping logical for the promotion of foreign tourism. Each region is similar, in terms of tourist attractions, to a separate country and should be promoted as such. In addition, enthusiasm, dedication and emotion are needed to promote tourism. Residents of the separate regions can best provide this type of support. The Institute or the government travel office could reinforce regional programs by participating in joint promotional activities with the regional associations, matching to some extent their funds expended on programs outside the United States. The promotional dollar of the Federal Government and the states thus would be stretched.

Discussions with the travel industry indicate that private financing and support can be obtained for programs of the Institute provided that the private sector is convinced of the Federal Government's serious commitment to the Foreign Visitor Program. The largest commitments would probably be for specific promotional programs and projects of direct interest to member organizations, rather than to the general operating budget. For example, a New York City reception center might be financed by New York State, the City of New York and local industry. An advertising campaign in Spain might be fi-

nanced by Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines. In each case, the government travel office could provide financial support by contract with the Institute.

While attempting to improve and vitalize the USTS within the Department of Commerce is the least complicated alternative for the government office, the USTS record does not engender confidence in the outcome of such efforts. Changes in federal travel programs must be sufficient to convince Congress and private industry that a new effort is being launched which is capable of far greater achievements and which justifies their full support.

A newly-established independent agency, having as its prime objective the building of foreign travel receipts, would have the benefit of fresh consideration by Congress and the advantage of dramatizing the government's program.

4. Budget requirements

Our program analysis—including a review of the programs of foreign national tourist offices—indicates that if the Federal Government hopes to redress the deficit in the travel account, research and development programs are urgently needed to guide both industry and government investment; and heavy advertising will be needed to provide the best return on this investment, generate additional advertising by private organizations, and encourage the travel industry to redirect its efforts at foreign markets. There is a need for leadership to demonstrate new activities, identify new markets and develop new days of promoting all markets.

The Commission has costed the elements of the recommended Foreign Visitor Program and has arrived at an annual budget estimate of \$30 million. This sum would eventually be divided between the government travel office and the Institute, as follows:

	Travel Office	International Travel Institute
Program planning and research.....	\$500,000	\$830,000
Central administration.....	550,000	760,000
Operation of foreign offices and promotional activities.....	2,350,000	6,790,000
Industry-Government coordination.....	605,000
Product and service development.....	695,000	5,620,000
Direct advertising.....	None	11,000,000
Budget total.....	4,700,000	25,000,000

Prior to the Institute becoming fully operational, some reallocation of the \$4.7 million programmed for the government travel office will be necessary, including "seeding" funds for the Institute.

The growth of the Institute's budget will depend on how soon additional Congressional appropriations are voted, and how rapidly nonfederal commitments are obtained.

I. PROGRAMS COMPLETED

[Omitted]

II. ACTIONS ON WHICH PROGRESS IS BEING MADE BUT HAS NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED

[Omitted]

III. RECOMMENDATIONS ON WHICH NO CONCRETE ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN

[Omitted]

IV. LONG-TERM PROGRAMS

(Summarized from the Commission's "National Travel Program Report")

Introduction

Forecasts of U.S. travel expenditures abroad through 1975 indicate that future annual increases in travel receipts must average 15 to 18 percent annually if the travel deficit is to be less than \$1 billion by 1975. This is double the annual increase in U.S. travel receipts over the past eight years. It represents an enormously difficult challenge

which cannot be met unless the U.S. Government and private industry discard their past attitude of indifference toward encouraging inbound international travel.

The U.S. travel industry consists of a fragmented, widely-dispersed group of enterprises often too small to be concerned with business outside their local areas. Even for those firms with broader horizons, the size and potential of the domestic market serve to diminish their interest in selling U.S. tourism abroad. The only major U.S. firms vitally concerned with inbound international tourism are international carriers. However, because of similarity of service and intensity of competition, profit motives dictate that a high percentage of their promotional efforts be devoted to selling their individual companies, rather than the U.S. That portion of their advertising which is devoted to promoting the U.S. often concentrates on limited destination areas. Thus, some of the most attractive U.S. tourist assets are not being promoted by the carriers.

Analysis indicates that coordination and an intensification of effort could be profitable for both government and private industry. Potential untapped markets have emerged as a result of continuing improvement in the world-wide standard of living. A new middle class is emerging in many foreign countries with four weeks' paid vacation and

the financial capacity for travel. The French market is one example: In the period 1962-1970, the number of skilled workers will increase 14 percent; junior management personnel, 39 percent; and technical employees, 56 percent. There will be 30 percent more engineers and 48 percent more senior management personnel. Many of these people intend only to travel to neighboring countries, but they can be influenced to make more distant trips if adequate promotional programs are directed toward them. These potential visitors must be made aware of U.S. tourist attractions and convinced they can afford them.

The size and importance of the United States and its influence on many aspects of life in other nations place it in a unique position in terms of potential tourist interest. Surveys continually show that most foreigners cite the U.S. as the first country they would choose to visit if they had the opportunity. These advantages, if properly capitalized, could ensure the U.S. success in attracting visitors in spite of the higher costs of traveling to the U.S. and the relatively lower purchasing power of many potential foreign visitors. Even lower income foreigners should be susceptible to "once in a lifetime" vacations in the U.S.

Objectives

The objectives of the United States Travel Service, as declared in the International Travel Act of 1961, are:

"To strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally."

There are two difficulties with these objectives as goals for the U.S. Government: they are not balance-of-payments oriented and they are not sufficiently quantitative to demand a responsive effort that can be measured for effectiveness.

The stringencies of the U.S. international monetary problem necessitate that the overriding objective of a national travel policy be to increase substantially total receipts from foreign travel to the United States. To achieve this objective, the United States must become a more attractive and pleasant place for foreigners to visit. Accomplishment will also lay the basis for improved international understanding. Nevertheless, the U.S. must not lose sight of the basic balance-of-payments goal.

The nature of the travel problem dictates that the part of the travel deficit represented by international transportation be solved by the carriers, rather than being directly attacked by the Federal Government, for the following reasons:

(1) At present, foreign carriers handle about 80 percent of all inbound foreign travel, and they spend at least as much as U.S. carriers in promoting visits to the U.S.

(2) If the U.S. is to obtain the large increase in the number of foreign visitors necessary, the continued cooperation and good will of those foreign carriers is essential.

(3) Foreign carriers are substantial purchasers of the U.S.-manufactured aircraft and replacement parts.

(4) Any action taken to diminish foreign carrier revenues by government appeal to U.S. citizens to travel on American flag carriers would undoubtedly incur retaliation by foreign governments, and be self-defeating.

Achievement of the balance-of-payments goals intrinsic in the mandate of the Commission requires that:

U.S.-flag carriers be asked to concentrate their efforts on obtaining a larger share of international fare receipts; and

The prime objective of the government's travel effort be a 15 to 18 percent annual increase in other travel receipts.

The level of effort required to achieve this prime objective requires a major reorientation of all major travel-related enterprises in the United States toward international tourism. The travel industry has not evidenced the ability or an inclination to do this by itself. However, the Commission has demonstrated that U.S. Government leadership is welcomed by the travel industry and is effective in achieving change and progress. Continuing government leadership will be necessary to attain a comprehensive and permanent reorientation.

Program choices

A consideration of program choices for the Foreign Visitor Program is hampered by the lack of adequate market data and statistics on foreign travel to the U.S., and the absence of reliable measures of effectiveness that can be applied in advance to program alternatives. However, the experience of national tourist offices in other countries is helpful.

The most sophisticated foreign national tourist offices tend to look upon themselves as marketing operations for the domestic travel product. Their programs cover: media advertising, exhibits, public relations, promotional literature, personal selling, direct mail advertising, conventions, incentive sales, special events, tour programs, visitor reception services, travel counseling, research, and financing for hotels and service facilities.

The majority of foreign tourist offices consider market research essential. However, they have an immediate advantage in identifying their own primary market—the United States—and they have a wealth of data to draw upon.

Foreign tourist offices also regard media advertising as essential, devoting an average of 32 percent of their total budgets to this program element. Most tend to regard advertising as a "seeding" device which can: (a) stretch and reinforce advertising by private industry, (b) enhance the returns from other promotional programs and product development, and (c) generate publicity.

Most foreign tourist offices cite direct sales promotion as their most effective marketing mechanism and the activity most susceptible

to measurements in terms of impact. Many tourist offices have found attractive cost-benefit ratio results from the promotion of international conventions.

Offices abroad are considered essential to even the smaller tourist offices as they provide a framework for influencing those who sell travel. Tourist officials believe, however, that direct services to the public by their overseas staffs should be de-emphasized as benefits gained do not justify the costs involved.

Formulation of a budget for a U.S. Foreign Visitor Program could be based on the Canadian or British model—involving about \$10 million annually—adjusted upward by 50 percent because of salary and other cost differentials, and because the markets that it must reach are less fertile than the U.S. market. To these costs must be added additional emphasis on research, product development and industry coordination especially needed by the United States. A second guide to budget levels is the expenditure by foreign tourist offices in those countries which are prime markets for U.S. promotion—about \$15 million. Again, additional funding would be required to attain the objectives of industry coordination, research and product development.

Another way to approach programming and budgeting is to begin with the recommendations in the report of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, which are responsive to the objectives of a specified reduction in the travel account deficit and a reorientation of the travel industry. Unlike past U.S. Government efforts, such a program would allocate substantial resources to product development and visitor services. Its strategy would be to lead and initiate, urging the industry to break new ground. It would provide (or cause private groups to provide) critical missing elements of promotion and product to create what might be termed a "balance tourism system."

Program models

Three possible models for a Foreign Visitor Program emerge from our examination of program choices and budgetary levels:

Activity	Industry catalyst model (No. 1)	Product improvement research and promotion model (No. 2)	Comprehensive model (No. 3)
Advertising.....	None	\$3,000,000	\$12,000,000
Promotion, including Overseas Offices.....	\$2,350,000	5,500,000	9,000,000
Product and Service Development.....	1,250,000	5,000,000	7,000,000
Program Planning and Research.....	500,000	800,000	1,200,000
Industry Coordination.....	600,000	700,000	800,000
Total.....	4,700,000	15,000,000	30,000,000

The industry catalyst model (No. 1), operating within the constraint of the present authorization for USTS appropriations, would emphasize missionary work in industry, such as the Travel Commission has engaged in, and a greater investment in research than USTS has undertaken. This program would require reallocation of USTS resources, redirection of its efforts and some change in personnel. Its objective would be to achieve a greater return from the current annual appropriations of USTS.

The product development, research and promotion model (No. 2) builds on Model No. 1, and provides for the implementation of many recommendations of the Task Force and Travel Commission by heavy investment in market research, sales promotion, and pilot projects. Its advertising budget of \$3 million would be designed to generate additional advertising by private organizations. Again, it emphasizes Federal Government leadership and stimulation of industry.

The comprehensive model (No. 3) allocates

substantial funds to fill the gap in destination advertising in foreign markets. Such heavy investment in advertising is based on the premise that the initial advertising effort should be large enough to: generate a high level of immediate interest; motivate those prospects considering trips to the United States to come now; and trigger heavy editorial coverage. Advertising experts believe that to start advertising modestly would not provide the best return on investment, as levels of awareness, excitement and interest can best be attained by heavy media exposure at the start. Where product development and improvement are being carried out, there is a need to assure that knowledge of such action is widely disseminated. Advertising money provides leverage in generating additional and more effective private advertising. In fact, an advertising budget could be treated as research and demonstration projects are treated—to test new approaches and to provide a basis for encouraging the travel industry to redirect its effort at foreign markets.

There exists no reliable way to measure precisely the results which are likely to be achieved by any of the three models as a whole or by any of the component programs within each of the models. However, given the wide gap between the three models, it is relatively easy to judge their probable success in achieving an annual increase in foreign visitor expenditures of 15 to 18 percent through 1975. If the United States Government is content with an objective of merely increasing the benefits from a budget of the level available to USTS, Model No. 1 may be an acceptable choice. The results which flowed from the greater emphasis given by the Commission to organizing industry efforts are clear evidence that improvements can flow from action which would cost no more.

If the government wishes to redress the deficit in the travel account, it will require the leadership in research and development and the level of advertising inherent in Model No. 3. The tourism industry in the United States has not heretofore shown an impressive capacity to innovate and it is certainly not organized sufficiently to assure concerted action. There appears to be a considerable need for leadership to: demonstrate new activities, identify new markets and develop new ways of promoting all markets. It has long been apparent that research and development programs are urgently needed to guide both industry and government investment.

Organizational alternatives

The United States Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by (1) a government agency; (2) a private travel-industry association; or (3) some form of partnership between government and industry.

(1) *Government Agency.* The advantages of a government agency include: responsiveness to Administration policy; opportunity to operate without the constraints of diverse and conflicting private viewpoints; availability of services and facilities of other government agencies; access to public funds; and prestige.

Several existing federal departments involved in important aspects of foreign visitor travel could be made responsible for the Foreign Visitor Program. The Department of Commerce has managed federal travel programs for several years. The Department of Transportation is concerned with many facilities servicing international travelers. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture administer many important travel destination areas in the country, and have acquired considerable experience in formulating and operating visitor programs. Treasury is the department most directly interested in balance of payments, the prime concern of any Foreign Visitor Program for the foreseeable future. The Program could also be carried out by an independent government agency.¹

Improving and vitalizing the present United States Travel Service within the

¹ One form of independent government agency considered was a Federal Government Corporation. The rationale for the corporate form is financial flexibility. It can employ a business-type budget and vary expenditures in proportion to earnings. Often, as with private corporations, there is an initial subscription to capital with further revenues being generated by the corporation rather than it being given yearly appropriations. This rationale does not fit an agency charged with encouraging foreign travel to the United States. It could not generate sufficient revenues to satisfy more than a small fraction of its financial needs and would, of necessity, be dependent upon appropriations.

Department of Commerce is the least complicated organizational alternative. Up to now, however, the record of USTS does not engender confidence in the outcome of such efforts. The U.S. Travel Service, established within the Department of Commerce in 1961, has not succeeded in building support for its activities or in substantiating its effectiveness. To be successful, changes in USTS and its programs within the Commerce Department would have to be on a scale sufficient to convince Congress and private industry that a new effort is being launched, capable of far greater achievements and justifying their full support.

There are, however, drawbacks to a government entity being solely responsible for the Foreign Visitor Program:

(a) Use of a government agency would preclude active participation by the private sector in the government's program. U.S. objectives require that the attention of private industry be reoriented toward foreign visitors. This reversal of emphasis cannot be accomplished unless private enterprise becomes directly involved and committed. It is not sufficient for involvement of industry to be limited, as in the past, to participation as an advisory group to a government agency. There must, instead, be a cohesive partnership involving goals, programs, and use of manpower.

(b) A Foreign Visitor Program capable of redressing our travel deficit cannot even be contemplated without Congressional support vastly different from that which USTS has known. Ever since its inception, USTS has come under severe criticism from the Subcommittee on Appropriations which reviews its programs. It should be recognized, however, that many of the stumbling blocks which impeded USTS success are endemic to government travel promotion. National travel promotion is a business. It can only succeed by the application of business methods. But methods which are necessary and proper in business—customer entertainment, advertising, sales conventions, etc.—are open to question when employed by a government agency.

(2) *Private Travel-Industry Association.* In theory, the Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by a private, non-profit association made up of members of the travel industry. This alternative has the advantages of flexibility possible only with a private organization. A private association could conduct promotional activities for which government agencies are not particularly suited. It would not be subject to Civil Service regulations, and could operate as a business.

In most instances, however, private industry is indifferent toward the international travel market. Industry has not demonstrated an interest in undertaking the Foreign Visitor Program without government support. It also is questionable whether private industry should be given sole responsibility for a task which is of such importance to the international monetary position of the United States.

As balance of payments is primarily a problem of the Federal Government, direct government involvement is required to seek solutions. It is unrealistic to believe that private industry would work for balance of payments results. Solutions not only bring balance-of-payments benefits to governments, they also bring increased tax revenues. In the case of the U.S., this could amount to hundreds of millions of dollars annually generated by the new programs. In effect, foreign visitors would pay for their own promotion and, additionally, would provide the U.S. Government with a high return on its investment.

(3) *A Joint Federal Government-Private Industry Organization.* U.S. objectives cannot be realized by the government or by

private industry acting alone. Attempting to place industry and government efforts together in one organization, however, presents unnecessary difficulties. Federal moneys cannot be expended without review and control by both the Executive and Legislative Branches. On the other hand, corporate officers cannot justify contributions to government programs not subject to their control and not directly beneficial to their stockholders. Neither government nor private industry domination is acceptable; there must be an equitable division of responsibilities which best serves the national interest and utilize the resources of government and private enterprise.

Recommendations

The Commission believes that a new Foreign Visitor Program should be adopted which: maintains the momentum gained in the last few months; demonstrates that a new, major effort is under way; undertakes new effective actions supporting balance-of-payments objectives; and engages the active participation of private industry and state and municipal travel organizations. It has weighed the advantages and disadvantages of alternate programs, budgets and organizations and makes the following seven recommendations:

1. *The U.S. Government should adopt as its objectives: (a) an annual growth of U.S. receipts from foreign travel of 15 to 18 percent, and (b) redirecting private industry toward the international travel market.*

2. *Federal programs should be changed to concentrate on actions that will demonstrably strengthen our balance of payments. Programs should emphasize innovation and leadership in achieving the permanent involvement of private industry in the Foreign Visitor Program. Past government travel programs have not focused on Canada, have not encouraged the purchase of U.S. products by visitors, have postponed effective market research, and have dissipated a limited budget by directly undertaking too many promotional activities—activities which private industry could have been encouraged to carry out more effectively.*

The Foreign Visitor Program should emphasize these activities:

Motivating firms to increase and expand promotional efforts to sell the United States as a travel destination;

Encouraging state governments to increase their overseas promotional expenditure and engage in joint promotional efforts;

Obtaining selective price cuts to bring the cost of travel to the United States within the means of larger numbers of potential foreign visitors; at the same time developing selective programs to increase expenditures by more affluent foreign visitors;

Continuing the efforts to ease entry procedures for short-duration-stay foreign visitors;

Operating overseas offices, including offices in Canada, charged with disseminating essential sales tools and information to travel agents, carriers, etc. These offices should conduct sales seminars for travel people and obtain, through good public relations, free publicity in newspapers and magazines depicting the favorable aspects of the United States;

Launching year-round advertising programs abroad to promote the United States as a destination;

Developing, in coordination with existing convention bureaus, a National Convention and Special Events program, to promote the U.S. as a site for group meetings and international conventions;

Working closely with long-range planning committees, architects, builders and contractors to develop new and exciting visitor attractions across the United States;

Developing a system which assures that adequate accommodations for foreign visitors will be available at major points of interest throughout the United States;

Launching a continuous educational program to explain within the United States the importance of inbound international tourism, the need for cooperation, and the role that every American can play;

Planning, programming and perhaps helping to fund private and semi-private foreign visitor host organizations;

Organizing a reception program at all international ports of entry throughout the United States to provide guidance, assistance and a friendly welcome to inbound foreign travelers;

Conducting research designed to identify markets and attitudes, test the effectiveness of U.S. promotional activities, and measure the size and structure of inbound international tourism.

3. *The scope and emphasis of the government travel office must be altered drastically.*

As there is insufficient time for the 90th Congress to consider other alternatives, the Department of Commerce should reorganize the U.S. Travel Service and its program along the lines of the government travel office outlined in recommendation 2. In January, a hard look should be taken at the degree of success which has been achieved. If USTS continues to prove unequal to the task, a reorganization plan should be submitted early in the 91st Congress creating a new independent agency of the U.S. Government.

A new agency would have the benefit of fresh consideration by Congress and the advantage of dramatizing the government's travel program. It could emphasize balance-of-payments considerations, and have a more flexible industry orientation than is possible for a bureau within a large department. A new program of the nature and magnitude necessary has the greatest chance of success if entrusted to an organization which can engender support and enthusiasm not only in Congress and private industry, but among the staff that carries it out. Largely because of these considerations, the Peace Corps and the Office of Economic Opportunity were created as independent agencies.

The government travel office should be the policy formulation instrument of the government, concentrating on balance-of-payments objectives, and the leader and catalyst for the travel industry. It should: monitor the activities bearing on foreign visitors which are carried out by other government agencies; coordinate and motivate private and public organizations; measure program effectiveness; conduct research; and represent the Federal Government. Many of its programs would be accomplished under contract with private industry. Contracting and government representation could be carried out within the authority granted in the International Travel Act of 1961.

4. *There should be created immediately a separate, private organization, to be known as the International Travel Institute, which would carry out operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program.*

The International Travel Institute, a private, nonprofit corporation, would eventually be the instrument for carrying out specific programs, principally promotional, required to implement the Foreign Visitor Program. The Institute should have a board of directors consisting of representatives of elements of travel-related private industry and regional state tourist organizations. Incorporators and initial directors of the Institute should be appointed by the President. No officer of the Institute should be a full-time

federal employee. It should be staffed by travel industry professionals, and should be the vehicle through which operational objectives of the Foreign Visitor Program can be carried out.

The establishment of the International Travel Institute could follow either the precedent of the Urban Institute or the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.²

The Institute should be financed by the Federal Government, private industry, and regional, state and local travel organizations. The amount of government funding should be dependent on the amount of financial support from the private sector. Federal funds should be received largely by contract from the USTS or its successor, which would be responsible for directly overseeing the Institute's use of these funds. It should be able to receive membership subscriptions and dues, solicit funds and property from public and private sources, sell its services and also sell subscriptions to and advertising in its publications (maps, discount catalogues, magazines, news letters, brochures, etc.). Discussions with the travel industry representatives indicate that private financing and cooperation can be obtained for activities of the Institute provided that the Federal Government demonstrates its firm financial support. The largest non-federal commitments would probably be made to specific promotional programs and projects of direct interest to member organizations, rather than to the general operating budget. For example, the Institute might develop a project or program which would be of special interest to one or more of its members. A New York City reception center might be financed by New York State, the City of New York and local industry. An advertising campaign in Spain might be financed by Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines. In each case, the government travel office could provide financial support by contract with the Institute.

The Institute's ultimate function would be to implement—on a cost-sharing basis with industry—elements of the Foreign Visitor Program related to: media advertising; publicity; public relations; promotional literature, including guidebooks; convention solicitation and special events; direct mail and other sales activities; low-cost package tour programs; development of accommodations; visitor reception services; travel counseling; market research and educational training programs; reservation services and possibly joint computerized reservation centers. It would be operationally oriented and geared to providing services which individual private firms would not otherwise offer.

Establishing an organization which conducts these activities outside of government gives added flexibility. If the Institute does not succeed, contracts can be terminated or personnel changed without civil service restrictions. If it does not produce results, government support can be withdrawn. (Pertinent excerpts on "The Quasi Nongovernmental Organization" from the 1967 Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York appear as Appendix A.)

² The Urban Institute was incorporated as a private, non-profit corporation under the laws of Delaware. Its 15-member board of directors includes one federal judge but no other federal officials. There was no legislation authorizing its establishment and its directors are not appointed by the President. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia as a non-profit corporation. Its board of 15 directors is appointed by the President. Its establishment was authorized and directed by Congress.

The two entities, working together to carry out the Foreign Visitor Program, provide a unique system—two organizations with complementary roles, each responsible for what it does best, but with a single purpose. The government office must have great flexibility in dealing with the Institute, in monitoring and motivating non-governmental activities, and in assuring a high return from its contracts with the Institute. It must have a fresh image and operational style.

This dual structure could help remove the bases of distrust in the relationship of future Congresses to the Foreign Visitor Program. In the government office would be civil servants responsible for obtaining hard results from appropriated funds, and having no duties which would be inconsistent with the conduct demanded of representatives of the United States.

The Institute would not operate under the constraints of a government agency. It would be made accountable for the efficient and proper use of all government contracted funds it receives, but it would also have private and state funds which can be used for independent promotional activities.

Until the International Travel Institute is fully operational, the government travel office will have to be responsible for certain operational activities. A gradual shift of emphasis will take place in order that the government effort eventually be concentrated on coordination, planning, research and evaluation, and the Institute assume almost all of the responsibility for operations. This will occur as financial commitments are obtained from industry, state and municipal organizations, and as federal funds are appropriated.

In formulating travel programs, the Federal Government should keep in mind that the U.S. is so immense and its attractions so diversified that from the standpoint of international travel it is comparable to a number of separate countries. A national travel program could take into account this diversity by grouping contiguous states into regional associations to promote foreign travel.

Each of these regional associations could operate in much the same way as individual European countries operate in promoting travel from the United States. The regional associations, headquartered within the regions, could bring in travel agents and representatives of the press for study tours. They could conduct their own advertising and publicity campaigns, complete with their own literature and display material.

The personnel, the promotional materials and the host programs, would all be more effective if they originated within the region. Local enthusiasm for the program could be enhanced as it became apparent that the purpose of the program was to improve the economy of the region. Enthusiasm, dedication and some emotion are needed to promote successfully a tourist destination. No London-born British representative could promote Ireland with the effectiveness apparent in the Irish Tourist Office. In the same way, it is difficult for a New Englander to be an enthusiastic missionary for California if he has never lived in the West.

The Institute or the government travel office could participate in joint promotional activities with the regional associations, matching to some extent the regional funds expended on programs outside the U.S. The promotional dollar of both the Federal Government and an individual state thus would be stretched.

5. *Government's commitment should be increased to annual appropriations of \$30 million, with the program division between the government travel office and the Institute roughly as follows: (For a more detailed outline, see Appendix B.)*

	Travel office	International Travel Institute
Program planning and research.....	\$500,000	\$830,000
Central administration.....	550,000	760,000
Operation of foreign offices and promotional activities.....	2,350,000	6,790,000
Industry-Government coordination.....	605,000	
Product and service development.....	695,000	5,620,000
Direct advertising.....	None	11,000,000
Budget totals.....	4,700,000	25,000,000

Prior to the Institute becoming fully operational, some reallocation of the \$4.7 million programmed for the government travel office will be necessary, including "seeding" funds for the Institute.

The growth of the Institute's budget will depend on how soon additional Congressional appropriations are voted, and how rapidly non-federal commitments are obtained.

6. *Appropriations for the USTS or its successor (including funds for its contracts with the Institute) should be from a special fund made up of amounts equal to 30 percent of the revenues from the ticket tax on international travel. (As a precedent, 30 percent of U.S. customs receipts is set aside for the disposal of agricultural surpluses.)*

The Treasury Department has estimated that the extension of the 5 percent ticket tax to international travel, as passed by the House of Representatives, will generate approximately \$95 million during the first year. Treasury does not regard the tax as a measure to raise revenue, but rather as a user tax to pay for improvement of airport and navigational facilities; and a source of funds to promote foreign travel to the United States. As U.S. residents who travel abroad help create the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, it is appropriate that they should be asked to help fund its solution.

7. *A preparatory commission should be appointed to obtain private sector financial support for the proposed Institute and then to incorporate it as a non-profit organization.*

V. PUBLIC REACTION TO THE PROGRAM

[Omitted]

APPENDIX A

(Excerpts on "The Quasi Nongovernmental Organizations" from the 1967 Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York*)

In recent years there has appeared on the American scene a new genus of organization which represents a noteworthy experiment in the art of government. Lodged, through the normal process of legal incorporation, in the private sector of society, this new entity has in many respects the countenance of the private, nonprofit enterprise and even some of the characteristics of the true voluntary association. Yet it is financed entirely, or in large part, by the federal government, it was created as the result of federal legislation or other governmental initiative, and it serves important public purposes as an instrument of "government by contract."

What precisely is this new creature? Why has it come into being? What unique purposes does it serve? Why is it quasi nongovernmental? What is its probable future?

These are questions that have on the whole been little considered. They should interest anyone who is concerned about the future of private institutions in our society. They should also intrigue anyone who is concerned about how—indeed whether—our national government can remain an effective force in the face of the mounting complexity and increasing extent of the problems with which it must grapple.

The quasi nongovernmental organization

has many of the activities of the true private organization. Typically, it has a board of trustees or directors that is supposed to govern it and that, in theory, is ultimately responsible for its affairs. The members of its staff are private employees, not civil servants. It is not housed in a government building or located on federal property. Its employees are in most instances free from security clearance except when working on classified government business. In theory, it determines its own program and carries this out as it sees fit. Frequently, it receives some, though usually limited, financial support from sources other than the federal government. It may, occasionally, even extend the privilege of membership in itself to individuals meeting certain qualifications, thus giving it the appearance of the voluntary association. Lastly, as we have seen, it is legally incorporated as a private institution, and it enjoys tax-exempt status.

It was created as the result of federal legislation or administrative action in Washington, rather than on the initiative of private citizens. It is dependent financially for its very existence on Congress and the particular federal department, agency, or service to which it is related. The accounts it keeps on its federal funds are examined not only by private but also by government auditors. . . . At bottom, its freedom of action, compared with that of a truly private organization, is considerably restricted because the necessity for public accountability is built into its very nature.

The existence of each type of quasi nongovernmental organization has at one time or another been seriously called into question. And yet in each instance there was a convincing basic reason for its establishment. An urgent national need had been identified that no other institution in the society was meeting, or, seemingly, could meet.

In the case of the "not-for-profits," the defense establishment, responding to new scientific and technological challenges, needed two products which it could neither develop in house nor buy from private industrial firms. These were, first, certain specialized technical skills derived from a scientific, scientific-engineering, or social knowledge base and, second, highly specialized advice given with absolute objectivity. The capacity of the "not-for-profits" to pay salaries higher than those which government could offer of course enhanced their ability to attract particularly well-qualified personnel.

The quasi nongovernmental organization, has, therefore, been established to fulfill a number of specific purposes. These may be summarized under three general headings: to meet government's need for specialized service not elsewhere available, to provide it with independent judgment, and to offer it the kind of flexibility required for fresh solutions to complex and novel problems. Each of the quasi nongovernmental organizations has had, in varying degree, these basic purposes. And in every case it has been deemed essential to achievement of the purposes, not only that a new organization be created, but that it be located in the private nonprofit realm of American life.

But in the final test it must serve public purposes, and if these do not coincide with the individual's purposes, government's interest must prevail. Moreover, the quasi nongovernmental organization does not have as a primary concern the safeguarding of the essential nongovernmental aspects of a democratic society. Its concerns are, rather, with the collective interests of the polity and with the discharge of government's responsibilities.

While in a showdown the trustees, it is true, could threaten to dissolve the corporation, government on its side has the power at any time to starve it to death financially, or use its financial power to shape the organization's program. And since financial

power of this kind implies the acceptance of responsibility, a measure of the final responsibility for these organizations must inevitably remain in Washington, in a federal agency in the first instance, but ultimately with the Congress.

The case for independence rests on the simple proposition that for government to recap the real benefits that these organizations offer, they must be *genuinely* independent. If they are anything less than this, their effectiveness will be compromised. Among the benefits, as we have seen, can be a special capacity for experimentation, objectivity, the ability to recruit specially trained or talented personnel, flexibility, economy, and efficiency. Each of these benefits is a direct function of the quality of the management of these organizations, and this in turn is a function of the degree of independence which management is accorded. In short, able men know that freedom of action is essential to their own highest performance, and they will demand it. Having won it, they will resist all attempts by government to erode it.

There would appear to be three minimum freedoms which the quasi nongovernmental organization must enjoy if it is to have real independence: freedom of program, freedom of administration, and freedom of communication . . . it must have absolute freedom to determine the nature of any part of its total program supported by private funds. It must have the right to hire and fire employees and determine their duties, compensation and prerequisites, and where and how they shall be quartered. Lastly, it must be free to reach its own conclusions on both technical and policy questions and, within the minimum limitations of security requirements, communicate these without restraint publicly or privately to anyone interested.

Also relevant is the degree of complexity of the activity being supported by government funds. The more abstruse and technical this is, and the further it is removed from the personal experience of the responsible civil servant or interested member of Congress, the greater is likely to be the freedom from supervision accorded it. Finally, there is some evidence to suggest that an organization's degree of independence is related to its general prestige and standing. If these are high, government is likely to treat it with greater respect.

The concept of a quasi private agency created as the result of government initiative and financed by public funds seems to work and in many instances work well: It works because there are constraints operating on both the governmental patron and its organizational protégé which most of the time enable them to avoid head-on confrontations. Most importantly, there is a job to be done in the national interest with no readily apparent alternative way of getting it done. This makes for a willingness to compromise on both sides, so that the requirements of neither independence nor accountability are ever fully met.

High on the priority list will be to find ways to give financial security to the quasi nongovernmental organization, because financial stability is an essential ingredient of independence. Here, fortunately, there is a device that is already working successfully for the defense-related organizations: the fee paid to them by their governmental sponsors over and above contract costs and overhead. This fee, which averages around 5 per cent of contract value, is unrestricted money, to be used as the organization sees fit. The fee arrangement seems to be the best device presently available for bringing to a nongovernmental organization the general support, free of project obligations, which it so desperately needs. The device could, and should, be extended to all organizations of the quasi nongovernmental variety and possibly to private organizations generally which receive substantial government funds."

*Reprinted through the courtesy of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

APPENDIX B

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute

A. National Travel Office:	
1. Program planning and research: Planning, programming, budgeting and program evaluation; research designed (a) to measure the effectiveness of promotion programs, including those carried out by the International Travel Institute; (b) to develop market studies identifying factors influencing international travel, and the size and structure of inbound tourism	\$500,000
2. Central Administration:	
(a) Salaries of Executive Director, Program Office Directors, Comptroller, supporting professional staff, and overhead, including secretarial and stenographic, rent, etc., at 100 percent	440,000
(b) Travel and miscellaneous expenses	110,000
Subtotal	550,000
3. Promotion (including overseas offices):	
(a) Fifteen foreign promotion offices, including 3 in Canada (Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver); professional salaries (\$40,000), secretarial support (\$15,000), rent (\$30,000), travel and related expenses (\$20,000), and other office expenses, supplies, phone, postage, etc. (\$20,000) (\$115,000 per office)	\$1,725,000
(b) Directing and supporting promotional programs: advertising, promotion and group business and conventions, production and distribution of sales materials and direct mail, publicity and public relations, special promotion for travel agents and carrier representatives. (Most of these programs would be carried out by the International Travel Institute.)	625,000
Subtotal	2,350,000
4. Industry-Government Coordination: Carrying out specific recommendations of the Industry-Government Task Force which involve motivating and coordinating travel promotion efforts of the Federal Government, States, cities, private industry and organizations, etc. Chapters of the report have been analyzed in programmatic terms and related to projected man-days of effort required (with estimated overhead) for the first full year of operations. As recommendations are carried out, budgetary requirements will be reduced.	
Categories (by task force report chapter):	

Footnotes at end of Table.

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute—Continued

A. National Travel Office—Con.	
Lowering costs (1,222 man-days, 5 persons)	109,950
Promotion (2,166 man-days, 8 persons)	194,910
Removing barriers (464 man-days, 2 persons)	41,730
Changing attitudes (176 man-days, 1 person)	15,810
Improving services (1,642 man-days, 6 persons)	147,750
Other recommendations (1,054 man-days, 4 persons)	94,850
Subtotal	605,000
5. Product and service development: Developing pilot projects for new facilities and services within the United States for foreign visitors. A final determination of programs has not been made, but the Commission recommends consideration of: airport and downtown reception centers, multi-lingual telephone service, assistance in creating new events (international expositions, etc.), language training programs for service personnel, youth hostel programs, etc. (The operational programs would be carried out by the International Institute or its member organizations)	\$695,000
6. Direct Advertising	0
Total, National Travel Office	4,700,000
B. International Travel Institute:	
1. Program Planning and Research: Testing effectiveness of promotional advertising programs through interview surveys; evaluating size and characteristics of international tourist business; forecasting and analyzing accommodation needs; developing package tours; analyzing markets, etc.	830,000
2. Central administration: Salaries of management personnel, overhead, travel expenses, etc.	760,000
3. Promotion:	
(a) Promoting group travel and conventions; six convention specialists attached to offices in the UK, Benelux, West Germany, Paris, Stockholm, and Tokyo, plus secretarial staff, transportation and travel, and related costs. Group business specialists operating out of nine overseas offices, including secretarial staff, travel, etc.	900,000
(b) Sales promotion and direct mail:	
Printed materials (brochures and booklets including reprints and joint activities with states and regions)	2,080,000
Tariff and sales information manuals	100,000
Slide presentations	125,000

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute—Continued

B. International Travel Institute—Continued	
10 Area films and sufficient prints of each	637,500
Posters	13,000
Displays	96,000
Direct mail campaign, all costs included	1,040,000
Creative agency fees	150,000
Shipping of materials	400,000
Subtotal	4,641,500
(c) Publicity and public relations, contracted with firms operating locally in major market areas abroad (costs will range from \$25,000 to \$50,000 per area, depending on the market, plus about \$500 per month in out-of-pocket expenses; \$35,000 average for seven market areas)	245,000
(d) Special promotion program for travel agents and carrier representatives operating abroad (500 representatives per year at \$1,000 including (transportation, maintenance, etc.)	500,000
(e) Special promotions with cities and department stores including travel and transportation plus out-of-pocket costs	500,000
Subtotal	6,786,500
4. Industrial-Government coordination	
5. Product and service development:	
(a) Establishment and operating five regional interior offices to work with States and regional organizations on regional travel programs for foreign visitors—two professional staff for each office, rent, office expenses, travel, secretaries, and financial support for program materials (latter estimate, \$150,000) (\$300,000 per office)	\$1,500,000
(b) Continuous educational program with the USA (producing and distributing films, special programs, articles, speakers, etc.)	250,000
(c) Reception Center Operation—includes a reception corps operating in 10 metropolitan centers: The reception corps would involve 500 people (many of them students) working part time in three shifts, average eight personnel operating from each reception center (average salary, \$5,000). Staff at reception centers (two to three people per center at \$15,000) Cost of developing, furnishing, and decorating centers at \$50,000	2,500,000 375,000 500,000
Subtotal	3,375,000
(d) Multi-lingual telephone service in 10 cities. Such a service would involve three shifts of five to six interpreters on each shift (salary costs, about \$360,000;	

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute—Continued

B. International Travel Institute—Continued	
phone costs would probably amount to another \$100,000 to \$150,000)-----	\$ 500,000
(e) Developing package tours (Included under the budget for research)-----	
(f) Developing accommodations. (This is primarily the responsibility of the hotel industry, but the responsibility of the International Travel Institute is to anticipate needs and see that the necessary steps are taken to meet such needs. To define this situation more carefully, funds have been included under research to permit such an analysis.)-----	
Subtotal-----	5,625,000
6. Direct advertising: A preliminary estimate for seven selected countries, plus Benelux and Scandinavia, has been developed, totaling \$6,600,000. This estimate was based on numerous factors including the following: number of individuals in each country who can afford to make the trip; cost of getting to the United States; concentration of population; growth of the economy; attitudes toward travel and travel habits; language barriers; percentage of business travel in relation to pleasure travel; government restrictions; competing promotion efforts; media advertising costs; previous levels of travel to the United States and projected future trends:	
Canada-----	\$1,500,000
United Kingdom-----	1,300,000
West Germany-----	900,000
Benelux-----	600,000
Scandinavia-----	600,000
Mexico-----	500,000
Italy-----	400,000
Japan-----	400,000
France-----	400,000
Subtotal-----	6,600,000
Most of the remaining \$4,400,000 would be apportioned—using the same series of factors—among additional foreign markets. A small amount could be spent within the United States of America to educate Americans to the social and economic importance of foreign tourism within the United States.	
Subtotal-----	11,000,000
Total, International Travel Institute (approximate)-----	25,000,000

¹ Recommendations requiring coordination and monitoring in market research would be carried out under program planning and research.

² A pilot operation in a single city, of course, could be considered; and then expanded as experience warrants.

THE BEAUTY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on my way into the Capital this morning, I could not help but be impressed with the beauty of Washington, D.C. I think it is without a doubt the most impressive looking of all the world's capital cities.

Much of the responsibility for the appearance of the District of Columbia, I feel, must go to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, our former First Lady. Her effective leadership in reawakening the citizens of the District and of the country to the preservation and conservation of our natural beauty deserves the praise of everyone of us.

Mrs. Johnson created a climate of interest which I hope will not die now that she is no longer living in Washington. She herself stated that she hoped her efforts would allow people to speak of their community with "affection and pride." Mrs. Johnson has certainly been successful here in the Nation's Capital. I hope that we will all continue where she left off.

THE VIOLENCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a tragic and potentially explosive situation to the attention of my colleagues.

Over this past weekend, mob violence again took place in Northern Ireland over political and religious divisions that have been slowly tearing that country apart. The British Government, at the request of Northern Ireland's Cabinet, has agreed to assign British troops to guard the public utilities throughout Northern Ireland. The seriousness of this situation is not yet fully realized, I believe, here in the United States. The British Government's decision could mark a fateful turn in the stormy relations they have had with Ireland over the years. I am sure that Prime Minister Wilson wants only to restore order to the six northern counties still under British domain.

But I believe there is a larger question involved here, not one of mere crowd control or restoration of civil order. It is a question of basic human rights being denied to a segment of the population because of their religious and ethnic background. It has long been evident that the nearly 500,000 Catholics in Northern Ireland have been suffering both religious and political discrimination at the hands of the majority of Northern Ireland's citizens. The blood of both groups has run in the streets of Belfast and Londonderry.

As we are all well aware, Great Britain refused to condone the blatantly racist attitude of Prime Minister Ian Smith

and his Rhodesian government. I believe that the racial policies of Northern Ireland are just as unconscionable as are those of Rhodesia or South Africa, both members of the British Commonwealth.

In Northern Ireland today, men are being refused basic rights accorded to them under the English Constitution. Peaceful demonstrations have been turned into riots because of the discriminatory attitudes held by a majority of Northern Ireland's citizens. Segregation and discrimination in housing, employment, and voting rights are just as repugnant to me whether they occur here in the United States or in Northern Ireland.

There seems to be a contradictory attitude within the Government of Great Britain. On one hand they have justly condemned and criticized a government based on apartheid, while on the other, they seem to be assisting in the suppression of a segment of the population bent only on securing the basic rights that must be accorded to them as human beings.

The Irish Catholic citizens of Northern Ireland have been denied the right to own property; they have been denied the right to vote; and they have been scorned because of their religious beliefs. A situation now exists that could prove detrimental not only to Northern Ireland but to Great Britain and, indirectly, to the United States.

As I have stated, religious persecution and segregation and political discrimination cannot and should not be allowed to go unnoticed by any person or groups of persons interested in freedom. The history of our country has been scarred by our mistakes and our negligent attitudes in this area but we are trying to overcome the mistakes of the past. There is a great deal of similarity in the plight of the Irish Catholics of Northern Ireland with the situation that many black people and other minority groups are confronted with here in our country today.

I urge all of my colleagues to appraise themselves of the events that have taken place in Northern Ireland and I urge Great Britain to act justly and compassionately with a people seeking only to be free.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN FLORIDA

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last evening at the Algiers Hotel in beautiful Miami Beach, within my district, I had the privilege of seeing a fine example of the reunification and the resurgence of the Democratic Party in Florida. The occasion was the installation of officers of the Biscayne Democratic Club, Inc., of Miami Beach. There was a very large attendance and great enthusiasm for new memberships in the club and for the club giving hearty and effective support to the nominees of the Democratic Party in coming elections. One of the outstanding businessmen of Florida, a very

successful and able businessman, Mr. Larry Taylor, was elected president, thus bringing into the leadership of the club a man of exceptional ability, administrative capacity, and distinctive faculty for organization and persuasiveness. Mr. Taylor has a deep grasp of the meaning of the Democratic Party and the role it has played and should play in the Nation's affairs. This deep understanding of democratic principle and a very sincere dedication to the Democratic Party were revealed in the president's outstanding address and the president's message carried on the program. President Taylor's address was movingly delivered by him and warmly received by his large audience. Mr. Speaker, I include President Taylor's address and also his message on the program in the RECORD following my remarks:

Brother officers, distinguished guests on the dais, members, honored guests and friends, I have taken the time to have my speech imprinted on the menu. The message of this speech is dear to the heart of every Democrat. I would like you to carry this menu with you and imprint it in your minds forever.

I would like to begin by saying that I accept the tremendous honor bestowed upon me with humility and pride. I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party has always been a symbol for the word democracy. A Democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The Democrats have always been the number one party in this country because the Democrats are the voice of the people. . . . But, friends, only a short time ago the voice of some of our people weakened. Yes, many good, honest Democrats faltered and changed their votes and we lost a great number of friends and supporters. It is human to be afraid. It is human to have doubts and fears. Some of these good people had children overseas, others felt there was too much tension in the country and still others were afraid of the rising cost of living and inflation. These good, honest people felt that by changing their votes they could accomplish a miracle! They hoped to change the natural course of history! They believed that a change of votes would stop the war, remove the tensions and pressures, reduce high prices and get rid of inflation! They forgot that the greatest miracle of all is democracy! Our problems today are people problems and the people have solved their problems ever since this country began. America is the greatest country in the world! This country was founded and built by people who wanted a new and better way of life! This country was built by the blood of Europe. The new party inherited a very healthy country with good times and prosperity that is unparalleled anywhere in the world! The wars, tensions and pressures are a part of the natural course of history and many of these problems were started before any of us were born. The will of the people will solve everything. They always have in the past and they always will in the future. If something bad were to happen to a country like America then all I can say is "God, have pity on the rest of the world."

And now I say to you Democrats, who are here today and to you who have temporarily voted for another party, I say to you "Keep this country, Democratic!" "Keep this country safe." "Stick with your party and when the time comes, vote for the people . . . vote Democrat!" When you vote Democrat, you are voting for yourself and your family! Support the Democratic Party. Now is the time to start. The Biscayne Democratic Club is open for new members. So, don't hesitate!

Be an active Democrat. Bring your friends, your neighbors, your relatives! Bring everybody you know into the Democratic Party. Make them members of the Biscayne Democratic Club. Don't wait. Do it now.

Thank you for your attention and may God bless you.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I am proud to be a member of the Democratic party. The Democratic party has always been a symbol for the word Democracy. A Democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The Democrats have always been the number one party in this country because the Democrats are the voice of the people. . . . But, friends, only a short time ago the voice of some of our people weakened. Yes, many good, honest Democrats faltered and changed their votes and we lost a great number of friends and supporters. It is human to be afraid. It is human to have doubts and fears. Some of these good people had children overseas, others felt there was too much tension in the country and still others were afraid of the rising cost of living and inflation. These good, honest people felt that by changing their votes they could accomplish a miracle! They hoped to change the natural course of history! They believed that a change of votes would stop the war, remove the tensions and pressures, reduce high prices and get rid of inflation! They forgot that the greatest miracle of all is Democracy! Our problems today are people problems and the people have solved their problems ever since this country began. America is the greatest country in the world! This country was founded and built by people who wanted a new and better way of life! This country was built by the blood of Europe. The new party inherited a very healthy country with good times and prosperity that is unparalleled anywhere in the world! The wars, tensions and pressures are a part of the natural course of history and many of these problems were started before any of us were born. The will of the people will solve everything. They always have in the past and they always will in the future. If something bad were to happen to a country like America then all I can say "God, have pity on the rest of the world."

And now I say to you Democrats, who are here today and to you who have temporarily voted for another party, I say to you "Keep this country, Democratic!" "Keep this Country Safe". "Stick with your party and when the time comes, Vote for the People . . . Vote Democrat!". When you vote Democrat, you are voting for yourself and your family! Support the Democratic party. Now is the time to start. The Biscayne Democratic Club is open for new members. So, don't hesitate! Be an active Democrat. Bring your friends, your neighbors, your relatives! Bring everybody you know into the Democratic party. Make them members of the Biscayne Democratic Club. Don't wait. Do it now.

BAGGS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the death of Bill Baggs, late editor of the Miami News and one of the finest gentlemen and courageous journalists it was ever my privilege to know, a member of the newspaper's staff adapted a moving and striking poetic eulogy to Bill's memory composed entirely from a news account of his life written by Miami News Columnist John Keasler.

That so many of the editor's qualities,

sheer love of life, and concern for those who shared his place in time could be captured in a few short lines of moving prose, is a tribute to the creativity of the writer. That what was said in those lines about Bill Baggs was true, is a tribute to the memory of the man.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the excerpt:

BAGGS

Pictures cover the wall with no precedence or pattern
 Liberal, he loved race jokes—if they were funny
 A marmalade jar full of pencils on the cluttered desk that holds a penny gumball machine and all sorts of things
 Throwback editor of eerie agelessness
 Mostregarious loner in the world
 Littered, literate, unique; waystop between a wild irreverence and a deep belief
 The "radical" and the country boy who seemed so true-blue safe
 He changed the face of a city and the thinking of a nation
 Never using a broadax if a scalpel nick would do
 He did not find humor ineffective
 And had that in his quiver, too
 He walked the streets of the city with the flair and air of a riverboat gambler
 An elegance of the past within, courtly always
 It's not just in every lifetime you get to meet and learn from a gentle maverick who somehow led the herd
 Reward enough for us, Bill Baggs.

HORTON PRAISES PRESIDENT NIXON'S TAX REFORM PACKAGE

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's tax reform proposals which we received today are a forthright response to the demands of Americans for fair and equitable tax treatment.

Mr. Nixon had to choose from among some very difficult priorities in this area. Specifically, his decision to seek repeal of the investment credit as a means of reducing the surtax on individuals shows his awareness of the tremendous tax burden borne by American families.

Last week, I presented specific proposals for Federal tax reform to the people in my district. I am happy to note that the President's message contained specific support for the following planks in my tax-reform platform: tax relief for those at the lowest end of the income scale; minimum tax on those at the top levels of income; fair deduction for family moving expenses; curbing artificial tax benefits of corporate subsidiaries; and limitation of deductions of farm losses to curb abuses and early reduction of the surcharge.

I urge my colleagues to support these and other tax reforms so that tax relief to those unfairly burdened can come in time for taxpaying time next year.

I have been putting tax reform bills in the hopper since I came to Congress in 1963. This year, for the first time, with both the Congress and the administration pushing for tax reforms, we have a chance for establishing an equitable tax system. I would like to share with my colleagues my specific proposals for

tax reform which I presented in a speech last Thursday to the Marion Grange in Marion, N.Y.:

A RESPONSIBLE PROGRAM FOR TAX REFORM

I'm glad to see that everyone in the Marion Grange is smiling tonight. People smile when they are happy, or when they feel a sense of satisfaction in doing a good deed or in helping others. I presume you are smiling because each of you on April 15 made a willing and generous contribution to solving the problems of the world, by making a donation to the District Director of Internal Revenue.

Since I am one of the 535 people responsible for spending your tax dollars, and for determining how large or small your Federal tax bite will be, I'd like to spend some time discussing the state of our taxes in America, and assess their fairness and their adequacy in a society of working men and women.

I will begin with the general statement that the Federal income taxes paid by most, if not all of the people in this room, impose an unfairly high burden on your families and your standards of living.

I have been putting tax reform bills in the napper in Congress since I got there in 1963. This year, for the first time, both Congress and the administration are pushing for tax reforms. The Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on Federal tax reforms since the beginning of this session. The administration has prepared a comprehensive tax reform recommendation which aims at eliminating or reducing the most blatant inequalities in our income tax structure.

The press, the broadcasting media, the Government and the people—all at once—are shouting in harmony for changes in a tax system which allows millions of dollars in the hands of a relatively few people, to slip through untaxed, or almost untaxed. The momentum of pressure for tax reform must be kept alive and increased. If there is ever going to be action to inject fairness into our tax system—that time is now.

Two days ago, a reporter from U.S. News & World Report called me in Washington to ask what issue my constituents were most concerned about. This was before the announcement that the North Koreans had murderously shot down a U.S. Navy aircraft over the Sea of Japan. I told the reporter that the people in my congressional district had a deep concern for the war in Vietnam in the back of their minds, but that the sharpest criticism and concern was aimed at taxes—all taxes—local, State, and Federal.

There is no question that the services governments must provide are growing in expense, in complexity, in urgency, and in terms of the number of people to be served. Governments are not going to stop paving streets, or providing the finest possible education for all our children, or delivering the mail, or supporting vital health research, or providing for our defense and security, both at home and abroad. It is unrealistic to think in a society which grows ever more complex, that the task of Government will somehow grow simpler, or smaller, or cheaper. This is simply not going to happen. The demands on governments, and therefore for taxes are not going down, and attempts to chop away willy-nilly at programs or at functions just for the sake of cutting spending will prove far more costly in the long run. What can be done about regulating the growth in the demand for taxes is to establish some sensible priorities—that is, deciding what tasks must come first, and what second, and what third in the expenditure of public money. A sensibly applied system of priorities which takes need as well as cost into account, can at least keep the Government's expenses from growing faster than the Nation and the economy are growing.

What are some of these increased demands on Government? Are they all unreasonable?

What can we do about them? I cannot list them all here, but I would like to cite two or three as examples.

The postal service is shamefully inefficient, and has been a money loser for some time. For years, postal costs have spiraled as population grows—and particularly as people move from easy-to-reach dwellings in our cities into more spread out suburban and rural residential areas. It does take more letter carriers, who must be paid wages commensurate with their skills and living costs; it does take more postal buildings and trucks and mailbags—no matter how efficient the system is.

This year for the first time, the administration has launched an all out attack on postal inefficiency and organization. Hopefully, postal service and postal profits can increase with the proposed reforms—ending a substantial tax drain for the Federal Government.

At the State and local levels, teachers' salary increases have accounted for a sizeable share of increases in education costs. Much blame has been leveled at teachers for bringing this about. But teachers, like farmers, have grown tired of lagging five to ten thousand dollars behind their college classmates who hold jobs in private industry. Every year, the number of children per class seems to grow, school facilities become more crowded, and the number of new teachers hired and new buildings built never seems to keep up with the needs.

Teachers found it difficult to make ends meet on salaries which were far below what factory workers and tradesmen were earning. The pressure of their demands grew, and today they have jumped ahead—and jumping right along with them the cost of education to the taxpayer.

Defense is a third example. In this day and age, defense is no longer a race with other nations to see how many men and how many rifles you can assemble in how short a time. Technology and invention have become the key to military security. New weapons have to be able to do more than the Communist equipment can do. Thus the costs of a single airplane, or a single submarine have skyrocketed. I am one who believes we are spending far, far too much on defense and weapons and the Vietnam war—and I believe that much of our problem of inflation, budget deficits, and high taxes can be traced to this source. You may have seen my weekly column on this subject in your local paper last week.

The upshot of all of these factors—demanding more services and more money from government at all levels, is a terrific tax squeeze on the people who can afford it least. Although we in America are supposed to have a graduated income tax, it just doesn't seem to work out that way. People with higher incomes are supposed to pay more taxes at a higher rate. People with lower incomes are supposed to pay less taxes and at a lower rate. In general, the theory works. But the problem is that of the thousands of pages of Internal Revenue laws and regulations, most of them deal with special categories of tax treatment which affect only the wealthy or the corporations. The more exemptions, tax credits adjustments and deductions that an individual or company can take advantage of, the smaller the share of his income that is actually taxed.

There are very few areas of special tax treatment for the wage-earner, and for the average family with income between \$7,000 and \$20,000 per year. These people are caught in the middle, between rising Federal, State and local taxes. They in theory, pay no more than their fair share. But because others with more income pay far less than their fair share, the middle income family, and the single taxpayer are left holding the bag.

These people cannot be expected to absorb

all of the pressure and all of the tax demands generated by the need for more Government services and expenditures. This burden must be redistributed—and fairly—to those who now enjoy a tax holiday on too much of their incomes.

Many special income tax provisions have evolved in order to encourage certain kinds of economic activity and transactions. Thus, the 7% investment tax credit is designed to sustain industry growth and modernization of factories and capital equipment. It has done this job admirably, but at a high cost to the Treasury. The theory of the investment tax credit is sound, but it is being re-examined in light of the effect it has on tax collections from highly profitable firms which take good advantage of it.

The special treatment of capital gains is another provision—designed to sustain a healthy investment economy—which has little relevance to the little man. For a large investor, the capital gains provision means that a substantial portion of his income will be taxed at a much lower level. But the little man gets very little advantage from this provision. The major investment of a farmer or a workingman's family—outside of a house or farm equipment, may be a savings account, which bears interest now taxed at the full rate.

The oil and mineral depletion allowance, designed to continue oil and mineral exploration and assure an adequate energy supply, saves literally millions of dollars in oil and mining company profits from taxation. Tax-sheltered investments, like State and municipal bonds, or tax-sheltered charitable foundations, business activities of non-profit organizations, special tax treatment of foreign investments, special tax benefits for stock-options which are latched on to hefty corporate salaries—all of these special categories, and hundreds more, help to push the major tax load onto the backs of those people who don't have enough income to afford these transactions. Each and everyone of these special exemptions, credits, deductions and regulations represents a worthy economic or social cause. But together, they have worked to change the basic theory and operation of our supposedly "graduated" Federal income tax.

I have received literally hundreds of letters from constituents—and not just people living in poverty—who have sent along copies of their family budgets—showing how fully one-third of their gross income gets doled out for State, Federal and local taxes of one kind or another.

A chart recently reprinted in the Saturday Review, shows that the vast majority of persons with incomes over \$500,000 per year pay less than 30% of their incomes in Federal taxes. Many persons earning over \$50,000 a year pay less than 10% in Federal income tax. Any system, no matter how virtuous its specific provisions are, which causes such an imbalance in tax burden, needs changing now.

Since coming to Congress, I have urged many reforms in our tax structure. Many of the reforms I have urged, would give the little man, the middle income family and the single taxpayer, some well-deserved tax exemptions and deductions of his own. One such provision would permit a tax credit for a sizeable chunk of college tuition paid by a student or his family. Another provision would eliminate the very unfair tax treatment of single individuals who, like married couples, must maintain a place to live and incur other necessary expenses. A third provision would allow full deduction of moving expenses which are not reimbursed by the taxpayer's employer.

I have also submitted a bill which would eliminate unequal treatment of self-employed persons, including farmers, under social security tax laws.

I have supported legislation to close some of the loopholes which provide tax-escapes without encouraging any worthy economic growth or social improvement. I have submitted a bill that would limit the amount of losses from the farming business which can be deducted from non-farming income by individuals at very high income levels. This is aimed at those who maintain "agricultural estates", and who pursue farming mainly for tax purposes.

There are countless other loopholes which should be very carefully scrutinized by the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury as they progress toward final legislation on tax reform. A provision which allows investment income to be taxed at capital gains rates at the death of the owner should be changed. This single provision costs the Treasury, and thus the taxpayers, a full \$2.5 billion a year.

The oil and mineral depletion allowance is far too large to fulfill its original purpose. Too much profit in these industries which is not needed solely for further resource exploration and development goes untaxed.

Also I propose an upper limit on the amount of income taxed as capital gains to an individual should be considered.

Three reforms, affecting middle income families, have been most often mentioned in letters I receive. The first is the fact that the individual exemption is still at the \$600 level, which is far from realistic in light of today's living costs.

Second is tax reform for the single taxpayer, which I have discussed. Third is a tax break for those who rent rather than own their homes, since they now get no deduction for mortgage interest paid through their rent, as do homeowners.

I personally favor a simplified approach to tax reform. I would like to see the Congress do away with many of the special categories for persons and corporations at all income levels. I think taxes, based on gross income, should be paid at a reduced rate, without this myriad of exemptions, deductions, adjustments and tax credits. If this approach were adopted, tax rates overall, would be lower for the great bulk of Americans. In many cases, the amount of income tax paid would not diminish, but at higher levels, the amount paid would substantially increase.

Because many of the special purposes served by the current myriad of special provisions have strong advocates in Congress, I doubt very much that a truly simplified tax structure can be adopted. In the alternative, I have urged members of the Ways and Means Committee to place high priorities on the following basic reforms within our present system.

1. The application of a minimum across the board income tax for persons earning above \$100,000 regardless of the nature or source of income above that amount.

2. A substantial increase in the individual tax exemption to \$1,200, so that a family of four earning \$7,000 a year would be taxed only on \$2,200 less deductions, credits and adjustments. The exemption for any family of four would be four times \$1,200 or \$4,800. Particularly at the lower end of the scale, this provision would eliminate a great deal of hardship which eventually gets heaped on the Government anyway, through social services expenditures.

3. The enactment of the Horton bills I have outlined above, which give to the working man and his family, and to the single individual, comparable tax breaks to those already afforded large corporations and wealthy taxpayers.

4. Closing or reducing many of the special provisions which have become tax havens for the very wealthy. This would be at least partially accomplished by enactment of a minimum tax on high incomes.

As your Congressman, I have tried to outline my concerns and my efforts in this very vital field. We cannot solve the tax-budget crises in all levels of government by going backward, that is by refusing to respond to the increased need for government services. No more than we would act to freeze the income potential of those engaged in agriculture at their present levels, or worse, at the level of ten years ago: no more than the government can ignore agriculture programs in order to pare down its budget, can we ignore the plain fact that efficient growth is as much a necessity for the public sector as it is for the private sector.

No, we cannot move backward, and we cannot stay where we are particularly in reference to the distribution of the tax burden in America. We must solve the tax crisis by returning to the original, sound theory of graduated federal income tax, and making it stick. I feel that the legislative steps I advocate would accomplish this purpose. I hope that I will have your support in winning enactment of a meaningful tax reform bill this year.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND EC-121

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, once more President Nixon has done the hard but right thing. He has refused to be provoked into precipitous action by the barbaric actions of the Communist Government of North Korea, in shooting down a fleeing, unarmed plane over international waters. It would be the easy thing to order a retaliatory raid against a North Korean air base, or a North Korean harbor. It would be easy, for that matter, to drop a 500 pounder down Kim Il Sung's smokestack. But, President Nixon made the courageous decision. He neither slipped into easy retaliation nor did he cave in to easy intimidation.

President Nixon's first concern was not a saber-rattling callup of the Air National Guard; his first concern was for possible survivors of the plane's crew. Determined to avoid empty posturing, President Nixon weighed the alternatives available and made the decision to protest the surprise attack and to protect future missions.

President Nixon refused to provide the propaganda base upon which the North Koreans could once again invade the South and tie down more American troops on the continent of Asia. There is no doubt of the President's intention to continue to assert America's interest in the Far East, but neither is there any doubt of the President's refusal to become involved in the shortsighted folly of easy retaliation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. MEEDS), on April 21, 1969, on account of official business.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and the balance of the week on account of official business for Department of Agriculture.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POFF, for 15 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. FIRNIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONABLE, for 30 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on April 22.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. UTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. RHODES, immediately following the message of the President on the internal revenue system and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. FEIGHAN during the debate on H.R. 514.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to extend her remarks during consideration of H.R. 514 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during consideration of H.R. 8434, today.

Mr. QUIE, to include extraneous matter with his remarks on H.R. 514 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. MORTON in three instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in three instances.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. LANDGREBE.
Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.
Mr. ESHLEMAN in two instances.
Mr. BRAY in three instances.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. RHODES in five instances.
Mr. CRAMER.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) to extend their remarks and to include additional matter in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks":)

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA.
Mr. EILBERG in five instances.
Mr. DADDARIO in three instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in six instances.
Mr. FRIEDEL in three instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. DIGGS in two instances.
Mr. GARMATZ.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in six instances.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mrs. MINK.
Mr. VIGORITO.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in five instances.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. CONYERS in three instances.
Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
Mr. DENT in six instances.
Mr. MEEDS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 1531. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 1625. An act for the relief of Gong Sing Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura; and
S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 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:

690. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

691. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, test, or research work negotiated under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) 11 and 2304(a) 16, for the period July-December 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

692. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development concerning a recommendation made by the Comptroller General in his report on Rossmoor Leisure World developments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

693. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MINNISH, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. GETTYS, and Mr. GALLAGHER):
H.R. 10283. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. KING, and Mr. LUKENS):
H.R. 10284. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, relating to the control and eradication of certain animal diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIAGGI:
H.R. 10285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:
H.R. 10286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduc-

tion from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10287. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10288. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10289. 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. 10290. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rate of educational assistance allowance paid to veterans under such section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10291. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 10292. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentation harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 10293. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize railroads to publish rates for use by common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10294. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 10295. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, regulating the practice of the healing art in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10296. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. COORMAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ST. GERMAIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H.R. 10297. A bill to amend the Merchant

Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10298. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10299. 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.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. HICKS):

H.R. 10300. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 10301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose additional limitations on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10303. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10304. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 10305. 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. McCLOREY:

H.R. 10306. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 10307. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 10308. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress to create within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Overseas Education Board having responsibility for the elementary and secondary education of certain overseas dependents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIZE (for himself, Mr. WINN, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.R. 10309. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10310. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1950 relating to the Libby Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10311. A bill to extend certain bene-

fits to National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 10312. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 10313. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 10314. A bill to designate the third Sunday in October of each year as "Foster Parents' Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 10315. A bill to cause a study to be made on the advisability of connecting Lake Pontchartrain, La., with the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10316. A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 10317. A bill to adjust the date of rank of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10318. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 10319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 10321. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10322. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 10323. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to make married female members of the uniformed services eligible for basic quarters allowance during such time as their husbands are full-time college students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. GETTYS, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 10324. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. BARETT, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. MIZE, Mr. REES, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 10325. A bill to provide for the more

efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. KARTH, and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 10326. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10327. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10329. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 10330. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10331. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to increase the penalties for wrongful disclosure of information by employees of the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10332. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 10333. 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. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ROGERS of Florida):

H.R. 10334. A bill to amend the National Commission of Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 10335. A bill to revise certain provisions of the criminal laws of the District of Columbia relating to offenses against hotels, motels, and other commercial lodgings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10336. A bill to revise certain laws relating to the liability of hotels, motels, and similar establishments in the District of Columbia to their guests; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10337. A bill to redesignate the position of hearing examiner as "administrative trial judge"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10338. A bill to designate the third Sunday in October of each year as "Foster Parents' Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 10339. A bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. BURKE, of Massachusetts, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ST. GERMAIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H.R. 10340. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 10341. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 10342. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. HICKS):

H.R. 10343. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. WYATT, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HICKS, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 10344. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 10345. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for the movement in commerce of certain State inspected products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10346. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide for the movement in commerce of certain State-inspected products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10347. A bill to extend the Federal-State unemployment compensation program to Guam, to extend chapter 85, title 5, United States Code, to Federal civilian workers and ex-servicemen in Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 10348. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 10349. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of

States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10350. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10351. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10352. A bill to 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10353. A bill, the Potomac Basin National riverways; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 10354. A bill to provide for the transfer of lands to the Navajo Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 10355. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication, entitled, "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPE System"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

123. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the 32d Oklahoma Legislature, expressing the feeling that the United States should not relinquish its control over the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. By Mr. ZION: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the Indiana time dilemma; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

125. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to return to Indiana highway users all Federal-aid funds paid in; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to changing the period for which daylight saving time is in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to changes in Federal welfare assistance programs; 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. BENNETT:

H.R. 10356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iris O. Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Talaat Henry Souryal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10358. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward J. Flatley, [REDACTED]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 10359. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a Medal of Honor to Cmdr. Lloyd M. Bucher; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10360. A bill for the relief of Andrea Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 10361. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Thornton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10362. A bill for the relief of Rosa Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKNEALLY:

H.R. 10363. A bill for the relief of Israel and Rivka Hershkof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10364. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10365. A bill for the relief of Elroy E. Cordova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 10366. A bill to provide for the lease or conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 10368. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 10369. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Coyne, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.