

tiary of the United States of America to the Somali Republic.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1969:

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION
Alfred E. France, of Minnesota, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 22, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Curtis W. Tarr, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
Lt. Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, with his current rank of lieutenant general while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 22, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

My beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.—I Corinthians 15: 58.

O Thou giver of every good and perfect gift, we are grateful for the opportunities for good which have been ours; for the love in our homes; for the fellowship of friends; for the freedom to worship as we desire, and for the happy experience of serving our country in this House of Representatives. Keep us ever alive with gratitude for Thy goodness to us.

Do Thou forgive our mishandling of some of Thy gifts—the opportunity neglected, the untruth accepted, the shallow judgment made, and the cynicism enjoyed. Forgive the unkind word, the unjust criticism, the false ambition, and every unworthy spirit which has reigned in our hearts.

May the light of Thy love and the triumph of Thy truth purify us and send us out into this day to be true to Thee, loyal to our country, and in love with our fellow men.

In the name of Him who reveals life to us we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SO-CALLED BUDGET CUTS

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed over President Nixon's so-called budget cuts, particularly the cold and callous cuts in the Veterans' Administration budget.

With the exception of the Defense Department and Health, Education, and Welfare, no other Department or agency budget was cut as much as the VA. The \$245 million cutback includes delays in structural improvements to VA hospitals as well as a veto on hiring needed medical care personnel.

The Nixon administration has jeopardized the entire program of veterans medical care by killing the VA's request for 4,700 new employees, most of them in the field of medical care.

Approximately 3,600 new employees in hospitals and VA outpatient clinics and another 500 in medical research were approved by the outgoing administration only to be rejected by the Nixon administration.

The Nixon administration has turned its back on the growing problem of crowded VA hospitals with long waiting lists and a shortage of doctors and medical assistants.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I will make every effort to restore at least a part of this budget cut so that our veterans can be assured of adequate medical care.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nixon's request for foreign aid for fiscal 1970 exceeds Mr. Johnson's January request by \$19 million.

Mr. Nixon's request for mutual security funds exceeds the 1969 appropriation by \$959 million.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that all Presidents in recent years have a way of getting hooked on foreign aid before the White House lights are turned off on inaugural night. They are willing to reduce requests for funds for justifiable projects in America but they always ask for increased funds for similar projects under foreign aid.

There are no ifs, no ands, and no buts. Mr. Nixon, in his revised budget, when the military assistance program is included, is asking for more foreign aid funds than did Mr. Johnson in January.

Mr. Speaker, the total funds requested for foreign aid and assistance for fiscal 1970, carried under 22 headings, total in excess of \$10,600 million. Stand by for recapitulation sheets covering totals, which will be placed in the RECORD in a few days.

The following recapitulation covers only one of 22 spigots of foreign aid and assistance:

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Item	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation	January budget request, Johnson	Revised budget request, Nixon	Nixon request exceeds Johnson request by—	Nixon request exceeds 1969 appropriation by—
Economic assistance.....	\$1,380,600,000	\$2,320,800,000	\$2,285,000,000	-\$35,800,000	+\$904,400,000
Military assistance.....	375,000,000	375,000,000	430,000,000	+\$55,000,000	+\$55,000,000
Total.....	1,755,600,000	2,695,800,000	2,715,000,000	+19,200,000	+959,400,000

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO TURNER ROBERTSON

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend birthday greetings and felicitations to one of our very hard workers, the chief page, Turner Robertson, who has completed over 30 years of service in the House of Representatives and I believe that all of us will join in wishing him a happy birthday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and

I join with the distinguished majority whip in extending Turner Robertson our very, very best wishes from this side of the aisle on this occasion.

I do not know which birthday in years, but a good one, I trust.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman. I believe Turner Robertson is about 60, but he will not admit it.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to bring the government of the District of Columbia under

the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

The legislation has a twofold purpose: It will bring about uniformity in the application of the information law at all levels of government in the Nation's Capital, and it will give the Mayor of Washington, the city council, and other officials a long-needed tool of statutory authority to disclose records and documents to the public—an affirmative authority they do not have at present.

It should be noted that the present officials of the District of Columbia, as in the case of their recent predecessors, have generally evidenced a desire to comply with the spirit of the freedom of information law. My amendment will strengthen their hand in the day-to-day implementation of a positive public disclosure policy.

THE NEW DIRECTION IS BACKWARD

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

Mr. HAYS. I have been reading in the public press about numerous occasions the minority leader and others have used the term "new direction" to exemplify this administration. It is very difficult when an object is standing still to figure out what direction it is going, so for the past 100 days I have been unable to ascertain what the "new direction" was. But in the last day or two I think I have been able to figure it out: the "new direction" is backward.

SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in introducing a resolution which would request the President to declare May 11 to 17 "Help Our Police Fight Crime Week."

Never in the history of our country has emphasis been needed more on supporting our police and law enforcement agencies as now. We hear of crime on the increase, riots and demonstrations on the campus, attacks on law-enforcement officers by hoodlums and demonstrators just because they are law officers sworn to do their duty.

Our policemen, patrolmen, sheriffs, deputies, and all law enforcement need the support of every good citizen. Law enforcement and law and order cannot be maintained without the support of the overwhelming majority of our people. It is fitting and proper that our Nation during these critical times pause to honor those men in uniform standing guard over our freedoms. The first line of American defense today against subversion, sabotage, and anarchy is through our local law officers. Their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" are on the firing line for all of us.

Law enforcement is dedicated and devoted to the preservation of our way of life. They are devoted to democratic

principles and ideals. They stand for justice, order, and restraint as opposed to violence, crime, and chaos. With the support of good citizens, they can and will maintain law and order and preserve our time-honored democratic institutions.

I believe this resolution will pass the Congress unanimously, paying a just tribute to our men who preserve rule by law instead of rule by man.

THIRTY-ONE AMERICAN CITIZENS DEAD AS A RESULT OF NORTH KOREA'S PIRATICAL ACTION

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure no Member of this House wishes to add anything to the onerous and awesome burdens which our President and our Government have to bear. I think all of us commend the action of the Chief Executive in giving notice that in the future our flights, although they are in international air space, will be protected by our Armed Forces.

But what I am troubled about, and what my mail and contacts with other citizens of this country indicate our people are concerned about, is whether we are going to just drop the matter of what our President termed a fourth-rate military power shooting down one of our planes which was not offending anybody, but was flying along unarmed in international air space, with 31 American citizens on that plane dead as the result of that piratical action.

The future is one thing, but those 31 men are dead. It would seem to me that the dignity of this country and the respect that we have for those men who give their lives would command that we do something surely to get some kind of redress for the families of these patriotic martyrs and redress which would deter North Korea or any other aggressor from offending in a similar way in the days and years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, surely recent history would compel anyone to understand that there is neither national honor nor national security in appeasing national brigands.

SALUTE TO PORK INDUSTRY IN NEBRASKA

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

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, meat-animal production and marketing in Nebraska is a very important part of the Cornhusker State's economy. Whether the primary or a secondary project of the Nebraska farmer, livestock production helps to provide his living and the livelihood of his fellow Nebraskans in related agricultural occupations.

Today I salute the pork industry in Nebraska. It has helped to meet the needs of a productive people, both in terms of providing a livelihood and in

providing nourishment to citizens across the Nation.

On this Friday, April 25, the U.S. Department of Agriculture will report confirmed production figures for agriculture in Nebraska for 1967, and will present a preliminary report for 1968. These figures will indicate the most up-to-date evaluation of Nebraska's stake in the pork industry, and the pork industry's stake in Nebraska.

Since the beginning of our State a little more than a century ago, the production of swine has been a staple commodity of the farming programs of Nebraska farmers. During good livestock years, the porker helped the farmer to prosper; and during the years when the future of farming was placed in serious jeopardy, as likely as not it was the pig that kept the farmer from "going under."

Nebraska has a fine history of meat-animal production, ranking second of the 50 States in commercial slaughter in 1966. In no small part, this level of production was achieved by the number of swine raised and slaughtered in our State. Constituting a healthy percentage of Nebraska's cash receipts from farm marketings, the production of pork continues to make its valuable contribution to the stockman's wallet as well as the consumer's plate.

THE PROBLEM OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Hays) expressed what I would term a certain wistfulness about the lack of action on the part of the Nixon administration, and it calls to my mind a story of ancient Greece, when Hercules was given the chore of cleaning out the Augean stables. The stables had been occupied for many years by several thousand horses without any cleaning. Hercules finally had to divert not one but two rivers to get the job done.

I mention this not to suggest that the previous administration consisted of horses or any part thereof, as a matter of fact, but simply urge a little bit of patience on the part of my good friend from Ohio.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman that I am not impatient. He apparently just missed the import of my statement. I said that I heard all of these remarks about a new direction, and I feel without any movement it is impossible to tell what the direction is. That is all I was complaining about.

Mr. FINDLEY. But the gentleman certainly agrees that it would be well to get the stables cleaned out before we become too impatient.

Mr. HAYS. I do not believe that we had stables to start with, so therefore we are off on the wrong premise.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. After we have been going around in circles for 8 years, any direction is new.

ADMINISTRATION STALLED

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with my distinguished colleague from Illinois that horsensense would lead to stable thinking, but the administration appears stalled.

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 sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 364

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL), chairman of the Committee on House Administration, has requested me to announce that on tomorrow or at some later date this week House Resolution 364, the election contest of Wyman C. Lowe, may be called up.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-104)

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 Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the report for 1968 on the Food for Peace Program under Public Law 480—a program which over the years has helped provide better diets for millions of people in more than 100 nations. In addition to its primary humanitarian aspects, Food for Peace contributes significantly to the maintenance of export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities and to the U.S. balance of payments position.

While this is my first official report on the program as President, I have been closely associated with it since its begin-

ning. This great humanitarian effort began in 1954 during the Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower. As Vice President at the time, I was keenly interested in the program and have followed its development and accomplishments ever since.

It is evident that the battle against hunger must continue, both in the United States and in the world at large, through programs such as Food for Peace. The present Administration eagerly accepts this challenge and dedicates itself to dealing effectively with the problems of hunger and malnutrition at home and abroad.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1969.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRINTING TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Printing be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. 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. 41]

Annunzio	Dwyer	Ottinger
Ashley	Edwards, La.	Pollock
Bates	Fraser	Powell
Bell, Calif.	Gibbons	Purcell
Blanton	Grav	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hébert	Rosenthal
Brademas	Jarman	Ruppe
Brooks	Jonas	Scheuer
Brown, Calif.	Kirwan	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Long, La.	Springer
Camp	MacGregor	Sullivan
Carey	Mahon	Symington
Casey	Mann	Taft
Celler	May	Tunney
Colmer	Mayne	Wilson, Bob
Daddario	Mizell	Wilson,
Davis, Ga.	Moorhead	Charles H.
Dawson	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 514, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) had 1 hour and 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYERS) had 1 hour and 6 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, we have come to another point in our historic fight to try to put into effect in this country a reasonable approach to Federal participation in the educational programs of our country. It has been a long, hard struggle over the years to get government at any level to recognize that it had any stake in the education of the children of our country. The original public law that established the public school system was sponsored by a Member of Congress from the great State of Pennsylvania, Thaddeus Stevens. Ever since that date there have been those who have tried to take the Government out of education and a few dedicated persons who have realized that local school districts cannot finance the type or scope of education required in today's world. The days and years of yesterday are gone. We live now in a modern world which depends upon the education of its peoples. The whole world and the whole future belong to the educator and the educated. The responsibilities of this Congress are that we now, at this point in our history, write indelibly upon the records of this Congress a mandate that the people of this Nation are going to take their responsibility and give to the children of today and tomorrow an opportunity to meet the conflicts and the challenges of the future. We may have added a few too many trimmings to the public school system. Maybe we have put it in a position where the cost per pupil is too high. This committee has before it today a piece of legislation aimed at carrying on at least at the level we have established for education. We also have the responsibility to look into the individual cost of education and see whether or not there are trimmings that do not add to the fundamental education of our children but become an unjustified item of cost in the budget of our school districts. I remember when I was a boy in a coal town and we had two classrooms and four classes in each room. We started school at the age of 5 and had what is known as a chart class for 1 year. We never had a pencil and we never had a scrap of paper. All we had was a chart before us with pictures on it and three-letter words where we tried to learn the word, the spelling, and the

meaning. We spent a whole year doing that. Then in the first year of official schooling we tried to learn our ABC's. Somehow or other we have now added so many subjects to the curriculum—even for small kids in kindergarten—that we may be overburdening not only the cost of education at that base of education, but the ability of the child to assimilate what we are trying to teach him.

And, I would say to this Congress let us not retreat, as I have heard some rumors to the effect that there will be an attempt to retreat from the standards which we have set. If we were to do the right thing, we would be adding to the cost of Federal aid to education simply because of the local school districts can no longer carry the burden, and the States cannot carry the State aid portion of the burden of the educational system of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the educational system of this country grew up on the premise that it was to depend upon real estate taxation for educational purposes. No person in his right mind could ever hope to maintain the educational plants of this country based alone upon real estate taxation. It cannot be done, nor can it be done by State taxation programs. My State, the great State of Pennsylvania, added a tax of now 6 cents—a State sales tax—to try to meet the burden of education.

Mr. Chairman, we are now talking about an income tax on top of the State sales tax. We have every kind of tax that most States have and a lot of taxes that other States do not yet have. This is because we are adding more and more to our State budget. We added \$167 million to our State budget in aid to education just yesterday. We do not have the money in the till to pay for this. Why? Because we in the Federal Government have reached too deeply into the pockets of the cities, of the States and local communities in order to meet certain other Federal problems. We do not recognize the fact that education is not the primary function of a State. When I say this, I have in mind the money that has been diverted to the Federal programs for Vietnam and other incidentals that have become a part of our Federal operation.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and to all Members of the Congress, do not make an attempt to make a political issue at this late stage of the Federal aid to education program; do not try to get some little political betterment for yourself or for your party, either Democratic or Republican, on the basis of aid to education. We have been through that battle. We have climbed over that hump and Federal aid to education is here to stay.

The proper and honorable thing for this Congress to do is join together on both sides of the aisle and try to put through the kind of legislation that will make Federal aid to education possible, make it work, and add sufficient funds to see to it that any child in any school district in any State of the Union will receive a minimum standard of education

equal to the needs of the moment. I plead with you sincerely to set aside these little personal wants and desires to have your name on an amendment just so you can go out and say I tried to amend the bill to cover this one small group.

Mr. Chairman, I have had all of them to come to me—school superintendents, school supervisors, representatives of the Government and State legislatures, each with a different idea. But that is not their responsibility. It is our responsibility. This is Federal aid to education. The titles are clearly spelled out. There is not a person in this Congress who cannot find out within 5 minutes exactly what this bill does, exactly what it is aimed to do and what it intends to do. If there is an honest difference of opinion with reference to one of the titles or with reference to all of the titles, let us debate them in an unbiased manner and let us do it in such a way that if we do amend the bill we strengthen the bill rather than weaken it.

So, I plead with you to give us as much help as you can, to give this committee, which has had a very serious time in bringing to the floor this very important legislation, as much assistance as possible.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-one 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. 42]

Annunzio	Downing	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Dwyer	O'Hara
Baring	Edwards, La.	Ottinger
Barrett	Fallon	Patman
Bates	Foley	Pelly
Bell, Calif.	Fraser	Pike
Betts	Friedel	Pollock
Blackburn	Gallagher	Powell
Blanton	Garmatz	Purcell
Blatnik	Glaimo	Rivers
Bolling	Gilbert	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Gray	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Grover	Ruppe
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Scheuer
Camp	Hébert	Sikes
Carey	Helstoski	Springer
Casey	Jarman	Steiger, Ariz.
Cederberg	Kirwan	Sullivan
Celler	Kleppe	Symington
Clark	Long, La.	Taft
Cleveland	Mahon	Teague, Calif.
Cohelan	Mailliard	Wiggins
Colmer	Mann	Wilson, Bob
Daddario	May	Wilson,
Dawson	Montgomery	Charles H.
Dickinson	Moorhead	Wright
Diggs	Morse	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON) having assumed 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 352 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 be in order.

When the Committee rose the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) had 2 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is it true that under the impacted areas section of this bill that any person working for the Federal Government on Federal property and who lives nearby, who owns his own home and pays the same taxes as does everyone else and has children in school, is it correct that they will draw—the school district will draw—additional money under the impacted areas section of this bill?

Mr. DENT. Under category B that is the fact.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman tell us what rationale or what reasoning goes on that would take someone who has his own home and who pays the same taxes as everyone else and who has children in school whereby that school district would receive additional money?

Mr. DENT. In answer to the question which has been propounded to me by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the impacted areas bill was passed long before I became a Member of Congress. Then I was fortunate enough to become chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee. At that time we made a very deep and thorough study into the impacted areas legislation. It came before the Congress with some recommendations which were denied by Congress and, therefore, we still have category B. However, we were able to wipe out category C which in my opinion represented a very grave inequity. The argument for the retention of category B was advanced by this committee on the basis that a Federal installation by its nature denies taxation for school purposes to the school district and, therefore, a large installation having many employees who may live within the community would be eligible for impact aid. Since they receive only the taxes paid by the individual in taxation but no return of the revenue from the installation itself. Some communities have only Federal impacted areas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is this true where the child has any impact on the school area? Let us take as an example the Dulles Airport. They have been there all of their lives. They have children in school.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further let us take, for example, a family living near Dulles Airport or a person living at Dulles Airport has a child in school. He has owned this property all of his life and he pays taxes on it, but he goes to work

over at Dulles Airport. He pays the same taxes as others do, but in addition to that that school district receives money under the impacted areas section of this bill because he is a Federal employee and works on Federal property; is that correct, and is it right?

Mr. DENT. That is correct. Whether it is right or not, that is a personal opinion.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I think the answer which the gentleman from Pennsylvania just gave was not quite correct under the circumstances indicated by the question. Before any child is counted for the purpose of impact aid it must first be demonstrated that the school district in which that child resides has, in fact, felt the impact of children coming from federally employed persons to the extent of either 400 schoolchildren or 3 percent of the school enrollment, whichever is lesser. So a child living at Dulles Airport would not be counted unless he lived in an affected school district that already had 400 children or 3 percent of its enrollment who would not be there but for the Federal installation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. When I answered the gentleman I tried to give the gentleman the rationale that was used before our committee. The regulation says that they must be impacted by 400 pupils or 3 percent. This of course allows certain small districts to participate that have less than an impact of 400 pupils.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a secretary who lives in Montgomery County, and has children in school. She works in my office. She tells me that her children come home with a statement that she signs that says that she is a Federal employee. So this school district, even though they own a home and they pay the same taxes as everybody else, receives this benefit.

Is this true or not?

Mr. DENT. It is true.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman that surely it is not right.

Mr. DENT. I did not believe it was right when I lived in Maryland, and the children of the parents next door, who paid the full taxes, and their parents happen to work for U.S. Government in Washington, the same as I do, but they were taxed the same as everybody else, and the local school district received this benefit.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I intend to offer an amendment because I do not believe it is right that a person working for the Federal Government and paying taxes like everybody else—that because of that then the school board gets additional money.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want

to express my vigorous support for H.R. 514—the legislation now before us to extend and strengthen the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and to urge the rejection of any proposed amendments that would inhibit the act's effectiveness. The programs administered under ESEA's provisions are, plainly and indisputably, among the most strikingly fruitful programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

H.R. 514, in addition to proposing an extension for ESEA, seeks an extension for Public Laws 874 and 815—the laws authorizing financial assistance to federally impacted school districts. The extension of these laws is essential if school districts in my Second Congressional District of Massachusetts, and thousands more throughout the Nation, are to make adequate provisions for planning budgets, construction and educational programs.

Cutbacks and retrenchments in the provisions of these laws have been proposed and discussed over a number of years, and rejected by the Congress. Slashes in these programs would result in utter chaos in the financing of school budgets and most certainly would make local tax increases mandatory in Springfield, Chicopee, Ludlow, South Hadley, Granby, and Belchertown.

For example, the city of Chicopee would have to increase its real estate tax rate \$17 this year to cover its school budget if Federal school impact funds were not forthcoming. The Public Law 874 entitlement for Chicopee in fiscal year 1969 has been set at \$1,447,846 for school maintenance, which is a significant portion of the city's \$7,700,000 school department budget. The impact in Chicopee is brought about by the children of Air Force personnel stationed at Westover Air Force Base, which is the headquarters of the 8th Air Force of the Strategic Air Command.

The need is equally pressing for an extension of the programs administered under ESEA. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is one of the most comprehensive attempts to assist education in our history. It has greatly changed the face of education in America and has come a long way toward providing a quality education for every American boy and girl.

Many of the titles of the ESEA have set our local school administrators, as well as experts in the field, thinking of more and better ways to educate our youngsters. I have seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the results of the questionnaire Chairman PERKINS sent to school superintendents. It is encouraging to see the enthusiasm displayed by the superintendents for the ESEA program and see them relate some of the achievements of their various programs. It is also encouraging to note the fact that Mr. PERKINS has gone to the local level to discover how well the programs are working and to ask for opinions. I feel that it is essential to keep in touch with the people who are directly involved in the programs in order to assure success.

In my State of Massachusetts, during fiscal year 1968 we received nearly \$25 million in support under the ESEA. Some new programs were implemented but more importantly, programs already set up under the act were extended and further developed. As I look into the educational record in Massachusetts, I am encouraged by the strides recently taken—at the State and at the local level.

Under title I, the State received almost \$15 million which was used for the education of 87,000 children during the school year of 1966-67. One of the main targets of the program was to keep disadvantaged children in school. A sampling of 40 percent of the potential drop-outs in urban areas involved in title I work-study programs showed that 65 percent of them stayed in school. Before the program, 18 percent would have been expected to stay in school. Other programs were equally as impressive. In a sampling, 32 percent of the children scored in the lowest quarter on a reading test, after 8 months in their title I program, only 18 percent were still in the lowest quarter.

It is my understanding that title I programs have had equally encouraging results in the rest of the country. In our big cities, there is evidence that title I pupils can make substantial academic gains in their compensatory education courses. Antagonistic attitudes toward school can be changed and energies channeled in more constructive directions. Besides the advances with disadvantaged students, title I is working in another direction. As educators develop and introduce new techniques for the disadvantaged students, traditional educational practices are challenged with the result benefiting the fortunate child as well. Innovative curriculum designs are currently being explored, developed, and are in use for all of our students—making a contribution to our total educational picture.

While title I perhaps receives the most emphasis when many of us think about the successes of the ESEA, the other titles have made outstanding contributions to the total educational picture also. Under title II, during fiscal 1968, \$99 million was made available for use on school library materials. This has allowed many schools virtually without libraries to offer the many benefits derived from outstanding reading to all of their students. Public and private schools have taken advantage of the program. Title III has taken us a step into the future by encouraging creative projects in education. Programs for the handicapped have been developed under title VI and with the 1967 amendments we can expect a much wider approach toward solving their special problems. We can also look forward to the results of bilingual education—and the progress of students who had previously been trapped behind a language barrier and taught by teachers insensitive to their special needs. State departments of education are progressing as well with the financial assistance now available—at this point every State has access to a

computer which will encourage the coordination so essential to the efficient functioning of an organization.

The ESEA programs have been in effect long enough for us to see that progress is being made. But, they have not been in operation long enough to make any definitive judgments about which programs are, in actuality, successful and which ones are not. It would be unfair to prejudge the progress being made and come to any hasty conclusions. Many of the educational problems attacked under the various programs are so intertwined with problems of poverty, housing, cultural background and health that progress will indeed be slow. I feel that any changes in the different titles of the ESEA would only put us back to the start before we have had a chance to develop the potential of our ongoing programs. I think one of the most important aspects of the Act is that each title provides for a separate program, but there is linkage from one program to the other. Educators have become familiar with the guidelines and have turned their attention to developing good programs.

I also feel that it is not only important to preserve the ESEA intact, and to extend the provisions, but it is equally important to extend them for a significant period of time. The advance funding provisions written into the recent amendments will go a long way toward achieving a consistency in funding which adds stability to any program. If authorizations were made for 1 year at a time, the consequent effects on the stability and continuity of the programs would be detrimental to the purposes for which the legislation was enacted.

I am very enthusiastic about the results we have obtained through the ESEA programs to date. I feel very strongly that they must continue in the years to come. Education is one of the most important factors in each child's life. If we are to look forward to a bright future for this country, we must provide a quality education for each and every boy and girl. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has made a good beginning in this regard—and I thoroughly support its extension by the provisions of H.R. 514.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I say first of all before getting into any discussion on some of these substantive problems with respect to this bill that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) has pointed to an inequity which some of us on the committee unsuccessfully attempted to correct. I have an amendment, which may be offered, which would meet the very problem the gentleman from Texas has raised. It would provide a limitation on those Federal employees who would be eligible to be counted for impacted aid by providing that in the first year that any with an income from such employment of over \$12,000 could not be counted. The second year, \$10,000. The third year, and thereafter, \$8,000. This would alter the situation that exists in

a county like Montgomery County, Md., in which they are getting impacted aid because they are adjacent to the District of Columbia, and they get a bonanza because the District of Columbia is so close. Those employees who live in Montgomery County, Md., pay real property taxes, pay personal property taxes, pay sales taxes, and income taxes. In my judgment, you cannot justify Federal payments in that situation under the impacted aid formula.

I hope the gentleman, if he is interested in this problem, will be willing to either support my amendment, or I will be happy to work with him.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to the gentleman that, of course, it is not only in the District of Columbia, it is all over the United States. This applies to my district, where we have many employees who work for a defense industry, and the same thing happens there. So it is not just the District of Columbia; it is all across the country.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that he is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, it seems to me this is one of the reasons to extend the bill for only 2 years so that maybe we can convince the House Committee on Education and Labor, and the Congress, to come back here and grapple with this problem where they have not been willing to do so.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is saying, and what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) is saying, I believe should be repeated, and that is at a time when we are trying to get more education money into the so-called disadvantaged areas, it makes no sense at all to maintain the position that a person who works for the Government and earns from \$15,000 to, say, \$35,000 a year, by any stretch of the imagination impacts in any area in the United States. And that is basically what we are saying.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman for his contribution. I believe he is correct.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I am just wondering if the gentleman deals with these so-called inequities that he has enumerated in the substitute he intends to offer.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no substitute that I intend to offer.

Mr. Chairman, there is going to be a great deal of discussion in the course of this debate on the way funds are distributed under the formula for title I of

ESEA. Some of the glaring inconsistencies have been pointed out. There are but a few examples of the many that could be chosen.

Actually, my State of Wisconsin does better than many others under this formula the way it works out—but I do not consider that a reason for supporting a 5-year extension.

This year the Wisconsin title I payments are figured on the basis of \$300.86—one-half our State average per pupil expenditure—which is well above the national average. When the appropriations for title I for fiscal 1969 are distributed, our Wisconsin schools get \$150.20 per child counted. Massachusetts, by comparison, has a higher per-pupil expenditure and their allotments are figured on the basis of \$303.73—but they only receive \$141.83 per child. Hawaii has still a higher base—\$305.18—but gets less than either Wisconsin or Massachusetts—\$132.31 per child counted.

Iowa, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, and Arizona, on the other hand, spend far less per pupil than Wisconsin, but this year they all end up receiving more per poor child counted than my State.

Obviously, we do not—or, at any rate, should not—want to distribute funds in such crazy quilt patterns indefinitely. Many Members have asked how such results can occur, and I confess to you as one member of the Committee on Education and Labor that I cannot give you a complete answer.

One reason for the wild discrepancies in this formula—and a reason also for not extending it indefinitely—is that part of the count of children involves the welfare program which varies from State to State.

As the formula stands now, we count school-age children who were estimated to have been in families with less than a \$2,000 annual income in 1960.

Then, apparently on the assumption that some child might otherwise be counted twice—which, by the way, is still possible under the act—we take an actual and recent count of the school-age children whose families receive more than \$2,000 in welfare payments under aid for families with dependent children—AFDC.

This immediately introduces an absolutely capricious element into the formula, because eligibility for welfare and the amount of the payments both vary from State to State. Worse, the poorer the State and the less able it is to support schools, the less likely it is that a poor child will be on welfare, or if he is on welfare, that his family will get over \$2,000 in welfare payments.

The simple result is that the less wealthy States count fewer children, and then get paid less for each child counted.

To put this in some perspective: there are 12 States—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming—which together in the 1960 census data had nearly 1 million school-age children in families with more than \$2,000 but less than \$3,000 annual income. Today these 12 States have over 17 percent of the total children on AFDC welfare rolls. Yet, they

cannot count a single AFDC child for payment under this act.

Compare that situation with the same figures in New York. In 1960, New York State had an estimated 175,000 children in families with more than \$2,000 but less than \$3,000 income; today the State counts under title I a total of more than 250,000 school-age children on AFDC whose families receive more than \$2,000 in welfare payments.

Where is the equity in this sort of treatment? Where is the sense in this kind of formula? I challenge any member of the Committee to explain it.

Even assuming changes in income levels and migrations since 1960, there are still hundreds of thousands of poor school-age children who cannot be counted at all under this act because they are not in the right States.

Three States—California, Illinois, and New York—accounted for less than 15 percent of the very poor school-age children in 1960—under \$3,000 income—yet this year they count nearly 60 percent of the AFDC children counted for payment under this act.

They count 60 percent of the AFDC children counted, even though they have only a little over one-third of the total AFDC children. But even between these three favored States there is no equity. Rounding the figures, Illinois in 1960 had 256,000 poor school-age children in families of less than \$3,000 income. This year Illinois counts 212,000 for purposes of payment under title I.

California on this comparison does somewhat better. It had 358,000 very poor children in 1960, and today counts 376,000 for purposes of payment under title I.

New York tops every other State. In 1960 it counted 375,000 poor school-age children, but this year its title I count is over 450,000.

The disparity in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, between California and New York is probably very much greater than the old 1960 census figures or even the current AFDC caseloads will show, because California since 1960 has exceeded New York in population, and now has public and private school enrollments totaling 600,000 more young people than the State of New York.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. When we were studying the formula, both in 1966 and 1967, we had statisticians from the Department of Commerce before the committee, and their projections were that the pattern would change very little percentage-wise between the decennial census of 1960 and the decennial census of 1970. The gentleman knows that the rural areas are losing population.

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

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the

gentleman that there is more equity in this formula than in any other formula that has ever been devised and has ever been before this Congress. You are trying to say that the formula is inequitable, but specifically where is it inequitable?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have given you 8 minutes worth of inequity in the formula. It makes no sense to me to have 13 States that can count no AFDC children. It makes no equity to me to have Illinois, California, and New York, each of which would have approximately the same cost of living, and each of which would have approximately the same cost of education, and yet the State of New York gets an inequitable amount of funds distributed under this formula as contrasted to the poor children in Illinois and California. If you are saying that this formula is the most equitable ever devised, or ever to come before the House, I think the facts in the Record yesterday, the facts that I have tried to discuss in detail today, clearly indicate that if we are to extend this act for 5 years, we will simply compound the inequities. We do not force the Congress to come back and correct the inequitable distribution per poor child that goes on under the existing formula. I for one support a 2-year extension.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Undoubtedly there are some inequities in the bill. Formula inequities result from underfunding and the resulting appropriation floor that has been written into the appropriation bill. The gentleman well knows that the States of New York and California have more migration into their States than any other States in the Union. We know the current AFDC count in every State. This data equitably compensates for migration occurring since the 1960 census. This is only one of the important aspects of the formula. It is most equitable. The title I formula is the best equalization formula ever devised. School administrators in the Nation know the equity in this bill. They know too, the amount of money they are going to receive when we appropriate.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, you sat more diligently through the hearings than any other member of the committee as chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor. You heard the responses of the State superintendents of public schools of instruction when I asked them their opinions about the equity of the formula time after time, and they all responded by admitting that the formula was not equitable, but they did not want to rock the boat.

So let us not confuse the issue—

Mr. PERKINS. We will not confuse the issue.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Either on the basis of admitting inequity or on the basis of stating there will be equity when we have full funding.

Mr. PERKINS. My response to the

gentleman is if the gentleman will look at the record—and I invite all members of this committee to look at the record—he will see that 99 percent of the people who came before the committee stated this was the most equitable formula that has ever been devised in this Congress.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I say with all respect that I do disagree because the cold facts require that I disagree. I disagreed in the hearings 2 years ago and I disagreed in the hearings this year, as the gentleman knows, because these same facts have been before us all this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us rely on the hearings on this issue. I am willing to let the hearings speak for themselves, and to look at the record, and look at the testimony of witnesses who were brought before the committee.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that all we have to do is read the numbers. If we look at the tables I put in the Record yesterday, we can see that if the State receives less money than another State, it is not fair, and if we count fewer poor children in one State than another State, it is unfair. All we have to do is look at the numbers. We do not have to wade through all the hearings and see if they want a 5-year extension or do not want to tamper with the formula at all. We can make up our minds.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Minnesota, may I say I remember the colloquy with the gentleman from New York who was accusing everybody of trying to tamper with the formula on the floor. I am not trying to tamper with it, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota is not trying to tamper with the formula. I am trying to suggest that the formula as it exists poses problems and disadvantages, and we should examine it in detail in the House of Representatives and in the other body, and we abrogate that responsibility if we go for a 5-year extension of this act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to continue with my statement, despite the fact that it is considerably harder to get on public welfare in California, the AFDC caseload is only slightly less than that of New York—which leads to the conjecture that today there are a lot more deprived children in California than there are in New York. Yet this year the schools of New York will receive well over \$40 million more than those of California under title I.

Mr. Chairman, in citing these figures, I am not trying to appeal to the Repre-

representatives of one State as opposed to another, but rather, I am trying to appeal to the sense of reason and justice which motivates—I assume—every Member of this House. We simply ought not to extend the operation of this very unjust formula beyond the earliest time when we shall have the information to make necessary changes.

We should not, therefore, extend the act for 5 years, but for 2 years at the most.

While this act—which I support—accomplishes much good and is a credit to the Congress, the title I formula is so full of inconsistencies and contradictions that its long term extension would not be in the interest of American education and would not be a credit to the Congress.

Those of us who opposed reporting a 5-year extension joined in the following statement of our views:

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO 5-YEAR
EXTENSION

We believe it would be unwise to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 more than 2 years; we favor extension of the act to June 30, 1972—in order to give effect to forward funding provisions and to assure advanced program planning—and we propose certain changes in the act to make it a more effective instrument for educational improvement. We oppose the committee-reported bill precisely because it fails to deal responsibly with urgent educational problems.

We confess to a feeling of intense frustration with the attitude of the majority on this committee which treats this legislation as something sacrosanct in the face of all kinds of evidence—some of it beyond question and openly acknowledged by members who voted to report this bill—that ESEA is falling far short of congressional hopes for a reversal of certain patterns of educational failure, and that the act is riddled with inequities which should be either eliminated or greatly reduced.

Even if the majority had desired the kind of searching inquiry and detailed consideration required to produce improvements in the legislation, the way it was handled in the committee would have defeated that intent. H.R. 514 was considered in "informal" hearings of the full committee which heard a seemingly endless parade of witnesses who dutifully and repetitively answered two questions posed by the chairman: "Has this act done some good?" and "Should it be extended for 5 years?" The second question could well have been asked in terms of 1 year, 2 years, 10 years, or 20 years; the answer would have been "Yes". The answer to both questions, of course, was "Yes" (even from a few witnesses who had the temerity to point out certain weaknesses in ESEA). The cumulative effect of 22 days of such hearings can best be described as stupefying; certainly it was not a better informed committee.

These attitudes and procedures produce predictable results which must now be untangled by the House. The purpose of these views is to attempt to clarify some of the critical issues in this legislation and to suggest changes which would go a part of the way toward correcting obvious deficiencies.

THE FOLLY OF A 5-YEAR EXTENSION

ESEA expires June 30, 1970. However, if the forward-funding provisions—which Republican members of this committee strongly supported—are to be operable the act must be extended now for at least 1 year. That is the only compelling reason for any committee action at this time. We support a 2-year extension as recommended by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch—to

June 30, 1972—for two reasons. First, an assurance of 3 more years of operation is desirable in order to encourage advance program planning. Second, and even more important, the census data which forms the basis of the distribution of funds under title I will be updated in 1969-70 and the new information very likely will necessitate major changes in title I, which is by far the most vital part of this act.

Additional factors support this view. The administration has undertaken a complete review of this legislation in the context of our total national effort to overcome educational and social problems, and the Congress should be assured of the opportunity to act upon any recommendations of the executive branch at an early date. There is also the cumulative evidence gathered by such groups as the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, and numerous public and private agencies and organizations, which should form the basis for constructive changes in the act.

Against the weight of such factors the only reasoning advanced in favor of the committee action to extend the act of 5 years—to June 30, 1975—was that a long extension gives "assurance" to educators and "continuity" to the program. As to the first, any educator worthy of the name must know that one Congress cannot bind another and that the only assurance possible of the continuation of these programs lies in the continued support of a substantial majority in the Congress. With respect to "continuity," to the extent that certain programs are weak and ineffective or certain provisions are inequitable, continuity is the very thing that must be avoided.

The illogical arguments for a long extension are not made more persuasive by the repeated assurances of the chairman—which we accept without reservation as being given in good faith—that the act can be reviewed at any time. Technically this is true; in practice it is meaningless. The Congress shares at least this one trait with every other legislative body from the city council on up the line—it seldom acts when there is no necessity to act. The only way to assure a timely review of this act is to fix its termination at the earliest prudent date.

It is pure folly—and a disservice to the vital objectives of ESEA—to extend the act beyond 1972. Perhaps the best single example of why the act needs thorough revision at the earliest possible time is provided by the much-discussed but little-understood formula in title I of the act. Title I is the most important part of the act because it provides the only clear focus on the needs of disadvantaged children and because it represents three-quarters of the authorized appropriations.

A "FORMULA" FOR FAILURE

Any distribution formula for Federal assistance thus far devised is at best an instrument for achieving a rough degree of equity based upon a rational assessment of need; its one essential quality is uniformity of application. The reason that many otherwise useful forms of data cannot be utilized in such a formula is that they do not apply uniformly on a national basis, a good example being welfare caseload data as a means of measuring poverty; it is useful within any given State to compare local needs, but is useless nationally to compare needs of States or of localities in different States because the welfare program is supported at widely different levels by the States; a child with certain needs in New York who is receiving welfare is in demonstrably better circumstances than a child with the same needs in Mississippi who does not receive welfare.

Yet the title I formula ignores this patently obvious fact and bases a large proportion of its payments upon the aid to families with dependent children welfare program

(AFDC). This error is further compounded by counting only those school age children whose families receive more than \$2,000 from welfare payments alone—which means that tens of thousands of schoolchildren on welfare cannot be counted simply because they live in States in which few if any families receive that amount of money from AFDC. We shall examine some of the results of this irrational procedure.

Other types of data are satisfactory if used to compare States, but quickly break down at the local level because changes occur too rapidly. An example of this are the census estimates of the number of school age children from families with a certain level of income, which is the basic factor in figuring title I payments. When this data was used in 1965 it was already 6 years old; it is now 10 years old and will be 12 years out of date before the 1970 census figures can be applied to the formula. Although this data might still be fairly useful in comparing the relative needs of most States (while undoubtedly unfair to a State such as California which has a huge immigration), it is woefully inadequate as a measure of the highly changeable economic and population status of individual counties and communities. Yet the title I formula applies these old estimates on just that basis. Between 1959 and 1966, for example, Los Angeles County had a net immigration of 276,200 persons, many of them schoolage children from low-income families, who cannot be reflected in the title I formula before 1972. Other counties around the Nation have had large outmigrations (often to cities within the same State) of low-income families, yet continue to receive title I payments on the 1959 data.

The other factor in the title I formula (aside from the "count" of disadvantaged children based upon census estimates and AFDC payments) is that the final allocation of funds is figured on the basis of the expenditure per pupil for public education in each State, with the result that the more a State can afford to expend the more it gets to spend. With the exception of a very few States which are supporting schools at a lower level than their resources should permit, this simply means that "the rich get richer." In 1966 the Congress amended the act to provide a partial correction of this effect by permitting low-expenditure States to use the national average expenditure to figure title I entitlements. When it became apparent in 1967 that limited appropriations would mean that districts in wealthier States would lose money in favor of those in poorer States, our committee attempted to suspend the operation of the national average provision, but this was reversed by amendment to the committee bill by the House—whereupon it was agreed to impose the 1967 allocations as a "floor" for each county and thereby distort the effect of using the national average expenditure for the States below that average. To say the least, this sort of performance creates its own credibility gap for some of those who are loudest in the protestations of concern for impoverished children attending impoverished schools.

The results of all these inconsistencies speak louder than any words we can muster to describe them.

SOME RESULTS OF THE TITLE I FORMULA

The title I formula currently counts children on the basis of (a) 1960 census estimates of the number of school age children in families with less than \$2,000 income and (b) most recent count of school age children on AFDC whose families receive over \$2,000 in AFDC payments.

For reasons already discussed, the AFDC count is worthless in comparing the needs of one State with those of another. Even using the 1960 census data gathered in 1959, a far more valid measure of need between States would be the number of desperately

poor school age children—using the \$3,000 poverty level for family income—in each State. Here are some of the results using that measure of need and then comparing actual 1969 payments to local schools in the States under title I.

Georgia had 5,000 more very poor school age children than New York, but received a little over 25 percent of the New York allotment for their education;

Texas had 272,000 more poor children than New York, but gets a bare 60 percent of the New York allotment;

Ohio had 2,000 more poor children than Illinois, but gets \$11 million less than Illinois;

Michigan had 83 percent of the number of poor children in Illinois, but gets only 73 percent of the Illinois title I allotment;

Indiana had half as many poor children as Illinois, but gets a little over one-third the amount allotted to Illinois;

Kentucky had 25,000 more poor children than Illinois, but gets \$14.4 million less to educate poor children;

Pennsylvania had 90 percent of the number of poor children in California, but gets 60 percent as much title I money;

With 87 percent of the New York total of poor children, Pennsylvania gets only 38 percent of the New York allotment.

New York, California, and Illinois combined had only 12.3 percent of the poor children counted in 1959, but their combined allotments in 1969 are more than 22 percent of the total allotments for title I. Even between the most-favored States, however, there are vast inconsistencies in treatment. California, for example, in 1959 had over 95 percent the number of poor school age children as New York, yet in 1969 receives only two-thirds the amount of funds going to New York. Moreover, there is more than a suspicion that in this period California has not only overtaken New York in total population, but in the extent of the educational problem with which title I is concerned; the total public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school enrollment in California now exceeds that of New York by 600,000 pupils.

Nor does one have to pick and choose carefully between States and sections to obtain these outlandish discrepancies between need and money allocated under title I to meet the need (such as a comparison between New York and Mississippi). The discrepancies appear almost at random.

For example, in the New England States of Maine and Connecticut, Maine in 1959 actually had 1,000 more poor schoolage children than Connecticut, but in 1969 Connecticut received over twice as much title I money as Maine (\$8.6 million versus \$3.4 million).

These wild results are not caused by using old data—and this point cannot be stressed too strongly—had this data been applied in 1960 when they were brand new the same relative values would have occurred, and they shall occur with the new census data of 1970 when it is applied in 1972.

All sorts of arguments have been advanced to explain why the schools in one State should receive much more than the schools in another in relation to demonstrable need and even when there is greater financial capacity in the favored State to meet such needs. The lamest of all these is that "costs" vary from State to State. They do—but not nearly as much as would be required to reflect the different treatments under title I, and they vary even less when comparing various metropolitan areas in which a high proportion of disadvantaged children live and attend school. The cost of living (according to the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics estimate) in Boston, for example, is only 2 percent less than in New York City and is 7 percent more than in Buffalo—yet for each poor child counted in Boston the schools are paid on the basis of \$303.73, while in New York City

and Buffalo the rate is \$467.88. Living costs are 6 percent higher in San Francisco than in Chicago, yet San Francisco's allotment is figured on the basis of \$287.32 per poor child while the basis in Chicago is \$302.72.

However, as we shall show, these are only the amounts that would be paid on behalf of each child if title I were fully funded. They enter into the calculations in determining the actual amounts with lesser appropriations, but they are not the only factors. This year the schools in Boston will actually receive \$150.01 for each child counted, compared to \$206.80 per child in Buffalo and New York City. In San Francisco the actual rate is \$151.88, while in Chicago it is \$159.01.

One conclusion from these figures is that title I becomes progressively more unfair as the appropriations for it are increased. This, in itself, is a strong argument for not extending the act beyond 2 additional years when, hopefully, more money might be available for this program.

The cost of providing a quality education for disadvantaged children undoubtedly does vary somewhat from region to region, but it would be difficult to argue that it varies to the extent reflected in the rates used—\$277.65 in the case of Mississippi and \$467.88 in the case of New York—to arrive at the entitlements under title I of this act. The true basis for this title is not the "cost" of a quality education, but only what the various States can afford to spend, which in many cases, adds up to an inferior education for all the children involved.

FORMULA DISTORTED IN APPLICATION

These various factors unite in producing a confused and distorted formula, but the result has become further distorted in application by changes occurring both through the appropriations process and through substantive amendment. The first of these was at the very beginning when many schools spent the first allocation of funds as quickly as possible and others held back until they could put together a sound program; thus the schools in some States spent a far greater share of the initial allotments than did the schools in other States. In the second year the appropriations act used the first year's expenditures as a "floor," which meant that the initial fast spenders were rewarded at the expense of the more cautious. This initial distortion has continued every year since, and has become further complicated by "floors" and formula changes written into the substantive act. The effects are extremely capricious from State to State.

Another distortion of the formula occurs because of limited appropriations for the program at the same time that more and more AFDC children are being counted in certain States and new categories of children (in State institutions, and so forth) are added by amendments. As the count of children goes up, the actual payments per child go down when appropriations remain stable. Again, however, the effect is uneven because some States have increased their AFDC counts far faster than others, and 12 States cannot count any AFDC children at all.

One of the effects of these distortions has been to reduce the range between the favored and less-favored States in terms of the actual payment to the schools for each child counted. If title I were fully funded, that range would be from \$277.65 (one-half the national average per pupil expenditure) in the poorest States to \$467.88 in New York (one-half its average expenditure). However, this year, the range actually is from \$123.32 per child counted in Nebraska to \$234.27 per child in Alaska.

It may clarify the situation to note that the entitlements are figured on one basis (the full authorization) and then ratably reduced to fit a much smaller appropriation,

but only after several "floors" have been figured into the State allocations. At any rate, we have appended to these views a table which shows exactly how much each State received this year for each child counted under the act. Members can note the obvious discrepancies between States with similar needs and costs and draw their own conclusions about whether this act works equitably.

THE EFFECT OF THE AFDC COUNT

As we pointed out, much of the irrationality of the title I formula stems from using welfare data which is neither uniform nor consistent from State to State in the benefits for poor people. A family which qualifies for AFDC aid in New York might not qualify in California and generally would not qualify in Mississippi, and in any case the amount of the assistance varies enormously. So there are tens of thousands of desperately poor school age children who are not counted for title I purposes simply because they are not on welfare or the welfare payments to their families do not exceed \$2,000. The inequity, even between wealthy States, is not hard to demonstrate.

California, for example, has 14.5 percent of the total AFDC caseload (50 States plus District of Columbia), but counts 20.4 percent of the AFDC children (schoolage in families receiving more than \$2,000 from AFDC) counted nationally in computing title I entitlements; New York has 15.8 percent of the total caseload, but counts a whopping 30.2 percent of the AFDC children under title I.

The inequity between high income and lower income States, of course, is tremendous.

Three States—California, Illinois, and New York—accounted for only 12.3 percent of the very poor school age children (under \$3,000 family income) counted in 1959. Yet they account for 35.9 percent of the current AFDC caseload and 58.2 percent of AFDC children counted for payment under title I.

Twelve States—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming—accounted for 37.2 percent of the 1959 count of poor children, have 17.2 percent of the total AFDC caseload, and cannot count a single AFDC child for payment under title I.

The basic data for these comparisons is presented in a table at the conclusion of these views, and Members may draw their own conclusions about the fairness of the title I formula.

Surely a more equitable and effective method of distributing funds can be worked out before the act would again require extension in 1971, and by that time the 1970 census data would be available to assist in that task.

Accordingly, we shall propose an amendment to limit extension of the act to June 30, 1972.

CONCENTRATION ON NEEDY DISTRICTS

Another major weakness in title I is that nearly 90 percent of the operating school districts in the Nation receive these funds. Even if title I were fully funded at approximately \$3 billion, this would represent a widespread dispersion of limited funds which should be more concentrated in the school districts having the most severe educational problems with disadvantaged children. This need becomes even more urgent when the amount of money is just over \$1 billion.

In its fourth annual report the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stressed the point that a concentration of funds is necessary to meet the multiple needs of disadvantaged children and stated:

"The Council again calls for adherence to the principle of concentrating funds where the need is greatest so that a limited number of dollars can have genuine impact rather

than being dissipated in laudable but inconclusive efforts."

The Council limited its recommendation to the use of funds available within a given school district. We feel that the principle it stressed is sound and that it should have even broader application. Under the existing act the wealthiest areas in every State, with the best-financed schools and the most extensive services for all the children, receive title I funds. There is virtually no authority in the act for either the States or the Federal Government to bring about a greater concentration of funds upon those areas—principally the inner city areas and rural pockets of poverty—where the schools most need help.

We recognize, as a practical fact of life, that there would be enormous resistance to any attempt to take \$1 away from any school district and give it to another, however much good sense this might make in terms of public policy. Also, there is a perfectly rational argument against cutting back special programs for the disadvantaged, once they have been initiated, even in the best schools. For these reasons, we proposed in committee that a modest step be taken in the direction of concentrating limited funds where the needs are most urgent. We proposed that every school district (appropriations permitting) be assured of receiving no less than was received in fiscal 1968 under title I (the highest level to date), but that all amounts in excess of that be made available to the State education agency for reallocation to the neediest districts for strengthening their title I programs—and that this be done in accordance with criteria supplied by the U.S. Commissioner of Education pursuant to a State plan approved by him.

The amendment we proposed specified that the excess funds be allocated to school districts having high concentrations of disadvantaged children from low-income families and to school districts in areas of chronic economic depression or which are geographically isolated with the result that children are denied adequate educational opportunities.

The committee majority rejected this amendment upon the most specious grounds. The argument was made that this would be turning funds over to the States without restriction (which is demonstrably wrong on the face of the amendment) and that it would set up some sort of competition for the extra funds between poor rural areas and beleaguered cities (which is highly speculative and almost irrelevant since both would gain in the process). The majority appeared to us to be troubled most with the thought that any change should be made in the pattern of distribution in this act.

The committee thereby neglected the opportunity to provide a little more help for the schools in every State which most need help, and then only if funds for title I are increased above the 1968 level. We shall again propose this amendment on the House floor.

THE NEED FOR CONSOLIDATION

In 1966 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administered 190 different programs listed in their publication "Grants-in-Aid," many of which involved two or more types of grants of financial aids; 59 were listed under the Office of Education. A number of new grant-in-aid programs have been authorized since 1966, and today the Office of Education has at least 105 different programs of aid to States, local school districts, colleges and universities, other public and private agencies, and individuals. There are many hundreds of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments covering virtually every aspect of their operation, and the schools among other institutions are beginning to choke on the redtape.

Every school administrator to whom we have posed the question, whether in public hearings or in conversations at home, ac-

knowledges that the proliferation of Federal grant programs—each with separate applications, justifications, accountings, and plans ad infinitum—has caused a major administrative burden. Many smaller districts with limited administrative staff are not able to cope with the multitude of requirements. Yet, despite increasing clamor for relief at the State and local level, the consolidation of Federal programs in any degree has proved to be a very difficult thing to accomplish.

Every Federal program creates its own special lobby which thereafter resists all attempts at consolidation. Indeed, the major lobby groups unite in Washington to protect one another (the most unusual argument advanced by the spokesman for one such group in opposition to combining programs was "We don't want to fight among ourselves for these funds"). As much as we hate the thought of discord in chummy little groups, we think that sound public policy dictates some program consolidation.

Accordingly, we proposed in committee that four very similar State-grant programs for elementary and secondary schools be merged into a single grant which would then be used for these four special purposes without radical change in the nature of the programs.

These four are: title III of NDEA (equipment grants); title V-A of NDEA (testing, counseling, and guidance); title II of ESEA (textbooks and library materials); and title III of ESEA (supplementary educational centers and services). Each of these is State administered under a State plan; each gives aid to local schools on a basis of need determined by the State; each has an allocation formula primarily based upon population; each requires approximately the same kinds of applications and accounting procedures. Rather than four separate grants, four separate formulas, four separate plans, four separate sets of applications and accountings, and four separate sets of rules and regulations, we proposed to have only one.

CONSISTENT WITH PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE REPORT

This approach is fully consistent with the recommendations made to President Nixon by a task force of distinguished citizens which included leading educators—the so-called Pifer report. In recommending what it termed "designated block grants" it took note of and concurred with the "widespread belief, both at the State and local level, that the seeking of funds under this multiplicity of legislation is an unnecessarily burdensome and time-consuming business, and the time has come for a major effort at simplification of the process." The report recommended "a general movement in Federal programs away from categorical aid narrowly defined toward more broadly defined designated block grants * * * as a way of lessening the burden on State, local, and institutional officials in applying for Federal funds—an area in which there is now considerable irritation and frustration—and * * * as an important step toward the urgent task of strengthening the administrative capacity of the States to meet their responsibilities in education."

The amendment we have proposed is an extremely modest step in this direction, but it is vitally important that a first step be taken.

SHARING EQUIPMENT WITH PRIVATE SCHOOL PUPILS AND TEACHERS

Aside from the consolidation of these programs, and permitting the States and localities a bit more flexibility in their allocation of funds as between these special purposes, the amendment proposed only one major substantive change in the programs—it proposed to make available to pupils and teachers in nonpublic schools the NDEA title III instructional equipment (microscopes, projectors, tape recorders, etc.) on exactly the same basis as textbooks, filmstrips, encyclo-

pedias, and other library resources are made available to those pupils and teachers under title II of ESEA; that is, the equipment would be purchased by the public schools, remain the property of the public schools, but loaned for the purpose of instruction in secular studies in nonpublic schools.

Frankly, this seems to us an eminently fair proposition involving no departure in practice from the successful ESEA title II program. We do not see any distinction to be made between a microscope and a set of encyclopedias, or between a film and a projector, that justifies making one available for the use of private school children but not the other. No member of our committee attempted to make any such distinction.

We were amazed, therefore, that the suggestion was made, in the course of rejecting the amendment, that our proposal would "raise the church-state issue all over gain." We see no reason why it should. One of the historic breakthroughs of the 1965 act as the working out of methods by which private school pupils and teachers—in many cases even more hard pressed than those in public schools—could share some of the benefits. These methods have not worked perfectly, as testimony before our committee disclosed, but they have worked best in the sharing of instructional materials under title II of the act, and instructional equipment fits perfectly into that pattern. Moreover, this would correct a glaring inconsistency in our treatment of nonpublic education.

IMPACTED AREAS AID—THE SACRED COW

Three consecutive national administrations have attempted by a variety of methods to make more sense out of our federally impacted areas school aid—principally to limit its application to those school districts which experience a genuine and adverse impact due to Federal activity. Every such attempt has been in vain.

In 1968 some 4,235 school districts qualified for assistance under Public Law 874 (operating expenses) on account of 2.6 million "federally connected" children. Of these children, only 348,000 fall into the "3(a)" category with parents who both live and work on tax-exempt Federal property; the remaining 2,222,000 (with a handful of exceptions) live with parents in private homes or other taxpaying properties. Literally hundreds of the eligible districts under Public Law 874 suffer no appreciable adverse impact on their ability to support schools; quite the contrary, the Federal activity is often a major and much-prized economic benefit. This is not too difficult to show.

An Office of Education study of impacted districts eligible in 1967—before the effect of the lower eligibility requirements designed to include large cities altered the picture—showed 860 districts (22.6 percent of those eligible in that year) with only 3 to 5 percent of their total attendance "federally connected"; they received 12 percent of the funds for the program. Another 900 districts (23.6 percent) had an "impact" of between 5 and 10 percent and received 16 percent of the funds.

The most astounding finding of the study, however, was that—due to an obscure amendment to the act in the mid-1950's which permits a district that once achieves the 3-percent eligibility level to be eligible for 2 additional years without 3 percent of the children being federally connected—947 districts (25 percent of the total) had from 0 to 3 percent "impact" and received nearly 10 percent of the funds under the act.

To summarize, over 70 percent of the eligible districts under Public Law 874 experienced a quite minimal "Federal impact," but they drained off nearly 40 percent of the funds.

It is little wonder that three successive Presidents (Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson) supported the Bureau of the Budget in trying to make some changes in this act. Yet

this legislation continues to be a sort of "sacred cow" in the Congress and in our committee, as evidenced by H.R. 514.

Secretary Finch suggested one sensible change which would give first priority for the funds to eligibility based upon the "3(a)" children whose parents both live and work on tax-exempt Federal property. There is no question whatsoever that payments should be made on behalf of all these children since every one of them represents an absence of tax revenue to the schools they attend. The amendment was rejected out of hand.

We attempted a more substantive amendment—the principal effect of which would have been to reduce the amount of funds being poured into counties surrounding Washington, D.C. (which are among the wealthiest in the entire Nation—Montgomery County, Md., in the last census had the nation's highest median family income). We proposed that payments for the category "3(b)(2)" children—whose parents work on Federal property but live in taxpaying residential property—be limited to those children whose parents earned as a result of the Federal employment less than a certain amount. The amount would be \$12,000 in fiscal 1970 (8 percent of Federal employees earn more), \$10,000 in fiscal 1971 (14.7 percent of Federal employees earn more), and \$8,000 thereafter (29.5 percent earn more). The purpose of cutting out payments on account of the better paid Federal employees who live on taxable property is to take account of the fact that higher income families are likely to be living on property which is taxed sufficiently to support the children they have in the public schools. The effect would be to trim the total program by perhaps as much as \$50 million, and by between one-third and one-half in the wealthy Washington suburbs.

This amendment was accepted by the majority on one day and rejected on the following day.

IMPACT AID AND PUBLIC HOUSING—"NOW YOU SEE IT—NOW YOU DON'T"

One successful amendment which we support in principle—but not in the illusory form in which it is found in this bill—would count as a Federal impact those children attending public schools who live in federally financed public housing projects. With few exceptions, these children are from very low-income families and are likely to be attending schools which urgently need assistance.

The tax-exempt public housing in which these children live makes an in-lieu-of-tax payment to the schools which averages out to a paltry \$11.61 per public housing child in attendance. In our judgment, here is a Federal impact more demonstrably real and adverse to the schools than most of that counted under Public Law 874.

Yet the majority added it to Public Law 874 in a way that virtually assures that little, if any, money will be made available in the foreseeable future to the schools involved. Instead of counting the public housing children along with the other "category (b)" children and then sharing the appropriations in whatever amount is made available for impact aid, the majority inserted it into Public Law 874 as a separate category for which a separate appropriation is required. In the existing budgetary situation it is highly unlikely that any such appropriation will be made, and under any conditions the large cities which have most of the Nation's public housing will have to make a separate fight for these funds.

In short, the committee has presented the Nation's 50 largest cities (as well as many smaller ones) with a classical "Now you see it, now you don't" form of assistance. They are not likely to see it.

If there is a sound justification for making payments to the schools on account of pupils from nontaxable public housing—and we believe that there is a very strong justification—then those pupils should be treated equally with the other "federally connected" children. They should share equally whatever amount is appropriated to compensate schools for Federal impact.

The committee bill succeeds only in protecting hundreds of school districts that don't need help against the threat of sharing these benefits with a few districts that need all the help they can get.

A LOST OPPORTUNITY

H.R. 514 is a disappointment to all those who believe that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 can be made more effective and more equitable in its impact on educational problems. It represents a lost opportunity for our committee to make a really penetrating analysis of the operation of the act and to make any significant improvements that could be made at this time. Both ESEA and the impacted areas legislation demand such an examination, not with a view to dismantling them or curtailing programs of demonstrable value, but for the purpose of strengthening them.

The Federal role in financing education has become one of critical importance to our schools, and may well spell the difference between success and failure in the total national effort to overcome a whole complex of critical social and economic problems. Legislating in this sensitive and vital field demands the best effort we can bring to it. H.R. 514 does not by far represent that kind of effort.

For this reason we voted against reporting the bill from the Committee on Education and Labor. The issues we have discussed in these views will now have to be resolved by the entire House of Representatives, which we regret. They are issues more suitable for determination within the committee.

A LOOK AHEAD

Quite aside from the issues we have raised in these views, with respect to this particular bill, we believe that the entire Federal role in education is overdue for a searching evaluation in the context not only of our total educational needs, but of total national needs for public services of all kinds and the tax structure upon which all this rests.

There is a growing taxpayers' revolt across the Nation which is reflected in the increasing number of instances in which school bond issues and millage increases for schools are rejected by voters. In the decade 1957-67 the average rate of approval in school bond elections was 72.7 percent; the approval rate for 1968 was 62.5 percent, down nearly 7 percent from 1967. Approvals for increases in millage follow the same trend. We should not deceive ourselves by shrugging off this trend as merely a result of local issues affecting local decisions. The feeling is general.

Short of a general overhaul of the present structure of Federal aid for schools there is still much that we can do to assure taxpayers of getting more for every Federal dollar expended. One is to take greater care that such programs are concentrated on the most important needs; another is to make certain that every program is thoroughly and objectively evaluated and modified or discarded as the evaluation shows necessary. Secretary Finch has expressed strong support for this concept, and we applaud him for it; we hope the Congress will give him the tools he needs to do this job.

We believe that if these intermediate steps are not taken, and if a beginning is not made now on the larger and long-range appraisal, the whole structure of education as we know it may be in deep trouble in the years ahead.

BASIC DATA ON PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND TITLE I PAYMENTS

[As a percent of the national total in each category]

	School-age children, families less than \$3,000 income, 1959	Total AFDC caseload 1968	School-age children in families receiving over \$2,000 from AFDC, 1968	Percentage distribution of title I funds, 1969, 1.123 in billions		School-age children, families less than \$3,000 income, 1959	Total AFDC caseload 1968	School-age children in families receiving over \$2,000 from AFDC, 1968	Percentage distribution of title I funds, 1969, 1.123 in billions
Alabama	4.34	1.83	0	3.24	Nebraska	0.78	0.45	0.34	0.53
Alaska	.09	.10	.05	.17	Nevada	.07	.15	.05	.10
Arizona	.80	.76	0	.87	New Hampshire	.15	.11	.12	.15
Arkansas	2.69	.69	0	2.02	New Jersey	1.32	2.92	5.37	2.27
California	4.46	14.50	20.39	7.43	New Mexico	.78	.76	0	.91
Colorado	.74	.97	.65	.83	New York	4.66	15.84	30.13	11.14
Connecticut	.45	1.22	2.14	.81	North Carolina	6.07	1.86	.01	4.57
Delaware	.15	.31	.03	.24	North Dakota	.49	.17	.28	.38
Florida	3.16	3.11	0	2.97	Ohio	3.21	4.14	2.95	3.09
Georgia	4.72	2.34	0	3.21	Oklahoma	1.75	1.57	.64	1.55
Hawaii	.20	.35	.41	.22	Oregon	.53	.67	.67	.76
Idaho	.29	.20	.25	.28	Pennsylvania	4.02	5.48	5.46	4.26
Illinois	3.19	5.57	7.71	4.11	Rhode Island	.27	.54	.60	.33
Indiana	1.65	.96	.50	1.39	South Carolina	3.69	.64	0	2.77
Iowa	1.52	.89	1.23	1.35	South Dakota	.59	.24	.25	.51
Kansas	.90	.77	1.02	.91	Tennessee	4.16	1.87	0	2.96
Kentucky	3.51	1.92	.10	2.79	Texas	8.06	2.74	0	6.79
Louisiana	3.85	2.83	0	2.81	Utah	.26	.45	.27	.29
Maine	.46	.40	0	.32	Vermont	.19	.17	.17	.17
Maryland	1.21	2.04	1.61	1.34	Virginia	3.34	1.13	.05	2.50
Massachusetts	1.10	2.76	4.23	1.55	Washington	.81	1.11	1.73	1.07
Michigan	2.65	3.51	5.61	3.00	West Virginia	1.90	1.40	0	1.49
Minnesota	1.67	1.12	2.04	1.72	Wisconsin	1.37	1.28	1.73	1.33
Mississippi	4.20	1.99	0	3.38	Wyoming	.12	.07	0	.14
Missouri	2.56	2.13	.30	2.12	District of Columbia	.33	.53	.58	.53
Montana	.31	.18	.11	.33					

Amount allocated for each child counted under title I formula (fiscal 1969)

States by rank:	Amount
50 States and District of Columbia (average)-----	\$154.94
Alaska-----	234.27
New York-----	206.80
District of Columbia-----	202.44
Florida-----	184.26
Delaware-----	183.68
New Mexico-----	182.27
Oregon-----	180.84
New Jersey-----	174.36
Wyoming-----	171.99
Montana-----	170.78
Arizona-----	170.27
Minnesota-----	167.94
Kansas-----	164.58
Washington-----	164.05
Connecticut-----	162.38
Texas-----	162.26
Illinois-----	159.01
Iowa-----	156.76
Wisconsin-----	156.65
Nevada-----	154.02
Idaho-----	153.98
Pennsylvania-----	153.81
California-----	151.88
Missouri-----	150.31
Massachusetts-----	150.01
Colorado-----	149.97
Michigan-----	148.91
Rhode Island-----	146.76
Indiana-----	144.12
Louisiana-----	143.84
New Hampshire-----	142.80
Arkansas-----	142.52
Maine-----	142.05
North Carolina-----	141.97
Oklahoma-----	141.95
South Carolina-----	141.65
Tennessee-----	141.44
Georgia-----	141.31
Mississippi-----	141.21
Alabama-----	140.81
Virginia-----	140.52
Maryland-----	140.46
North Dakota-----	140.13
Vermont-----	139.54
South Dakota-----	139.80
Hawaii-----	138.19
Kentucky-----	137.40
Ohio-----	136.11
Utah-----	135.15
West Virginia-----	131.96
Nebraska-----	123.32

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I shall support an amendment for a 2-year extension.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin stated previously he intended to offer on this floor an amendment connected with Public Law 874 category B funds. In response to a comment made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), I would like to call to the gentleman's attention, if he has this intent, the necessity of taking into consideration, in the matter of this Public Law 874 category B funds, the situation which exists in many parts of the United States and is typified by a school district in my congressional district. From this district has been taken away recently over 87,000 acres. To the school district has been added approximately 2,000 to 3,000 students. The homes in this district are from \$9,000 to \$18,000 or \$20,000. The only industrial areas we have are small modest shopping centers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-five 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. 43]

Annunzio	Fisher	Ottinger
Ashley	Ford,	Powell
Baring	William D.	Purcell
Bates	Fraser	Ronan
Bell, Calif.	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rosenthal
Brooks	Hébert	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Helstoski	Scheuer
Brown, Ohio	Hollifield	Sikes
Camp	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
Carey	Jarman	Springer
Celler	Kirwan	Sullivan
Clark	Mahon	Taft
Daddario	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Martin	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	May	Watts
Dwyer	Mollohan	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Charles H.
Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wold
Evins, Tenn.	O'Hara	Wright

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 374 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. When the Committee rose, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) had been recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, who I believe is one of the hardest working Members of the House and certainly one who has the best interests of education very much in his mind and in his heart.

I must say I regret that on this particular occasion I am not able to give my wholehearted support for the bill as it has been reported out of the committee. The chairman and I do have some minor disagreements, though I believe not major in the goals we both seek.

However, I cannot in good conscience vote for this legislation, as it was reported by the committee, without amendments. Therefore, I should like to discuss the proposed changes in the legislation which is before this Committee, and I should like to discuss it first of all from the political standpoint and second from the standpoint of the proposed substantive changes.

I shall have specific amendments to offer later during the time we are marking up the bill. Those amendments would address the problem created by the ever increasing direction of American education from Washington, D.C. For many years I have been committed to the idea that the success of our schools depends upon local and State control of our educational system.

I am also more than ever convinced that we on the committee and we in the Congress cannot sit as one great school board to determine what is the best educational policy in each one of the 2,500 or 2,600 school districts throughout the country, from Florida to Alaska and from Maine to Hawaii.

As a matter of fact, I would say in all honesty that we in the Congress cannot even provide good education for the schools in the District of Columbia. We have classrooms here in the District of Columbia that are turning into battlefields. We are watching the deterioration of the schools in many of our ghetto areas, a deterioration occurring before our eyes.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to title I of the bill which would allow the funds under title I to be spent for teacher combat pay. I say that in all seriousness. As we witness city classrooms being turned into battlefields it seems to me we ought to give the teachers in especially difficult school areas bonuses in order that the Nation can recruit and retain qualified teachers to engage in what amounts to actual combat duty.

There is also a provision in the bill now, of which I am not sure all Members of the House are aware. Under this provision a school district is required, when it is making its plans for title I funds, to submit its plans to the local community action agency. The local community action agency has endorsed those plans of the school district before the district can present them to the State for funding.

In the case of Portland, Oreg., there was an 8 month delay between the time the Portland School Board actually submitted its plan under title I to the local community action agency, and the time the district received it back. The community action agency is an agency in a small part of the Portland School District. It took that community action agency 8 months to approve the plans of the Portland School Board, which that board, elected by the people of Portland, had already determined were best for all the boys and girls in that school district. I must say, I think this is an outrage.

We elect a school board to determine policy. We elect a school board to use its best judgment and its best wisdom in making plans. For us to pass laws that say we turn this responsibility over to a community action agency is a situation, I believe, where a change ought to be made.

I shall also, at the appropriate time, offer amendments to cut out a couple of other advisory committees which, I believe, will create only chaos and confusion.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say I am opposed to the 5-year extension, which is in fact a 6-year extension, because it would carry the legislation to July 1, 1975.

I do believe that education is too important to be considered on a purely partisan political basis. I long for the day when Federal aid to education at the elementary and secondary levels will be considered on the basis of individual convictions instead of on a party line.

But since political considerations can-

not be avoided this week, then let me say to my Democratic colleagues, from a purely democratic standpoint that it makes more political sense to require the Nixon administration to come up with its recommendations on programs to meet the crisis that is in our schools, rather than to give them the "out" that Congress has spoken in passing a \$25 billion education bill extending not only through the 4 years of the Nixon administration but also 2½ years beyond.

I also say to my Republican colleagues that I am more confident than some of my Democratic colleagues, because I think there will be a change in the White House in 1973; and we will have a Democratic administration. Therefore, I am unwilling to cast my vote this week for a 6-year bill which not only extends through the life of the Nixon administration, but 2½ years into the life of the next one. I wish to say that I want my Democratic President in 1973 to have the chance to, and be required to, submit his recommendations to this House.

Beyond these purely partisan considerations, Mr. Chairman, I cannot stand here today and say to anyone that this bill even begins to meet the serious crisis facing this country and our schools.

In the *Journal of Secondary Education* for October 1968, we read:

ABOUT STUDENT UNREST

(By William N. McGowan)

It was inevitable that the unrest that has become status quo in this troubled twentieth century find its way into public schools. It was inevitable that student unrest take forms already tested on the general public. It was likewise inevitable that the problems created would have a dramatic effect on school business.

School trustees face demands to reorganize school districts and alter curricula, shift personnel, close schools. Teachers are attacked in classrooms and in halls. Administrators are harassed at school and in their homes. It is getting more and more difficult to find competent teachers and administrators to serve in "inner city" schools. Schools are closed by student protests, and by teachers protesting the conditions that make them the victims of protesting students. Manifestations of student unrest are varied and numerous.

One of the more dramatic manifestations of student unrest is the development of underground curricula. Mimeographed sheets labeled "Urban Guerrilla Warfare" and containing diagrammatic instructions for the construction of Molotov Cocktails are passed from hand to hand by high school students in San Francisco.

Careful instructions are given for making fire bombs. Discussion groups providing information on how to avoid the draft are well-organized and are being conducted in communities across the nation. Seminars to teach techniques for challenging all authority are being conducted in Los Angeles, New York City and other parts of the country.

Then, from an article published by the High School Principals Association of New York City we read this:

THE NATURE AND LIMITS OF STUDENT DISSENT AND PARTICIPATION

(A report of the Committee on Student Unrest of the High School Principals Association of the city of New York. Unanimously approved and adopted at its meeting of Jan. 16, 1969)

Until quite recently, manifestations of student unrest have been largely confined to our colleges. Now there are unmistakable signs

that similar kinds of student disaffection have spread into our high schools, expressing themselves in the following forms and strategies:

Student demands for complete, unsupervised, unchecked student control of student government, student newspapers and magazines, student finances.

Student demands for a determining voice in the rating and retention of school personnel.

Student demands for a determining voice in shaping, revising, and modifying present curricula, and introducing new courses.

Campaigns against traditional school regulations governing dress, behavior, use of school facilities, etc. The evidence to hand strongly suggests that outside groups and individuals are providing encouragement and leadership to students involved in these campaigns.

A strong, insistent thrust to eliminate or diminish the present legally mandated policy and decision making powers of the principal and his staff, and to turn these powers over, in whole or in part, to students.

The consistent characterization of all administrators as rigid, authoritarian, unfeeling, insensitive to the needs of youth or "the community".

Deliberate, planned "confrontations" designed to provoke the school authorities into actions that will win adherents and sympathizers for the dissidents.

Underground newspapers and leaflets (frequently anonymous) filled with generally unsubstantiated attacks on school policies and school personnel. The language of these publications is often obscene, the tone strident, belligerent, and arrogant.

Disorders and fears of new and frightening dimensions stalk the corridors of many of our schools. Yet in the face of these obviously clear and present dangers, our Board of Education has virtually abdicated its responsibilities for the safe and orderly conduct of our schools. Preoccupied with the dismantling of a school system it does not understand or care about, our Board of Education seems unable or unwilling to come to the defense of our beleaguered schools. No one appears to be in charge. No one appears to be listening.

It is in this present context that we feel we must make clear to parents, students, our Mayor, our Board of Education, our Superintendent of Schools, and every citizen of this city, what we conceive to be:

The essential mission and responsibility of the school.

The nature and limits of student dissent and student participation in the direction and governance of our schools.

We are deeply committed to insuring and protecting the rights of all students to responsible dissent and to an appropriate role in the life of our schools. We are equally committed to insuring for the non-dissenting student the right not to dissent and the right to uninterrupted, unrestricted access to the education he wants and needs.

We are aware that some of the present student discontent has its roots in very real defects and inadequacies in our educational system. Much of this discontent, however, is based on misunderstanding, some of it fostered by forces with a stake in promoting misunderstanding.

We are encouraged by our students' active interest and concern about their education and about the times they live in. We take their efforts to bring things "nearer the heart's desire" as a heartening sign of their growing maturity.

Through democratically elected student government organizations, our schools are providing significant and constructive channels for responsible student participation in developing fruitful approaches to school problems that vitally affect them. Some of these student organizations are not as alert,

as concerned, or as effective as we or our students would like them to be. But there are signs all around us that they are moving responsibly and intelligently to expand their functions, take on new responsibilities, and adapt themselves to changed and changing conditions. Under the leadership of their school advisers, they are creating vital forums and instrumentalities for their meaningful, responsible participation in a healthy and stable school environment.

Implicit in every one of these school councils or similar organizations (which have functioned in our schools for many years) is the unequivocal recognition that students have a right to speak and to be heard. As in the past, they are now speaking in our schools—and they are being heard. And where feasible and possible, their suggestions are being incorporated into school policy and practice. They will continue to be heard—on any matters they feel they have a stake in. And their requests for change and modification in the content, direction, and quality of our educational programs will continue to receive the attention and response they merit. We shall continue to delegate to students those responsibilities and functions which the schools are legally permitted to and can safely delegate, and which students are qualified to assume and execute. We shall, as we always have, continue to meet in our schools with our democratically elected student organizations to consider with them their problems, needs, and desires.

A significant amount of contemporary student protest is raw, crude, disruptive—and frequently designed to be so. We deplore this misdirection of youth's essentially idealistic impulses. We will not, however, be party to those strategies and policies calculated initially to keep our schools in turmoil and, ultimately, to render them incapable of sustaining an atmosphere in which students who want to learn can learn. We will not supinely accept programs designed to destroy our schools and the society we are pledged to strengthen and uphold. We do not intend to capitulate to the violence or the threat of violence that will surely take our schools down the road to anarchy.

In the following we have identified some current, persistent, surfacing issues and problems that face our schools. For each we have indicated what we believe to be a fair and appropriate response. Unequivocally implicit in these responses is the inescapable fact that the principal is charged by law with the responsibility for supervising the school's teaching staff and instructional programs, implementing the mandates of the city Board of Education and the State Education Department, providing, under optimum conditions, for the education, safety, and welfare of all the students.

The principal is not an absolutely free agent operating in a vacuum. His duties, responsibilities, and accountabilities are clearly spelled out for him. He may not shirk or neglect them. He may not improperly delegate them. He may not let them go by default.

STANDARDS OF DRESS

Good taste, propriety, sensible restraint are the desiderata here. Dress codes stressing what is proper and fitting for school wear have been promulgated in individual schools by students, faculty, and parents working together. They have proved effective in helping to set and maintain acceptable school tone and appearance. Changing fashions, of course, will call for periodic review of these dress codes.

DEMAND FOR UNRESTRICTED FREEDOM IN CONDUCTING STUDENT GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS WITHOUT BEING SUBJECT TO PRINCIPAL'S VETO

Were he to accede to this demand, the principal would be abrogating his authority in an area where he is precisely charged with

the responsibility for reviewing and approving student government decisions as they apply to the whole student body. It is very much in order for students to suggest that student government broaden its present concerns, that it meet and consult with school authorities on matters vitally affecting student welfare. This is exactly what is now happening in many of our schools. And schools welcome this evidence of constructive student concern and desire for more significant involvement in vital problems. But students must not be allowed to believe that lending a respectful and sympathetic ear to their desires and demands constitutes an automatic mandate on the school. The intensity of student demand is not necessarily a measure of its legality, validity, or practicality. No governing body in this country has the absolute, unchallengeable rights that some student demands seem to be asking for. Our City Council's recommendations are subject to Mayoral veto. The State Legislature's are subject to the Governor's veto. And the acts of Congress are subject to presidential veto. So, in school matters, the principal is in duty bound to exercise his veto over unwise or unsound student proposals governing the expenditure of student monies, the assumption of obligations that the school cannot meet, etc. The principal cannot abdicate his ultimate function as the legally responsible, executive head of the school.

DEMAND FOR A STUDENT SMOKING ROOM

This request would have to be denied. It constitutes a threat to the health and safety of students.

DEMAND TO REVIEW AND SET ASIDE PRINCIPALS RULINGS IN DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

Such demands now take the form of student "review boards" or student courts endowed with the power to overrule the judgments and decisions of the principal. The school cannot accede to these demands. The principal cannot legally or ethically delegate to students the responsibility for maintaining school discipline, punishing offenders, official recording of student offenses, and administrative dispositions. Under such procedures, students would have access to confidential records of other students. This would constitute a grave breach of student privacy. Students and their parents may see their own confidential records. Limited access to these records is permitted to specifically designated governmental agencies or individuals—for specific purposes. Teachers, administrators, guidance personnel, of course, are permitted to work with these records, but required to keep them confidential.

DEMAND FOR UNRESTRICTED, UNSUPERVISED STUDENT USE OF SCHOOL MIMEOGRAPH AND SIMILAR FACILITIES

School facilities and school supplies (duplicating machines, paper, ink, etc.) may legitimately be used only for instructional and noninstructional purposes consonant with the legally sanctioned, recognized, and accepted objectives of the school. No other use can be sanctioned. The duplicating of materials for school use must be approved by a responsible school official. Students may and do operate these machines under faculty supervision in carrying on the affairs of student government.

DEMAND TO DISTRIBUTE LEAFLETS (SIGNED AND UNSIGNED), PETITIONS, OR OTHER MATERIALS, ETC. INSIDE SCHOOL

The principal and his assistants are charged with responsibility for all activities that take place within the school. They must, therefore, determine in advance whether materials are pertinent to or have a meaningful bearing on the school's educational program, whether they are inimical to student welfare and safety, whether they constitute a clear threat to the proper and orderly running of the school, whether they are libelous in nature, etc.

We have an inescapable obligation to give our students free and legitimate access to each other while, at the same time, protecting them against exploitation, manipulation, assaults on their sensibilities.

DEMAND FOR INTRODUCTION OF SPECIFIC COURSES OF STUDY

We have always recognized students' right to examine the content of their educational program; and to make specific recommendations designed to improve them. We recognize, too, our obligation to discuss and evaluate with student representatives the soundness, pertinence, practicability of their proposals. We must point out, too, since all suggestions for curriculum revision, whether student or faculty originated, have district and city-wide implications, they must, under our present operating procedures, receive the approval of the District Superintendent and the Local School Board.

DEMAND TO SET UP NEW CLUBS

All school clubs must be chartered, sponsored, and supported by the school's General Organization and approved by the principal or his delegated representative in charge of student activities. Every club must have a faculty advisor who is frequently chosen by the students, but officially assigned by the principal. Clubs may be affiliated with outside organizations provided the purposes of these organizations do not run contrary to the Board of Education's by-laws.

DEMAND TO WEAR BUTTONS, ARMBANDS, INSIGNIA, ETC.

In most instances these requests present no problems. But at times schools have rightly barred the wearing of various kinds of insignia when they were obviously obscene, in egregiously bad taste, racist in intent, and inflammable in effect, provocative of disorder, etc. We shall continue to exclude from our schools emblems that violate community canons of good taste and good manners, that arouse and feed racial antipathies, that pose a threat to the orderly conduct of our schools.

DEMAND TO BRING IN OUTSIDE ASSEMBLY AND CLUB SPEAKERS WITHOUT SCHOOL APPROVAL

We cannot accede to this demand. The principal is responsible for all activities that take place in school during the school day. Since outside speakers, by their very entrance into the school, become a part of the school program, the principal is obliged to judge these speakers just as he would judge any other proposed additions to the school's curriculum or extra-curriculum—for their propriety, their consonance with the purposes of the school's program, their impact on and contribution to students' school experiences.

An essential part of the school program is making students aware of and sensitive to varying viewpoints that are legitimately held and espoused in our society, and training them in thoughtful, balanced evaluation of conflicting views. These highly desirable ends are best achieved in school under responsible adult supervision. Indeed, standing legally as it does *in loco parentis*, the school would be derelict in its duty if it failed to provide such supervision and guidance for its students.

DEMAND TO CALL AND HOLD ASSEMBLIES UNDER STUDENT DIRECTION WITHOUT FACULTY CONSULTATION OR SUPERVISION

The total absence of even minimal adult control and supervision under these conditions poses obvious hazards to student safety and to the proper conduct of the school's program. Further it raises the real possibility that the school might be used to further causes or ends at hostile variance with the educational and social purposes which the school, as an agent of the society, is specifically charged to promote and support.

We welcome student suggestions for vitalizing and improving assembly programs. In some schools students are now serving on student-faculty planning committees in this

area. But the request for free-wheeling, unsupervised calling and holding of assembly programs cannot be granted.

DEMAND FOR STUDENTS TO JUDGE THE COMPETENCY OF TEACHERS OR CALL FOR THEIR REMOVAL

The methods and procedures for evaluating teacher performance are clearly spelled out in the State and City education law. The determinations of teacher competency can, by law, be made only by trained, certified supervisors.

DEMAND TO SET ASIDE SCHOOL REGULATIONS

These demands commonly ask for the right to leave classes at any time without official passes, the right to attend or not attend classes at will, the right to leave the school building during lunch periods, the right to spend study periods outside school, etc. Acceding to these and similarly anarchic demands would make the safe and orderly conduct of the school impossible. Such demands obviously cannot be granted.

We have a painful, daily awareness that we do not have the answers to many of our school problems. We, therefore, welcome any suggestions from any source to explore any avenues that may lead us to the development of the more vital, more effective schools we all want.

Meanwhile, as we continue to heighten and sharpen our awareness of and responsiveness to the pressing and unmet needs of our students and parents, we are united in our determination to make and keep our schools places where teachers can teach without fear and harassment, and students can learn without distraction and disruption.

There are limits to the right to dissent—as there are limits to every other right. The right to dissent does not confer on students the right to disrupt the normal school processes. The right to dissent does not entitle any students to deprive their fellow-students of their education if they do not share or wish to join in their dissent. Nor does the right to dissent, by its mere utterance, give instant sanction to student demands that cannot legally be granted or that students are demonstrably incapable of performing. The right to dissent carries with it the obligation to respect the rights and opinions of those who do not dissent. This, we take it, is the essence of democracy. This is what we propose to safeguard in our schools and in our society. And in this we know we can count on the overwhelming support of our parents and students. They see clearly that the disorders planned and executed by small, destructive groups are a menace to their education and security.

The hour is late. Our schools are in peril. It is the ineluctable duty of our Mayor, our Board of Education, our Superintendent of Schools to do what they have sworn to do: protect our schools, our teachers, and our students against the disturbers, the violent, and the enemies of public education within and outside the school system. We call on them to act firmly, quickly, and courageously against the divisive, disruptive forces and individuals loose in our schools working to radicalize, subvert, and poison the minds of our students.

We call on our Mayor, our Board of Education, our Superintendent of Schools to stop surrendering our schools piecemeal to the foundations, the opportunists, the extremists, the unrealists.

We ask the Mayor, the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools to stand up and talk up, loud and unequivocally, for our schools. The people of this city, the teachers who man our schools, have a right to know whose side our public officials are on: the side of the parents who want their schools to be places where they can safely send their children to learn, or on the side of those who, by design, capitulation, indifference, or their naivete, are leading our schools down the road to anarchy.

We call on the Mayor, the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools to meet, at long last, their sworn commitments to provide a full, meaningful, secure education for "all the children of all the people" all the time—in all our schools.

And, from Education U.S.A. for September 1968, we read:

School vandalism cost New York City nearly \$2 million in 1966-67, according to a vandalism survey just released by the Baltimore City Schools. Next was Los Angeles with damage totaling \$555,491; Detroit, \$515,319; and Cleveland, \$449,500. Following in the \$200,000 bracket are Baltimore, Newark, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and Boston. Newark leads the list in vandalism cost per pupil with \$3.30. In response to the problem, schools report using various electronic detection systems, window screens, all-night guards, fences, lights inside and outside schools, plastic window glass, and programs to teach student and parental responsibility. St. Louis has planned police training, emphasizing vandalism laws and police relations, for its administrators, and is trying to combat truancy as a means of reducing vandalism. And in Detroit, a former policeman has been named to a new school post, head of security.

Then we find in the San Francisco Chronicle preliminary statistics in San Francisco on violence in San Francisco's 10 high schools since the schools opened on September 4. These were released yesterday. They show there have been 189 reported cases of assault on either students, teachers, or school personnel. They show that there have been 41 reported cases of robbery or extortion with students, teachers, or school personnel as victims.

From the U.S. News & World Report we have another article about vandalism and about these attacks and the fact that teachers today have the threat of physical violence as daily accompaniment to their job.

Here in the District of Columbia what happened? Hearings this year before the Senate District Committee show that the director of an organization dealing with narcotic addicts estimated that in one local high school of 1,400 students, one-third are heroin addicts.

The Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Office and the FBI uniform crime reports indicate that drug arrests of persons under 18 rose 778 percent during the period 1960 to 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentlewoman 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask if the gentlewoman would yield to me briefly at this point?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I, of course, want to compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon on her statement.

I do not think the gentlewoman intended to leave the impression that the administration would be locked in connection with this extension. I know that the gentlewoman last year in the bill which she brought to the floor under her able leadership—the higher education bill—we extended that bill for 3

years and she is now conducting hearings to amend that bill.

I just wanted to make clear at this point that we are only asking for the lengthy extension because of continuing the continuity of the program which in my judgment will enable the committee to be more deliberate and review the programs with greater intensity if we do give these programs some stability and give an extension here to meet a problem which has increased all over this country to the extent of at least 5 percent, I would think, in every local school district in the Nation. That is what many witnesses have said.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman on her statement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman, and I may ask for several additional minutes later in view of his statement.

In reply, may I suggest it is my judgment that if this bill is extended for 5 years, which is actually 6 years, we successfully foreclose the possibility of seriously considering alternatives. Let me tell you why. This is a \$25 billion bill. We all know the budget restrictions. The saddest part of all is that even with the authorization today we only have 41 percent funding.

Mr. PERKINS. Well—

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Will the gentleman permit me to finish this statement?

Mr. PERKINS. I will yield the gentlewoman some additional time, but with reference to the \$25 billion figure I think we all know that 75 percent of the moneys are in title I of this bill and the appropriation for fiscal 1969 is \$1,115 million. Now, there are many titles in this bill like title III that carries an authorization of \$550 million, but there has been only \$42 million appropriated. We are talking about, out of this so-called \$25 billion bill, now appropriating \$1,375 million.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat just briefly, if we pass today a \$25 billion bill I do not think that this Congress is going to vote another multibillion-dollar education bill this year. And I do not think that this particular bill meets all the needs. Also, conditions are changing very rapidly in this country. How many of us today would have stood on the floor of the House 6 years ago and made the prediction that we would be facing the kind of school crisis we are facing in this country in 1969? How many of us would have known the seriousness of the situation and, in fact, how many of us really know the seriousness of the situation today?

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. When we were considering Federal aid to elementary and secondary education several years ago—6 years ago and prior to that—a consideration at that time was to try to give assistance in a field that would bring about real help toward getting teachers' salaries commensurate with what they ought to be in that particular profession.

It would appear to me that the argu-

ment presented by the gentlewoman from Oregon would extend over into that area. If we were to pass a bill of this magnitude for the length of time proposed in it we might foreclose the opportunity of giving serious study to writing legislation that would earmark specific sums of this money for classroom teachers.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon has so wisely and vigorously stated here, that is the area in which we suffer the greatest problem today, that of teachers' salaries. And until we do something in my judgment that will channel these funds into helping the classroom teacher meet not only her or his professional qualifications, but to meet the problems they have in the classrooms, I believe we ought to be very, very careful in making long-term programs until we reach the point that we have given ample consideration to this.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would ask the chairman of the committee if I may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. I can yield only 2½ minutes unless I borrow time from someone else. Therefore I will yield 2½ additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we can spare 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue—and I believe no confidence is being violated, for I believe the chairman referred to it in the hearings—as soon as this bill is voted upon by the House, the chairman intends to introduce and to put in the hopper the bill which is sponsored by the National Education Association, which has a price tag on it of over \$7 billion a year for each of 5 years.

Now, I happen to know that the NEA bill is a very carefully thought out bill, and is a really good bill. I know I will not have my way in that regard, but if I did have my "druthers" I would favor passage of the NEA bill for I believe our schools need a vast infusion of Federal funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentlewoman yield on that point?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will yield to the gentleman if I may have an additional extension of time.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe we ought to make it clear that the National Education Association is on record and agrees with the thinking of the committee that this bill should be funded, or that the NEA approach is the second priority, because they say that not at the expense of special educational programs do they want their own bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for that contribution. But the point that I am making is that in my judgment—and I have said this to some of the people connected with the NEA—I believe that they are foreclosing serious consideration of that kind of legislation. And I believe that kind of legislation is necessary in the United States in the 1970's. To bolster what the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM) said, the latest figures that I have are that there are 131,000 teachers who left the teaching profession in 1968, not including those who retired. Also 79,000 finished teacher education courses, but did not go into teaching. We are fast reaching the place where we are not even going to have enough physical bodies for each one of the classrooms, and we ought to be talking about this critical need.

HEW released a report not too long ago that said the most urgent education problem in the United States today is the shortage of qualified teachers.

So I ask for the possibility for the consideration of other alternatives, not necessarily this year, but if we extend the act for 6 years, then we will foreclose that possibility entirely.

I believe the testimony that I cited earlier in the articles on the troubles in our schools could be referred to as a catalog of defeats. If we consider this final defeat then we can withdraw, and each of us could help build his own little enclave where he can labor under the delusion that security is provided for his children and his posterity.

But this is an impossible alternative. We must consider these problems today as simply a catalog of problems—problems which must be solved. They will not be solved by high expectations and verbal cheers. It is going to require hard cash and the effort, energy and courage and the will to do something about it.

The conditions in our schools as I said are changing very, very rapidly. We need to be reviewing and reevaluating the legislation each year.

May I also say that to vote \$25 billion when we know it is going to be funded only at 40 percent, is a cruel hoax on American educators and on American children.

Reference was made in the last few days as to the necessity of giving some kind of stability to the program, and that that is what we are going to do by voting for a 6-year extension, and that we are going to provide for long-range planning. The chairman has suggested that on several occasions.

May I ask you how we possibly, by our vote today for a 6-year extension, can guarantee any stability or provide for any long-range planning?

In 1967 under title I my school district of Portland received \$1,940,000.

In 1969 with the authorization level still higher, the Portland school district received less funds. They received \$1,484,000.

Now this is not the way to get stability. The way to get stability is to pass a realistic authorization bill that will bear some relation to the appearance of the appropriation bill when it is passed. The way to do it also is for every single Member of the Congress who believes in good education to fight as vigorously when the appropriation bill comes up as they did when the authorizing legislation was passed.

So I would say to my colleagues—really make a sincere effort to consider the seriousness of the situation. Let us try to persuade the White House, that while they may deem the deployment of the ABM system be necessary to our se-

curity the revision of the ABC system in the United States and the gearing of our schools to the 1970's is going to be far more important for the future of our schools and for the future security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman yields back 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 514, extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the impacted area aid programs for 5 years.

The committee, when originally reporting the act, clearly indicated the purpose of the legislation was to meet a national problem because of basic education deficiencies. This was the first major effort on the part of the Government to provide a general education program for elementary and secondary schools. Amendments in 1966 and 1967 expanded the scope of the program and extended the authorizations for the program.

I have repeatedly stated that the greatest asset that this country has is our youth. And, the most prudent investment we can make for their future is in their education. This program is designed for that purpose.

At this point, I believe Chairman PERKINS and the committee are due a special word of commendation for the diligence with which they have pursued this program and its goal of improving the level of education across the board throughout the country. Today, as we look at the financial crisis facing so many school districts we can be thankful that Congress had the wisdom and foresight to enact the program.

The program is now 4 years old, and since the inception of title I, almost \$3 billion has been invested in an effort to make schooling more responsive to the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. By 1968, over 9 million children were being served by title I programs conducted in 16,000 school districts across the Nation. Approximately 500,000 children attending nonpublic schools are included in the 9 million. Title I has also sought to reach certain special classes of educationally deprived children, namely children of migratory farm laborers, neglected and deprived children in institutions, children with physical or mental handicaps and Indian children. This is a most commendable record.

The report notes that at present the maximum effective use of Federal funds for educational programs is being impaired by "delays in continuing authorizations and untimely funding." It is indeed most unfortunate that the elementary and secondary education programs have not received full funding.

The practice of the past, short-term extensions of the programs, does not provide local administrators and the personnel they seek with sufficient assurance that Congress will not abandon the program. The experience of 1966 and 1967, when program extensions were not

enacted until several months after the school year had begun, placed an undue burden on school administrators.

There is an urgent need for long-term planning and for knowing well in advance what kind of program we will have in education. The 5-year authorization as proposed in H.R. 514 will correct the past failure to give long-term authorization to the program with the incident delays and breakdowns in the machinery.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the committee and pass the bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have consistently supported education. However, if the House fails to limit the bill, H.R. 514, to 2 years, I may be forced to abandon this position and vote against final passage.

A 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with no more change or improvement than contained in this bill would foreclose any real opportunity for the new administration and Congress to move forward with new ideas and programs. This bill, without amendment, will virtually freeze policy for the next 5 years. This would be unfortunate. Nearly all of the witnesses before the committee testified that substantial changes should be made in one or more of the programs included under this bill. Very few witnesses indicated complete satisfaction with the manner in which this legislation is operating. Many of the witnesses felt that some, perhaps even most, of the programs should be extended but modified. Few of the amendments suggested by the witnesses and by members of the committee were adopted and included in this bill.

The legislation before us would negate anything we have learned in past experience and this proposal would prevent the administration and the Congress from taking advantage of this experience in administering these programs.

The block grant approach is one of the various new, exciting and challenging ideas which have been developed to the point where they should be tested in practice on a pilot basis. I believe the block grant approach is worthy of being tested in actual practice. It has been my experience that most educators in State and local government and other officials responsible for elementary and secondary education would prefer the flexibility of the block grant. Other approaches also should be tried, perhaps in a mix of programs.

Many members of the committee were disturbed by the results of reviews and surveys made of the present Federal educational assistance programs. Dr. J. Galen Saylor, distinguished professor at the University of Nebraska, writing in the journal *Educational Leadership*, described Federal spending on education as producing "very meager educational results" and as "one of the God-awfullest messes you ever saw in educational administration."

Any claim that a 5-year extension of present programs would permit educa-

tion authorities to plan and budget better is highly misleading. An extension of this nature is not necessary. One thing is certain, Federal aid to education will be continued in one form or another. It has become an accepted responsibility of the Federal Government. In time it probably will expand as need arises. Hopefully it will take such form as will permit the States and localities to meet their educational needs rather than be forced into a mold cast by a Federal school authority in Washington, D.C.

The real test of Federal funding for the schools is not in what is authorized nor for how long. It is in what is appropriated. That is an annual process and is apt to remain an annual process for the foreseeable future.

Furthermore, the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Act, retained in the pending bill, will produce substantial changes in distribution of funds from present allocations, once the statistics compiled in the 1970 census become available. The Congress, the administration and the educational system of the Nation should be permitted another opportunity to review and modify this act after the 1970 census report is released.

The language of the House Committee on Education and Labor to extend the act for 5 years is excessive. I will support substitution of a 2-year extension and am hopeful, for the sake of education generally, that the 2-year extension will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, there are those in the course of the discussion of this bill who suggest that the question still is, Should we have Federal aid to education? They have intimated, if not outright emphasized, that a vote for anything less than the 5-year extension is a vote against Federal aid to all school districts in the Nation.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The question of whether we are going to have Federal aid to education has long been resolved. The real question facing this Congress this day is, How are we going to develop a structure that will effectively and efficiently distribute funds to the local school districts, emphasizing the areas of highest priority and utilizing fully the real strength of our country's school system, that of the local school districts themselves?

Mr. Chairman, I for one am very much opposed to the extension of this bill for 5 years without substantive amendment. The absolutely capricious operation of the title I formula is alone a major reason for not extending it any longer than we have to in order to assure us of forward funding and program continuity, and a 2-year extension will do this.

Even though I am a member of the committee and have studied the formula, it is difficult to determine how this formula, which is so confusing and inconsistent, could be so vehemently defended. The formula would confound a Ph. D. in mathematics, and probably would drive a professor of logic to the depths of despair.

Michigan is but one State that is sup-

posedly favored in this formula. I cite it as but one example—and not out of provincial interest.

We have a largely urban population with heavy concentrations of disadvantaged students. Our AFDC welfare program is supported at a level high enough to permit us to count over 45,000 welfare children in families receiving over \$2,000 in welfare payments. Most States can count relatively few of these children and 12 cannot count any at all. So Michigan should do well under this formula.

What we find, however, is that Michigan only receives \$138.45 this year for each poor child counted. Thirty-three of the 50 States do better than Michigan under this formula.

Now, Michigan is a high-cost, high-expenditure State, so one of the chairman's explanations yesterday for this kind of discrepancy—that States with higher school expenditures get more per child—does not make any sense at all when applied to my State. Only 10 States and the District of Columbia have higher per-pupil expenditures this year than Michigan.

Even if this act were fully funded, it would not be fair in the distribution of funds. I submit that it costs just as much to give a disadvantaged child a quality education in Detroit or Ann Arbor, Mich., as it does in New York City or Binghamton, N.Y. Yet, if this act were fully funded right now, the schools in New York City and Binghamton would be getting \$165.59 more per child than the schools in Detroit and Ann Arbor. This year the New York advantage is only \$61.56.

In short—if we fully funded this act, the discrepancy between our schools and New York schools becomes almost three times worse than it is now.

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

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish my statement and then, if I have time left, I will yield. I think we have been very generous with the Chairman. I hope that is all right. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, to continue my statement, even that does not tell the whole story, because I doubt that Michigan can ever match New York in welfare payments—so that New York will continue to count a much higher percentage of their poor children than can Michigan.

If a State like Michigan fares badly in comparison with New York, what of all the other States? The fact is that most of them do even worse. The basic assumption of this formula is that the more a State can afford to spend for education, the more it should get from the Federal Government.

I submit to you that this is a strange assumption which defies commonsense.

If what we are really talking about is the cost of equalizing the educational opportunities of extremely disadvantaged children—of giving them a genuine chance to overcome all the handicaps with which they are burdened—then I suspect we are talking about approximately the same order of costs whether the child is in New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, Denver, Birmingham, Atlanta, Dallas, or some isolated hollow in Appa-

lachia. Title I of this act does not even approximate equal treatment in different places for children with similar needs.

That is why we must not extend this act indefinitely—or for any longer period than absolutely necessary. We should extend it no longer than 2 years, and then our committee should get to work immediately on devising a new formula and a new approach that will mean equal treatment for all disadvantaged children in every State. We should not wait for the 1970 census results to commence this task.

If we in our committee, and in this Congress, cannot put aside questions of who gains or loses how much in any formula change, and in the name of the welfare of impoverished children, approach this matter with a degree of disinterested statesmanship, then we shall have made a further contribution to making "politics" a demeaning word in our society.

Mr. Chairman, it is also important for us to recognize that the bill before us today does not really attack the major problems faced by urban education. The central city school system is in a state of crisis. With a decreasing tax base and an increasing population of disadvantaged schoolchildren the systems are simply not able to offer quality education to those students who need it most.

This is a crisis which can no longer be ignored. Last year I joined with my colleagues, Congressmen BELL, DELLENBACK, HORTON, and OGDEN REID, to study the problems of urban education in detail. Our study took nearly a year and the results were included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year.

Our conclusions were clear. The present system of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education is simply not adequate to deal with the special problems faced by urban education. The multiplicity of separate programs under present arrangements makes it impossible for an urban system to organize its programs on an overall basis and apply Federal funds where they are needed most. Categorical grants tie school systems to programs which are not of highest priority for their system and encourage a shotgun approach.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be extremely unwise for the House to take action today which would tie us into a continuation of this system, unchanged, for 5 years. When Secretary Finch testified before the Education and Labor Committee he endorsed our study and indicated that the special problems of urban education are receiving utmost consideration in the Department and that the administration hopes to make full recommendations for improved Federal programs in this area. I understand that a task force has been established in HEW to make specific recommendations in this field. Congress should not take action today which would make it impossible to make constructive and innovative changes in the years ahead. Allow me to summarize for you the conclusions of our study:

First. Item by item, the urban youth, especially the ghetto resident, have fewer physical facilities for education which are up to date and in good condition, fewer curriculum aids, a less com-

elling academic curriculum and learning environment, and slightly lower quality in teaching.

Second. Recognizing that some of these differences obviously restrict educational opportunity, the level of differences could not alone account for the vast gap in the results of the students in the cities versus those in the suburbs.

Third. Data from achievement scores, from progress reports, from armed services entrance tests, and from dropout rates and college attendance rates demonstrate explicitly that each student in America is not now being given the opportunity to acquire the basic tools of speech, writing, reading and mathematics, tools without which he can neither continue learning nor compete effectively.

Fourth. The kind of individual who enters the urban school system and the kind of environment he comes from leads to the conclusion that urban education has failed in not responding effectively to the challenge of teaching culturally deprived students.

Fifth. Urban education, then, must be made superior to suburban education if the graduates of both are to have equivalent skills.

Sixth. The recent Federal effort to promote better education across the board has been extraordinary, with Congress having passed over 49 pieces of legislation dealing with education over the past 4 years and spending some \$9 billion a year to implement 111 programs, twice what was being spent 4 years ago. Nevertheless, the Federal effort has failed to produce the results in urban education which are needed.

Seventh. The very multitude of education legislation and the numerous programs implementing it put the local school in a position where it can, at best, only adjust to its desperation within the administrative nightmare imposed by the segmented bureaucracy of Washington. Such a plethora of programs prevents the one thing the local education agency must do—devise a comprehensive plan to provide real education to the urban children.

Eighth. The "something for every thesis" approach to Federal aid deprives the Congress of the opportunity to concentrate on the desperate urban need for education in the basic learning skills.

Ninth. Congressional preoccupation with the legal formula by which Federal aid is extended has obscured the real issue of improving education. It is wrong for Washington to run every school district in the Nation, not just because Congress forbids it, but because it would not produce good education. But it is equally wrong for this, the best educated nation in all history to force the least fortunate and skilled among us to find their own wisdom and initiative and optimism to better their own education system before we can help them. The Federal Government must be bold enough to tie its aid to the States with strings that demand action in the crisis in urban education.

Our study then recommended the following:

First, a recognition that priority attention to be given to urban education

as one of the keys to solving the urban dilemma;

Second, revision and consolidation of the Federal support programs to direct a single education payment to the cities;

Third, providing the opportunity for each city to undertake a total revision, restructuring, and revitalization of their entire local educational system;

Fourth, Federal aid to education which requires only that a local program be comprehensive in nature and that in planning, attention and consideration by the local area be given to teacher training and recruitment, facilities construction and use, curriculum aids and supplemental services, preschool programs and year-round school, use of technology and provision for adequate nutrition and medical care;

Fifth, Federal support which encourages consideration by the urban center of the fundamental questions of the adequacy of existing control over education and the question of decentralization, the existing financing of local education, and the existing administrative management of education;

Sixth, Federal support which encourages consideration of the value of a synergistic curriculum based on planning which considers each and every aspect of education and its effect on every other aspect, including basic skills, vocation/technical education, recreation and extracurricular activities, remedial programs, and a wide range of academic subjects. The support programs would encourage the urban center to use relevant cultural background material and to include programs for the development of personal creativity and self-reliance.

Seventh, Federal support which requires community participation in the development of education plans and utilizes the talents of officials of private independent schools, private industry, higher education institutions, and local citizens;

Eighth, the appointment of an Associate Commissioner for Urban Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Ninth, a massive increase in teacher training programs emphasizing instruction designed especially for the urban area.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 514. At the outset I want to express my admiration and congratulations to the great chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), who, I think it is fair to say, has contributed more than any Member of Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, to the passage of legislation to improve the elementary and secondary schools of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to take a few minutes to express several concerns I have with respect to this measure and the elementary and secondary education programs generally and with respect to some of the amendments that have been suggested to H.R. 514.

First, I want to say something about money. I am much concerned about the funding, as I know Members on both

sides of the aisle must be, for education programs.

I speak in no partisan sense when I observe that President Nixon in his budget message of a few days ago proposed—and I believe my figures are correct—approximately \$370 million less for education than did President Johnson in his outgoing budget message for fiscal year 1970; and in all candor, I did not think President Johnson proposed adequate funds for education in his recommendation.

For example, President Nixon would, in his budget, completely eliminate all funds for title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is the title that has provided funds for library resources in our elementary and secondary schools, a program which has meant a great deal to schools throughout the United States which have been short of funds for library materials.

President Nixon also proposed that we invest no money at all for title VI of the National Defense Education Act, a program for guidance, counseling, and testing.

He would cut the title III elementary and secondary education program, which provides for supplemental centers and services by a very large amount of \$56 million.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, quite rightly, I believe, expressed her concern that we are not doing enough to provide for the education of elementary and secondary schoolteachers. I regret to report that President Nixon asked for \$10 million less, approximately—\$9.5 million, to be exact—for the Education Professions Development Act than had President Johnson.

Mr. Chairman, let me here cite another authority to which reference has been made in this debate, which has also come to be a council considerably respected by members of our committee on both sides of the aisle. I refer to the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, which has won a reputation for independence of thought because of the ability of its members and because it is independent of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in putting together its judgments and recommendations. The Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children warned in its report this year about what, to quote it, "appears to be a weakening Federal commitment to the education of disadvantaged children." The report continued:

This is best evidenced by the \$68 million cutback in funding title I, from \$1.19 billion last school year to \$1.123 billion this school year. This cutback, combined with the continuing increase in the cost of education, results in an estimated \$400 million less for disadvantaged pupils in local schools this year than was available the first year of the program.

We are deluding ourselves if we think we can make an impact on education of the disadvantaged without providing the necessary resources.

So, Mr. Chairman, when people say that we keep spending more and more money for title I, ESEA programs, that is not accurate. We have been putting in less and less money.

I was struck also by the recommenda-

tion of President Nixon's Education Task Force, which the President appointed when he was President-elect. This task force, chaired by Alan Pifer, the very distinguished president of the Carnegie Corp., recommended an increase of \$1 billion on education for the elementary and secondary schools in the big cities of our country alone. That report even went so far as to propose an Urban Education Act to supplement title I, not as a replacement for it. This is an indication that Mr. Nixon's own advisers, the authors of what I think is one of the best education reports I have seen in a long time, share these concerns about underfunding these important programs.

The point I want to make, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is that the proposals which may be coming before us tomorrow, which would consolidate several of the elementary and secondary school programs, carry with them the very great danger that there would be even less money put into a consolidated program than is presently being put into these several programs when they continue to exist in separate form.

A second concern I have, Mr. Chairman, deals with proposals that would place greater control of the Federal funds in the hands of some of our State education agencies as distinguished from maintaining the present patterns of distribution, whereby the Office of Education often works directly with the local public school systems.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I just want to comment from a little experience we are having right now in my State of Indiana, to explain to Members what I mean. The State of Indiana as of this week stands to lose over \$6 million in vocational education funds because the chief State school officer, the superintendent of public instruction, is in a fight with other State officials in Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has sent checks in excess of \$1 million in Federal moneys for education which, until a few days ago, State officials had not even deposited in the bank, despite the fact that those checks had been issued months ago.

I will give you a second instance. The Governor of my State during the last campaign promised that if elected he would see to it that 50 percent of the cost of public school education in Indiana would be paid from State funds. He thereupon announced that he would veto any increase in State sales or State income taxes to meet this promise. The result is that after the 61-day session of our State legislature, Indiana has inadequate funds for the schools of our State, and we know that property taxes will be soaring all over Indiana, as a direct result of the Governor's position.

Therefore, I raise certain questions

about the wisdom, the advisability, and soundness of taking more dollars voted by Members of the Congress of the United States and putting them into the hands of State officials who have, to be very candid about it, almost completely abdicated their responsibility to provide adequately for State support of education.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, I cite the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children with respect to proposals to shift responsibility for handling Federal funds for title I programs to the States.

The Council warns that in many States and possibly in all States, such a move would "diminish the impact of this necessary investment in the education of disadvantaged children," and continues:

The Council's position is not based on preconceived theories but hard data which show that State distribution of funds rarely, if ever, favors those sections of the State with the greater concentration and numbers of educationally deprived children.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-eight 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. 44]

Addabbo	Edwards, La.	Ottinger
Annunzio	Evins, Tenn.	Patman
Baring	Flynt	Pike
Barrett	Gilbert	Powell
Bates	Harsha	Purcell
Bell, Calif.	Hébert	Rivers
Brock	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Hollifield	Sandman
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Scheuer
Broyhill, Va.	Jarman	Scott
Burton, Utah	Karth	Sikes
Camp	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Carey	Lowenstein	Stokes
Celler	McKneally	Sullivan
Clark	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	May	Ullman
Daddario	Mollohan	Widnall
Davis, Ga.	Moorhead	Wilson
Dawson	Murphy, N.Y.	Charles H.
Diggs	Nix	Young
Dwyer	O'Hara	

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 371 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 setting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) had 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have only two or three other observations to make.

In urging passage of H.R. 514 I was warning against the dangers of proposals like that to consolidate several titles, a move that could result in leading to less financial support for those several categories than they receive when, as at present, they are funded individually.

Second, I was observing that there would be a real danger of shortchanging programs for the educationally deprived if we put more education money into the hands of State agencies.

The last point to which I refer is represented by a phrase used in President Nixon's Educational Task Force report which is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, namely, "The Church-State Issue."

I quote from the President-elect's task force report as follows:

2. THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE

The immense complexities of this issue are explored with great clarity in two special memoranda which were commissioned by the Task Force. These are included as appendices to this report, and we urge that they be carefully studied. While for the moment the Church-State issue is quiescent because of the essentially political accommodations reached over recent Federal education legislation, especially ESEA, there are two distinct possibilities for it to become once again a lively area of controversy that could cause the new Administration a great deal of trouble.

The first of these could result from an unsophisticated effort to rearrange the methods through which Federal aid is channeled to the support of education, either through some general aid plan, a badly designed block grant or a clumsy scheme for the consolidation of legislation. Such an effort could easily upset the present delicate Church-State accommodation.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. And then the members of President-elect Nixon's Education Task Force go on to observe:

We recommend that neither he [Mr. Nixon] or any high official of his Administration make any further allusions to block grants until the full implications of new methods of Federal financing of education can be fully explored. Since more than 30 States, including three of the largest, have provisions in their constitutions which tightly restrict aid to parochial schools, Catholic officials will in all probability be strongly opposed to any move on the part of the Administration which appears to have the effect of turning Federal educational dollars into State educational dollars.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think the point made by Mr. Nixon's advisers is telling and accurate.

Let me just summarize, Mr. Chairman, because I have only a minute or two left.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Not until I complete my remarks and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I want to direct an observation or two to my friends on the Republican side. In Mr. Nixon's Education Task Force report there is to be found the following very revealing observation—and these are not Democrats speaking; these are Mr. Nixon's own advisers:

Speaking candidly, we do not believe that President-elect Nixon, with all his varied and high qualifications for office, would at present by most Americans be considered to have the kind of special concern for education that the times require.

Now, following that observation by the Nixon Education Task Force, I call your

attention to the fact that in his message on domestic priorities which the President sent to Congress and the country last week, although he set forth about 10 different priorities for our Nation, the President did not once mention the word "education."

And further, I remind you that President Nixon in his budget message of last week proposed a tremendous cut of \$370 million below the budget request for education that President Johnson had suggested for fiscal year 1970.

Now, I think, and I do not want to make this a partisan issue, but I do want to make an observation. I have been citing from Republican authority and not from Democratic authority. I believe the bill before us today affords a superb opportunity for both the majority and the minority parties in the House of Representatives to make clear whether they are going to make speeches about education and simply write support for education into their party platforms, or whether they are going to really support aid for education, and when the roll is called, and vote in support of education.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to one of our colleagues on our committee who is interested in education, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana yielding to me.

Perhaps, by oversight, the gentleman from Indiana did not fully discuss the report which he put in the RECORD so that we could all review it. The Members will note that the gentleman from Indiana mentioned designated block grants, but I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the following statement concerning block grants:

This approach is fully consistent with the recommendations made to President Nixon by a task force of distinguished citizens which included leading educators—the so-called Pifer report. In recommending what it termed "designated block grants" it took note of and concurred with the "widespread belief, both at the State and local level, that the seeking of funds under this multiplicity of legislation is an unnecessarily burdensome and time-consuming business, and the time has come for a major effort at simplification of the process." The report recommended "a general movement in Federal programs away from categorical aid narrowly defined toward more broadly defined designated block grants * * * as a way of lessening the burden on State, local, and institutional officials in applying for Federal funds—an area in which there is now considerable irritation and frustration—and * * * as an important step toward the urgent task of strengthening the administrative capacity of the States to meet their responsibilities in education."

The amendment we have proposed is an extremely modest step in this direction, but it is vitally important that a first step be taken.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying, and I myself subscribe

to much of what he is saying, but I would call attention to other passages in the Nixon Education Task Force Report. I believe that the best and most honest way to approach this matter, if one is seriously interested in what the Nixon Task Force said, is to read it from start to finish. Then I think you will agree with me that very clearly the kind of people who put that report together would be in support of the passage of H.R. 514.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say to the gentleman that I believe the approach suggested by the amendment to be offered is one which meets the criteria of the Nixon Task Force. In addition to that, and I quoted from it at the time of the hearings, the Nathan Task Force, which also was concerned with this, was recommending this kind of consolidation of programs. This is the effort that we are making on the floor today, not in a partisan vein, but one which will meet the educational needs of the young people of this land.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would say to my friend from Wisconsin that what he has said flies completely in the face of the testimony we heard from all of the witnesses on this bill, especially the local school superintendents who joined, most of them, in warning us against the dangers of the gentleman's proposals.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to rise in support of this bill and to urge the Members to join the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) in resisting amendment to the bill as it has come to the floor.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

Mr. Chairman, today, for the fifth time since I came to Congress and became a member of the Education and Labor Committee, the House is debating the merits of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to have served at the side of the Honorable CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, who was chairman of the subcommittee upon which I served when this act was originally written and passed. Now, as chairman of the full committee, he comes once more to the floor of the House leading again the fight to continue Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

If I may be permitted, I should like to join the other members of this committee in paying tribute to the chairman for his untiring efforts in behalf of Federal aid legislation and for full funding of this worthy program.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that we have had to debate this same program every year for each year of its life should demonstrate the need for a 5-year extension.

Here we are, as each year in the past, still discussing the amounts to be authorized, and in fact the very question of whether any or all of the titles of this act are to be continued, while school

boards and administrators across the country are trying to plan programs and find personnel for the coming school year.

It must certainly be apparent that we have reached the stage where this House should be capable of adopting a realistic extension of the act to permit the kind of advance planning needed for quality education.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has, since its enactment in 1965, been more important to the grade schools and high schools of our Nation than any previous education legislation ever enacted. We cannot today calculate its total impact—for that will be felt in the years to come in the increased earning power and good citizenship of many thousands of schoolchildren whose education was in some way significantly improved through the application of funds under the provisions of this act. It may be the Mexican-American child whose enrollment in a bilingual education program enabled him to keep pace with his English-speaking peers; it may be the deaf child who was reached by a teacher especially trained to understand his needs, it may be the potential dropout who was encouraged to continue his education and obtain his high school diploma. All of these individuals and many others whose needs have heretofore not been adequately met by the schools because of lack of funds, of skilled teachers or of relevant materials are, and will continue to be, served by the programs under this act.

If ever Congress was faced with an imperative to enact immediately a piece of legislation, that time is now. Although the present act does not expire until 1970, we cannot afford to let it wait until next year for extension. Repeated testimony and evidence before the Committee on Education and Labor indicate that present late funding means that many schools do not receive their moneys until well after the school year has begun, thus greatly reducing the effectiveness of the legislation. By extending it now, and extending it for 5 years, we make sure that advance funding is possible, and we will give school officials and administrators a chance to prepare in advance for optimum use of the funds they are to receive. What is more, they will be able to plan with certainty on an expected amount of income, and will not be forced to cut crucial programs at the last moment, or exclude children from programs already underway, because the appropriations from Washington fell short of what they had expected.

In addition to extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 514 also extends Public Laws 815 and 874, the impacted area aid laws. These important laws have been providing assistance to school districts, suddenly and severely overburdened with a school age population to be educated as a result of Federal activities in the area, since their enactment in 1950. Public Law 815 provides assistance for school construction, and Public Law 874 provides funds for operation and maintenance. Payments to local educational agencies are based on the existence of Federal property in or within reasonable commuting distance of a school district where children reside with their parents or on which the par-

ents are employed. These payments are intended to compensate the school district for loss of revenue from untaxed property. Today, there are many school districts which receive a major portion of their budget from the funds allotted under Public Law 874, and thus the law plays a substantial role in providing a good education for the Nation's school-children, many of whose families provide substantial services to their Government in the Armed Forces.

An important amendment to both Public Laws 815 and 874 will make children who live in federally assisted public housing eligible for being counted for payment purposes to the local educational agency. The great increase in federally assisted public housing which is not countable for State and local taxing purposes has placed a severe burden on many school districts in recent years. Although the Federal Government does provide some payment to the local district in lieu of taxes, the national average of this payment is only \$11 per child for each school year, while the national average of estimated current expenditure for public elementary and secondary schools per pupil—in average daily attendance—is \$680.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to summarize the major provisions of ESEA.

TITLE I—EDUCATION SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

Title I, is designed to help local school districts improve the quality of education offered educationally disadvantaged children. Services provided range from medical care, to special reading programs to cultural exposure field trips. Any educationally disadvantaged pupil in a school receiving title I funds may be eligible to participate, regardless of income. Projects are designed at the local level and approved by State educational agencies.

Since passage of the ESEA in 1965, title I has provided in round figures the following: In fiscal year 1966, \$960 million to serve 8.3 million children in 17,500 school districts; in fiscal year 1967, \$1.011 billion to serve 9.1 million children in some 16,400 school districts; in fiscal year 1968, \$1.070 billion to serve 9 million children in an estimated 16,000 school districts.

Special populations of disadvantaged children specifically provided for in later amendments to ESEA, title I, have been served by projects designed to meet their special needs. Funds spent to serve these special groups under title I amounted to approximately the following:

	[In millions]		
	In fiscal year 1966	In fiscal year 1967	In fiscal year 1968
Handicapped children.....	\$10.5	\$13	\$21.7
Neglected children.....		.205	.922
Delinquent children.....		1.7	8
Migrant children.....		8	32.7

Local school districts have elected to spend most of their title I funds on services that touch children directly: improved instructional services, guidance and counseling, food, health care, and so on. Equipment and construction ex-

penditures represent a minor portion of funds spent by local education agencies—13 percent in fiscal year 1967.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES

The purpose of title II is to provide nonmatching grants to States for the procurement of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional material for use by students and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966.....	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000
1967.....	128,750,000	102,000,000
1968.....	154,500,000	99,234,000
1969.....	167,375,000	50,000,000
1970.....	200,000,000	(¹)

¹ Not yet passed.

Among the three categories of eligible materials—school library resources, textbooks, an other instructional materials, the States have given priority in each year to school library resources. States expended title II funds for acquisitions in fiscal year 1967 in the following proportions:

	Percent
School library resources.....	92.0
Textbooks.....	4.0
Other instructional materials.....	3.4

In fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the States reported a total of almost 8,500 new public school libraries serving approximately 3,800,000 students. More than 70,500 libraries were expanded in fiscal year 1967 alone.

Of an estimated 47,000,000 public and private schoolchildren eligible to participate in the title II program each year from 1966–68, an estimated 44,000,000 or almost 94 percent of those eligible, participated. About 1,800,000 teachers—approximately 89 percent of all those eligible—participated in the program each year.

It is estimated that the 1969 appropriation of \$50,000,000 will provide for the purchase of 9,000,000 books and filmstrips or about 1 book or filmstrip for every five children participating.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY CENTERS AND SERVICES

The title III program is designed to encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems; to utilize research findings; and to create and design innovative educational practices. Grants are made for supplementary educational centers and may be used for the planning of projects, pilot projects, and programs such as guidance and counseling, experimental academic services, specialized instruction and many others.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966.....	\$100,000,000	\$75,000,000
1967.....	180,250,000	135,000,000
1968.....	515,000,000	187,876,000
1969.....	527,875,000	164,876,000
1970.....	566,500,000	(¹)

¹ Not yet passed.

During fiscal year 1969, primary responsibility for the administration of title III shifted from the Office of Education to the States. Currently, the States,

under a State grant program, are administering 75 percent of all title III funds with the Office of Education administering the remaining 25 percent. During fiscal year 1970, the States will assume responsibility for all title III funds except those necessary to complete projects begun in prior years.

Persons benefiting from fiscal year 1968 approved projects

A. Preschool.....	135,000
B. Elementary and Secondary Students.....	10,000,000
1. Elementary.....	8,000,000
2. Secondary.....	2,000,000
C. Teachers.....	35,000
D. Parents, adults, and others.....	90,000

Of the 1,587 projects active in March 1969, the estimated present distribution of the \$158 million is as follows:

Activity:	Percent
New curriculums.....	30
Educational technology, facilities, equipment, and materials.....	15
Institution or personnel improvement.....	14
Special education-remediation.....	13
Research, survey, planning, evaluation, and dissemination.....	8
Pupil personnel services.....	8
Community involvement.....	6
Instructional methods.....	5
Other.....	1

Beginning fiscal year 1969, at least 15 percent—about \$23 million—of the total ESEA title III appropriation must be spent for projects for the handicapped. In fiscal year 1938, \$15 million or 8 percent of the total title III funds went to such projects.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

The purpose of title V is to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership of their educational agency and to assist them in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966.....	\$25,000,000	\$17,000,000
1967.....	30,000,000	22,000,000
1968.....	65,000,000	29,750,000
1969.....	80,000,000	29,750,000
1970.....	80,000,000	(¹)

¹ Includes funds formerly appropriated for Public Law 85-564, the National Defense Education Act, title X (\$2,250,000) and title III (\$5,500,000).

² Not yet passed.

In fiscal year 1938 funds were distributed as follows:

	Percent
Strengthening leadership, consultative and technical assistance to local educational agencies.....	31
Planning, development, and research coordination.....	16
Strengthening States' internal management capabilities and data processing services.....	36
School and teacher accreditation and other services to local educational agencies.....	17

Originally, 15 percent—\$3,300,000—of the appropriation was reserved for special project grants to State education agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects. Beginning in fiscal year 1969, 5 percent—\$1,487,500—is now reserved for this purpose. The 1967 ESEA

amendments require that 10 percent of the State educational agency's entitlement, under section 503, be distributed to local educational agencies for use in directly strengthening their programs.

Virtually all the States and outlying areas have been involved in the 41 interstate special projects which were funded through the 15 and 5 percent reserve.

State educational agencies have added over 4,260 professional personnel since the program's inception. More than 1,000 professional personnel and a similar number of nonprofessionals have been added to their staffs in 1968 alone.

TITLE VI—EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Title VI, added to the ESEA in 1967, is a three-part program for the improvement of special educational services for handicapped children.

Part A is a State grant program; over its 3 years of operation VI-A has supported a great diversity of projects for school-aged handicapped children. These include work-study programs, special transportation arrangements, mobile units to carry services to handicapped children in rural areas, and diagnostic services. It is estimated that by the end of this fiscal year, almost one-quarter of a million handicapped children will have benefited from the program.

Appropriations for the program have steadily expanded to provide for more children. In VI-A's first year, fiscal year 1967, approximately \$2.5 million was appropriated for planning grants. In 1968, \$14,250,000 was appropriated, and this year the figure reached \$39,250,000.

Part B authorizes the establishment and operation of regional resource centers devoted to improving the education of handicapped children. This year will mark the initiation of the program. Applications are yet to be approved, but it is expected that four planning grants will be approved by June, at about \$125,000 each. Appropriations for fiscal year 1969 are \$500,000. For each child referred, centers will offer diagnostic testing, individual analysis of each child's learning problems, and a specially developed educational program to assist his teachers in meeting his special needs.

Part C, also new this year, provides for the establishment and operation of a limited number of centers to serve deaf-blind children. One million dollars has been appropriated for fiscal year 1969, and grants were recently made for eight centers for amounts ranging from \$36,260 to \$189,000. Each center is to serve a multiple-State area, providing diagnosis and evaluation, family consultation, and adjustment services for these severely handicapped deaf-blind children.

TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The purpose of title VII is to provide grants in support of programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children 3 to 18 years of age, who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. Three million school-age children are deprived of equal education opportunity because of their limited communication skills. The concern is for these children's desire and need to develop greater competence in English, for the realization of their full potential as speakers of two

languages, and for their educational advancement.

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1968	\$15,000,000	0
1969	30,000,000	\$7,500,000
1970	40,000,000	(¹)

¹ Not yet passed.

The Office of Education received 312 preliminary proposals requesting over \$41 million for projects beginning in fiscal year 1969. Of these, 78 were selected for funding. These projects will serve some 139,000 pupils, 64 percent of them in urban communities.

The majority of projects will deal with children from Spanish-speaking backgrounds; five deal with American Indian dialect backgrounds, four deal with students from Portuguese-speaking families, and two deal with students from French-speaking backgrounds. The projects are located in 22 States, and include pre-school storefront centers, the development of special curriculum materials, in-service education in bilingual methodology for bilingual staffs, and summer bilingual programs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 514 and wish to commend the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), for a very fine statement and associate myself with his remarks. I know he has worked hard and contributed immeasurably to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been described as a widening door to opportunity for the development of talent and skills. In 1965 enactment of ESEA provided the key which opened that door for the first time. Both the 1966 and 1967 amendments to the act further expanded the chances of each and every American for equal educational opportunity. The bill which we are considering here today—H.R. 514—would extend the programs of ESEA through 1975, thus insuring that the door to excellence in our schools would remain open wide.

When President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 he stated his belief that:

No law I have signed—or will sign—means more to the future of America.

ESEA has already sparked great changes in our schools, but due to limited appropriations and the ever-present specter of late funding, it has not yet lived up to its full potential.

Considering the budget cuts which have been sustained in recent years by many of the programs included in H.R. 514, the returns on the Federal investment in education have been most gratifying. According to one big-city school superintendent, Dr. Norman Drachler:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided the only significant funds that the Detroit Public Schools have had for program improvement since the bill was enacted.¹

¹ House hearings on H.R. 514. Pt. 1: p. 418.

This statement is typical of the sentiments expressed by the educators who testified in hearings before the Education and Labor Committee on H.R. 514.

The accomplishments of ESEA in its first 3½ years merit more than a quick catalog. A rundown of some of the major breakthroughs for which it is responsible, however, may serve to convince you of the urgent necessity for favorable action on this bill. As a result of ESEA—

An average of 9 million children in low-income areas receive each year extra help they need to overcome the cumulative effects of poverty and educational deprivation;

The purchase of over 70 million books and instructional materials has provided 88 percent of our schoolchildren with the basic tools essential to learning;

More than 10 million students have benefited directly from programs designed to release the creative potential inherent in our schools. The education of countless other young people will be enriched as a result of the knowledge generated by these programs;

Some 250,000 handicapped children have received the extra services which they require to surmount their mental or physical disabilities;

More than 275,000 teachers each year have improved their skills through the various inservice training programs offered under the act;

State departments of education, the key to effective coordination of Federal, State, and local efforts, have been strengthened through the addition of more than 4,000 professional personnel;

Adult basic education has brought the gift of literacy to over 1 million Americans who were trapped in a twilight world of ignorance. In the words of one expert:

This program has given them hope, dignity, and a start on the road toward productive citizenship—at a cost of approximately \$100 per year per student.

In addition to the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 514 will also insure that the impacted area programs authorized by Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 will continue to assist those schools impacted by Federal activities. During 17 years of its operation, Public Law 815 has helped to finance the construction of over 62,000 classrooms and other facilities housing nearly 1,900,000 pupils. In fiscal 1967, Public Law 874 contributed to the education of more than 2,300,000 children. These are programs for which we in the Congress bear a direct responsibility, for we can hardly expect the local schools, hard pressed as they are for funds, to absorb the additional financial burdens placed upon them by federally connected children.

Unprecedented legislation, such as ESEA, always requires a few years in which to mature. The amendments proposed by H.R. 514 represent a distillation of the experiences of those countless educators who have been called upon to implement this act. The major contribution of the bill before us will be the continuity provided by the certainty of continuing authorizations. In addition, however, it will also refine and improve the provisions affecting institutionalized,

neglected, delinquent, and Indian migratory, children. The evaluation process so essential to successful programs will be substantially altered. The invaluable National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children will be re-established and strengthened. Equitable participation in title III—supplemental educational centers and services—programs will be insured.

Just as recent legislation must be altered in the light of newly acquired experience, so older laws must be changed in response to changes in the society they serve. H.R. 514 will accordingly amend Public Laws 874 and 815 to compensate for the crushing burden placed upon many school systems by the growth of public housing projects.

The bill which we consider here today will insure that the Nation we bequeath to our children will be in good hands. As H. G. Wells once reminded us:

Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

Education can win that race, but not without the help and foresight of both the people and their Government. I call upon my colleagues to display their foresight by providing that help.

Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague from New Jersey in commending the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs).

Today we are considering the extension of ESEA. In my mind the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the most fundamental and most important piece of Federal legislation in the field of education. Of course legislation in higher education and vocational education is important, but it is elementary and secondary education that provides the necessary foundation. Without adequate elementary and secondary education no further or additional education is possible. So today we are considering the essentials; the foundation not only for our educational system but for our society. It is incumbent upon us to create an elementary and secondary system adequate for all. Even in our complex society a person graduating from secondary school should be able, if it is necessary, to intelligently participate in our democratic processes and to lead a productive life without further education. All too often the complexities of our modern life are used to justify the failures of our elementary and secondary education. Truthfully too many of our young men and women are receiving an education that would be considered inadequate even 200 years ago. This is particularly true of children of minority groups and children from schools in the inner cities. These students frequently have not mastered the elementary skills of reading and writing.

Recognizing the desperate need and the urgency of the situation Congress passed in 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This legislation, however, has been plagued by late funding, chaotic funding, and underfunding. In this period of budgetary restraint there is very little we can do about the

consistent underfunding of education legislation. We can, however, substantially alleviate the problem of late funding by extending this act for 5 years.

The legislative calendar does not coincide nor is it easily reconciled with the school calendar. The result of much of the education legislation that we have passed in recent years has been to create a permanent anxiety and doubt in school administrators and personnel. They begin programs they do not know if they will finish. People begin jobs that they do not know will continue. We all know dedicated teachers and administrators who for months work without pay while legislators debate. We cannot expect the development of a continuous and cohesive program under such conditions. We must provide more continuity and certainty in our education legislation if we do not want to turn the teachers of this country into a band of hobos and gypsies.

A 5-year extension of this program would rectify this problem. A 5-year extension would allow administrators to plan programs that will really meet our education needs.

Educational programs should be planned to meet long-term needs and should not be a desperate attempt to use suddenly available and unpredictable Federal funds. If we cannot provide adequate funds let us at least provide that the funds will be timely.

While ESEA is a bill drafted to meet the general educational needs of our society there are many commendable provisions tailored to meet a specific educational need.

The assistance provided for various forms of handicapped children is a worthy concern for this body. The handicapped child has special problems that will not be met unless this bill is passed. The training for desperately needed educational personnel in this field is provided by this bill.

This bill continues the bilingual education program which was first established by Congress in 1967. Again children from families where English is not their native tongue have special problems which require special assistance.

The dropout prevention program, section 807 of title VIII of ESEA, is another program that must be extended. The educational system cannot and must not give up on its students. Certainly some children will be poor students and other students will be effected by poor families or environment. A dropout represents not only the failure of a student and his family and environment, but of the school system. We would not think much of a doctor who excused his constant failures by asserting that his patients were sick. It is the duty of the doctor to heal the sick and of the school to educate the ignorant.

While these are all worthwhile provisions I believe our elementary and secondary educational system will rise or fall on the success or failure of three main titles in ESEA—title I, title III, title V. After all the books, television documentaries, campaign rhetoric about poverty there still is only pitifully few Federal laws trying to solve some of the

problems of poverty. Whatever the shortcomings and failures of title I it is making an effort in an area of utmost importance to this country. Failure to solve the problem of poverty will mean the failure of this country.

There is a tendency in this area for some to minimize the difficulties while maximizing their demands for success. Education is really a miracle between individuals. It involves not only the imponderable human element of the student but the incalculable human consequence of the teacher. Judging from their criticism there are some who seem to believe that education success can be planned with the precision of a moon shot and that educational problems can be solved by creative bookkeeping. If we are sincere about quality education for all we must be willing to endure a long-term commitment.

Title III to provide supplemental educational centers and services has a two-fold objective: First, to stimulate and assist in the providing of vitally needed educational services otherwise unavailable in the local schools in sufficient quality and quantity; and, second, to develop exemplary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Title III has provided innovation, stimulation, and competition in our educational system. Of course, there have been failures but to do nothing or to continue as we were before 1965 would have been the greatest failure of all. The old ways, the old methods were not working. Something new was needed in this area of human imponderables; what was needed, what would work was not clear. Therefore, title III was started as an experiment. It has been my observation that it has been a successful experiment. An experiment that is now up to the State education agencies to continue.

Title V provides grants to strengthen State departments of education. State institutions of education are integral parts of our education system. With the increasing importance of education the function of State educational agencies is of growing importance. It is the purpose of title V to assist the State agencies in meeting this responsibility. It is incumbent upon the State agencies to insure that they are not merely a reward for faithful service or a final resting place for those without inspiration.

For the reasons stated ESEA must be passed. It must be made clear, however, that we will have not fulfilled our commitment to education until we have adequate funding of educational programs. Until there is, adequate funding of the passage of education legislation is like the title of the Broadway musical "Promises, Promises, Promises."

Full funding for fiscal 1970 under present provisions of ESEA requires an estimated appropriation of \$648 million. The 1970 budget request, however, is for only \$300 million.

Today we provide the home for education. Hopefully in the future we will furnish it.

Mr. AYRES, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. Chairman, there should no longer be any question

about whether it is proper for the Federal Government to provide assistance to elementary and secondary education throughout the United States. The past few years have shown clearly that the Federal Government can provide this assistance without encroaching unduly upon the autonomy of our Nation's schools. The questions have become instead how Federal aid can be most beneficially and equitably distributed among the States, what shall be the specific areas in which Federal dollars shall be made available, and how many Federal dollars shall be appropriated for educational purposes.

I would point out to the gentleman from Indiana, who has served so ably on our committee, and who spoke from the well immediately prior to my remarks, that he should not continue to confuse several of these distinct questions. When it comes to the questions of what shall be the nature of Federal education programs and what shall be the manner and distribution of Federal funds, we should not mix up these questions with how many dollars should be appropriated. As I believe he and we are both fully aware, we are not today discussing the appropriation of Federal funds. We are talking about the authorization of Federal funding. We are talking about the question of what shall be the nature of Federal education programs and the manner of distribution of Federal funds, and this type question.

Mr. Chairman, ESEA has contributed significantly to the general public acceptance of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education. Since its passage in 1965 ESEA has made possible unprecedented support for schools throughout the Nation and has yielded some fine accomplishments. In my opinion, however, ESEA has the potential to provide even greater benefits. This potential will never be realized if Congress refuses to try to improve the act to make its programs as effective as possible. A 5-year extension, as authorized by H.R. 514, erroneously assumes that ESEA is perfect and beyond improvement in its present form. On the contrary, ESEA as extended by H.R. 514 contains several serious imperfections.

One almost universally recognized imperfection of the present law is the lack of opportunity for forward funding. Under the present funding system of ESEA, schools are often not informed of how much money they will receive until after the administrators have had to formulate plans. A sad pattern emerges from this delay in funding. Encouraged by an act, which seems to promise a great deal in terms of Federal funds for innovations, educators and administrators plan creative, new programs. When the time comes for implementing these programs, the administrators are too often faced with the fact that they have far less funds than they had anticipated. Their plans must either be drastically curtailed or totally abandoned. It is clear to me from this pattern that the lack of forward funding tends to discourage creativity and innovation in our Nation's schools.

While the lack of opportunity for advance funding is surely one of the most

serious of the present ESEA's imperfections, it is by no means the only defect in the present law. The multiplicity of programs has caused unwieldy administrative burdens and rigid, confining requirements. The proliferation of programs works a special hardship on small school districts which frequently lack the staff and facilities to cut through red-tape and determine what funds are available.

Dr. Dale Parnell, the Oregon State superintendent of public instruction, wrote me last week to urge my support of several changes in ESEA. One of his suggested improvements involves combining ESEA title II and title III with title III and title V-A of the National Defense Education Act. Dr. Parnell feels, and I quote from his letter:

I am in full agreement with the proposals to consolidate some of the related programs as I believe this could be a step in the direction of a more flexibly administered total aid program.

As one who strongly supports the exact proposed combination of programs advocated by Dr. Parnell, I welcome his expert testimony in favor thereof.

ESEA has obviously been in effect long enough to demonstrate the need for change to educators as well as to Congress. Yet I feel we need further direction to indicate certain of the most constructive specific roads to follow in making changes. In his testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee on March 10, 1969, Secretary Finch stressed the need for additional evaluation of ESEA programs during the coming months. The Office of Education is at this very time in the process of making the very type of evaluation in depth of the provisions of ESEA and programs aided thereunder which is so very badly needed. We have his assurances that the results of this evaluation and his recommendations based thereon will be before the Congress for consideration as soon as possible.

With a 5-year extension of ESEA, these evaluation efforts by the Office of Education run the risk of being virtually pointless. But if, as I hope, we extend ESEA for only a 2-year period, there will be a definite and desirable urgency for Congress to reconsider this act next year and to apply the results of sound and thorough evaluation. Congress will in this way be exercising its essential responsibility of making ESEA as effective as possible. The danger is clear and great that the passage of H.R. 514 with a 5-year extension will lock in ESEA's present weaknesses and imperfections and serve a grave injustice to elementary and secondary school children across the country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to direct a question to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) chairman of the committee.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that we will finish all general debate this afternoon except for 20 minutes, with 10 minutes to remain for each side; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is the understanding.

Mr. AYRES. Then, after general debate is completed tomorrow, we will start reading the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, if it is permissible, I would like to reserve the 10 minutes for tomorrow, and if it will accommodate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) I would be glad to yield to the gentleman what time we have, except for the 10 minutes to be reserved for tomorrow, that is if the gentleman from Kentucky would like to use the time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have a couple of additional Members who wish to speak. I do not know how much time they will consume. But we may have to take you up on your offer since we are just about out of time, in order to reserve 10 minutes of time for discussion tomorrow.

Mr. AYRES. I should like to ask the Chairman what time remains on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 27 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Kentucky has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the chairman of our committee 17 minutes, reserving 10 minutes for tomorrow.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for being so generous.

I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1969 is a very important piece of legislation. H.R. 514 is the result of a serious consideration of education legislation and has provisions which are essential to a continuation of our commitment to build a bright future for our country. Education is one of the basic elements in the preparation of youth to take our places in the future.

Education has long been cited as one of the key factors in solving the economic and social problems we have in America today. We must continue to strive for excellence and equality of educational opportunity. Not until we can say that each American boy and girl has had a good education can we begin to feel that our educational system is living up to the expectations we have for it. We in Congress, have played a big part in the fulfillment of educational priorities through passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since its enactment in 1965, an amazing success story can be told. It has not been an unqualified success, but with each new year, the pace of progress keeps increasing. And yet, we have only begun to realize the potential it contains.

H.R. 514 essentially provides for the extension for another 5 years of education programs such as the federally impacted areas aid, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Adult Education Act. Each of these acts covers a separate area of education—all are essential in relation to the whole. When

we consider the accomplishments growing out of each one of the acts, we can see their importance.

Public Laws 815 and 874 more popularly known as federally impacted areas assistance have been in existence since the 81st Congress. They are continually being revised to reflect the needs of the times. Their function is to provide assistance to areas which educate large numbers of children whose parents either live or work on Federal property. In the years since their enactment, they have helped thousands of children. Under Public Law 815, help has been given for the construction of over 62,000 classrooms and other facilities which now house almost 2 million students. Under Public Law 874, entitlement was made for over 2 million children for fiscal year 1967, the figure will be even higher for 1968 and 1969. Funds given to school districts through these acts are especially useful because they become a part of the overall budget of the education agency and help with the education of all students in the school district.

The Adult Education Act of 1966 has meant that the basic tools of literacy were given to over 1 million adults. Most of them were the product of a now bygone age when education was not considered important. It is estimated however, that an additional 24 million adults are in need of a basic education which would allow them to feel truly a part of this modern age.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has made possible benefits for nearly 90 percent of America's schoolchildren. An enumeration of the many programs would be a lengthy but a worthy tribute to this legislation. To mention a few, approximately 9 million disadvantaged children have participated in some way in the new programs; an estimated 43 million children and 1.7 million teachers have utilized library and instructional materials made available under the provisions of the act; and an estimated 10 million students, parents and teachers have benefitted from innovative programs encouraged or begun through the provisions of the legislation.

A 5-year extension of these programs along with the minor administrative changes incorporated in H.R. 514 is essential to provide the continuity which must accompany any Federal assistance. The addition of students residing in low-rent public housing to the provisions of the Federal impact aid is a step forward in equalizing some of the pressures exerted on many school districts by Federal activities. By including these children in a separate category requiring a separate appropriation allotments will not be reduced to those school districts already participating in the program.

Another valuable section of this legislation is the \$40 million authorization for bilingual education. This program is vital to the educational needs of millions of children of limited English-speaking ability. There are almost 2 million Mexican-Americans in California. The bilingual education program will hasten equality of education.

A report by the National Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education says:

The average Mexican American child in the Southwest drops out of school by the seventh year.

A recent study in California showed that in some schools more than 50 per cent of Mexican American high school students drop out between grades 10 and 11.

Although Spanish surnamed students make up more than 14 per cent of the public school population of California, less than 1/2 of one per cent of the college students enrolled in the seven campuses of the University of California are of this group.

These facts give tragic evidence of our failure to provide genuine educational opportunity to Mexican American youth; and today there are nearly two million of these children between the ages of 3 and 18.

Money is only one problem. Perhaps an even more serious one is the problem of involuntary discrimination—that is, our insistence on fitting the Mexican American student into the monolingual, monocultural mold of the Anglo American. This discrimination, plus the grim fact that millions of Mexican Americans suffer from poverty, cultural isolation, and language rejection, has virtually destroyed them as contributing members of society.

I am encouraged by the progress of education in my district, in my State, and in the country. The programs which will be extended by H.R. 514 are an integral part of the educational picture. Each has many accomplishments to its credit and has much to offer as we look to the future.

Considering the gains which have been made, I believe that the next few years will be ones of continuing progress and I therefore urge an early enactment of H.R. 514.

However, the enactment of this authorizing legislation is a meaningless gesture unless it is followed by adequate funding. In the past only a little over 50 percent of the authorization has been appropriated.

In 1968 over 55 percent of local and State school bond issues were defeated. The property and other local and State taxes are no longer able to support educational needs. The Congress has an opportunity to act to prevent a crisis in our Nation's educational system. Our children and the future of our Nation called upon us for a decisive and positive response.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget request for the impact area program is only \$202,167,000. This revised budget request is \$113 million lower than the previous fiscal year 1970 budget request. Most of the cut has occurred in the maintenance and operation portion of the Impact Aid Program. For this portion of the program the new request is \$187 million compared to a previous \$300 million.

The revised budget request for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is \$1,415,393,000, a reduction of \$110,483,000 from the original budget request.

These budget reductions are intolerable and cannot support our Nation's increased educational needs.

If category B of Public Law 874 is eliminated as the revised budget suggests, schools in my district will lose \$2,500,000 and many will be unable to operate. The State of California will lose about \$75 million in education funds from its full entitlement.

Many school districts throughout the State of California would be in a pre-

carious situation. School districts in California have annually received an average of 21 percent of the total available assistance under Public Law 874. Under section 3 of Public Law 874, 446 districts in 47 of the States 58 counties have received entitlements. California has a large number of Federal facilities and installations and this places a heavy burden on already overburdened property owners. It is clear that the property tax can no longer be the sole vehicle for financing education. Other sources must be found. The impacted area aid program has served as an effective and needed supplement to many school districts. Instead of curtailing this concept of school aid, we should be expanding it.

I would like to urge the approval of H.R. 514 and subsequently the appropriation of sufficient funds to carry out its provisions.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 514, a bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education. This legislation extends and strengthens the most significant Federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools. I wish to state for the record my admiration for the skill and vision of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), in bringing this bill forward.

ESEA was passed in 1965 to confront a national crisis: the deteriorating quality of many of our elementary and secondary schools. Since 1965, measurable progress in this area has been achieved. H.R. 514 would insure the continuation of this progress.

By passing the recommended extension, H.R. 514 would add stability to this program, would provide more time for realistic and effective planning, and would allow more appropriate budgeting through advance funding, in the same manner that the gentleman from Oregon just requested. I think it is much healthier to extend it beyond the 2-year period for purposes which I just enumerated and those which the gentleman from Oregon just mentioned than for a lesser period of time.

Mr. David Tankel, director of title I programs for the board of elementary and secondary education, Trenton, N.J., testified before the Education and Labor Committee on this point as follows:

A cutback or cutoff of funds in these times of stress would be a death blow to the efforts of the cities to improve the whole of inner city education. . . . First of all, Congress can help by providing a 5-year extension of Title I funds. Hopefully, more funds will be made available.

The legislation before us implements this suggestion of Mr. Tankel. The need for speedy enactment of H.R. 514 is apparent. In my judgment, Federal money for education represents the most important investment in America's future freedom and security which we can make. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 514.

I might point out that during his testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Finch, was extremely candid in recognizing that during the short time in which he has

been in office, he has not had enough time to evaluate the programs in such manner as he would like. This is a completely understandable statement and position. I do not think—and I have been an advocate, either a sponsor or a principal advocate, for more than 14 years of legislation leading to the Elementary and Secondary Act and of the act itself—that a shorter period, a period as short as 2 years, would be enough time for the type of evaluation which the new Secretary indicated he has in mind.

I very strongly urge the adoption of the bill as reported by the committee and ask my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

For the sake of making clear to the Members present the length of time that a 2-year extension would bring about, am I not correct that the present law actually extends this through fiscal year 1970, and a 2-year extension beyond that, so a 2-year extension of the act would be, in fact, at the present time something in excess of a 3-year extension of the law?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I believe that is the case. In spite of that, I believe it should be necessary to extend it beyond the 2-year period and beyond the period which the gentleman just mentioned.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That was only to make the record clear that a 2-year extension does not mean 2 years from the present time. The 2-year extension we are speaking of means a 3-year-plus extension from the present time.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say I concur in what the gentleman from New Jersey has said and to add my note of congratulations to the distinguished chairman of this committee, who has been a Rock of Gibraltar in the great effort he has put into this matter. He has come to be recognized across the Nation as one of the greatest friends of education, and in this House I know of no one for whom higher personal regard is held than the distinguished chairman of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the majority leader.

I know Members on both sides of this body recognize the really tremendous contribution, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has outlined, made by our friend, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, after his splendid statement, that it would seem to me what we are urging on

this side is a vote of confidence in this bill for 5 years, to give the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the new Commissioner of Education from the State of New York a chance to work with a stable bedrock foundation on which they can build and implement the new Nixon program in education. A vote of confidence of that kind I would think for 5 years, with forward funding for the children of America, would seem to very closely configure to what the administration has been saying about stability and tranquility and speaking quietly and saying what we mean in forward terms.

I do not know why we should short-term the children and shortchange the country by saying that before the 1970 census the bill will expire, before the census takes effect. We need, of all things in the schools of this country, a long-range stable program on which the localities can count, a precise and exact foundation formula in forward education. This is what I have heard all the way from Miami to Washington.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my colleague from New York that he expresses it better than I could. I thank my colleague, and I agree that in this interim period, the new Secretary and the prospective head of the Office of Education, who will not arrive on his job for a month or so from now—in the month of May—may at any time during this period come up with a forward-looking innovative, creative, or changing program, at which time I am absolutely certain, with the depth of interest in education, led by our chairman and shared by a majority of us on both sides, we could revise the entire program; but, at the least, the very least, what we are doing, as the gentleman from New York so very well puts it, is to give a vote of confidence to education and offer to the school districts throughout the land some degree of stability.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman will agree that the great proponent of Federal funding and advanced planning on our committee has not really been on our side, but it has been the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), who suggested for a long time that we should do forward funding in higher education and give the colleges and other schools of our country an opportunity to plan minimal input and to achieve maximum realization of their plans. I give credit to the gentleman for the idea of forward financing. I do not know why at this time they suddenly depart from their own ideas.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. We are not departing from our ideas of forward funding. That is why we are asking for a 2-year extension now, rather than a 1-year extension, because we know that in 1 year we would get caught up with the same kinds of pressures.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The

gentleman means that 2 years is more forward than 1 but less than 5?

Mr. QUIE. We do not need to go as far as 5.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This is a matter of semantics.

Mr. CAREY. There is an old expression around New York City that says, "If you cannot get five take two, but if you can get five take five when you can get it."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The New Jersey version of that is, "If you cannot get five take four."

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the much needed extension of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As my colleagues well know, this title was added to the act in 1966 and is designed to improve both the quality and quantity of special educational services for handicapped children. The day is long past when through ignorance we hide our physically and mentally handicapped children away from the world. We have learned that they can and do serve as complete members of our modern society. But they cannot become participants unless they receive a full and understanding education that helps them to overcome specific handicaps. This law is doing an excellent job in focusing on the educational needs of the handicapped and a 5-year extension of the authority is needed to insure its future success. There are about 5½ million children in this country who could be benefited through this extension.

The needs of the handicapped for a good education are greater than those of normal children, and the education itself is more difficult to give, but this act has been providing special educational services for hundreds of handicapped children who had received no special help before its passage. It has also helped State and local agencies to raise the quality of assistance they had been offering to school-age handicapped children. In addition, the program has had a number of important byproducts. It has prompted a greater awareness of the special needs of handicapped children among school administrators, both regular and special education teachers, and the general public. Title VI has supported administrative personnel at all levels, and it has sparked better cooperation and communication among the many agencies dealing with the handicapped.

The regional resource centers which have been begun this year under part B of title VI will provide a much-needed boost in the ability of educational personnel to offer handicapped children an education specifically designed to meet their individual needs. Services provided in the center will focus, not only on the problems of handicapped children, but also on the problems a teacher has in teaching the handicapped child. This program has only been functioning for a few months. It holds great promise for improving the entire range of curriculum and teaching of the handicapped. We can serve the needs of the handicapped people of this country best by firmly standing behind this program through a 5-year extension of its authority so that

the development of a worthwhile educational program for all handicapped children of this country can be achieved.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House in offering my enthusiastic support for the passage of H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969.

The chairman and members of the House Committee on Education and Labor are to be congratulated on their excellent work on this legislation, and in particular for the 5-year authorization provision which they incorporated into the bill.

This provision alone will be of tremendous value to the cause of better education in America, because it will allow school administrators to plan ahead in an orderly way, and utilize Federal, as well as local and State funds, in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

At this time, I would like to focus my attention on title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments—ESEA—the bilingual education program to assist in meeting the special educational needs of children with limited English-speaking ability.

This legislation is making a significant start toward establishing a system of bilingual education programs for America's more than 3 million limited English-speaking elementary and high school students—to offer them for the first time, a real chance to achieve their full educational potential.

Few persons now would dispute the fact that there is an urgent need to find constructive solutions to the unique bilingual/bicultural education problems faced by these hundreds of thousands of American school children who are members of our many ethnic and nationality groups whose home language is other than English.

The situation is just beginning to receive the long-overdue national recognition it deserves as one of the most critical education problems in the United States—calling for immediate, aggressive, remedial action to help overcome the serious learning difficulties experienced by this important segment of the Nation's school-aged population.

Today, job opportunities, income levels, economic advancement, in fact, all the aspects of personal and family well-being are closely linked to educational achievement and the ability to communicate effectively with one another.

Those of our citizens who are severely handicapped because of language barriers in our modern, predominantly English-speaking society suffer a continuing denial of the opportunity to participate and share fully in the rich abundance of 20th-century America.

What we need, and what title VII of ESEA represents, is a major effort to develop the kind of local-State-Federal cooperative approach necessary to meet the special educational needs of the large

number of students in the United States to whom English is a second language.

The compelling urgency for greater attention to this area is graphically demonstrated by the fact that the median of years of school completed for Spanish-speaking in the Southwest is 7.1 years, whereas for the Anglo child in the Southwest, it is 12.1 years, and for the nonwhite child it is 9 years of school completed.

This tragic record of educational disparity and underachievement in the Southwest has been called "the greatest single failure of our system to provide equality of educational opportunity in this region."

However, December of 1967 marked the beginning of a new day in the lives of our citizens with limited English-speaking ability. For, in that month, the Bilingual Educational Act was adopted as title VII of ESEA, and the potential of this new program was widely heralded by Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, and many other ethnic groups in the United States who spoke a language other than English—as a real breakthrough in their fight for equal educational opportunity.

Unfortunately, the Bilingual Education Act has not yet been given the chance to fulfill its promise. Of the \$15 million authorized for fiscal 1968, there were no funds appropriated. Thirty million dollars was authorized for fiscal 1969, and after a lengthy battle, \$7.5 million was finally appropriated.

By December of 1968, more than 300 preliminary proposals from some 39 States, seeking \$41 million, with projects involving seven different languages—Spanish, French, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, Cherokee, and Navajo—had been received by the U.S. Office of Education.

Of the many deserving projects submitted, however, 81 have now been invited to prepare formal grant proposals to serve about 140,000 students in 22 States.

There is simply not enough money to go around.

The programs established next year can serve as the vanguard for those to follow—training the personnel, providing the research, developing the materials, and demonstrating the new teaching techniques necessary to the success of every innovation in education.

The knowledge which these programs generate, however, will be of little value if the Bilingual Education Act is not extended beyond its present 1970 expiration date. To raise the hopes of so many non-English-speaking communities only to dash them once again to the ground would be a cruel blow indeed.

H.R. 514 would extend the Bilingual Education Act through 1975, authorizing an appropriation of \$40 million each year. It would also amend the act to include Indian children attending Federal schools run by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I urgently enlist your support for H.R. 514. We have made a promise to all the children of America—to the disadvantaged and the child of limited English-speaking ability, as well as his more fortunate classmate. A vote for H.R. 514,

and for title VII, is a vote of confidence in the future.

I trust that you will join me in my efforts to safeguard the promise we have made to equal educational opportunity for all by giving the programs included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 the time they need to accomplish the purposes for which they were designed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as we reach the end of general debate on this very important bill I believe we can congratulate both sides on the manner in which the debate has been handled. It has been informative. It has been a good discussion. It has been most helpful to all of us.

I think it is important at this point perhaps to put in perspective the genesis of this bill.

Earlier one of the Members suggested combat pay for teachers in the ghettos. There is no question that the teachers in some of the ghettos have tremendously difficult assignments, and it is becoming more and more difficult to hold these teachers. I saw over the weekend a report of the New York situation, where 20,000 teachers are not expected to come back to their assignments after the school holidays.

Certainly all sorts of efforts have been made to provide additional compensation to teachers who take on these difficult assignments.

I should like to remind the House this can now be done within the framework of title I. Any local school administrator who has tried it has always been opposed by the local teacher unions and various other organizations that have opposed a dual standard of salaries. This is a decision the local administrator must resolve.

I do not believe the Congress of the United States wants to inject itself into these policy questions at the local school level; at least, I hope we do not want to.

There was also some talk today about the formula being unfair. This is perhaps the most important single aspect of the debate.

I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee as to the fairness of the present formula. We have gone to a great deal of time and effort over many, many years trying to find an equitable distribution formula to bring assistance to the areas of the greatest need.

Let me remind my colleagues of what is the main thrust of this legislation. For years and years and years, for decades, the Congress of the United States has tried to get through some form of a Federal aid to education bill. At one time we came pretty close. We got the bill as far as the Rules Committee, and it got tied up in the Rules Committee.

Finally, in 1965, under the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky, we evolved a concept of legislation for Federal aid to areas of proven need.

I agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon about all the horrible things that are happening in the schools today. There is no question; there is a serious

problem. We have to deal with this problem. But title I is primarily designed to bring to local school districts Federal funds to provide compensatory education to disadvantaged children who need this help to bring them up to an acceptable academic norm.

That is the main thrust of title I.

We have other bills. We have the Vocational Education Act, which this House passed last year unanimously, without a dissenting vote, to deal with some of the other problems of education. We have before my subcommittee, of which I am chairman, a school construction bill to deal with construction needs. Last year we passed a bill on juvenile delinquency hopeful that we could move forward into the problem of solving the marihuana problem and other social problems. But H.R. 514, the bill before us today, is primarily designed to continue this program of Federal aid to areas of proven need, namely, compensatory education in the disadvantaged communities of this country where we have to try to bring these children up to the norm so that they can join the mainstream of other young people in this country in our educational process. That is the main purpose of it.

For us to try to divert ourselves from this purpose is to invite disaster for the whole bill. I remind the House that for years and years we tried to get a general education bill through the Congress. Every time we did we were rolled back. So I say it is through the great wisdom of this chairman that we have a formula which proved acceptable to the Congress of the United States.

As far as the distribution formula is concerned, it is very simple. We first determine how many children are in every school district who come from families that earn under \$2,000 a year or who are on public assistance. After we have ascertained the number of these children we decide the average per pupil expenditure by the State for education. After we have ascertained how many children there are in this school district that qualify for this help, we take the State formula and the State average and take the national average, whichever is the greater. If the State average is, then we get one-half of the State average for every one of the children counted in that school district to provide compensatory education to bring the youngsters up to a norm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If he comes from a very poor school district, as many of our school districts are, where one-half of the State average is below the national norm, then we apply the national norm and use one-half for that.

I submit to the good sense of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle that this formula is honest, equitable, and recognizes the poor school districts of this country. It also recognizes the fact that when a district like New York or Chicago or some other district does indeed spend more money per child, that we ought to be able, in meeting half

of the cost, to meet the extra expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill is worthy of our support and I hope it will be approved by the House in its present form.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1959 represents the continuing commitment of this Congress to the goals of providing a better education for every child living within the borders of the United States.

The amendments have been carefully considered by the House Education and Labor Committee. Hearings have been held and controversies explored. The amendments proposed are based on past experience with this act and they carry the stamp of approval of the vast majority of the Nation's educators.

In the past few weeks we have seen the erosion of this Nation's basic commitments to its citizens as program after program vital to the welfare of this country has been cut. We in this House have little or no control over this erosion, but we do have the ability to make known our commitment and our determination to do the necessary work of this Nation.

It is in this context that I think it is vital that these basic education programs be extended for 5 years. The Nation's educators have told us they need a foundation on which to build. That they can not plan when programs are changed and distorted on a year-by-year basis, according to the changing political tides. The representatives of school districts within my area have come to me and said, "These programs are working. We need them. Why change now?" Some of them, shaking their heads, have even asked, "Is this a plot to cut our support?" I cannot answer that question. But I can urge that this House offer to the educators and children of the United States a long-term, workable program, clearly spelled out.

The administration already has cut vital educational programs and is proposing further cuts. The stark example of the closing of Job Corps centers throughout the Nation, including the one at Camp Parks in California, demonstrates its disregard for the needs of the disadvantaged. The administration also has sliced deeply into the work-study programs at the colleges, \$200,000 alone from San Jose State College, programs designed to help the disadvantaged to work their way through college. These are programs which should be expanded, not made smaller. I believe we can expect similar fund cuts in support of elementary and secondary education support.

Secretary Finch, for example, has proposed the elimination of an important part of aid to school districts flooded by Federal installations. The proposal to eliminate funding for children whose parents work in Federal installations and live off the installations, would work a real hardship in California, the Santa Clara Valley, and the Ninth Congressional District.

For the State of California the elimination of these funds will cost the

schools \$75 million a year and in my congressional district the cuts will cost \$1.5 million.

Two of the school districts within the Ninth Congressional District illustrate the problems facing California school districts. The Eastside Union High School District would lose an estimated \$100,000 in funding, forcing an increase of 3 cents on its tax rate, and the Alum Rock Elementary School District would lose \$80,000, 10 or more cents on its tax rate.

Both of these districts, as well as school districts throughout the Ninth Congressional District, already face tremendous funding problems. They, like districts throughout the State and Nation, are in the midst of the present crisis of education. These cuts hurt them rather than help. These cuts take away not so much from the haves, but from the have-nots.

I am afraid that the philosophy of many of the other proposed changes in the committee's recommendations will produce the same result in our efforts to improve education—hurt rather than help. By combining the titles, it would be easier to cut the total program. By setting up block grants to the States, the results of those cuts could be hidden.

Those who are harmed by these cuts are not the haves, but the have-nots. Those who most need help are being denied help.

We have clearly seen the intent of the present administration in its so-called economies already inflicted. I believe this House must make clear to the Nation its commitments, and that can be done best by approving these amendments as proposed by the committee.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the annual battle to provide an adequate educational system for our children is with us again. H.R. 514, extending the ESEA program and the impacted areas program is now up for our consideration on the floor after having gone through 22 days of committee hearings and 3,000 pages of testimony. This is a good bill. It has gone through the markup mill and has emerged as a tight, fiscally responsible proposal with only one marked deficiency—it does not provide enough authorization for some of the most necessary and valuable programs. Impact aid is an example of one underfinanced section. I will get to the impact aid problem later, however.

One major feature—the extension of the basic ESEA and impact aid programs for 5 years is outstanding. School districts must be able to plan their programs over a long time span. Educational programs are inherently a long-term operation, they cannot be cut and pasted on a year-to-year basis if the students are to receive the type of education that we expect in the latter half of the 20th century. A 5-year program is the minimum that we should consider for these basic educational necessities.

I cannot agree with the suggestion of Secretary Finch made before the committee that the extension of ESEA be limited to 2 years. It is all well and good that HEW is conducting a review of the existing programs. I support these

studies and hope that HEW does, indeed, come up with the proposals for substantive changes that will strengthen the federally supported education programs. This is no reason, however, for cutting the extension to 2 years. If the new proposals do, in fact, come out of the Department the act can always be amended, but cutting the extension on the basis of the promise of future studies is educational suicide. I fear also that the pending amendments relating to a 2-year extension are in some ways a ruse by the antieducation factions to gut the existing programs with no thought of new and better proposals.

The committee report—No. 91-114—clearly indicates that ESEA "is doing a successful and effective job in carrying out the congressional purposes for which it was enacted." The hearings and letters from school administrators, teachers, and educational experts have convinced the clear majority of the committee that the No. 1 priority education need from the Federal level is a 5-year extension of ESEA with adequate and timely funding. I repeat—adequate and timely funding. While I do not sit on the Committee on Education and Labor, I can certainly vouch for the statement that school administrators are in full support of the 5-year extension. I have received numerous letters from school superintendents in my congressional district urging my support of this measure. I have personally spoken with a number of these superintendents, and have been very impressed by their arguments for a long term program under which they can adequately plan for our future education needs.

At the present time a number of the school districts in my congressional district are in deep financial trouble as a result of delays in allocation of the presently funded programs. A number of the school districts will have great difficulty in meeting their payrolls by the end of the school year, and many of them have resorted to borrowing measures to keep the doors open up to now. I would stress that these school districts are having trouble meeting salary commitments. These are not frill programs, or experimental projects that are debatable on the basis of cost effectiveness or educational necessity. These are the basic costs for the operation of any school.

On the question of the Public Law 815-874 program I want to clearly stress my view that this title must be fully funded on an adequate basis from the view of those persons included. There is an almost continual murmur of criticism directed toward impact aid. Critics are always deriding the program, but I use the word "murmur" because the criticism never seems to get beyond the general complaining stage. Impact aid may not be the perfect answer to the educational financing problems of the affected areas, but it is the best program that has been devised thus far, and at all costs should be continued. I eagerly await the much-heralded new proposals that we hear will be coming out of HEW on this subject, but in the meantime I will paraphrase Winston Churchill and agree that while impact aid is a terrible form of subsidy, it is far better than any other program yet devised.

Full funding for Public Law 874 with the housing amendment would require an estimated \$875 million appropriation for fiscal 1970. The 1970 amended budget request is only \$185 million. Funding at less than one-third the authorization is not to my mind a sensible solution to the problems of the impacted areas, especially after this year's problems with the withholding of allocated funds. For this reason I want to concur with the views of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

While I support the theory of aid to areas affected by public housing, I cannot see the advantage of tacking on another \$235 million to a program which is already underfunded.

If we are going to provide the necessary aid for these children, we must fund the existing programs at an adequate level before we can consider adding new categories of students to an already overburdened system.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 514—the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. The education of our Nation's youth is one of the most important challenges we must face. We have long ago made a firm commitment to education in this country and we must continue to back it up in every way possible. We have passed various pieces of legislation over the last decade which have contributed largely to the efforts of the State and local educational agencies in whose hands the responsibility lies. Our Federal assistance must be in the form of dependable support to allow programs to begin and then grow and expand as our educators learn from experience. Some of the legislation which we have passed must now be extended. H.R. 514—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1969—is the bill which provides for these extensions.

The most comprehensive act which H.R. 514 will extend is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The effects which this one piece of legislation has had on education are even now just beginning to be measured. Title V has helped State departments of education refine their administrative techniques and in almost every State turn to automated data systems to assist them in their evergrowing responsibilities. Title II has made library materials available to students who attend any type of school—large or small, urban or rural, public or private—materials which enrich the curriculum and help to spark an

enthusiasm for learning which is so important. The great good already accomplished by this title fully justifies its extension at the present annual level of authorization—\$200 million—as recommended by the committee. I hope that the inadequate budget estimate for 1970—less than 25 percent of the authorization—can be raised to the authorized level so that the critical needs for library books and other instructional material can be met more adequately. Title IV has helped to expand innovative research in education. Together with title III for supplemental education centers, it has allowed some of the miracles of the computer age to be utilized in one of our most important concerns—education.

Other titles of the ESEA are for programs aimed at helping specific types of students. Title VI helps children who are handicapped. Title VII will provide programs for those who must learn English as a second language and have unique problems which the average teacher is not equipped to handle.

Possibly the most dramatic results have been achieved through title I for the educationally disadvantaged. In 1966-67, over 9 million children participated in programs of compensatory education—services over and above what schools normally supply. Reading projects were carried out in various grades spanning prekindergarten through the twelfth. Title I programs throughout the Nation have made it possible for youngsters who could see no future for themselves in school, to take a second look and become more a part of the educational system which is such a basic part of our society today.

In a conference with the New Jersey congressional delegation on April 15, the New Jersey Association of School Administrators reported that our State's experience with title I has been excellent. This year these funds are providing vitally needed educational programs and services for nearly 130,000 children from low-income families in public and private schools. However, the Association warned that New Jersey is faced with a crisis in its program as indicated by the following chart. As noted in the chart, in the first year of the program, local districts received \$287.79 per eligible child based upon a total of 85,309 children. In the current year the local districts received \$106.75 per child based upon 137,857 eligible children. The increase in eligible children is attributable to an increase from 25,464 to 71,813 children in the AFDC category.

School year	Number of eligible children					State allocation	Amount available per child
	Foster	Neg.ected delinquent	AFDC	Census	Total		
1965-66			25,464	59,845	85,309	\$24,551,083	287.79
1966-67	5545	1,271	42,106	59,845	108,767	22,865,002	210.22
1967-68	5545	1,271	58,213	59,845	124,874	22,865,209	191.49
1968-69	5051	1,148	64,696	59,845	130,740	21,035,992	160.75
1969-70 ¹	5051	1,148	71,813	59,845	137,857	18,932,393	137.60

¹ Projected.

The reduction has necessitated the elimination of over 100 districts from the program and a curtailment in valuable summer programs. For example, Newark, the largest recipient of title I funds in

New Jersey, has been able to operate summer programs since 1966 utilizing approximately \$1,000,000 of its annual allotment. Because of the increased cost of providing services, increased numbers

of children to be helped, and a decrease in title I funds, Newark will have a substantially reduced summer program this year.

The impact of these cutbacks on children in urgent need of these services is illustrated in the following letter from the South 11th Street School Parent Teacher Association, Newark:

Are human needs to be sacrificed in the interests of balancing the budget? We, the undersigned, are a group of parents of trainable mentally retarded children at the South 11th Street School in Newark, who are deeply concerned about the severe curtailment of the Title I program contemplated for the coming summer months and for the next school year.

To abandon a program that has paid such high dividends in human response and values solely in the interest of so-called economy seems to us callous and unconscionable.

A recurrent rationale for indiscriminate slashing of worthwhile projects such as Head Start, remedial reading, and summer programs for disadvantaged children is the tired cliché of "balancing the budget." Well, we would like to say, "Please don't balance the budget at the expense of human pride and dignity and service." Our children, who are trainable mentally retarded, not only need at least the same type of summer program they had last year, but if possible, one with services even expanded.

We urge you as our elected representative to restore the Title I program to its former status. We believe that our most important commodity is our children. They deserve the best that we can give them.

I urge Congress to respond compassionately to the needs of these unfortunate children.

The experience of my State with title I and other programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is shared by many States. We cannot permit our economically and educationally disadvantaged children to suffer the loss of these enriching services. Are they not entitled to qualified education as much as the more fortunately situated suburban children? Quality education should be the birthright of every child in a democratic society, not only the well-born.

H.R. 514 will also extend Public Laws 815 and 874—Federal impact aid. This program has been in effect since the 81st Congress. Under Public Law 815, assistance has been given for the construction of over 62,000 classrooms. Under Public Law 874, over 2 million children were eligible for entitlement during fiscal year 1967.

The Adult Education Act will also be extended by H.R. 514. The purpose of this act is to help to provide a basic education for adults who do not possess the skills of literacy. It is estimated that 24 million adults in this country are lacking these skills—skills which are essential in this modern age.

It is important that these programs are extended at this time as provided in H.R. 514. An early enactment of this bill will allow appropriations to be made for fiscal year 1971—before school administrators begin planning for the 1970-71 school year. This advanced funding eases the burden of program planning, because administrators can secure a competent staff with the assurance that the funds have been allocated.

One outstanding change is included under the provisions of H.R. 514—that of including public housing children in Federal impacted areas assistance. This is a change which is designed to keep the programs in line with the reality of the situation of today. Large numbers of children residing in public housing have created economic problems for school districts and including them in the programs will offer some relief. At the same time, they should be included as a separate category thereby eliminating the danger that districts already participating in the program will suffer a reduction of funds.

The provisions of H.R. 514 extend some of the most important education programs for elementary and secondary education in effect today. The 5-year extension period will allow a continuity which cannot be achieved with a shorter period of extension. We cannot afford to shirk our responsibilities to education. We can see the progress being made through our elementary and secondary education programs and an early enactment of H.R. 514 will assure that this program continues. I urge passage of this bill as reported by the committee so that we can continue to advance toward the goal of high-quality education for every American child.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1969. The provisions of this bill will extend three essential components of Federal aid to education for an additional 5 years. Each of these programs—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Federal Impact Aid Act, and the Adult Education Act—have been major contributions to the shape of education in this country. Each can be termed successful and each has a role to play in education for the next decade.

I have spoken with school administrators in my district and I am encouraged by the enthusiasm they display for Federal aid programs. The progress that has been made under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was cited particularly and the many possibilities it has opened up for the schools of my district and the State of New York speak clearly of its accomplishments. As school administrators they are in a particularly good position to evaluate the success of a program. Their remarks are comparable to those of the many school superintendents who traveled to Washington to testify at the hearings on H.R. 514. Their vote of confidence makes it clear that the programs are working at the local level.

An extension of 5 years is particularly important for these programs. The uncertainties associated with shorter funding periods tend to lessen the impact of the programs. Highly skilled and qualified personnel—so essential to the efficient operation of any program—generally prefer to work for programs which are assured of continuity from year to year. If the legislation must be reworked every 2 years it makes it difficult for our administrators to secure the best possible personnel. These programs need the 5-year extension.

H.R. 514 is the result of an examination of the three programs and their results. The changes which are contained in the bill reflect a streamlining of the administrative aspects and will improve the operation of each program. On substantive change will allow children who live in low-rent public housing to be counted as federally connected children for the purposes of Public Laws 815 and 874—a change which updates this legislation to meet the needs of our modern day. Since this legislation was passed in the 81st Congress, it has been periodically reviewed and changes made which reflect changes in our situation. The inclusion of low-rent public housing students is just such a change offering additional relief to school districts which are burdened with large numbers of children whose parents either live or work on Federal property.

The importance of Federal aid to education programs for this country is a fact. We cannot allow them to fall by the wayside. H.R. 514 will extend three of these programs for an adequate period. We have seen the success of these programs and can look to the future for additional progress. For these reasons, I am in favor of the passage of H.R. 514.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 514 extends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which is one of the most vital Federal programs in existence. The Federal Government has a responsibility to provide educational assistance to school-age children, and the approval of the 5-year extension of this program is critical to that effort.

However, in approving this extension, we should not delude ourselves that it is an adequate response to the challenges posed in elementary and secondary education today. Despite the fact that the programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have proven themselves effective within the limitations of their resources, the programs continue to be badly hampered by a lack of funding. In order to continue an effective program which can perform on more than a limited basis, it is necessary for this Congress to significantly increase the appropriations. For adequate funding is perhaps the greatest single cause of the failure to meet the needs of our Nation's school-age children.

The discrepancy between the authorizations and the appropriation requests made for fiscal year 1970 is in itself enormous. While the authorization is \$4.37 billion, the appropriations request is \$2.78 billion.

Many school systems are presently overburdened by large numbers of children enrolled in their schools who reside in tax-exempt low-rent public housing. While this housing is essential to the basic welfare of the children, the fact that the school systems which they attend are deprived of sources of revenue through tax exemption has an adverse effect on their education. Existing Federal payments, in lieu of taxes, to schools confronted with this problem now average only \$11 per public housing child. The result of this inadequate support is an inferior education for the children living in the districts involved. H.R. 514 would provide authorization for increased

payments to these districts. But, as in the case with other vital Federal programs, that authorization will bring little relief unless adequate appropriations are voted.

Approximately 3.3 million, or 60 percent, of all handicapped children do not now receive the special educational training required to lead productive and meaningful lives. Again, although \$162.5 million was authorized for aid to these children, only \$29.25 million was actually appropriated in fiscal year 1969. Even so, the program was able to reach some 100,000 handicapped children.

The dropout prevention program, which is urgently needed to provide counseling and assistance to potential high school dropouts, was also deprived of an appropriation which would have stepped up its effectiveness. Of the \$65 million authorized for the program, only \$5 million was appropriated in fiscal year 1969. As a result, only 20 of 369 proposals for the establishment of dropout prevention programs could be approved by the Office of Education, and only 10 of these proposals are expected to be put into operation in the near future. Once again, inadequate funding is sabotaging creative and necessary programs for dealing with some of our most significant educational problems.

The approval of the extension sought for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is clearly a prerequisite to meeting the educational needs of this Nation's elementary and secondary age children. It is also imperative that the House reject amendments which would undermine the school desegregation effort which must continue if racial balance in our schools is to be achieved. With almost 80 percent of school-age black children in the 11 States of the Deep South still attending segregated schools, it is obvious that the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision is still being defied. To approve any amendments which would diminish efforts to achieve school desegregation or nullify title VI would be a betrayal of the policies and ideals adopted by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Let me repeat that a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act cannot be viewed as more than a minor victory. For the needs of our Nation's schoolchildren remain unmet. To meet them, we must do more than approve programs. We must provide sufficient funds so that the programs are able to meet effectively the educational needs of our Nation.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my support to H.R. 514 as reported to the House by the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. PERKINS. The committee spent many long hours in the hearing room and in executive session hammering out this legislation. I believe all viewpoints were carefully considered, and the legislation we have before us today reflects this excellent work.

While I would like to comment on many provisions of the legislation we are now considering, I will only address myself specifically to the matter of how long we should extend the authorization for the Elementary and Secondary Educa-

tion Act programs. I believe we should adopt the 5-year extension contained in the committee bill. In this regard, I am reminded of one particular section of the report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children which states that we must recognize "that a successful attack on poverty through improving the education of poor children will be measured in terms of decades and not congressional sessions." This is why we should extend the ESEA programs for 5 years.

Not only must we act to extend the authorization for the ESEA programs for 5 years, but I believe we must also act to provide for advance funding. In the city of Philadelphia, public school officials begin planning their operating budget in considerable detail 10 months before the fiscal year begins. Their planning is guided by a 5-year budget projection. But, they never know how much ESEA money they will receive or whether a given program will be continued, re-directed, funded at 80 percent of the authorization, or at 100 percent. Sound planning and management are impossible under these conditions. It becomes necessary for Philadelphia school officials and others across the country to practice a kind of fiscal roulette.

In terms of the mission that Federal, State, and local school officials have, they need as long a commitment in terms of program authorizations and appropriations levels as possible. They need at least as long as the space program. The nature of the educational problems which the ESEA programs are designed to help solve are at least as complicated and complex as those of the space program. Under the current authorization and funding system, ESEA programs have started and stopped due to delays in processing the legislation. School districts have not known in some instances until the year is half over whether the authorization for these programs will be extended or at what level they will be funded. As a result, each year school districts have been forced to gamble and play this game of fiscal roulette. But, this gamble has not only been with dollars and cents but with the needs of children who desperately need the help these programs provide.

Year-to-year authorizations have aggravated the ability of school systems using these funds to secure topflight educational specialists. In many instances, arrangements must be made by the systems to provide special training and to upgrade personnel. These arrangements must be made in a timely fashion with institutions of higher learning and other educational agencies. The systems' ability to perform any effective long-range planning has been seriously impaired by these year-to-year extensions. A 5-year extension such as that proposed in H.R. 514 will provide school systems with the assurance that the Congress intends the ESEA programs to continue. Such action as on our part will enable administrations to secure dedicated and specialized personnel and will enable them to make the most effective use of Federal dollars.

Mr. Chairman, if we yield to those who will argue that this legislation should

only be extended for 2 or 3 years, we will renew fears on the part of State and local educational officials that these programs will be phased out or abandoned.

School administrator after school administrator, who testified before the Education and Labor Committee, stressed that we are at a critical point in the history of Federal support for education, and that ESEA has enabled the educational system to begin structural changes within the schools which will release the talents of students and teachers alike. They said that the system itself has begun to respond more readily to the individual needs of students, and that not to put the ESEA programs on a stable 5-year authorization would produce chaos in the schools. The need for this extension of 5 years is particularly critical for the schools in our large cities. It takes time to formulate plans to attack the educational problems of the Nation's needy children and it takes time to implement these plans. We must begin to think more in these terms as we consider education legislation in the 91st Congress and hereafter. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to support the 5-year extension, reject debilitating amendments to H.R. 514, and pass the bill as reported by the committee.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 514.

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

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 369, Rept. No. 91-151), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour,

to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REMOVING THE SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME LIMITATION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that most, if not all, of my colleagues in the House have received a wide expression of discontent with the present Social Security System. One of the most common concerns is with the income limitation placed on those who, at 65 or earlier, enter compulsory or voluntary retirement.

Today, I am introducing legislation to completely remove the income limitation for those receiving social security benefits.

The present law, as amended in 1967, sets a minimum income of \$1,680 a year for those eligible for social security benefits up to age 72. Further income earned up to \$2,880—the maximum income—reduces the benefits by \$1 for each \$2 earned. This limitation applies regardless of how many dependents the individual has.

Consider for a moment how this compares with the poverty levels of income as determined by the Office of Economic Opportunity. For an individual, the poverty line is \$1,600 a year; for a married couple, or family of two, \$2,100; for a family of four, \$3,300. By writing such low income levels into our social security laws, we are committing our elderly citizens to a standard of living no better than the poverty level. Is this their just reward after so many years of gainful employment?

The bill I am introducing today is designed to correct this unfair situation—unfair for two primary reasons. First, money which is included within this income restriction under social security is limited only to wages. It does not include income received from nontaxable earnings, such as bonds and other investments. So a retired person who has no investment portfolio is prevented, under the present law, from receiving the income which exemptions allow to an investor. He is penalized if he goes out to earn money to supplement his meager allowance.

So this restriction on individuals who have paid into the System throughout their working years and who are entitled to the benefits of their long-term investment and who want to live a little better than the substandard level provided under social security, penalizes them by reducing their social security benefits. Incentive to work is stifled.

This is not only demoralizing for the individual, who may have many good

years of service to offer and who does not want to simply retire from the pleasures which come from meaningful work, but it is also a loss to the American economy which loses the benefits of his many years of experience.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, if enacted into law, will completely remove this income limitation for those individuals who retire and who are eligible for social security benefits. It will, I believe, correct a grossly unjust provision applying to our senior citizens who deserve better than they are receiving from our Government.

CURBING INFLATION

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I noted two items in the Wall Street Journal this morning that have a juxtaposition that interests me in terms of the administration's desire and our great hope for doing something about inflation.

One item indicated that the President hopes to be able to take off at least half of the 10-percent surcharge by the first of next year.

The other items referred to the possibility of bringing back the Committee of Advisers on Labor-Management Problems.

These items set me thinking of the interaction that occurs between the major, dynamic factors that effect inflation.

It suggests to me that you might turn your eyes for a moment toward England where you see the interaction between taxes and wages. When the English faced the crunch that followed devaluation, they made a brave move in substantially increasing taxes. It was loudly and proudly proclaimed that this "belt tightening" gave full assurance to the outside world that Britain was going to stabilize its economy and curtail imports. However, and unhappily, shortly after the tax rise a series of wage increases nullified the tax influence on domestic consumption and internal inflation. Since devaluation, the negative effects of wage policies have been canceled out the positive effects of tax increase. Additionally, wage and price increases canceled out effects of program reduction in Government spending.

England is just about to get on the merry-go-round the second time with a new tax increase proposal that will come out soon.

Think on that for a moment.

I would also suggest you turn your eyes to another phenomenon and that is the counter productivity of high interest rates. Certainly, it ought to occur to us somewhere along the line that interest rates become a part of the price of commodities and that just as sure as taxes and wages interact, the interest rates and prices also come in and get tied up in one flow.

If the interest rates get to the point where they are effective simply in pushing up higher prices, they become part of the total inflation.

Any business which can recapture higher interest rates in higher prices will

pay the higher interest and go on with inflation. I think it is about time that we think of this very carefully because you cannot operate the economy by looking just at the taxes. You cannot operate the economy just looking at the interest rates or monetary policy and fiscal policy alone. You have to look at all these plus wages and prices. If we are not grown up enough to face that, then we are not grown up enough to fight this battle against inflation.

We need a fiscal policy. We need a monetary policy but just as sorely we need a wage policy and a price policy. Where all are not working then none will ultimately work.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure some are impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from California, but I did not hear him make this speech during the last 4 years when interest rates under the Democratic administration went soaring up to the point as high as they are today. We in the new administration are trying to do something about it, and we are going to do something about it, but you cannot in 100 days overcome and solve the problems that we inherited from the last 4 years.

Mr. HANNA. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the salutary release process that comes when you are no longer handicapped or tied up with the administration. The gentleman has had more experience with that delightful state than I have had.

HICKS URGES ACTION TO INCREASE THE TIMBER YIELD IN OUR FEDERAL FORESTS

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago I joined other Members in strongly urging that limitations be put on the export of timber from Federal lands.

I did this at some peril. The largest city in my district is also the largest log exporter in the United States. Export of logs to Japan is of substantial importance to many of my constituents.

But my district also is a major producer of lumber and plywood, and includes substantial areas of national forests.

I did not believe, and I do not believe, that it makes sense to export raw material that is badly needed at home. That belief left me no way to satisfy the strong voices in my district that spoke out in favor of exports.

The limitation was imposed, and I support it.

However, I did not support that limitation in every effect it would have. One of those effects is to make it difficult for the people of Japan to realize their housing goals. But the people of the United States should, I believe, come first in their demands on our resources.

Now there is a way out of that dilemma.

The timber shortage that inspired the limitation has grown worse. But the forest industry, rather than demanding a further limitation, has wisely proposed another solution in hearings in both the Senate and the House, before committees concerned with housing.

That proposal has been incorporated into the National Timber Supply Act, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. It calls for the establishment of a high timber yield fund that would allow the Forest Service to apply the same principles of silviculture to its land that are now used by industry to produce yields almost four times greater than those on Federal lands.

I believe we would be wise to accept this proposal, and I am persuaded it will be successful.

There is no argument over the ability of industry, with its dependable funding system, to outproduce the Forest Service, although there may be some differences on the exact ratio.

I have seen some of these results myself, in my own district. The Weyerhaeuser Co., one of the country's largest timberland owners, has some of the most productive forests in the world. That company's headquarters, and some of its forests, are located in my district.

The purpose of this bill is to make it possible for the Forest Service to bring its practices up to the level of those of the Weyerhaeuser Co. and others in the industry. An announcement a year ago by that company makes me certain that this goal is easily attainable.

The Weyerhaeuser Co.'s board of directors has agreed to the financing of what the company calls a high yield forestry program. The comparisons being made today are not with this program, but with the programs of the past.

The high yield forestry program, which includes the same elements called for in the National Timber Supply Act, increased the yield on the Weyerhaeuser timberlands by a full third over present yields during 1968.

Obviously, the foresters who conceived it have put their professional careers on the line. The company's directors have committed millions of their stockholders' dollars to high yield forestry on the basis of increasing returns on the investments.

No one involved in this program doubts for a moment that it will do what it is supposed to do, and more. The company's stock has held up and increased in value.

The Weyerhaeuser men tell me that the personnel of the Forest Service are fully competent to do the same thing. But only if we in the Congress can make the same commitment to them that this company's directors have made to their foresters.

For that reason I have no reservations about supporting the National Timber Supply Act and, as a Representative of a timber-growing district, about urging all of my colleagues to give it the same support.

The sooner we act, the sooner we can begin to supply all of the timber that we need for our own programs, with more than enough left over to supply the needs

of our friends and allies around the world.

TWENTY-SEVEN DEMOCRATS INTRODUCE LEGISLATIVE REFORM ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, today, 27 Democratic Members of Congress are introducing their version of the Legislative Reform Act of 1969.

I am optimistic that this might well be the year in which Congress finally decides to make much-needed changes in its organization, bringing this venerable institution into the realities of the 20th century.

I believe that the reform effort this year will be a genuine bipartisan effort and that there is considerable agreement among a majority of Congressmen as to what is needed to make us a more functional and responsive body. Although there are some differences between this bill and the Republican bill sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUMSFELD), the differences are not so substantial as to hinder a united effort.

The bill closely parallels the measure originally recommended by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and approved by the Senate in 1967. The reorganization bill affects many of the functions of Congress. The committee process is improved immeasurably. Open meetings of committees are encouraged. Committee votes, in executive sessions, are to be made public. Rights of minority members are protected in committee staffing and on submission of material for minority reports. Reforms are made in proxy voting.

New proposals improving the ability of Congress to cope with its growing duties are proposed. These would include the use of systems analysis in the area of the Federal budget and the strengthening of the Legislative Reference Service.

The reform bill would take some steps toward correcting the antiquated, disorganized business operation of Congress, developing the beginnings of a personnel system based on factors other than patronage. The Capitol Police would be removed from patronage. Also, postmasters and rural letter carriers would be removed from congressional patronage.

The bill also tightens up the current restrictions on lobbying. The oversight functions of committees are emphasized so that this process will be constant in examining Government functions under a committee's jurisdiction.

Many of us are concerned about the ability of the legislative branch to cope with the responsibilities that face us in the year 1969. Each day we see a further erosion of our capacity to deal with the executive branch of Government. We simply do not have the facilities and the expertise to adequately analyze the complexities of the Federal budget and the multitude of agencies and programs

we must face on a day-to-day basis. At times it seems as if the legislative branch is playing only a minor role in the governing of this Nation.

For example, in order to deal with the \$195 billion Federal budget, every Member of Congress is in need of far more comprehensive information than we now receive from the Comptroller General and the Appropriations Committees. The reform bill proposes to strengthen the position of the Comptroller General so that his office might act more as a legislative budget bureau using the most modern techniques of data processing, analysis, and program budgeting to give us reports on current and future trends of budgeting for all the departments of Government.

The bill we are introducing differs from the Rumsfeld version in several aspects. Additions provide for a revision and printing of House precedents at the beginning of each new Congress; the printing of a bill digest with every newly introduced bill; and the printing of new bills in such a manner as to indicate additions and deletions in present law. All amendments over 25 words introduced to bills during floor debate would be required to be printed and made available to Members.

Changes deal with the use of proxy voting, the composition of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, and the method of meeting the staff needs for minority members of committees.

I include at this point a summary of the bill and the list of cosponsors:

SUMMARY OF "THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1969" INTRODUCED BY MR. REES

Title I improves and contributes to the democratization of committee procedures in Congress by providing for:

- (1) Open meetings of committees, and public disclosure of votes taken in committee meetings;
- (2) Prompt filing of committee reports;
- (3) Standardization of proxy voting procedures in committees;
- (4) Public statement of the permanent and temporary authorizations available to standing committees;
- (5) The right of minority committee members to call witnesses, and to file additional views to committee reports;
- (6) A prohibition against Floor consideration of a bill until the committee report has been available to members at least 3 days;
- (7) Public notice of committee hearings, and provision for live telecasting and broadcasting of open committee hearings;
- (8) More equitable procedure whereby committees may obtain permission to hold hearings while the House or Senate is in session;
- (9) Better performance by all committees of their legislative oversight functions, i.e. review of the administration of existing laws;
- (10) Annual authorization for additional committee staff, with fair consideration for staff needs of the minority; and
- (11) Allowing additional explanatory views in conference reports, and equal time for both parties in the debate on conference reports.

Title II strengthens the resources and procedures of Congress for dealing with fiscal matters, by providing for:

- (1) The use of automatic data processing of Federal budget information;
- (2) Involvement of the General Accounting Office in the establishment of a standard classification code of activities and expendi-

tures, and more efficient location of budget information, provision for expert assistance in the analysis of cost-effectiveness studies, and preparation of tabulations of budget data;

(3) Improvement of the budget document to provide Congress with information about its long-range fiscal implications;

(4) The annual appearance before the full Appropriations Committee of each House of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers within 30 days after submission of the Budget to discuss the budget as a whole;

(5) Closer examination of multiagency programs;

(6) Open hearings of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses;

(7) Mandatory roll call votes on all appropriations bills, including the adoption of conference reports on appropriation measures;

(8) More comprehensive reports on supplemental and deficiency bills; and

(9) Greater participation by the legislative committees by having them provide projection of costs on new legislation, and by having them regularly review grant-in-aid programs.

Title III enhances the sources of information available to members and committees of Congress, by providing for:

(1) Additional professional staff for committees, including staff for minority members;

(2) Comparability of pay for House and Senate committee staffs;

(3) Use of consultants by committees;

(4) Specialized training for professional staff of committees;

(5) Improvements in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, including authorization for obtaining automatic data machinery;

(6) Annual updating of a compilation of relevant precedents of the House of Representatives;

(7) Summaries to accompany each House bill when it is introduced, and clear explanations of the changes such bills seek to make in existing law; and

(8) The printing of every Floor amendment over 25 words before it may be acted upon.

Title IV deals with some of the institutional problems of Congress by providing for:

(1) A permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations;

(2) An office to assist members and committees in securing trained personnel and office management advice;

(3) Greater authority for the elected officers of each House to supervise employees under their jurisdiction;

(4) Improvements in the Capitol Police, Senate and House pages, and the Capitol guide service;

(5) An August recess;

(6) Removal of postmasters and rural mail carriers from the patronage system;

(7) A quarterly accounting by every member of his employees and their salaries, to be reported to the House Administration Committee and published annually by the Clerk of the House.

Title V provides for improved administration of the Lobbying Act by providing for:

(1) Transfer of the Act's administration to the General Accounting Office;

(2) Broadening the Act's coverage to require registration by individuals and organizations who solicit or receive funds for the "substantial purpose" of influencing legislation;

(3) A more complete disclosure of lobbying expenditures, and disclosure by individuals and organizations not currently covered; and

(4) The disclosure of contingent fee arrangements for purposes of influencing legislation.

LIST OF COSPONSORS ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

1. Thomas M. Rees (California).
2. William Hungate (Missouri).
3. Andrew Jacobs (Indiana).
4. Brock Adams (Washington).
5. William Hathaway (Maine).
6. Lee Hamilton (Indiana).
7. Sam Gibbons (Florida).
8. William L. St. Onge (Connecticut).
9. James J. Howard (New Jersey).
10. Joshua Ellberg (Pennsylvania).
11. Richard Ottinger (New York).
12. Robert L. Leggett (California).
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Michigan).
14. James H. Scheuer (New York).
15. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (New York).
16. Edward P. Boland (Massachusetts).
17. George E. Brown, Jr. (California).
18. Abner J. Mikva (Illinois).
19. Jonathan B. Bingham (New York).
20. Bertram Podell (New York).
21. Adam Clayton Powell (New York).
22. Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).
23. Mrs. Shirley Chisholm (New York).
24. Peter N. Kyros (Maine).
25. John C. Culver (Iowa).
26. Glenn M. Anderson (California).
27. Edward I. Koch (New York).

REPEAL OF THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is a law on the books which many people do not even know exists, and which those of us who know of it find hard to believe. This law is the Emergency Detention Act of 1950. The law provides that in the event of invasion of the United States or its possessions, of declaration of war by Congress, or of insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy, the President may declare an internal security emergency and may authorize the Attorney General to apprehend and detain any person "as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage." As part of that act, emergency detention camps were authorized. This law is an anachronism and an abomination.

I feel quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that if it were possible to test the provisions of this law, it would be found unconstitutional. Because of the limited situations in which the emergency detention power can be invoked, however, there has never been a real challenge mounted to the act.

There are stronger reasons, however, for repealing the Emergency Detention Act. As unlikely as it is that any President would ever invoke the authority he has under the act, that authority still exists—the act is still on the books.

The very existence of this authority is subject to misunderstanding and to gross distortion. Unfortunately the existence of the emergency detention authority has been used by some to distort the intentions of the U.S. Government toward some of our citizens. Thus, a recent report written by Phillip Luce for the House Committee on Un-American Activities referred to the emergency detention camps authorized by the 1950 act as

a good place to keep black militants and other "radical" political groups which, the report said, advocate guerrilla warfare. It was not clear from the report whether the camps existed or not.

Despite the fact that emergency detention centers have not existed since 1957 when the original appropriation ran out, nevertheless some Americans believe that the Government does have and intends to use emergency detention facilities. I had this forcefully brought home to me last week, Mr. Speaker, by a group of young men who actually believed that "concentration camps," as they called them, exist in America and that they are intended for blacks.

The Emergency Detention Act has never been used. Even when there was money to establish such centers, only six were ever in existence, and these have since been abandoned. Three of the sites are no longer even under the control of the Department of Justice. As my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) noted last year on the floor of the House, assurances have been received from the Assistant Attorney General for Internal Security that the emergency detention program is now inactive.

But having the program inactive is not enough. This was recognized by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Senator INOUE, last Friday when he introduced a bill in the Senate, S. 1872, to repeal the Emergency Detention Act. Congressman CONYERS and I take pleasure in introducing a similar bill in the House today. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 10396

A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 811-826) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8312(c) (1) (C) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "822 (conspiracy or evasion of apprehension during internal security emergency), or 823 (aiding evasion of apprehension during internal security emergency)".

(b) Clause (4) of section 3505(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(4) in section 4 of the Internal Security Act of 1950."

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at 4 p.m. this afternoon, a briefing session will be held in room 2123 in the Rayburn Building, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee room, during which Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director of the National Institute for Mental Health, and his associates will present to Members of the House the activities of NIMH in research, training, service, and public education in the area of drug abuse.

I strongly urge my colleagues to attend this session as I am sure they will find it most interesting and informative.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that attendance is imperative in light

of the frightening increase in drug abuse which we have witnessed in recent years.

A recent study of five California campuses shows that marihuana use has almost tripled in the 18 months ending December 1968. The survey shows that 57 percent of students at the schools had smoked marihuana at least once, compared with 21 percent a year earlier. About 14 percent were regular users, against 4 percent a year before.

In 1963, Federal Government officials seized 6,432 pounds of marihuana at the borders of the United States. In 1966, 23,260 pounds were confiscated.

LSD, marihuana, "speed", hashish, STP, and DMT are the most frequent names which appear in the expanding subculture which has developed with the increase in the use of drugs. These are the names of the drugs which are reaching more and more of the young people of our Nation. Recent studies indicate that such drugs are as near as the neighborhood schoolhouse, and that more and more young adults are "tuning in, turning on and dropping out" of school, society, and the conscious, rational world.

Estimates of high school and college administrators of drug abuse range anywhere from 5 to 35 percent of the students in a given institution are using "speed", LSD, or some other drugs. Students themselves claim use runs as high as 80 to 90 percent among their peers. Accurate statistics are hard to obtain, but it is undeniably clear that abuse is on the increase.

We have laws, Federal, State and local, which make possession, sale, and manufacture of depressant and stimulant drugs a criminal offense. These laws, in part, act as deterrents.

In November 1967, I introduced legislation to make the possession of LSD and other related hallucinogenic drugs a Federal offense. That bill, H.R. 14096, is now Public Law 90-639, and provides, in part, that possession of LSD and related hallucinogenic drugs shall be a misdemeanor on the first offense.

During hearings on this legislation in the spring of 1968, the committee was concerned, after the testimony which we received, that not enough was being done to educate the public, and particularly the young people about the disastrous effects of drug abuse.

For that reason, the committee provided the following language in section 5 of the law:

It is the sense of the Congress that, because of the inadequate knowledge on the part of the people of the United States of the substantial adverse effects of misuse of depressant and stimulant drugs, and of other drugs liable to abuse, on the individual, his family, and the community, the highest priority should be given to Federal programs to disseminate information which may be used to educate the public, particularly young persons, regarding the dangers of drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to further implement the intention of that provision of Public Law 90-639.

This legislation would amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new section on "Drug Abuse Education and Information Programs."

The sum of \$3 million would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$7 million for fiscal year 1971, and \$10 million for fiscal year 1972.

The thrust of this legislation that I am introducing is to mount an educational offensive against the growing menace of drug abuse which is damaging an increasing number of young lives.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under this legislation, would assist projects designed to educate the public on the problems of drug abuse by:

First, making grants to or entering into contracts with public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and other public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations for the development of curriculums on the use and abuse of drugs, for the testing of the effectiveness of such curriculums, and for pilot projects to correct ineffective curriculums;

Second, making grants to public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to help educators, law-enforcement officials, counselors, and community officials attend short term or summer institutes on drug education; and

Third, making grants to local educational agencies for community education programs on drug abuses—including seminars, workshops, and conferences—especially for parents and others in the community.

In order to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this act, the legislation also provides for the creation of a 14-member Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education. The Advisory Committee shall consist of persons familiar with education, mental health, and legal problems associated with drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this section of the bill I am introducing will carry us many steps forward in our efforts to bring order out of chaos that is encroaching on the lives of many young adults as the result of drug abuse.

There is, however, another section of my bill which I feel is also important, and relates to this basic problem of drug abuse. Section 2 of the bill that I am introducing would transfer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the functions, powers, and duties of the Attorney General under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968 to designate a drug as a depressant or stimulant drug under section 201(v) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and to make a finding that a drug or other substance is an opiate under section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On April 2, 1968, when Reorganization Plan No. 1 was before the House for consideration, I expressed reservation concerning the transfer from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Justice Department of the clinical and pharmacological determination of what drugs should be controlled.

Since passage of Reorganization Plan No. 1, I have talked on numerous occasions with HEW officials concerning the wisdom of the decision to transfer

this determination of what are dangerous drugs.

The officials expressed increasing concern that the Department of Justice cannot properly meet the problem with its present pharmacological facilities. Moreover, I do not feel it is desirable to expand the pharmacy facilities for the Department of Justice thereby duplicating the expertise and facilities which already exist in the Department of HEW.

Rather, I believe that we should permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to reassume its proper responsibility to make the determination of what drugs should be controlled and continue to permit the Department of Justice to exercise its proper responsibility of enforcement of the laws.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill to create a Presidential Commission to determine what the effects of marihuana are. As the gentleman knows, a British panel recently brought in a report indicating that marihuana was not addictive; that there is no connection between the use of marihuana and violent crime; nor, reported the panel, did the use of marihuana lead to heroin addiction. That British panel answered many medical, sociological, and legal questions.

The intent of my bill is to have an American commission make a definite investigation into all of the questions relating to the use of marihuana in this country so that the American public could be better informed. Would the gentleman agree that we need such a commission?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think we need more research, there is no question about it. I think it is well, also, to point out there has been a recent study which shows marihuana developed psychological dependence and also brings out latent psychotic personality traits, so there is great danger.

SUSPENDING FEDERAL AID TO COLLEGES UNWILLING OR UNABLE TO COPE WITH STUDENT UNREST

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced last week a bill that would suspend Federal aid to colleges that proved themselves unwilling or unable to cope with the wave of student unrest that has grasped our Nation by the throat.

I have been told that the bill is unnecessary, that it fails to go to the roots of the problem, that it is oppressive and would punish the innocent along with the guilty.

Mr. Speaker, I could want no more graphic illustration of why I think this bill is necessary than the weekend events at Cornell, when a proud center of learning was disgraced and humbled by armed rioters, and its administrators were forced at gunpoint to capitulate to the

demands of a radical minority. They gave them everything but the clock tower.

Punishing the innocent along with the guilty, Mr. Speaker? Nonsense. What is happening now, and who is being punished? How many thousands of students are being deprived of an education, cheated out of the learning they have paid their tuition to get, blocked from their classrooms, because 2 percent of their classmates want to study basket weaving instead of military tactics?

The rights of the minority are precious to me, but so are the rights of the majority. And the majority of the students want their campuses returned to normalcy, so they can go about the day-to-day business of learning how to become the leaders of tomorrow. Instead, they are being taught graphically, that might makes right, that you can get what you want by force, and that college administrators will give you the world with a fence around it if you are loud enough and rowdy enough.

Is this the lesson we want burned into the minds of the young people who will be the Senators and Representatives of the U.S. Congress in one short generation? Is this the legacy we want for our children and our grandchildren?

On today's university campuses, there is usually an office near the office of the president or the chancellor, in which one person has no duty except to coordinate the spending and acquisition of Federal funds for his university. Federal funds are big business, running into more than \$3 billion annually. Make no mistake about it, it is our only avenue of attack on this most vital social problem, but it is a highly vulnerable area. Faced with a complete cutoff of the Federal spigot, and the knowledge that the spigot will be turned off if he does not act, the administrator will act. He cannot afford to do otherwise.

The bill is designed for one purpose only: to stiffen the backbones of those men who would rather see their colleges closed down, their professors held captive and their files ransacked than to see one student arrested or one policeman on their campuses.

It is bad, Mr. Speaker, to have to use the carrot-and-stick tactic in order to force some of our educators to do what should have been done already. But we must do something, to remind these men that it is they, and not the sophomores who can yell the loudest or block the door with the broadest shoulder, who are running the college.

So far, many of them have only acted in a manner designed to make us all ask, "Who's in charge here?"

TREASURY TAX REFORM PROPOSALS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend President Nixon and Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy for their latest tax reform proposals. They reflect

the administration's genuine desire to enact fair and equitable tax laws.

The time for tax reform is long overdue. The hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee are an excellent first step in this direction. I had the pleasure of testifying before that committee on the subject of tax-exempt foundations. Among other things, I advocated stricter surveillance of exempt organizations. I am particularly pleased to see that this is one of the latest reform proposals.

The proposed repeal of the investment tax credit would bring in, in added taxes, an estimated \$1.8 billion for the 14 months following its removal. But equally important, it should play a major role in helping to bring under control the very dangerous inflation problem which we are presently faced with in this country. This recommendation required a great deal of courage. I congratulate President Nixon and Secretary Kennedy for exercising such courage.

I was impressed by the entire package. The "low-income allowance" will help not only our families in poverty but also our young people. These young people need the relatively modest amounts they earn to further their education and to get their feet on the ground.

I hope that recommendations to reduce the oil depletion allowance also will come forth at a later date. This, to me, certainly is one of the major tax loopholes which should be corrected in any tax reform legislation. However, I am happy to see that they attack certain mineral transactions. I support this effort as a first step toward the realistic taxation of the oil industry.

The proposed limits on farm losses should eliminate another tax gimmick employed by the wealthy. I strongly support this measure.

I also support the liberalization of moving expenses. For several years I have introduced bills to this effect. It is gratifying to see such measures given serious consideration.

The reform proposals are characterized as much for their individual merit as they are for their balance. The low-income allowance is offset by the imaginative "minimum income tax." In addition, the investment credit repeal is offset by a proposed reduction in the surtax.

Finally, these proposals will permit the administration to fund two high priority programs. These are the revenue sharing program and the tax credit program.

President Nixon's recommendations certainly form the basis for much-needed change in our tax structure. The need for an all-out effort, including new ideas, to remedy our domestic ills is obvious.

I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to comment on the latest tax reform proposals.

A LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speak-

er, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Bernard J. Goldmann, of Santa Paula, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: If the idea of representative government is sound, then most letters to Congressmen are unnecessary. Telling a good man how to vote on a particular issue after sending him to Washington violates the whole principle. Writing him a short deserved note of thanks occasionally may be a nicety but is inconsistent with human nature. What is left? Gripping, of course! This only wastes the Congressman's time, increases his office costs, and keeps him from more important legislative matters.

Perhaps letters can only be condoned if Congressmen, thousands of miles away, like to know what their constituents are thinking. You have received more than enough of these from me, all promptly, courteously, and calmly answered. On this end, pressure builds up, and the theme is always the same—increasing discontent with our federal government, namely taxes and waste. We have created a monster in Washington.

As two Californian neighbors who love to grow citrus, we could compare the problem to a giant, old, eucalyptus tree growing in the middle of a potentially fine orange grove. It is soaking up every bit of moisture and nutrient for a hundred feet around. Also it is now malformed with unsightly dead limbs everywhere. Surprisingly, not a single foreman or worker seems to notice it, much less has the initiative to prune it, or plans to take it down.

Theoretically, the new Nixon Administration should give us Republicans comfort. What happens? Continued welfare programs but without fanfare, continued 10% surcharge, continued depletion allowances, continued agricultural subsidies, continued raising of the debt limit, and possible added expense of an ABM system. As a teacher, I wonder how long it will be before any administration checks to see that much federal aid to education is only establishing many little nests of privilege at the expense of the many. Money siphoned out of the state does not come back in a way to help the regular classroom. No wonder schools are in trouble.

However sad, my purpose now is to plead that our government is no longer the friend of the small, honest, industrious, law-abiding citizen. Let me return to another domestic illustration:

My grandfather, dissatisfied with the German army, bought a steamship ticket to the United States of America in 1900. He had nothing but a grade school education and a short apprenticeship as a carpenter. America was such a land of opportunity in those days that he retired in 15 years. He adequately raised seven children and accumulated so much money and real estate that his last surviving daughters were still spending it until they died a few years ago.

My own father had only one year beyond grade school and he supported six children as a machinist. Despite the big depression and five years of unemployment without welfare or aid, he arrived at the age of 70 with a proud \$3000.00.

I began working under social security and the federal income tax. My starting assets would be adequate in some countries: a college degree, journeyman skill as a machinist, auto and airplane mechanic (4 years in the Navy as a volunteer), tool maker foreman, tool and production planner in an aircraft factory, and now as an elementary school teacher. I had zero time lost to sickness and unemployment, a genuine passion for work and only three children to care for. I send three annual checks to IRS in addition to withholding tax, send one to the state beside gas and sales tax, and deliver two plump ones to cover property taxes. At

the age of 54, after an entire working career, I now have \$110.00 in the bank!

In order to accomplish this, our family has had to practice unbelievable economies. I have not once taken my wife and family out to a restaurant in 26 years. I fix every radio, T.V. (1953 black and white), washing machine, or car that we have ever owned. All autos have been purchased used, overhauled, driven, and junked. Our present one is of 1955 vintage. My wife cuts my hair and paints the house alone while I grow fruit trees. The reason we own a house is because three little kids and I spent 9 years building one from scratch, including plumbing, electricity and stucco. We own no stocks, securities, nor a penny's worth of insurance. This is not a land of opportunity to me.

Therefore letters to you are of the complaining kind. Who else can I tell that a horribly sloppy bureaucracy and excessive taxation is aimed at exterminating the middle class? What amazes me is that no force in our nation—newspapers, radio, T.V., books, elections, rebel or statesman can check this giant from crushing the will of the little people who honestly try. If representative government no longer serves the industrious common man what will happen?

Just mentally reviewing the series of letters to you, I note degeneration of spirit: first hope, then puzzlement, shock, frustration, bitterness. Projecting this I am beginning to understand how governments age, how orderly protest is ignored, discontent spreads, undergrounds develop, riots appear. Some rather fine men joined a cause in 1776.

There comes a time to choose. Our country has noisy mouths who love violence as well as quiet folks who love to work. But remembering my grandfather's remarkable luck with just one skill, I think emigration has a virtue or two."

Very truly yours,

BERNARD J. GOLDMANN.

COMMENTS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION BY ROTHWELL H. BROWN

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a retired general, Rothwell H. Brown, writes a weekly column in the Rappahannock Record, a weekly newspaper published in my congressional district at Kilmarnock, Va.

Last week he endeavored to analyze the international situation and our relationship with the Communist nations. He referred to a report recently published by a British strategic study group stating that the United States had lost the will and ability to compete with Russia diplomatically, economically, and militarily, and stated that one of the most important items for national existence is the will to survive.

It is a very thought-provoking article and I insert it at this point in the RECORD for the information of the membership:

Now LET'S SEE

(By Rothwell H. Brown)

A British Strategic Study Group recently published a report stating that the United States has lost the will and the ability to compete with Russia, diplomatically, economically and militarily. This report should not be dismissed lightly simply because of its British origin.

The report may come as a shock to many Americans who are blindly inclined to believe that Russia is still 50 to 100 years behind

this country in practically every respect—a belief not eradicated by sputnik.

Far too many Americans consider this country to be omnipotent without actually understanding the true sources of and the manifestations of power.

Russia does indeed appear backward if one considers millions of miles of concrete highways, millions upon millions of automobiles, millions of electric dishwashers, the heights and numbers of skyscrapers, the millions of tons of detergents produced, or even the millions of tons of steel produced as standards for the measurement of national power.

Unfortunately, while many of these things are measures of affluence they cannot be considered as accurate gauges of a country's ability to cope with the ambitions of an aggressive nation.

The British report points its finger at the two most critical and salient criteria which must prevail if this country is to assure its survival in spite of Russian designs for our destruction.

First, and rightly so, the most important is the will to survive. Without this everything else is naught. And this will to survive presupposes an understanding of and widespread knowledge of the threat to survival.

It is here that the British report points out our greatest weakness. Except for a few voices which are almost drowned out by the loud-mouthed shouting of disputatious liberals and out-and-out communists, there seems to be no one who dares to alert the American people to the fact that Russia is our mortal enemy.

While it is true that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles created strong barriers against Russian expansion, this sole attempt at containment was permitted to wither away without the American people ever being aware of the serious results flowing from our abandonment of this worldwide system of alliances.

Our lack of will to compete with Russia diplomatically goes way back to President Roosevelt who failed to see through the evil designs of Stalin and paved the way for the enslavement of central Europe.

Truman exhibited the same fundamental weakness. He sold out Chiang and the Chinese to communism. He then refused to carry the Korean War to a victorious conclusion. Then Eisenhower, who should have known better, closed out the war by negotiation, but by no means reduced our casualties from those which would have occurred had Truman permitted MacArthur to push on to victory. President Kennedy continued this evil trend and supinely permitted the Russians to establish a stronghold in Cuba.

Vietnam has now disclosed not only the weakness, vacillation and lack of will in our leadership but the disintegration of patriotism, love of country and faith in God throughout our country. The communists—Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese—can see our lack of will which is going to result in another abject withdrawal by President Nixon without having achieved victory.

Finally the British report concludes that since we no longer have the will to survive, we have lost our ability to compete in the power struggle in which we are engaged.

This may surprise those who judge our capabilities versus the Russians in terms of our successful moon orbits and outer space programs. Unfortunately, while we may get to the moon first, the Russians have developed such formidable and awesome weapons for delivery through outer space that our astronauts might not have any America to return to from the moon.

When one listens to the shouting in our universities, the oratory of appeasement, detente and defeat in our Congress and the weasling words from most of our leadership, it is no wonder that the British have concluded that this country is doomed from lack of will and lack of ability to defend ourselves.

Once the countries of the free world get this message they will strip us of our gold and desert us like rats leaving a sinking ship.

MEETING OUR NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, with a steadily increasing and highly mobile population we have a great need for new residential construction. Congress recognized this need last year when it set a goal of 26 million housing units to be built during the next 10 years. It is now predicted that we will fall short of this goal by 200,000 units in even this first year under the Housing Act of 1968.

Recent congressional hearings have shown us that present practices and procedures in the management of our national forests will not yield sufficient lumber and plywood in the right places and at the right times and at the right prices to make possible the attainment of our essential national objectives.

Congress must make additional funds available to those who manage the national forests in order to make possible the construction of an adequate system of forest roads, reforestation of current cut-over lands, and other nonstocked or poorly stocked lands, thinning of the forests, increased salvage of timber killed by fire, insects, or disease, and enhanced research to develop new ways to grow timber faster, use wood more efficiently, and reduce the cost of production. We of the Congress cannot justifiably expect even the able and dedicated persons serving the national interests in the employ of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to accomplish what it is possible to accomplish with our national timber resources unless we give them the necessary tools and funds which are within our power to make available to them.

The distinguished chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who serves on the House Banking and Currency Committee which recently held extensive hearings on the lumber and plywood problem (Mr. ASHLEY) yesterday were principal sponsors of the National Timber Supply Act of 1969. This act calls for the creation of a high-timber-yield fund which will assure that timber sale receipts will, for a period of time, be used for intensified management of our national forests.

The bipartisan cosponsors of this measure are Members who are concerned that the Nation provide the necessary building materials to meet our growing consumer needs, including Members from the producing areas that can make those materials available. All of us are working together to make sure that the Nation will not fail its commitment to provide more and better housing for its citizens.

The Fourth District of Oregon has roughly 10 percent of the standing commercial softwood timber in the United

States. The vast public and private land holdings from which our timber resource is harvested account for a very significant share of the economy of southwestern Oregon. Most of the people in my district derive their livelihoods, directly or indirectly, from caring for, harvesting, and replacing the timberland stands as well as converting logs from the forests into useful consumer products.

I am pleased to cosponsor the National Timber Supply Act and I commend its careful consideration to my colleagues. I offer my full assistance in bringing the full promise of our Nation's housing goals—through the intensive and creative management of our national forests—to reality.

HOGS ARE BEAUTIFUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to set the record straight in a matter of very great importance to the constituents of my district, to Iowa, and this country. The record which I desire to set straight is the record of the contribution made by the pork industry, the producers of pork and the importance of pork to our economy and the importance of pork to the nutrition of our people. I have no quarrel with other producers of protein and other meat producers. They are making significant contributions to a more wholesome and healthy life. My purpose here today, is to set the record straight with respect to the pork industry and the maligned pig.

The need for correcting the record arises in part from a dialog which has been in progress among certain Members of the other body. It seems that some of the Members of that body are engaged in a contest to determine whether Virginia, Tennessee, or Kentucky, produces the best ham. Their efforts to point out the savory flavor of ham products is to be commended. It is wonderful food. However, they are terribly misguided in one sense, for the States which they represent may produce very good ham, but they lack sufficient capacity among the three States to produce more than a merest percent of the total ham produced in this country. Iowa alone produces over 24 percent of all the hams produced in this country. In addition, anyone with a discriminating palate knows full well that Iowa ham has the best flavor of all. Besides this well-known fact, we boast of delicious and nutritious pork chops, protein rich and tasty bacon, palatable energy giving loins—this plus 70 other products such as a delicacy like pickled pigs feet.

A second source of error in the record, is a series of television clips in the "Keep America Beautiful" campaign. These films depict the hog as being stupid, and an animal of unclean habits. This is a serious error which I hope to correct here today. The National Pork

Producers Council has spearheaded the drive to correct this image by their distribution of bright green and yellow buttons proclaiming, "Hogs Are Beautiful." My purpose here this afternoon is to further correct the record and the general image of that much maligned animal, the "picked on porker."

I like pigs, and I honestly believe that most pigs like me. Hogs are beautiful. Some of my best friends are hogs.

Like Patrick Henry, I care not what—unfortunate—remarks others may make, but as for me, I like pigs. Against all those who would besmirch them, I stand ready to speak in their defense—even on the floor of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

The pork industry in America is disturbed about the bad image that my countrymen are creating for this lowly farm animal. Last year the promotion agents for "Keep America Beautiful" came out with this slogan:

Don't be a pig in the park.

Long before this slogan was coined, there were other expressions in common use that the advertisers suspect have somehow cooled the market for pork products. And that is not hogwash—to use just one such expression.

To keep pace with the litterbug campaign, National Pork Producers Council has launched a counteroffensive with slogans and buttons proclaiming that "Hogs Are Beautiful." And I understand that already they are sold out of buttons.

To amuse ourselves, let us take a look at some of the uncomplimentary terms and phrases being heaped upon the poor pig. Consider these imagemakers, for example:

She is pigheaded.

Her apartment is as dirty as a pigsty.

On weekends, she goes hog wild.

She knows as much about politics as a hog knows about Sunday.

She is always hogging the show.

What's more, she is a road hog.

Her Congressman is nothing but a pork-barrel politician who feeds at the Government trough.

I've never met her, but they say she is as fat as a pig.

Who wants to buy a pig in the poke.

Maybe she is all lard, who knows?

I've heard rumors that she casts her pearls before swine.

Does she have a cute little piggy bank?

Yes, I know, but you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

On the dance floor, she is as awkward as a hog on ice.

Now that we have a pig's eye image of this girl, how would you like to go whole hog and hire her as a member of your congressional staff?

So much for the scintillating semantics of swine slang. Now, I want to pay tribute to the noble pig for its 9,000 years of loyal service to mankind. In doing so, I shall quote in part from "The Story of Pork" published by the American Meat Institute:

Americans have special reason for paying tribute to the hog. He's contributed greatly to pioneering, settling and building this land. Supposedly at Queen Isabella's urging, Columbus brought eight pigs with him on his second voyage to the New World. Cortez' excursion into Honduras in 1524 included a drove of swine. But it was on May 25, 1539—

almost a century before the arrival of the Pilgrims—that the hog was introduced to mainland America.

On this date, Hernando DeSoto, who was determined to conquer Florida and establish colonies in the interior, landed at Charlotte Harbor, Florida, with 600 soldiers, 350 horses and only 13 hogs. The Indians along his route learned just how good roast pork can be, and DeSoto's records show that the whole Spanish encampment was completely burned a couple times because of the Indian's craving for pork.

When the encampment in Arkansas was burned in 1541, "more than 400 pigs were lost in the fire and only about 100 remained." A year later, when survivors of the expedition built boats for the voyage down the Mississippi, they killed 700 pigs to provide meat for the journey. Fifty years later, when the French explored the Mississippi, the Indians fed them pork raised from the descendants of DeSoto's party. The 13 hogs had made a sizable contribution to the formation of a new land.

Pork was a staple of the Pilgrim diet. Supplies had to be locked up because the Indians on the East Coast liked pork, too. Pork packing was the chief business of William Pynchon, the first American meat packer. Yankee trade with the West Indies sprang from barreled pork; and before 1700, packers had made Worcester, Massachusetts, a center of flourishing export trade. The American Revolution was in part possible because of the strength that the pork trade brought to the colonies.

During the trying days of Valley Forge, pork chunks in brine became a saving provision to the tattered Continental Army. Sow-belly (salt pork) in the Civil War and canned K rations in World War II were later instances when pork was on the winning side.

PIGS, PORK, AND PROGRESS

When the covered wagons went West, the hog went with them. He was a hardy traveler, able to hold his own against the animals of the forest where he had to forage for food. Small hams and stringy bacon were the yield of these "razorbacks" and "stump rooter." Pork as we know it was not available until settlers used the abundant Indian corn as feed and changed the hog from a scavenger to a standard farm commodity.

As river towns sprang up, small packing plants and slaughter houses were built where farmers could get cash for the swine their families did not consume. The canals that brought such color to American history were built primarily to provide dependable transportation for pork products and live hogs. The three routes colonial drovers used to take their hogs to market later became the routes of the New York Central, the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio railroads.

Cincinnati became known as "Porkopolisse" and packed more pork than any other place in the world in the mid-1800's. Packers perfected the assembly-line ideas of Eli Whitney and made important developments in food refrigeration. Shortly after the Civil War, the first refrigerator car appeared. This invention played a major role in enabling the entire nation to enjoy the nutrients and flavor of pork.

THE HOG TODAY

Grandmother and her mother depended heavily on the hog as a source of fats, and yesterday's hog was obliging plump and jolly. The fats in lard, produced from pork, was particularly important during the effort for World War I. Today's homemaker is diet conscious, and the hog has again been adjusted. With the help of researchers, breeders, and farmers, a "meat type" now offers the more-lean-less-fat combination which the homemaker prefers. Once again the hog has condescendingly agreed to change its form just to meet (no pun intended) our needs. The hog is one of our most efficient convert-

ers of feed grain to meat. We can produce one-hundred pounds of pork from two-hundred and fifty pounds of feed. This is a real feat! It serves to further demonstrate the flexibility and the adaptability of the hog to our economy over the years. The true versatility of this noble animal can be seen more clearly by reviewing the many products which the "porker" provides us.

List of products that contain only pork

FRESH OR FROZEN

1. Boston butts.
2. Brains.
3. Cheek meat.
4. Chitterlings.
5. Hams.
6. Head meat.
7. Heart.
8. Jowls.
9. Kidneys.
10. Knuckles.
11. Link sausage.
12. Lips.
13. Liver.
14. Loins.
15. Loin end roast.
16. Lungs.
17. Melts.
18. Neck bones.
19. Patties.
20. Picnic.
21. Pigs feet.
22. Pork chops.
23. Rib end loin roast.
24. Shoulder.
25. Shoulder steaks.
26. Snouts.
27. Spare ribs.
28. Stomachs.
29. Tails.
30. Tongues.

PROCESSED (CONDIMENTS AND CURING AGENTS INCLUDED)

1. Bacon squares.
2. Canned hams.
3. Coppa.
4. Copicola.
5. Cottage butt.
6. Chopped ham.
7. Chopped pork.
8. Hocks.
9. Pickled pigs feet.
10. Sliced bacon
11. Smoked ham.
12. Smoked ham, butt half.
13. Smoked ham, butt end.
14. Smoked ham, shank half.
15. Smoked ham, shank end.
16. Smoked ham slices.
17. Smoked picnic.
18. Smoked pork chops.
19. Spiced pork.
20. Sweet and sour pork.

List of products with pork and other ingredients

1. beans with bacon.
2. beans with ham.
3. blood pudding.
4. blood sausage.
5. bologna.
6. braunschweiger.
7. breakfast sausage.
8. canned pork and gravy.
9. chill with pork.
10. chow mein with pork.
11. deviled ham.
12. frankfurters.
13. German style potato salad.
14. ham a-la-king.
15. ham hash.
16. liver.
17. liver sausage.
18. liver spreads.
19. luncheon meats.
20. margarine.
21. meat loaf mix.
22. meat spreads.
23. metwurst.
24. nonspecific loaves.

25. peperoni.
26. pickle and pimento loaf.
27. pork and beans.
28. pork pot pie.
29. potted meat food product.
30. salami.
31. sausage pizza.
32. scrapple.
33. shortening.
34. souse (head cheese).
35. split pea soup with ham.
36. sulze.
37. summer sausage.
38. smoked sausage.
39. thuringer.
40. tamales.
41. tongue spreads.
42. vienna sausage.

The hog's years of service continue as he offers palate-tempting eating, variety in cooking and high quality proteins, plus iron and niacin. Pork is especially important for thiamine, both because it is one of the most valuable sources and because there are fewer food sources of this vitamin than of other known B vitamins.

BYPRODUCTS

By-products of pork can be found in all facets of everyday living. Pigskin is a light and durable leather used for gloves, insoles, wallets and various novelties. Of course, some of the most important pigskins are those which we use so much on Saturday and Sunday afternoons in the Fall—the football! Hog hair is used for bristle brushes, upholstery, insulation and felting. Hog casings are used for sausage. Gelatin, cosmetics, roofing compounds, defoamer and cleaning emulsions come from pigskins and fats. Glue, animal feeds and industrial greases are other useful by-products.

PHARMACEUTICALS

Pharmaceuticals are by-products of which the meat industry can be justly proud. Hogs have circulatory, respiratory and digestive systems similar to man but do not suffer from the "bodily imbalance" diseases of man. Packers' long-range research has uncovered many medical potentials in hog glands and organs.

The thyroid gland of the hog is used as raw material for thyroid extract. The diabetic patient depends on the meat industry for insulin; the pancreas glands from 120,000 hogs are required for one pound of insulin powder. The pituitary glands of 25,000 hogs are needed to produce one ounce of ACTH, and the extraction process is a skilled and intricate one. Cortisone, pepsin, mucin and epinephrine are a few more of the lifesavers that originate in the packing plant.

THE WONDERFUL PIG

The most intelligent domestic animal in America, according to a study made by Cornell University;

Adaptable to the extent that he will accept an environment forced upon him through ignorance, although he prefers a clean lair;

A perfect conservationist, will eat whatever his master provides; and

A prolific meat-making machine.

Surely these are qualities enough to warrant esteem and gratitude.

Praise to the pig for 9,000 years of service and the thousands of years to come!

IMPORTANCE OF THE HOG INDUSTRY

The hog industry is big business. The \$3.8 billion received by farmers last year from the sale of hogs accounted for 9 percent of the Nation's \$44.1 billion of cash receipts from farm product sales. Iowa's \$1 billion in 1967—latest available—from hog marketings was tops in the country and was 28 percent of the State's total farm sales. Of the 85 million hogs slaughtered commercially last year, almost 21 million—one-fourth—

were killed in Iowa packing plants—more than three times as many as slaughtered in the No. 2 State—Minnesota. Iowa has led the Nation in the number of hogs on farms in every one of the past 80 years.

WHO SAID HOGS ARE DUMB?

Yes, Sir; pigs are versatile creatures—and smart, too. Sometimes they are smarter than we think. For example, I recall a story I heard as a boy on my father's farm in Franklin County, Iowa, about the city slicker from Boston who bought a farm near ours. He wanted to get rich quick raising hogs. For a start he had one sow. He wanted some baby pigs so he loaded his sow into the wheelbarrow and pushed her up the road a couple of miles to the nearest neighbor to visit a boar. Then he wheeled the sow home again. Next morning he went to the barn bright and early, but to his surprise there were no little pigs. So he hoisted the sow into the wheelbarrow and repeated the journey. Next morning he went to the barn again—and still no little pigs. But there was the sow sitting in the wheelbarrow.

Yes, sir; pigs are smart. Even Abe Lincoln thought so, for he once said:

A pig won't believe anything he can't see.

HOG DRIVES IN THE EARLY DAYS

I am sure you are aware that Iowa and other Midwestern States are famous for corn and hogs. But perhaps you are not aware that the area was also once famous for its great hog drives.

In pre-Civil War days, the early settlers herded their pigs across the countryside to eastern assembly points for shipment by rail or water. Madison, Ind., and Cincinnati, Ohio, were both known as "porkopolis" about 100 years ago. In those days, hogs had different names, too. They were commonly called elm peelers, alligators, land-pikes, razorbacks, and prairie rooters. They ran at large until 2 or 3 years old, living mostly on acorns, beechnuts, and whatever they could scrounge. But before the drives began, they were fattened out on corn.

The droves often contained 2,000 to 3,000 hogs. They traveled hundreds of miles from Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, and surrounding States. These hog drives were similar to the famous cattle drives of the early West. But the men were not called cowboys; they were called drovers. The trail boss was usually owner of the drove. He brought up the rear, seeing to it that his drovers—usually on horseback—kept the hogs moving. At night the crew would make camp in the beech forest and sit around the campfire, singing ballads and telling stories, just like in a western movie.

This bit of forgotten history gives me an idea for a new TV series to help brighten the image of pork. Perhaps we could promote a "Gunsmoke" type of program centered around the romance of the famous hog drives of the early Middle West. All we would need is a sponsor, a good script writer, a Matt Dillon, and a few thousand razorbacks.

WHY IS THE USE OF PORK FALLING OFF?

Today Americans are eating more meat but less pork. In 1879, per capita pork consumption was about 73 pounds.

By 1966 the consumption was down to 58 pounds per capita.

What are some of the possible explanations for this unsettling change? According to a study published in 1968 by Iowa State University entitled, "The Pork Industry, Problems and Progress" there are four factors involved:

First. Proliferation of alternatives.

Second. Increased protein competition.

Third. Changes in consumer attitude toward obesity.

Fourth. The image of pork.

More choices are available to the housewife today when she goes shopping for food. A century ago the general store carried fewer than 60 different products for all consumer needs, including food. Today's supermarkets carry more than 35,000 coded items, and that is enough to confuse any housewife.

Competition has also increased. Since 1953 the American consumer has been eating more beef than pork. He now eats 79 percent more beef, and the lines plotted on the graph continue to diverge.

Popularity of other forms of animal protein has also increased sharply.

In absolute pounds consumed by civilians during the last decade, for example, poultry increased 85 percent; breaded shrimp by 120 percent; fish sticks by 53 percent; beef by 47 percent; but pork actually showed a 3-percent loss during this period when the U.S. population had increased by 19 percent. In its most recent biennial review of 10-year growth patterns in the food industry, Food Processing & Marketing magazine showed substantial increases in 39 of 42 categories of food products, topped by an 822-percent growth in frozen potato products and a 679-percent growth in noncaloric sweeteners—with cane and beet sugar also up by 20 percent. During the past decade, only three of the 42 categories lost ground—pork, with a 3-percent loss, butter—down 11 percent—and citrus fruit used fresh—down 13 percent.

But the threat to pork from increased competition from alternative protein sources is clearly not limited to other animal proteins such as beef and poultry. Within the past 2 years a technological breakthrough has been achieved in isolated spun soy protein products, and there is every indication that these will play an increasingly important role in the consumer diet within the very near future. With a source of protein that is roughly half the cost of animal protein, and with the ability to provide a very wide range of texture, flavor, and appearance, it seems reasonable to suppose that vegetable proteins will make further inroads into the market for pork producers. An interesting recent development is a patented process which combines soy protein with animal protein to yield an entirely new kind of product.

The third cause for pork's decline was listed as "changes in consumer attitude toward obesity." This is a strange paradox. For almost since the beginnings of recorded history, overweight has been a prestigious sign of affluence. Only the prosperous could afford enough food to provide the caloric surplus that results in obesity. And this is still so throughout much of the world. But the United States,

as Charles Slater once pointed out, is "the first nation in history to be seriously threatened by mass obesity." It is well within the reach even of those who subsist on public funds to become grossly overweight.

Regardless of the extent to which people actually are overweight—and it is doubtful that two-thirds of the adult population would really qualify as medically obese—it is still a fact of enormous significance that two-thirds of the population consider they are fatter than they would like to be. The ratio of women who considered themselves to weigh too much was even higher than that of men, and it is obvious that women have a disproportionate influence on the choice of foods that are purchased and served.

With the proper selection and trimming, pork can be among the leanest of meats. But does the consumer perceive pork to be lean? Just how much of an effort is actually being made by the producer, the packer, the retailer to encourage the consumer to think of pork as a lean meat?

The fourth cause, the image of pork, has already been mentioned in my introduction. To the extent that people associate "pork" with the pig, there is some reason to believe that its consumer image is less than shining bright. Such phrases as "dirty as a pig," "this place looks like a pigsty," and so forth have conditioned the consumers mind since childhood. Add to this vague fear about diseases such as trichinosis and even hog cholera, and then top it off with publicity about the role of saturated animal fat in arteriosclerosis, and it would be strange indeed if there were no negative ruboff on pork and pork products.

I would like to close with a brief quotation from Charles Lamb. In his "Dissertation Upon Roast Pig," he gives one of the most glowing tributes to pork in all literature.

Pig, Let me speak his praise, is no less provocative of the appetite, than he is satisfactory to the criticalness of the censorious palate. The strong man may batten on him, and the weakling refuseth not his mild juices.

Unlike to mankind's mixed characters, a bundle of virtues and vices, inexplicably intertwined, and not to be unravelled without hazard, he is—good throughout. No part of him is better or worse than another. He helpeth, as far as his little means extend, all around. He is the least envious of banquets. He is all neighbours' fare.

If we can only get more consumers to thinking about pork and pork products in this way, the future for pork would indeed be bright.

Some pertinent correspondence follows:

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
April 16, 1969.

Mr. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: As a Pork producer and a promoter of improving the image of Pork, I am pleased to know of the tribute that you and your colleagues are planning to give to the swine industry. As you know I am presently serving in the capacity of Vice President of the National Pork Producers Council which has the largest paid membership of any commodity group in the country today. We have started the voluntary check off program to

help in the promotion of our own product. Naturally an occasion such as the one you are promoting April 22nd makes me especially proud to have you representing this area of Iowa. As you know, Iowa in general is where hogs are "King".

Iowa has 25% of the Grade A land in the U.S. Land that produces some of the best yields in corn, and as you know Fred, hogs are the best converters of corn to red meat. This is why Iowa raises about 30% of the hogs in the 10 corn belt states. Last year 19,493,000 hogs were slaughtered in Iowa to produce 5,041,866,000 lbs. of pork, more than any other State. The processing of pork also contributes to the employment of many people in and out of Iowa.

Pork, fresh, cured, pickled, smoked or canned sets the pace for a wide selection of delectable dining and has an impressive nutritive value for the homemaker when planning family menus. Today's pork is superior due to better breeding and feeding and closer trimming by meat packer and retailers. Among other things pork is a major dietary source of the B vitamins, especially thiamine, riboflavin and niacin, essential to food utilization, appetite, skin and oral health. With less fat and fewer calories, pork plays a particular role in the diet of weight control. Whether it is barbecued pork roast, ham, bacon, or left-over pork in a sandwich, you can be sure of the same outstanding nutritive values that mean so much to the health and well being of old and young alike.

I will be thinking of you, Fred, on April 22nd with pride, knowing how well you will be representing Iowa. Thanks again for your support of the hog industry. Enclosed please find a pig tie tack that I hope you will wear proudly that day.

Sincerely,

ROY B. KEPPEY.

NATIONAL LIVE STOCK AND MEAT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., April 8, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHWENDEL: The management of this organization commends your intent in saluting U.S. produced pork and the agricultural industry that brings it to our tables. Pork producers in your constituency and across the land will be applauding this public recognition. We join them!

Very sincerely,

DAVID H. STROUD,
President.

IOWA SWINE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
IOWA PORK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 11, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHWENDEL: The pork producers of Iowa are pleased to have this opportunity to inform the House of Representatives in our United States Congress of the importance of the hog industry to our great state and nation.

We believe that hogs are truly beautiful in this state because they furnish most of the livelihood for the 80,000 farmers who raise them. These same hogs furnish jobs for thousands of other Iowans who work in packing houses, drive trucks, build tractors, produce and sell feed, and work in the other agricultural related jobs.

The average Iowa pork producer raises 250 head of hogs. The average American eats 65 pounds of pork per year. The Iowa pork producer markets his hogs at 220 pounds, and if this hog dresses out at 70% he will furnish 154 pounds of pork which will feed more than two Americans each year. It figures out that the average Iowa Pork producer provides

enough pork for more than 500 hungry Americans each year.

Iowa is the largest pork producing state in the nation. We raise a few over 20,000,000 head each year, one-fourth of the nation's total pork supply. It then follows that Iowa provides enough pork to feed between 40 and 50 million Americans.

In Iowa we know that the hog is one of our most efficient converters of feed grains to meat. Here we can produce 100 pounds of pork from 250 pounds of feed. We feel that pork will be one of the best and more efficient sources of protein in a world where the need for protein is ever increasing.

Hogs are not only beautiful—they're just plain wonderful.

Sincerely,

MIKE FORD.

DERWINSKI'S POLISH SAUSAGE WITH SAUERKRAUT

2 pounds Polish sausage	1 cup diced bacon
2 pounds sauerkraut, drained	½ cup onions, diced
½ cup diced carrots	1 cup grated raw potato
2 apples, peeled & diced	1½ cups soup stock
	½ cup sauterne

Place all vegetables in a 3-quart casserole in layers. Combine soup stock and wine and pour over vegetables. Cut Polish sausage into 4 to 6 pieces and put on top of vegetables.

Bake in foil-covered casserole in preheated 350 degree oven 2 hours. If after 2 hours, there is too much liquid, remove cover and cook an additional 15 minutes. Serves 6 generously.

SWEET AND SOUR RED CABBAGE

1 medium size red cabbage (1½ pound size), shredded	¼ cup cider vinegar
3 tablespoons granulated sugar	½ cup butter
1 tablespoon flour	1 green apple, peeled & sliced thin
½ teaspoon ground allspice	1 teaspoon salt
	2 cups boiling water

Melt butter; add hot water, sugar and flour and blend well. Bring to a boil. Add all other ingredients. Cover saucepan and cook about 20 minutes over low heat until cabbage is cooked. Stir occasionally. Drain liquid when ready to serve. Serves 6.

NATIONAL PORK PRODUCERS COUNCIL,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 16, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENDEL: I personally wish to thank you for your efforts in giving the pork industry recognition among the members of Congress.

The pork industry plays a vital role in our economy, providing approximately one third of our nations meat supply. Consumers are spending 8¼% of their food dollar for pork products which represents a 7 billion dollar annual expenditure.

It is important that members of the congress be kept informed of factors affecting the pork industry.

Sincerely,

ALBERT E. GEHLBACH,
President.

IOWA SWINE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
IOWA PORK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 15, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHWENDEL: Iowa's hog producers, some 80,000 of them, are delighted that you've decided to stress the importance of one of the nation's most important food products.

As you must know, politically-inspired efforts to appeal to the consumer vote have left

the impression that bad meats would flood the market unless there is an inspector hovering over every carcass.

Nothing could be more in error. We're not objecting to adequate inspection, of course. But the simple fact is that producers are doing more to protect the health of the American consumer than 10 million inspectors could do.

I'm the third generation to raise hogs on the family farm where I live. Neither my Grandfather, my Dad nor I are stupid enough to think that we can make a living from the production and marketing of sick hogs. On the contrary, hog producers know that we simply cannot stay in business unless we keep our hogs healthy. A sick hog costs us money, and we're in this business to develop profits.

So I would say, and you could say in public, that if people were one-tenth as disease free as are our hogs, we could forget about all kinds of medical programs. They simply wouldn't be needed. We raise in excess of 20 million hogs in Iowa each year . . . and we haven't had a single case of cholera in five months. Compare that with the flu, cancer, heart trouble and other human ills. We have more than 200 million people in this nation . . . and not a single American died of trichinosis last year. Less than 100 cases of human trichinosis was diagnosed—nearly all of these having been caused by handling hogs, not by eating pork. Compare this and you'll find it is about as rare as leprosy.

So what? So if there is one sick hog in each 150,000 marketed, we hog farmers want it intercepted and removed from human consumption. But when you "have your say", tell the world that our pork supplies are clean and wholesome because farmers raise healthy hogs. We can't afford to do otherwise, because disease bankrupts us in the growing process, and because we're pretty consumer-conscious and we refuse to scare off our customers with questionable quality.

There are many major problems facing the nation. Isn't it fortunate that every American can enjoy his daily "fill" of clean, wholesome, safe, fresh red meat at a price level well within even limited budgets. This kind of high-protein diet will give us strength to resolve the other problems . . . and when human health and human behavior comes up to that of the American hog, this will be nothing short of Utopia.

Sincerely,

JOHN SOORHOLTZ,
President.

AGGRESSIVE YOUNG LEADERS BRIGHTEN FUTURE OF HOG INDUSTRY

"The hog industry is in the soundest hands it has ever been in," declares Rolland "Pig" Paul, hustling executive vice president of the National Pork Producers Council.

He explains, "Our breeding and production come closer to providing the desired product than ever before. And I don't think we'll see much resistance to future changes as they become necessary."

A big reason: The "youth movement" in the business. Paul stresses that the "young" thinkers building and leading the industry include many heads sprinkled with gray. But he thinks that these men deserve real credit for stepping aside to let men also young in years shoulder some of the responsibilities of actual leadership.

"The boards of state organizations in the Midwest average under 40 years of age," he points out. "We're electing young men as state officers, too."

Paul adds, "We've got a lot of good, solid young people in the business. They're going to make it because they have to make it—they've invested their money and their lives in it—and because they're prepared to do whatever it takes to make it."

Don't talk to Paul about "deserving" to make it, however. Here's how he feels about

that: "Hogs will be raised by whoever can handle and produce them the best and the cheapest—and that's the way it ought to be."

With the industry sound, some speculators and money will move into hog production, he says. So there's no room for complacency. But he believes an individual or "family" producer will stick in there as long as he can do a better job. "And he shouldn't be there a minute longer," observes the outspoken Paul.

Paul has kept a little dirt on his shoes, raising 35 to 40 litters of purebred Durocs a year with a partner, Jack Moran, on 160 acres in Dallas County, Iowa. Paul's wife, Donna, did her share, too.

"That's been my balance-wheel," he says. "It's easy to talk about accrediting, validating, testing—someone else to do it. When you open a door some morning and smell TGE, when you call the rendering truck—when you pay feed bills—it keeps you closer to the men you work for."

As indicated, "Pig" presently plans to leave his NPPC post this summer to go into production fulltime. He'll continue the purebred herd he began developing as a youngster, and also raise feeder pigs.

"Hogs have been good to me," he says. They've been his life. He was on the show circuit at 11, an award winner in 4-H, worked in the hog barns at Iowa State University, livened up the Iowa hog industry as state secretary, then directed the industry effort that gave real life to NPPC and its check-off.

"Something was stirring in the industry," he says. "I just happened along at the right time." Well . . . when something stirs in the hog business, you can look for Pig Paul's hands on the paddle some place. And you can bet that "Pig" and his trademarks—big grin, the two-cylinder chuckle and the cigar—will continue to show up "where it's happening" in the hog industry.

DICK SEIM.

THE SENATE, STATE OF IOWA,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 17, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I am informed that you are having a program to recognize the pork industry. I most highly commend you for your efforts in this area.

It is most fitting that you should do this. The State of Iowa produces twenty-five percent of the hogs produced in the U.S. Thus it has a large impact on the economy of our state. The First Congressional District of Iowa produces a large portion of the hogs produced in our state. Thus the economic impact of the pork industry is reflected directly or indirectly on most of your constituents in the First Congressional District. This impact is very great, is also felt by all of our Iowa citizens.

As a producer of both commercial and purebred swine, I am particularly proud of the progress we have made in the last fifteen years on upgrading the quality of pork, and pork products. We have come a long way and hope with the determined effort of our pork producers, we will be able to continue to upgrade the quality for all pork consumers.

We are hopeful that we can continue our existing state-federal program for the eradication of hog cholera. This is a very important program to the pork industry. To the farmers it will mean saving the cost of vaccination. It will further and more importantly open up many foreign markets for our pork products which are now closed to us because we do use the Cholera Vaccination.

Through the years, Fred, hogs have been known as the mortgage lifter for Iowa farmers. This has been true because with our relatively low capital investment, farmers have been able to realize a relatively high return. I feel that the future will hold that pork production will continue to be most

important as an economic factor to our Iowa farmers and to our Iowa economy. Thus I find it most refreshing, Fred, that you should bring to the attention of the Congress and the people of the U.S., the importance of the hog and it's resultant product of nutritious, wholesome pork.

I much appreciate your efforts.
Sincerely,

RICHARD L. STEPHENS.

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Ill., April 17, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENDEL: The American Meat Institute is deeply appreciative of your good efforts to bring to the American public a better understanding of pork, one of our most important, most nutritious, and most economical foods. We particularly welcome this opportunity to join with you and others in a salute to the National Pork Producers Council and its many thousands of members throughout the land.

Pork has always been a staple of our national diet. It is one of the finest sources of proteins, vitamins and minerals needed by everyone, every day.

The meat packing industry is indeed optimistic about the future market for pork. Pork quality is continually on the upgrade. And the nation's pork packers and processors are turning out a vast variety of pork products in various forms, shapes and sizes which are meeting with high popularity among consumers. I doubt that there is any valid reason why pork cannot continue to be moved into consumer markets at something in the magnitude of 60 to 65 pounds per person per year at prices that will maintain a healthy swine industry. The swine industry's potential for future production efficiency coupled with the creativity of the modern meat packer bring promise of a bright future for a progressive swine and pork business that can and will capture and hold an even stronger place in the consumer market.

With every good wish.
Sincerely,

HERRELL DEGRAFF,
President.

Mr. ROLLAND PAUL,
National Pork Producers Council,
Des Moines, Iowa

DEAR MR. PAUL: My first graders are partial to pork! Most of them come from families who raise hogs. One boy's father manages the Wilson hog station, here, and another boy's father has the sale barn. All the children agree that pork is *delicious!* Enclosed are some illustrated letters from them.

I have been reading in the Des Moines Register about your "Hogs Are Beautiful" campaign. If the buttons are available again, we would be very grateful to receive about 30 of them. Thank you very much.

Keep up the good work.
Sincerely,

Mrs. J. W. CUSACK,
First Grade Teacher, Our Lady of Good
Counsel School.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My daddy sells them in his sale barn. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

BARRY HAMMEN.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

LINDA LYNCH.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family please? Thank you.

PATRICK WITTRICK.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

DENNIS HESS.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My Daddy has a hog buying station. May I have some pins, please? Thank you.

MIKE CHETTINGER.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. I like them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

LUANN MARIE TEGELS.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My Daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

ANN PEIFFER.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My Daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

GLORIA.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. I like them. May I have some buttons for my family, please. Thank you.

MARIA.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My Daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

MARILYN MOHR.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My Daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you. Love.

RITA TOLAN.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. My daddy raises them. May I have some buttons for my family, Please? Thank you.

KATHLEEN.

Yes, pigs are beautiful. I like them. May I have some buttons for my family, please? Thank you.

CRAIG ALAN FITZGERALD.

LA CROSSE, IND., April 18, 1969.

Congressman SCHWENDEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. CONGRESSMAN SCHWENDEL: For years cornbelt farmers have long referred to hogs as mortgage raisers, because they play an important part in farm income. It is well known that the byproducts of the pork industry have helped win wars and fight disease.

Millions of Americans have been awakened since childhood by the sizzling aroma of bacon. American tradition almost dictates that each family enjoy the tantalizing taste of the Easter ham. The new generation of cookout kings recognize the outstanding quality of pork for outdoor cookery. Budget-conscious space-age housewives always pick pork for protein, pep, and price.

Certainly, no doubt people of all walks of life agree with you Congressman Schwengel that "Hogs Are Beautiful."

Root 'n for pork.

CLAUDIA ARNDT,
National Pork Queen.

FRANKLIN PARK, ILL.,
April 20, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHWENDEL: I saw a brief article in Chicago's American on your planned tribute to pigs. I'm glad to see someone standing up for this maligned animal. Although I'm a city girl who has seen few pigs in person, the pig is my favorite animal. From what I have read this animal is quite intelligent and is not as dirty as is generally believed. I collect all sorts of pigs—stuffed

animals, salt and pepper shakers, banks, figurines, pictures, etc. And Arnold of "Green Acres" is one of my favorite TV stars. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,
PATRICIA DEE HANEY.

RADIOBIOLOGY LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Davis, Calif., April 20, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
Republican-Iowa:

While in the city this weekend I read with interest a news release that you will lead a tribute to pigs in Congress this coming week.

I share your enthusiasm re. pigs & thought you might be interested in the enclosed article.

Respectfully submitted,
E. O. BUSTAD,
Professor and Director.

PIGS IN THE LABORATORY

(NOTE.—Similarities between the physiology of swine and of men suggest that if pigs were smaller, they would make excellent experimental animals. The problem of size has now been solved by breeding miniature pigs.)

(By Leo K. Bustad)

The pig is a greatly underappreciated animal. For thousands of years it has been a mainstay of civilization and a versatile servant of man. It is easily domesticated, and it can be raised in pens or allowed to fend for itself in the field or the woods, since it will eat almost anything, including man's leavings. The pig is the world's most bounteous supplier of meat and fat. What is not commonly realized is that it is capable of serving, and has served, in many capacities besides providing food. It was long employed as a beast of burden. In ancient Egypt it was used for treading seeds into the ground, its small hoofs planting them at the right depth in soft soil. The Polynesians, making use of the pig's sensitive nose, employed it to search out lost burials; other cultures trained the pig to grub for truffles and to retrieve game. In England pigs became popular substitutes for the hunting dog. A celebrated sow named Slut developed such proficiency in hunting that her accomplishments were recorded in 1807 in the periodical *Rural Sports*: "Slut was . . . trained . . . to find, point and retrieve Game as well as the best Pointer. . . . When called to go out Shooting, she would come home off the Forest at full Stretch, and be as elevated as a Dog upon being shown the Gun."

The subject of this article is not, however, the pig's aptitudes or its domestic history; it is the pig as a servant of science. In anatomy and physiology the pig is remarkably like man. Its heart and circulatory system, its diet, its alimentary tract and even its teeth are very similar to those of human beings. Like man, the pig has comparatively little hair on its body. It has a tendency to be sedentary and fat. It develops stomach ulcers and cardiovascular diseases resembling man's. In almost every way the pig offers a closer analogy to man than do those laboratory favorites, the rat and the dog.

The potential usefulness of the pig as an experimental animal was recognized in a general way centuries ago. Leonardo da Vinci studied the cyclic motions of the pig's heart. The 18th-century investigator John Hunter, one of the most brilliant men of medicine Britain has produced, declared the pig to be the most useful of all animals for physiological studies. An anecdote in John Kobler's recently published biography of Hunter (*The Reluctant Surgeon*) has a pig as its hero. The Margrave of Baden Dierlach was stricken with an apparent heart disturbance, and his court physicians decided a poultice should be applied over the heart. They fell into dispute, however, about exactly where the heart was located in the chest. "To settle the issue to the Margrave's satisfaction, they dissected

a pig before his eyes in the belief—and it is true—that the situation of a pig's heart is the same as that of a prince's. The Margrave finding this logic admirable, they applied a poultice accordingly a little to the left of his median pectoral line."

Notwithstanding such recommendations, until recently the pig had won no enthusiastic admittance to laboratories. The great Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov tried experimenting with pigs but gave it up when he found that as soon as a pig was placed on the table it began to squeal at the top of its lungs and squirm so that work was impossible; Pavlov concluded that pigs were inherently hysterical. Work with pigs was handicapped by a general lack of knowledge about the care, feeding and handling (including anesthesia) of these animals in the laboratory. Most forbidding was the pig's size (pigs weigh as much as 800 pounds); there simply was not room for such a subject in most laboratories.

All of this has now changed. Over the past decade several laboratories have succeeded in breeding miniature pigs that grow little larger (150 to 200 pounds) than the average weight of a man. These animals not only are more manageable but also make possible more significant physiological investigations, because they are more closely scaled to the human body. As a result the pig has at last come into its own in biological research. A report by the United Kingdom Agricultural Research Council lists 3,094 publications and current research projects with pigs as the subjects, and the Battelle-Northwest Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a selected list of more than 1,500 articles that have been published in the past five years on studies of pigs in biology and medicine alone.

My interest in pigs goes back to my boyhood on a farm in a Norwegian community in western Washington. I never ceased to be amazed at how much pigs resembled people. They were temperate at the trough, neat and clean if given a chance, dignified in courtship and conjugality. It was as a graduate student at Washington State University in the late 1940's that I developed an enthusiasm for the pig's research possibilities. There, working under Tony J. Cunha and Eugene Ensminger, who introduced me to the use of the pig as an experimental animal, I began with studies of the effects of vitamin deficiencies. In the course of these investigations I attempted the difficult task of raising pigs from birth without their mother, so that we might have subjects uncontaminated by colostrum (the milk secreted immediately after delivery). I learned a great deal about pigs as I lived with them night and day for weeks, feeding them around the clock every two or three hours. When I returned some of the piglets to their mother after a few days, they embarrassed me somewhat by squealing and running to me in preference to their mother (in consequence of their early imprinting) whenever they heard me approaching. The experiment, however, succeeded only in breaking up happy pig families (besides putting a severe strain on my own); under the given conditions and in the time allowed I did not manage to keep viable any litter that had been removed at birth from its mother.

Much as I would have liked to continue my work with infant pigs, exploring problems in nutrition, I was more strongly attracted to the field of radiation biology, and so I joined the Hanford Laboratories of the General Electric Company (now the Battelle-Northwest Laboratory); there investigations of the effects of ionizing radiation were being carried out on experimental animals. These studies began with sheep, but we soon extended them to swine, anticipating that the effects on the pig would provide a firmer basis for extrapolation to man. We used a standard breed of swine, called Palouse, that

was developed at Washington State University. These animals grew to a weight of between 600 and 800 pounds, even on a restricted diet. They were costly to feed and maintain, were unwieldy and developed arthritis; moreover, their size made it questionable that they could accurately be compared with man. As we ran short of feed, housing and patience we began to wish for a smaller pig.

I learned that a friend from my graduate school days, David England, was conducting a project in breeding a small pig for research purposes at the Hormel Institute of the University of Minnesota. He and his associates William E. Rempel and Almut E. Dettmers had started the crossbreeding program with three wild pig varieties: a guinea hog from Alabama, a wild boar from Catalina Island and a hog from the piney woods of Louisiana. Later a fourth variety, a swine called Ras-N-Lansa from Guam, was introduced. Most recently a white domestic pig, the Tamworth, was bred into the line to give it a light color. The Minnesota group's breeding efforts produced a comparatively small pig (adult weight about 180 pounds) called the Hormel miniature. In the 15 years since they first created this breed they have reduced its weight by roughly a third.

The Hormel Institute provided us with some castrated miniature pigs for experiments. It was the institute's policy at the time not to release any animals in its breeding program that were capable of reproducing. Since we wanted to raise our own miniatures we had to look elsewhere for a breeding stock. We found that the Pitman-Moore Company of Indiana, a veterinary pharmaceutical firm, was breeding another strain of miniature swine from a small, wild Florida hog of mixed ancestry; it was descended from pigs Columbus had brought to the New World and that had interbred with Caribbean swine. The Pitman-Moore Company generously presented the Hanford Laboratories with some of its best stock of this breed. With these animals as the basis, my associates—V. G. Horstman, M. E. Kerr and W. J. Clarke—and I began in 1957 to breed a new strain. We particularly wanted white pigs, to facilitate studies of the effects of radiation on the skin; hence we crossed the Pitman-Moore breed with white swine of the Palouse strain. Later we crossed the offspring with a Labco pig, a sparsely haired, gentle swine from Mexico, and so produced an animal that not only is white but also has a smooth skin with very little hair. The weight of the Hanford miniatures at present runs from 150 to 200 pounds.

From the stocks I have mentioned and from others, several institutions are now engaged in breeding small pigs for research; among them are the Battelle-Northwest Laboratory, the Hormel Institute, the University of Nebraska, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the Vita Vet Laboratories, Labco and laboratories in France and Germany. One goal is to produce a pig smaller than a man—about 60 pounds or less—that would require no more space or food than a dog and would be a better subject than the dog for many biological investigations.

Let us review some of the recent research in which pigs have served as the experimental animals. It would take volumes to survey the vast field of these wide-ranging studies; I can only report here the highlights of a few particularly interesting investigations.

Chief among the inquiries in which the pig has been used so far is the study of nutrition. The pig's alimentary tract and metabolism are so similar to man's that it has yielded a wealth of information bearing on human nutritional problems. The pig provides a standard for the feeding of infants and young children. It has been found that

a young pig has more stringent food requirements than a human baby; consequently one can be sure that a diet that provides healthy growth in a piglet will be adequate for a baby. Experiments with pigs have also shed light on the protein-deficiency disease of children called kwashiorkor. Wilson G. Pond and his associates at the Cornell University Graduate School of Nutrition produced the symptoms of this disorder in young pigs by feeding them a low-protein diet containing only 3 percent protein and 20 percent or more of fat. Curiously they found that on the same low ration of protein young pigs did not develop as severe symptoms and showed normal activity if the fat content of the diet was reduced. On the low-protein, high-fat regime infant pigs suffered severe liver damage, anemia, gross edema and in addition permanent losses of learning ability.

Several investigators, among them Jerome C. Pekas of the Battelle-Northwest Laboratory and Donal F. Magee of the Creighton University School of Medicine, have shown that the pig is a particularly convenient animal for studying the functioning of the pancreas and other elements of the digestive system. An operation on the gastrointestinal tract of the pig is the same as the corresponding operation in a human subject; a given dose of drug or other substance produces very nearly the same degree of response in a pig as it does in a man, and presumably the various digestive juices secreted by the pig are about the same in quantity and composition as those secreted by man. The pig's pancreatic juice is rich in enzymes. Pekas has found that the animal can be excited to a high rate of pancreatic secretion by a continuous infusion of secretin, the pancreas-stimulating hormone. Looking into the functioning of the young pig's pancreas, he has observed that the animal sometimes shows a congenital falling, marked by inefficient metabolism of soybean protein, that parallels a similar disorder in human infants.

Other investigators of the pig's gastrointestinal tract have discovered that it occasionally develops spontaneous ulcers similar to those in man. Experimenters at Purdue University have produced a high incidence of ulcers by feeding pigs gelatinized cereal products.

In the course of the studies at Washington State University in which we tried but failed to raise pigs from birth without the mother we noticed that the pigs usually succumbed to infection. This fact and other observations suggested to us, as it had to other investigators, that the pig might be a good subject for studies of immunology. In recent years a number of investigators have found that the young pig is indeed uniquely suited for studies of the development of immunity.

A newborn pig has very little gamma globulin (the principal antibody protein) in its serum. Apparently it acquires gamma globulin and other immunoglobulins from its mother's colostrum when it begins to suckle. Diego Segré of the University of Illinois found that baby pigs deprived of colostrum remained deficient in gamma globulin for weeks and showed little of the normal antibody response to antigens. He concluded that colostrum provides the young with the basis for developing the immune mechanism. Experimenting further, he found that colostrum-deprived baby pigs acquired immunological capability when he injected an antigen together with a small amount of a specific antibody or large amounts of gamma globulin. These results supported the theory that the antigen-antibody complex, rather than the antigen alone, is the usual stimulus for the production of an antibody.

Somewhat different results emerged from experiments by Dennis W. Watson, Y. B. Kim and S. Gaylen Bradley at the University of Minnesota Medical School. They took infant pigs from the mother prematurely by sur-

ger and kept them without colostrum and under germ-free conditions. The piglets proved to be completely free of any detectable immunoglobulins or antibodies. Yet these immunological "virgins," unlike Segre's, showed an excellent ability to produce antibodies against antigens soon after birth.

The development of the miniature pig proved invaluable for our studies of radiation effects at the Hanford Laboratories. These studies were prompted by the need for detailed information about tolerances and treatment for people exposed to radioactive substances. For such investigation the miniature pig has many useful characteristics as an experimental animal. Its body size and skeletal mass are about the same as man's; its general similarity to human beings in diet and digestion permits meaningful tests of experimental diets; its life-span (15 to 20 years) is long enough to allow measurement of the effects of radiation in shortening life and in causing malignancies.

One of the Hanford investigations, still under way, is exploring the effects of strontium 90, a long-lived and potentially hazardous constituent of nuclear fallout, which is deposited principally in the bones. Strontium 90 at various levels of dosage is fed daily to experimental pigs. Leukemias have already developed in animals receiving the very high levels of dosage in the program. No bone tumors have appeared as yet, but this form of malignancy is known to have a long latent period of development.

Roger McClellan and his associates at Hanford's successor laboratory, Battelle-Northwest, extended the strontium-90 studies to other radioactive substances that could be used in power generators with minimal hazard to man. Power generators of the thermoelectric type with radioactive isotopes as their energy source are being developed for small portable units on the earth and in space. An important factor in determining the safety of such devices is the extent to which the radioactive material in them would be taken up by the body if it were accidentally ingested. McClellan found that when strontium in the form of a titanate is ingested into the pig's digestive tract, less than .5 percent is absorbed into the body. This is only about a tenth of the amount absorbed when more common chemical forms of strontium are ingested. Still smaller is the absorption of the radioactive substances cerium 144 and promethium 147: less than .01 percent of the oral dose of those isotopes is absorbed into the pig's tissues.

Our miniature pigs enabled other investigators at Hanford and Battelle-Northwest to examine the toxic effects of plutonium and to test methods of treatment. It was found that certain chelating agents, including DTPA (diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid), are effective in helping the body to eliminate plutonium that has been absorbed.

Using a standard breed of pig, the U.S. Navy Radiological Defense Laboratory made detailed tests of the results of high doses of radiation. The investigators found that the 50 percent lethal dose resulting in death within 30 days was 400 roentgens. Surprisingly, they also learned that a sublethal dose endowed pigs with considerable resistance to later heavy exposure. After the animals had received a dose of about 265 roentgens and had been allowed three weeks for partial recovery, it took a dose 70 percent greater than the usual one to cause a 50 percent death rate.

The largest study utilizing swine in radiobiology is one that has been conducted since 1959 at Iowa State University with Atomic Energy Commission support. D. F. Cox and his associates are measuring the effects of radiation on the fertility of male pigs and the genetic effects on their offspring. The standard procedure consists in giving the male's testes an X-ray dose of 300 roentgens

and breeding the male later after germ cells subjected to the radiation have developed. As was expected, the irradiation reduces the amount of sperm by about 20 percent; this does not, however, significantly impair the pig's reproductive capacity. So far more than 15,000 baby pigs have been sired by the irradiated males. In one of the breeds under test (the Duroc breed) a peculiar result has been noted: the litters fathered by irradiated males tend to be slightly larger than normal. This result was not observed in the Hampshire breed. No explanation of the phenomenon has yet been found.

The Battelle-Northwest group has studied the effects of radiation on the karyotype (chromosome pattern) by examining the white blood cells of miniature pigs fed radioactive strontium. Investigators in other laboratories have found the pig to be an exceptionally useful animal for analysis of the various forms of chromosome in the cell nucleus. The domestic pig normally has 38 chromosomes—19 pairs. Six of these pairs have characteristic, readily identifiable shapes and the rest can be classified in small groups. R. A. McFeely of the University of Pennsylvania is making a detailed study of abnormalities in pig chromosomes. This inquiry carries special interest because pigs have an extraordinarily high rate of embryonic death—about 30 to 40 percent—and it is known that chromosome aberrations are sometimes associated with embryonic death in human beings.

Robert Murphree and A. F. McFee of the Agricultural Research Laboratory of the University of Tennessee have found a distinctive complement of chromosomes in a pig resulting from a cross between a domesticated swine and a European wild sow. The parents have 38 and 36 chromosomes respectively, and the offspring turns out to have an odd number: 37. Apparently it is completely fertile, and its chromosome number should be a good marker for research purposes. This case of an odd number of chromosomes is not altogether unique; a cross between two breeds of European ponies has been known to produce a fertile offspring with 65 chromosomes.

Among the institutions that have used our Hanford miniature pigs for research is the University of Oregon Dental School. There E. B. Jump, M. E. Weaver and their associates have found the animal highly useful for studying dental problems. The pig's teeth are nearly the same size as man's (approximately a fourth larger) and are of the same type, consisting of molars and cutting teeth. Moreover, the general growth pattern is the same: the pig starts with deciduous teeth and sheds them as its permanent teeth develop. Hence the pig's mouth and jaw provide a model that makes possible experimental studies on many of the dental problems of children. Douglas L. Buck and other Oregon investigators have used it to look into the details of tooth growth and development, the basic movements of the teeth in biting and chewing and the functioning of orthodontic appliances.

Probably the field in which the pig will make its greatest contribution to human health and longevity is that of research on the heart and circulatory system. In this area the parallels between the pig and man are striking, to say the least. The pig's rearing as an item for the table has produced an animal that is a counterpart, even a caricature, of the overfed, physically lethargic human population. Coupled with this similarity of nurture and disposition is a porcine cardiovascular system that also is remarkably parallel to the human system. The pig's heart and coronary arteries, unlike the dog's, have much the same pattern as man's. Its blood-clotting mechanism is like that of man.

Investigators have found the pig particularly valuable for the study of atherosclerosis. H. C. Rowsell and his associates at the Ontario Veterinary College have used it to ex-

amine the effects of diet. Since the pig likes all man's foods (from peanuts and popcorn to a steady diet of eggs), Rowsell's group has tested pigs with high-cholesterol diets, including foods such as eggs, butter and lard. They find that in pigs such a diet indeed accelerates the development of atherosclerosis, and the signs and symptoms of the disorder are like those in man. Rowsell also used the pig to test anticoagulant drugs administered in certain human cardiovascular diseases. He found that a small dose of dicumarol or heparin was worse than ineffective: it actually had a coagulating effect on the blood. The finding emphasized the importance of proper dosage in the use of these drugs.

D. K. Detweiler and Hans Luginbuhl at the University of Pennsylvania have been analyzing the progressive stages of the development of atherosclerosis. For this purpose they had the good fortune to gain access to a herd of 2,000 breeding sows of various ages that have been raised on garbage (that is, essentially a human diet). In these animals, ranging up to 14 years in age, they have made detailed analyses and tests of the atherosclerotic lesions, the blood vessels and the blood. At Iowa State University, Robert Getty, studying the development of atherosclerosis from another point of view, has found that the characteristic deposits on the artery walls commonly start in the first year of the pig's life and are present in most animals by the second year.

G. D. Lumb and his associates at the Warner-Lambert Research Institute in Canada are studying how blood is supplied to the heart under adverse conditions. It is well known that when the major coronary arteries in man are partly blocked or constricted, this stimulates the development of an auxiliary or substitute circulation to nourish the heart. Lumb's group, using a plastic constrictor to narrow the pig's coronary vessels gradually, demonstrated that the animal, like man, develops a bypass system of circulation. Lumb also found that vessel-dilating drugs could improve the survival of pigs whose coronaries had been occluded.

A joint group at the University of Colorado and Colorado State University (C. A. Maaske, N. H. Booth and T. W. Nielsen) is using the pig to study congestive heart failure, a complex disorder that involves the functioning of the heart as a pump, the mechanisms controlling the heart and secondarily the functioning of the kidneys and lungs. They have found that the pig is a much better subject than the dog for an investigation of this matter. A single operation on the pig's main pulmonary artery produces the symptoms of a gradual development of cardiac failure.

All in all, although the pig is only a newcomer to the laboratories of basic biology, there can be little doubt that it will become, along with the primates, a most important contributor to knowledge about the biology of man.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. MAYNE. I did not hear the source of that quotation the distinguished gentleman gave. Was it Lamb's "Tribute to Pork"?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. A quotation from Charles Lamb; yes.

Mr. MAYNE. Lamb's "Tribute to Pork."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa for the few minutes to dwell on one of the finest aspects of our great country, and also hopefully to indulge for a few minutes in some of the interesting aspects of an animal, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) mentioned a moment ago, that has made a total commitment so far as this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, pigs are pretty but "hogs are beautiful."

We have all heard the expression "beautiful people." Some probably wonder how they got that way. It was because they consumed those beautiful hogs from Iowa.

The beauty of the hog, which this color photograph illustrates so graphically, is not only physical but philosophical.

Hogs are not only beautiful, they are perhaps the most intelligent of animals—sometimes perhaps exceeding man himself. Each is an individual, with its own mind, and does not willingly follow the herd blindly. The hog has little fear, and rarely is found to abandon its responsibility for its offspring. It knows how to relax, but also knows how to work, as it constantly seeks freedom. It will not overeat into indigestion and illness at every opportunity, but on the other hand is capable of considerable effort to find nourishment when it is not provided. It does not just wait for the handout. A hog will not foul its own litter or nest.

One of the most beautiful things about a hog is that every part of it can be marketable except, as the old Iowa saying goes, the squeal.

Yes, "hogs are beautiful" and its by-products are generous. Of course, when I speak of hogs, I mean Iowa hogs. There are pork products peddled in this precious country which I cannot endorse. Hams from Poland cannot compare to those pork products produced in the Pigland of America, Iowa. For many years Iowa farmers and processors have produced the highest quality pork in the world. The wholesomeness of Iowa pork, despite demagoguery, has assured all Americans that Iowa pork is of top quality.

I join with my colleagues from Iowa in proudly wearing my "hogs are beautiful" button and in saluting the pork industry for its high integrity in producing a great meat product.

We refer to our "beautiful hogs" in Iowa as "mortgage lifters." Their contribution to the consumer is total. If you appreciate the finer delicacies of life, try our beautiful Iowa hog—of which we have many, and which I am sure you will all enjoy.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think as a Minnesotan I should challenge the statement that the Iowa hog is the one that should be glorified today, because we give Iowa great competition in that field. I do want to say to my colleagues from Iowa that it has really been an enjoyable occasion to listen to their challenging of the statements that have been made and their support of the lowly pig. I owe a great deal to that animal, I

think. One of the reporters at the luncheon today that FRED sponsored asked me what is beautiful about a pig. I said they have a personality, and few animals have a curl in their tails as pigs do.

I wish to relate that many years ago I was engaged in 4-H Club work. Through the sponsorship of the then representative in our State legislature I acquired a Duroc-Jersey pig. It became a Minnesota grand champion and took third place at the National Swine Show. As I recall it, the registration number of that pig was 366093. I would be interested in knowing from the Duroc-Jersey Pig Association if my memory is correct. However, I am sure that is right. This pig won the grand championship. I sold it for \$150 and had my choice of three herds. This became the beginning of a show herd that I had for many years.

There are those who say that pigs are not clean. I can honestly say that I slept in the pig house during the time of the furling of the spring litters. It must certainly be said that if you gave that lowly animal a chance, he would be clean. If the pigsty is unclean, it is not the fault of the pig but the fault of the man in charge of the pigsty, house, or barn, or whatever you want to call it.

So to my colleague, FRED, my hat is off for taking the time to do the research that you have done.

Also I see my colleague NEAL SMITH of Iowa on the floor, but I still challenge Iowans, because I believe Minnesota pork is just a little bit superior to that of Iowa. However, I am sure my statement will be challenged.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I expect him, of course, to defend the product of his State. I am sure he feels that way. It seems to me that we have every year a contest between great institutions with regard to that noble animal, the hog.

You played football, and I know, and you have often won on the gridiron field, but you know that you did it with a pigskin and did it under the rules that we agreed to. You have surpassed in this field. We have had our good days, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to pursue this contest with my neighbor, but I will let the record stand on the facts.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) on having taken this time for this special order to pay tribute to the pork industry.

Apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), I would point out that the trophy which passes each year to the winner of the football game between the Universities of Iowa and Minnesota is Floyd of Rosedale, a pig.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the pork industry is of the greatest economic importance to the people of Iowa and especially to the constituents of Iowa's Sixth District.

Zoologically, swine are classed as hoofed mammals of the family Suidae. They are stout-bodied, short-legged, artiodactyl animals with omnivorous habits. The meat of swine, known as pork, is an important part of the diet of people throughout the world.

In all probability, man's first use of swine occurred during the Neolithic age, or before written history, when swine were found of the type known as turbarry or Asiatic pigs. Chinese history relates that hogs were domesticated about 4900 B.C. Swine are mentioned in Biblical historical writings as early as 1500 B.C. while legendary and historical accounts mention the keeping of swine in Great Britain as early as 800 B.C.

The domesticated hog of today is closely related to the wild hog. This domesticated animal appears to have had an origin that involves the crossing of several distinct species. Although the exact origin is obscure, it is generally accepted that the domestic hog of today descended from the European wild boar, *Sus scrofa*, and the first improvements were brought about the Neopolitan, Siamese and Chinese crosses. Columbus is credited with bringing hogs to North America. Spanish explorers brought them to Mexico and Hernando De Soto is credited with introducing hogs into what is now the United States.

In the world today there are over 300 breeds of hogs. Careful selection, feeding, and breeding have been the main contributions to the development of modern swine. Most of these improvements have been carried out by progressive livestock breeders in the United States, especially in Iowa, and by our land-grant colleges and universities.

From an economic standpoint, hogs are indeed beautiful. Hogs have traditionally been known as mortgage-lifters on midwestern farms. As my colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) pointed out, last year American farmers received \$3.8 billion from the sale of hogs. Iowa was first in the country, contributing more than \$1 billion to total sales. Iowa also leads the country in the total number of hogs produced. Two of the great counties in Iowa's Sixth District, Plymouth and Sioux, are among the top four hog-producing counties in the United States. All of the 18 counties in this district are listed in the top 300 hog-producing counties.

The swine industry has also contributed favorably to our foreign balance of payments. The first recorded exports of pork were to the West Indies in the year 1790 and amounted to 6 million pounds. In 1968, 85.1 million pounds of pork valued at \$31.6 million were exported.

I salute the pork producers of the United States for continuing to furnish this country and the world with a plentiful supply of nutritious wholesome meat.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my fellow colleagues in the House the speech today of Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, on the contribution of the pork industry to our Nation's economy. His remarks deserve the attention and consideration of all of us.

The pork industry is indeed important

to our total economic life and to our health and well being. I wish to commend the distinguished Congressman from Iowa for his effort to set straight the record of the contribution made by the pork industry, and particularly in regards to the false image in films and television which depict the hog as being a stupid and unclean animal.

Hogs are, in fact, a very important animal to our economy. About two-fifths of the meat eaten in the United States comes from hogs. These animals provide us with bacon, ham, sausage, and pork chops. The fat, skin, and other parts of hogs are used to make many products such as lard, leather, brushes, soap, and medicines. As Congressman SCHWENDEL points out, the hog industry is big business. Of the Nation's total cash receipts from farm product sales, the sale of hogs accounts for 9 percent.

Indiana ranks third in the Nation in pork production. Hogs continue to be the leading source of Indiana cash crops. In 1967 hog sales accounted for 23.4 percent of the total receipts from marketings. Cash receipts from hogs led income from other enterprises in 43 of the 92 Indiana counties.

Indiana produces virtually all of the main breeds of hogs, including Berkshire, Chester Whites, Duroc, Hampshire, Poland China, and Spotted Poland China. There were 4,278,000 hogs and pigs on the farms of Indiana on January 1, 1969, having a total market value of \$135,-613,000.

In the Second District of Indiana, which it is my privilege to represent, there are 198 registered hog breeders out of a total of 2,062 breeders and feeders of hogs. Income from hogs in my district amounted to \$30,339,936 in 1967, which was 15 percent of the total income from the sale of agricultural products. Hog production continues to grow and has increased by 3 percent in 1968 over the previous year.

Also located in the Second District of Indiana is the Heinold Hog Market, the world's largest buyer of hogs. Founded a number of years ago by Harold Heinold of Kouts, Ind., this thriving company last year purchased 2,647,145 hogs at 51 buying stations operating in six Midwestern States and requiring 130 employees according to Mr. Joe Vogel, general manager.

I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues the observation that Congressman SCHWENDEL has made concerning the once-famous hog drives. Indiana was also part of this in pre-Civil War days when hogs were herded across the land for shipment by rail or water to the Eastern States. And a final note must not be forgotten. The National Pork Queen, Miss Claudia Arndt, is a resident of LaCrosse, Ind., which lies within the Second Congressional District.

In conclusion I would like to add my voice to that of my colleague in his efforts on behalf of the pork industry and the campaign to strengthen the swine industry's image to bring a greater awareness among our people of the contributions that it has made to our economy and welfare.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, proudly

wearing a "hogs are beautiful" pin, I am glad to join the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENDEL) in this suitable recognition of the importance of hogs to good life in America.

I speak with special pride on this occasion, because my hometown, Pittsfield, Ill., has earned the title, "Hog Capital of the World" and proclaims that honor with a marker in the public square. A city of 4,000 population—4,004 when the Findleys are home—Pittsfield is the county seat of Pike County, which has the enviable record of producing 100 million pounds of pork annually.

A reporter asked me today what is beautiful about hogs. My answer was that the economic base and the pleasant eating that hogs provide constitute a thing of real beauty. And while city dwellers may envision hogs in terms of mud, squeals, and grunts. I have seen many an animal that deserves the word beautiful.

The 20th Congressional District, which I serve, has the world's finest agricultural State fair at Springfield each year, as well as 14 outstanding county fairs. Each features swine exhibits, with animals neatly groomed and well ordered, real beauties.

Many a time I have watched as exhibitors, young and old, proudly paraded beautiful hogs to the admiration of judges and other spectators.

These animals came by beauty not without effort, care, and research. As a visit to almost any hog lot in Pike County, Ill., will prove, the production of beautiful hogs is a scientific endeavor.

The diet of hogs is more carefully watched than the diet of people. The same may also be said of health care. The result is pork far superior to that of yesterday. It comes from animal lean, well-proportioned and healthy.

The official organ of the world hog capital is the weekly newspaper, the Pike Press.

In recent issues it has reported and commented on the supremacy of this community is quality hog production. Here are some samples:

From the July 10, 1968 issue of the Pike Press, this news story and editorial:

FREE BARBEQUED PORK—TWIN EVENT: ANNUAL STREET SALE, SALUTE TO PIKE PORK INDUSTRY

Think Pig!

That's exactly what's going to happen in Pittsfield all day Friday, July 12, during the annual street sale.

The event is being heralded by the Chamber of Commerce as Pittsfield Pig Day, in recognition of farmers who make Pike one of the top two hog production counties in the state.

Merchants are going whole hog in the bargains which will be piled high in front of their stores.

PIGAWOTOMIE TRIBE

Numerous sales people, it is rumored, will be dressed for the occasion as Indians from the Pigawotomie tribe.

TO UNVEIL PRINCE PIG

One of the highlights of the day will be the unveiling of "Prince Pig" by Charles Durrall, president of the Chamber of Commerce, assisted by Gaylord Rhodes, chairman of Friday's event, and Miss Linda Kinscherff of Pleasant Hill, recently selected as queen by the Pike County Pork Producers Assn.

Prince Pig, a monumental work of art,

promises to be a tribute to Pike-grown pigs for generations to come. It has been executed under the artistic guidance of Farm Advisor Harry Wright and a team composed of pork producers, welders, painters and pig patrons.

IT LOOKS EXCELLENT

All Wright would reveal when he was contacted by this newspaper on details of the monument was "It looks excellent." He did disclose that the model for the art piece was the 1967 champion barrow from the national show held in Minnesota.

UNVEILING AT 11 A.M.

The unveiling is scheduled around 11 a.m.—about the same time merchants will begin serving shoppers free pork barbecue sandwiches from a tent to be put up on the west side of the courtyard.

Another highlight will be the hog judging contest.

CAN JUDGE HOGS

This event will go on all day. Ten hogs will be on display in the courtyard for all comers to take a crack at evaluating hog fine points. Those whose judgments match those of the official judges will be presented hams. The judges will be a panel selected from Cooperative Extension personnel from surrounding counties.

WEIGHT GUESSING CONTEST

For shoppers less skilled, there will be a hog weight guessing contest. Hams will be given to those guessing the correct weight, or closest to it.

All winners will be announced and prizes awarded from a stand in the courtyard around 8:45 p.m.

About mid-afternoon entrants in the pork cook-out contest will descend on the courthouse lawn with their charcoal grills to start the preparation of their pork specialties. Judging will take place at seven o'clock.

FOR MEN AND BOYS ONLY

The contest is open to any male 12 years old and up, with the winner eligible to represent the county in a state-wide pork cook-out contest to be held during the State Fair in August.

Harry Wright, who is coordinating the cook-out in cooperation with the Pike County Pork Producers Assn., asks that cook-out entrants notify him of the cut of pork they need and the amount. The local pork producers will contribute the meat for the contest.

Anyone with a yen to ham it up, shouldn't miss Pittsfield Pig Day on Friday.

FRIDAY IS PIG DAY

Friday will be "Pig Day" in Pittsfield.

As such, the day has a double significance. First off, it's an attempt to pay overdue recognition to the role of pork in the economy of Pike county. Secondly, it's the occasion of the annual outdoor sidewalk sale by Pittsfield merchants.

The second event is not new. The sidewalk sale has been held each summer the past few years and always draws a big crowd to town as merchants offer special bargains, along with a carnival atmosphere and lots of plain good fun. You can expect the same attractions this year. With something new added.

It's the first objective we'd like to discuss here.

Pork production is a key factor in the county's economy. Yet we are sometimes inclined to take it for granted. Friday's celebration will demonstrate, we believe, that the contribution of the county's pork producers is indeed recognized and appreciated.

There will be a variety of events, described elsewhere in this issue, all related to the promotion of pork. There will be free pork barbecue sandwiches served Friday on the courthouse lawn. All this week Pittsfield merchants, store clerks, and others have been wearing big red and white buttons proclaiming Friday, July 12 as "Pittsfield Pig

Day." In this issue of the Pike Press we are publishing 21 pork recipes, gathered from Pike county homemakers by Helen Hackman, county home economics adviser.

Illinois ranks second in hog production among all 50 states, exceeded only by Iowa. In Illinois, Henry county is generally regarded as the top hog producing county of the state, with Pike in second place. Nationally, Pike county ranks fourth, behind two Iowa counties, according to the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

In local on-the-farm income, in related feed and equipment businesses, in pork-related processing activities, hog production is a most essential link in the chain of Pike county's economy.

Friday's "Pig Day in Pittsfield" represents a community-wide recognition and celebration of this important relationship.

Hats off to the Pike County Pig. He'll be Prince for a Day Friday, but in truth he reigns the year round.

The July 21 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried this report from the "hog capital":

PITTSFIELD, "PORK CAPITAL OF WORLD,"
CELEBRATES PIG DAY IN BIG WAY
(By Clarissa Start)

PITTSFIELD, ILL., July 20.—There was a psychedelic pig in a pen on the main street and a number of less arty but more meaty pigs in an inclosure around the corner. Just before noon, a crowd gathered in the town square for the unveiling of a "Pigcasso."

It was Pig day in Pittsfield, Ill., and merchants and residents were going whole hog in their tribute to the pork industry of pike county, where Pittsfield is located, just across the Mississippi river from Louisiana, Pike county, Mo.

Pike county, Ill. now claims to be the "Pork Capital of the World," having produced 100,000,000 pounds of pork last year.

More than 850 pounds of it was served in free barbecue sandwiches on Pig day, July 12. Street sales, an auction, cook-outs, hog-calling, hog-judging and other festivities were part of the occasion. Costumes for the event included farmerette ensembles of mini-blue jeans and straw hats and Indian costumes described as representing natives of the pig-awotamie tribe.

"We haven't had this much excitement since the Sadle Hawkins day race last winter," Marge Nighbert said, as she organized the barbecue stand where the sandwiches were to be served.

Crowds thronged the sidewalks from the early morning hours and by 9:30 the atmosphere was pure holiday picnic.

Pittsfield is centered about a town square with a conventional courthouse with a somewhat unconventional soaring steepled center, raspberry-red in color. Merchants on the four sides of the square and down the side streets had moved merchandise out onto the sidewalks, racks and stacks of it, at tempting bargain prices and were doing a brisk business.

A center of attraction was in front of the pharmacy which is owned by Warren Winston, president of the Pike County Historical Society. This was the "Psychedelic Pig," painted in vivid swirls of orange, red, blue and green. A sign described it as, "An artist's contribution to Pittsfield. Body by pig. Art work by Lilly Brown." The pig spent most of its time lying in a puddle of water at the side of the pen, looking slightly self-conscious.

On another side of the square were more pens of pigs, these in a natural state, attracting large crowds of children. They were Hampshires, we were told, and two contests were being held, one to guess the weight of a particularly shapely sow, the other to second-guess the judges in the various points of competition in the hog-judging to take place later that day.

Also in preparation for late-day activities was a roast pig turning over a huge home-made rotisserie.

"It was 160 pounds, dressed down at 120 pounds," said Dick Alspaugh, who was in charge of the roasting. "We started the fire at midnight last night and it ought to be ready by late afternoon. We haven't put any barbecue sauce on it. Barbecue sauce doesn't really do anything to a pig but flavor the air. We'll pour a little on the fire later on for atmosphere."

The street sale has been an annual event in Pittsfield but this is the first year Pig day has been celebrated. Chairman of the event was druggist Gaylord Rhodes, assisted by Mayor Frank Penstone, other merchants, pork producers and Co-operative Extension personnel.

Several experts on pork production—Walter Dehart, Lawrence Smith and Winfred Dean—had gathered on the square and were discussing Pike county's claim to being the Pork Capital of the World. According to past statistics, Illinois has ranked second in hog production among the 50 states, exceeded only by Iowa. Henry county to the north of Pike county has been regarded as the top producing county in Illinois.

"But while Henry county had the largest number of pigs last year, we outranked them in number of pounds last year," said Dehart. "We believe we're not only first in Illinois but right up there for the nation with Clinton county, Ia., our only competition in the ranks."

If Pittsfield and its environs make it the pork capital of the world, this would be a second claim to fame for Pike county. Neighboring Griggsville calls itself the Purple Martin Capital of the World.

Whether the top or only near the top, Pike county farmers can live high on the hog from their pork proceeds. Many farmers in the area have from 2000 to 5000 pigs.

"You hardly call yourself a hog farmer around here unless you have at least 1500," one man said. "The farmer with the most heads of hogs is Ray Myers; no one knows exactly how many he has but it's between 7000 and 12,000."

Pigs grow big in a hurry under modern systems of nutrition and grain feeding. At 5 months, one may weigh as much as 220 pounds.

"The weight's different than it was when we used to raise 'em," said one farm woman, studying the pig in the weight-guessing contest. "Much less fat, much more lean solid meat, but that means they weigh more. It makes it hard to guess the weight."

Pigs from Pike go all over, some to the St. Louis market, some to Beardstown, some to the east. Recognition of the role of pork in the county's economy is overdue, Allan A. Seller, editor and publisher of the Pike Press, wrote in a special Pig day editorial.

"Pork production is a key factor in the county's economy," the editorial said. "Yet we are sometimes inclined to take it for granted. . . . In local on-the-farm income, in related feed and equipment businesses, in pork-related processing activities, hog production is a most essential link in the chain of Pike county's economy."

"Friday's Pig day in Pittsfield represents a community-wide recognition and celebration of this important relationship."

"Hats off to the Pike County Pig. He'll be Prince for a Day Friday, but in truth he reigns the year round."

The Pike Press published 21 pork recipes gathered from Pike county homemakers by Helen Hackman, University of Illinois county home economics adviser, and her assistant, Florence Metternich.

Farm adviser Harry Wright supervised a cook-out for amateur cooks and also supervised the construction of the statue named "Prince Pig," also termed a freestanding "Pigcasso," which stood in the square,

swathed in cloth and waiting to be officially unveiled.

At 11:20, a crowd gathered, television cameras and microphones were set up and Charles Durall, president of the chamber of Commerce, approached the pig-shaped outline.

Assisting him was Linda Kinscherff, Pike County Pork Queen, a student at Quincy College. Linda's sister, Janet, is Miss Pike County Fair, Miss Illinois Rural Electric and Miss Adams County. She was competing that day for the title of Miss Illinois.

Durall and Linda, in a co-operative effort, removed the covering from "Prince Pig," as the crowd applauded. "Prince Pig" turned out to be a sort of orange wire, curly-tailed sculpture on a pig-shaped wooden background. Model for the art piece was the 1967 champion barrow from the national show held in Minnesota.

By this time, long lines of hungry people were waiting at the barbecue stand and farmer Gene Reeves gave the official opening signal—a lusty expert exhibition of hog calling.

"Hoooooocooey," he sent the call ringing across the square. "Hooo-hooo-hooo-hooooey."

The first free barbecued pork sandwich was served. Later it was learned that the 850 pounds of meat lasted just about two hours. As calls of "hooocoy" echoed around the square, one bystander summed it up.

"It's safe to say," he observed, "that there's a little ham in everybody."

When the Illinois Pork Producers held their annual statewide meeting January 25, 1969, they were greeted by a special issue of the Pike Press which included this welcoming editorial:

WELCOME, PORK PRODUCERS

We extend a hearty welcome to the Illinois Pork Producers and Pork-Ettes who will be in Pittsfield Saturday for their annual state meeting.

Pittsfield is the smallest city to be host so far to the state annual meeting and so we take special pride in being the host community.

The Pike County Pork Producers deserve much credit for their part in arranging this meeting, acting as the host association, and formulating the program, along with the University Extension service.

The Pike Press has consistently supported the purpose and program of the pork producers and we are pleased to report that national progress has been fruitful. Quoting from the January issue of the National Pork Producers Council News, "The membership, now at 30,000, will move to or above the 50,000 level during 1969, as the local units and the State Producers groups reach the goals which they have set."

Put pork on more tables more often is a key objective of the pork producers, but not the only one. Using its "Nickels for Profit" project, the national council has moved into a major consumer research program, a co-operative research-testing plan with other segments of the industry to eradicate trichinosis, a cooperative project with federal extension service to catalogue and summarize all available pork production information, and in recent weeks the development of a pilot project to study the potential of advertising and promotion for increasing consumption of fresh pork and of improving the consumer image of pork.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many of my colleagues have indicated their desire to comment upon this subject, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include ex-

traneous matter on the worthiness of this great food product for America and for the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RACKETEER INFILTRATION OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, after mutual consultation, Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska, and I have joined Senators McCLELLAN and ERVIN in a bipartisan bill aimed at racketeer infiltration of legitimate business enterprise. Senator McCLELLAN the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, has introduced for himself and his able colleagues, S. 1861, entitled the "Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969." The companion House bill is H.R. 10312.

Racketeer corruption of honest business organizations was brought into sharp focus by the President's Crime Commission. The Commission reported that organized crime was acquiring control by four principal methods; first, investment of income illegally acquired; second, requiring payment of gambling debts in the coin of business equity; third, foreclosing on loanshark loans; and, fourth, extortion by various means and methods.

In response to that report, Senator HRUSKA and I introduced legislation which in its latest form is found in S. 1623 and H.R. 9327 and is known as the "Criminal Activities Profits Act." That legislation was designed to activate the tax laws and the antitrust laws against money invested in business concerns which was either, first, unlawfully acquired, or, second, unreported for tax purposes. That legislation does not meet the whole need. The new bill will help.

The new bill is innovative and pioneering. As the need is new, so the remedy must be new. Based on the interstate clause, it creates a new Federal crime called "racketeering activity." Specific acts covered in the definition include acts of violence, bribery, counterfeiting, embezzlement of union funds, interstate theft, loansharking, white slave traffic, obstruction of investigations, obstruction of justice, and conspiracy to commit these acts. All of these are crimes already defined in existing Federal statutes. The new crime would require the prosecution to show a "pattern of racketeering." When the pattern is shown, it will be unlawful, first, to invest or use income derived from the pattern in the creation or operation of any enterprise in interstate commerce; second, to acquire or maintain control of such a business through such racketeering activities or through collection of unlawful debts; and, third, to work for or manage an enterprise engaged in such activities. The penalty is up to \$10,000 fine or 20 years in prison, or both.

Another penalty is provided. It is forfeiture. After conviction, the ill-gotten gains must be forfeited to the Govern-

ment. This sanction is not only poetic justice but a strong deterrent as well.

Another section of the bill borrows conceptually from the antitrust laws. The courts are given broad powers in the civil remedy field. They can issue injunctions restraining criminal violations of the act. They can order dissolution of any offending business organization. They can compel racketeer business owners to divest themselves of their equity. They can prohibit such owners from engaging further in the same type or other business activity. In this context, these powers are innovative. In other context, they are tried and tested. Under present law, one large corporation can be required to divest itself of ownership in another corporation for competitive or other economic considerations. It is a logical extension of the concept for society to protect itself economically and otherwise by requiring criminal elements to leave the house of honest business.

The bill contains another parallel to the civil aspects of the antitrust laws. It authorizes the Attorney General to make an investigative demand upon any person or enterprise in possession of documentary material relevant to a civil racketeering investigation. If the demand is refused, the Attorney General can obtain a court order, disobedience of which would incur contempt penalties.

The new crime of "racketeering activity" is added to the list of crimes covered by the electronic surveillance title of the omnibus crime bill adopted in the last Congress.

A witness immunity clause is included in the bill. Conceived as a "use restriction" against all evidence given under immunity—and the fruits thereof—this clause follows the concept recently recommended by the National Commission on Reform of the Federal Criminal Laws. This represents a bold improvement over the "total defense" theory of present witness immunity statutes. It will do much to help gather information not otherwise available and still not grant a total pardon to guilty informants in the operating structure of the Cosa Nostra.

Mr. Speaker, the Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969 will not eliminate organized crime in our society. No law or set of laws ever will. But it will materially strengthen the hand of the law-enforcement establishment against the lawbreaker.

LEGISLATION TO BRING EYE, HEARING, AND DENTAL CARE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF PART B OF MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yesterday introduced legislation—H.R. 10291—to bring eye, hearing, and dental care under the provisions of part B of medicare. The bill would also change the present cost sharing under part B by which the individual pays 50 percent of the cost and the Federal Government the other 50 percent, to a one-third to two-thirds sharing. The legislation has been

introduced in the Senate by the Honorable VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana.

Medicare is doing an excellent job in helping the elderly to finance their health expenses; however, three areas of health care of very considerable importance to the elderly are specifically excluded from coverage. These three areas of affliction are each, by testimony of the Public Health Service, more common in those over 65 years of age than in any other age group. These are the areas of eye, hearing, and dental care.

Yet, although their incidence is more frequent in the elderly, the elderly receive in proportion to these problems less care than other groups. The reason is plain—and it is the same reason which was pervasive when the Congress adopted the part B program for medicare. That is simply that the costs are beyond the means of millions of those who are social security beneficiaries.

The cost of the three services I propose would run approximately \$750 million. Under the present financing, this would necessitate an increase in the cost to those electing part B, an increase from the present \$4 to approximately \$6 a month, with an equivalent increase in the Federal share. Because I believe we should bear the burden through Federal financing rather than increasing the load of the social security beneficiary, my amendment also includes a change in the financing of part B from a 50-50 sharing to a one-third and two-thirds sharing. This would fully cover the additional financing for those covered without increasing the present \$4 as now fixed for fiscal year 1970.

While the \$750 million cost may seem high, it represents less than a day's cost for the war in Vietnam. For that money, we would be able to provide help to a great number of the 4 million old persons who are hard of hearing, the 700,000 or so with a difficult visual impairment, and the vast numbers who need dental care they are not receiving.

THE HATE ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of immigrants. Every one of us, save the Indians, is either an immigrant or the descendant of immigrants. All immigrants or their ancestors are either members of some racial or religious minority or their descendants have been, at one time or another. There is not a living American who either is, or has been, or has a descendant who was a member of some minority. As it happens I am myself a member of an ethnic minority and am so classified by the census. I think that there is not a Member of this body who is unaware of the effects that minority status can have on an individual life.

Eric Hoffer has observed that no matter how protective the laws may be, no minority group is ever truly secure; a minority exists in the knowledge that its rights are protected only on the consent of the majority, or at least on the benevolent neutrality of the majority. Minority rights are protected, but only

as long as the majority is willing. It does not matter whether you happen to be in a political minority or a racial minority, but that you realize deep in your soul that your position is tolerated, but never secure. Perhaps it is never said, maybe even never thought, but somehow the feeling is inescapable that there may be something wrong with you or your position, because after all it is a minority position. One feels safety, but not security. It is a fortunate thing that all of us can understand this, that most of us recognize that we are or may be in a minority, and that therefore minority rights must be—and generally are—protected.

An ethnic minority is in a peculiar position. I happen to be an American of Spanish surname and of Mexican descent. As it happens my parents were born in Mexico and came to this country seeking safety from a violent revolution. It follows that I, and many other residents of my part of Texas and other Southwestern States—happen to be what is commonly referred to as a Mexican American. That label sums up most of the elements of a vast conflict affecting perhaps most of the 5 million southwestern citizens who happen to bear it. The individual finds himself in a conflict, sometimes with himself, sometimes with his family, sometimes with his whole world. What is he to be? Mexican? American? Both? How can he choose? Should he have pride and joy in his heritage, or bear it as a shame and sorrow? Should he live in one world or another, or attempt to bridge them both?

There is comfort in remaining in the closed walls of a minority society, but this means making certain sacrifices; but it sometimes seems disloyal to abandon old ideas and old friends; you never know whether you will be accepted or rejected in the larger world, or whether your old friends will despise you for making a wrong choice. For a member of this minority, like any other, life begins with making hard choices about personal identity. These lonely conflicts are magnified in the social crises so clearly evident all over the Southwest today. There are some groups who demand brown power, some who display a curious chauvinism, and some who affect the other extreme. There is furious debate about what one should be and what one should do. There is argument about what one's goals are, and how to accomplish them. I understand all this, but I am profoundly distressed by what I see happening today. I have said that I am against certain tactics, and against certain elements, and now I find yet more confusion. Mr. Speaker, the issue at hand in this minority group today is hate, and my purpose in addressing the House is to state where I stand: I am against hate and against the spreaders of hate; I am for justice, and for honest tactics in obtaining justice.

The question facing the Mexican American people today is what do we want, and how do we get it?

What I want is justice. By justice I mean decent work at decent wages for all who want work; decent support for those who cannot support themselves;

full and equal opportunity in employment, in education, in schools; I mean by justice the full, fair, and impartial protection of the law for every man; I mean by justice decent homes, adequate streets and public services; and I mean by justice no man being asked to do more than his fair share, but none being expected to do less. In short, I seek a justice that amounts to full, free, and equal opportunity for all; I believe in a justice that does not tolerate evil or evil doing; and I believe in a justice that is for all the people all the time.

I do not believe that justice comes only to those who want it; I am not so foolish as to believe that good will alone achieves good works. I believe that justice requires work and vigilance, and I am willing to do that work and maintain that vigilance.

I do not believe that it is possible to obtain justice by vague and empty gestures, or by high slogans uttered by orators who are present today and gone tomorrow. I do believe that justice can be obtained by those who know exactly what they seek, and know exactly how they plan to seek it. And I believe that justice can be obtained by those whose cause is just and whose means are honest.

It may well be that I agree with the goals stated by militants; but whether I agree or disagree, I do not now, nor have I ever believed that the end justifies the means, and I condemn those who do. I cannot accept the belief that racism in reverse is the answer for racism and discrimination; I cannot accept the belief that simple, blind, and stupid hatred is an adequate response to simple, blind, and stupid hatred; I cannot accept the belief that playing at revolution produces anything beyond an excited imagination; and I cannot accept the belief that imitation leadership is a substitute for the real thing. Developments over the past few months indicate that there are those who believe that the best answer for hate is hate in reverse, and that the best leadership is that which is loudest and most arrogant; but my observation is that arrogance is no cure for emptiness.

All over the Southwest new organizations are springing up; some promote pride in heritage, which is good, but others promote chauvinism, which is not; some promote community organization, which is good, but some promote race tension and hatred, which is not good; some seek redress of just grievances, which is good, but others seek only opportunities for self aggrandizement, which is not good.

All of these elements, good and bad, exist and all of them must be taken into account. The tragic thing is that in situations where people have honest grievances, dishonest tactics can prevent their obtaining redress; and where genuine problems exist, careless or unthinking or consciously mean behavior can unloose forces that will create new problems that might require generations to solve. I want to go forward, not backward; I want the creation of trust, not fear; and I want to see Americans together, not apart.

Just a few days ago, in Denver there

was a demonstration mounted by a priest and a few others. The priest and eight others pledged that they would fast for 8 days in behalf of legislation to protect migrant farmworkers. About 30 people were on hand to support them. Within 2 hours a convention of militants arrived and took over; they refused to listen to legislators who were working for the legislation they supposedly supported. After a while, someone pulled down the flag of the State of Colorado and mutilated it. The militants left and marched back to their convention, jeering at police along the way and generally behaving in imitation militant manner. The original protest was drowned, its purpose obscured, and justice moved forward not at all. The priest remarked sadly:

The group who destroyed the flag was not part of our group. We don't agree with that philosophy.

In this case I doubt that the plight of migrant farmworkers was ever called to public attention, but was lost in the antics and hoopla mounted by unthinking people who apparently got bored with their own meeting and decided to take over another one. I fear that this is an instance where the cause of justice took a back seat to the cause of publicity.

Assuredly there is cause for wrath among people who have suffered long and endured much. But the question that must be answered is whether wrath alone will bring about justice, or whether it will merely obfuscate the real remedy. It is easy to be angry, but it is hard to have that moral indignation that alone reveals the depth of injustice, and lights the corridors of truth.

It is not simply a case today where a local protest is taken over in an isolated incident; the Denver situation is not at all unique. In fact the very day after that incident, a demonstration in Del Rio, Tex., attracted militant types, who sought to turn it to their advantage. Militants attempted to provoke police and plastered their slogans all over the premises where a meeting was held. Even the local Republican organizer hung stickers around, so that he might possibly gain some converts. The organizer of this protest said:

We have nothing to do with militant leaders who infiltrated the Del Rio march.

In the midst of change and unrest there are always parties who want to use that unrest to their own advantage. It is no secret that militants want to use others for their own ends and purposes; but it should also be no secret to the perceptive that there are also people who want to use the militants for their purposes. It is no secret that a political party organizer hopes to promote militant action as a means to win votes, or possibly embarrass political opponents. But that is a game that many can play. If people should not be shocked that my minority party friends had a paid organizer running a hospitality suite in Del Rio, then neither should they be shocked that sympathizers of the Cuban regime might also hope to turn the incident to their advantage. Protests can advance the ambitions of many, and the ambitious will attempt to advance their interests if they

can by taking advantage of the unwary and the naive.

Unfortunately it seems that in the face of rising hopes and expectations among Mexican Americans there are more leaders with political ambitions at heart than there are with the interests of the poor at heart; they do not care what is accomplished in fact, as long as they can create and ride the winds of protest as far as possible. Thus we have those who play at revolution, those who make speeches but do no work, and those who imitate what they have seen others do, but lack the initiative and imagination to set forth actual programs for progress.

Indeed there are even those with the best of intentions who find their efforts misguided. Foundation grants meant to achieve harmony and unity have created greater divisions and hatreds; funds meant to support the development of new leadership have only been used for the friends of grantees, who might or might not have any potential for constructive leadership and action. Like Tolstoy's Count Bezukhov, a foundation with the best of intentions may be able to produce only greater misery by entrusting its funds to ambitious but ruthless and self-seeking overseers. No one could quarrel with the good intentions of the bumbling Count or the great foundation, but one can and must examine what has happened to that benevolent intent. After all, the best of programs must be translated into action by human beings, and not all human beings interpret an idea in the same way. One man's facade is another man's empty and crumbling building; it all depends on who is looking at it.

About 3 years ago the Ford Foundation, by far the greatest of all foundations devoted to the advancement of humanity, took an interest in the Mexican-American minority group. What the foundation saw was an opportunity to help. That opportunity, coupled with the best of intentions, has produced what I could classify only as a very grave problem in the district I am privileged to represent. As deeply as I must respect the intentions of the foundation, I must at the same time say that where it aimed to produce unity it has so far created disunity; and where it aimed to coordinate it has only further unloosed the conflicting aims and desires of various groups and individuals; and where it aimed to help it has hurt. I hope that all of this will change; but before it can change the facts must be examined.

The Ford Foundation believed that the greatest need of this particular minority group was to have some kind of effective national organization that could coordinate the actions of the many that already existed, and give for once an effective and united voice to this minority group. This good desire may have rested on a false assumption; namely, that such a disparate group could, any more than our black brothers or our white "Anglo" brothers, be brought under one large tent. There are conflicting interests in any group of any race or creed, and this must be recognized. Whatever the case may be, the Ford Foundation established the Southwest

Council of La Raza and gave it a treasury of \$630,000.

Not long after the Southwest Council of La Raza opened for business, it gave \$110,000 to the Mexican-American Unity Council of San Antonio; this group was apparently invented for the purpose of receiving the grant. Whatever the purposes of this group may be, thus far it has not given any assistance that I know of to bring anybody together; rather it has freely dispensed funds to people who promote the rather odd and I might say generally unaccepted and unpopular views of its directors. The Mexican-American Unity Council appears to specialize in creating still other organizations and equipping them with quarters, mimeograph machines and other essentials of life. Thus, the "unity council" has created a parents' association in a poor school district, a neighborhood council, a group known as the barrios unidos—or roughly, united neighborhoods—a committee on voter registration and has given funds to the militant Mexican-American Youth Organization—MAYO; it has also created a vague entity known as the "Universidad de los Barrios" which is a local gang operation. Now assuredly all these efforts may be well intended; however it is questionable to my mind that a very young and inexperienced man can prescribe the social and political organizations of a complex and troubled community; there is no reason whatever to believe that for all the money this group has spent, there is any understanding of what it is actually being spent for, except to employ friends of the director and advance his preconceived notions. The people who are to be united apparently don't get much say in what the "unity council" is up to.

As an example, the president of MAYO is not on the Unity Council payroll; but he is on the payroll of another Ford Foundation group, the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund. He is an investigator but appears to spend his time on projects not related to his defense fund work. This handy device enables him to appear independent of Foundation activities and still make a living from the Foundation. Of course, his MAYO speeches denigrating the "gringos" and calling for their elimination by "killing them if all else fails" do little for unity, and nothing for law, but that bothers neither him nor his associates.

As another example, the "Universidad de los Barrios" is operated by a college junior and two others. The "universidad" has no curriculum and offers no courses, and the young toughs it works with have become what some neighbors believe to be a threat to safety and even life itself. After a murder took place on the doorstep of this place in January, witnesses described the place as a "trouble spot." Neighbors told me that they were terrified of the young men who hung around there, that their children had been threatened and that they were afraid to call the police. After the murder, the "dean" of this "university" said that he could not be there all the time and was not responsible for what happened while he was away. This might be true, but the

general fear of the neighbors indicates that the "university" is not under reliable guidance at any time. I note that since I have made criticisms of this operation its leader says it is ready to enter a "second phase." I hope so.

Militant groups like MAYO regularly distribute literature that I can only describe as hate sheets, designed to inflame passions and reinforce old wounds or open new ones; these sheets spew forth racism and hatred designed to do no man good. The practice is defended as one that will build race pride, but I never heard of pride being built on spleen. There is no way to adequately describe the damage that such sheets can do; and there is no way to assess how minds that distribute this tripe operate. But, Mr. Speaker, I say that those who believe the wellsprings of hate can be closed as easily as they are opened make a fearful mistake; they who lay out poison cannot be certain that it will kill no one, or make no one ill, or harm no innocent bystander.

I have no way of knowing whether foundation money goes into the publication of these hate sheets, but I cannot see why the foundation would permit its money to support groups that published these sheets either, and I cannot see how good can come from the building of passions that have throughout the history of mankind brought about only distrust, fear, hate, and violence.

I fear very much that the Ford Foundation miscalculated in choosing those who have charge over their grant money.

We see a strange thing in San Antonio today; we have those who play at revolution and those who imitate the militance of others. We have a situation in Denver where the local leader said, "This is our Selma," and not a week later a situation in Del Rio where the local leader said, "This is our Selma." But try as they might, Selma was neither in Denver nor in Del Rio. We have those who cry "brown power" only because they have heard "black power" and we have those who yell "oink" or "pig" at police, only because they have heard others use the term. We have those who wear beards and berets, not because they attach any meaning to it, but because they have seen it done elsewhere. But neither fervor nor fashion alone will bring justice. Those who cry for justice, but hold it in contempt cannot win it for themselves or for anyone else. Those who prize power for its own sake will never be able to use it for any benefit but their own; and those who can only follow the fashions of protest will never understand what true protest is.

I believe that a just and decent cause demands a just and decent program of action. I believe that a just and decent cause can be undermined by those who believe that there is no decency, and who demand for themselves what they would deny others. I have stood against racists before, and I will do it again; and I have stood against blind passion before and I will gladly do so again. I pray that the day will come when all men know justice; and I pray that that day has not been put further away by

the architects of discord, the prophets of violence. I pray that these great tasks that face us in the quest for justice and progress will be taken up by all men; and I know that when all is said and done and the tumult and shouting die down those who only spoke with passion cast aside, and those who spoke with conviction and integrity will still be around. I am willing to let time be my judge.

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS IS NOT AMENDABLE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, of late a series of statements have been made regarding intentions of the administration to seek some sort of amendment to our Bill of Rights. We hear a request will be made for a study to ascertain whether the Constitution should be amended to soften effects of Supreme Court rulings that have enlarged the rights of the defendants.

Our priceless heritage, the Bill of Rights, has remained viable, vibrant, and meaningful since the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution were ratified in 1791. These rights have not only survived, but have grown in world as well as national stature over the generations. Massive challenges have been thrown at them, only to be surmounted by their inherent strength and truth. Because we have lived by the Bill of Rights, rather than in spite of it, America has become a haven to the oppressed and a light to the world. Now, we are informed that this administration seeks to weaken them in order to cater to hysteria and demagoguery. How unthinkable.

Does President Nixon not read history? Has he never contemplated the fate of the Alien and Sedition Acts? Has he not read proceedings of the Hartford Convention? Is he not familiar with those periodic attempts which have been mounted to abrogate constitutional liberties of all Americans? Or how about the Palmer raids in the World War I period? What of the refusal to seat the New York Socialists? Is he not familiar with these challenges? Once we abrogate such guarantees, the prison camp and secret police are around the corner.

Mr. Speaker, a free society of free men stands and grows not out of fear of its institutions and guaranteed liberties, but because of continued faith in and reliance on them. Ever has this been true of our own country. Are we now so terrified of our traditional liberties that we shall seek to destroy them in the name of a crusade against crime? Shall we deprive all Americans of liberty in the long run because we seek to serve a short-term political objective? Do we have so little faith in our rights and constitutional vitality?

If we take away any of such guarantees from the least of our people, we are in effect wrenching them away from all of our people. Liberty such as Americans enjoy under the first 10 amendments to the Constitution has been dearly bought, nobly defended, and unselfishly

paid for. Nor will this generation of Americans allow any erosion of their foundation of dignity which is the essence of our republic.

Today we hear a crescendo of voices calling heatedly for prosecution of this one and a halt to activities of that one. Again the frightened and weak seek recourse to repression instead of relying upon inherent strengths. To them we must present a front of unyielding defense of our Constitution. Better men then we have passed this glowing heritage to us, and we dare not break faith with them.

We have already seen what the difference is between campaign oratory and demands of reality. I pray that the administration will turn from this course of proposed alteration of the Bill of Rights. If they do not, then Vietnam and the ABM will be mere introductory chapters to a bitter story of constitutional struggle.

Let us heed the lessons of history both here and abroad. Most men dream of liberties we enjoy, and never behold or taste of them. Down through the corridors of history sounds the lament of those in bondage, echoed all too often in our own Nation. Shall we toy with the most sacred rights of men because there are those who would deprive men of liberty and others who would accede to their demands?

On March 23, 1775, in the Virginia Convention at Richmond, Patrick Henry uttered words I commend to Mr. Nixon and those around him. They read:

Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Is a demand for repression so necessary and national fear so overpowering as to hurl us as a nation over the brink of abridgement of our most priceless possessions? Let those who propose to tinker with the Bill of Rights give us an answer.

TO DIE IN WARSAW—AND BE REBORN IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, spring is a time for rebirth and revitalization of old lessons. It is a time not only to look forward to new beginnings, but to keep fresh in our minds previous happenings. Such efforts more than once have enabled people to evade repetition of past mistakes. Some happenings, even though long removed in time, contain major relevance for generations yet to come. Among them are two anniversaries which fall in the spring—the Warsaw ghetto uprising and the founding of the Nation of Israel.

One was and remains a reaffirmation of the human spirit, even though its immediate result was the snuffing out of much human life. The other is a celebration of life, made possible in part by sacrifices which were an inherent part of the first event.

In a way the history of the Jewish people is so bittersweet, with a heavy emphasis on the bitterness contained in

the cup history has held to the lips of this unique people. Torn from their land by force of conquest, they tasted horrors of slavery early in man's recorded history. Matured in the fires of oppression, they survived in spite of generations of dictators. None extinguished their spirit, which flourished along with their love of learning and capacity to rise above life's vicissitudes. Yet as history progressed, violent oppression aimed at them increased, until excesses of the crusaders were replaced by the Inquisition, and discrimination of medieval days gave way to organized and government-sponsored programs of Eastern Europe. Still the Jewish people prevailed and gave cultural light to the world.

The 20th century unfolded the most horrible chapters of all, climaxing in the unspeakable torment of the Nazi era, as names such as Auschwitz, Babi Yar, and Dachau became household words. Six million Jews perished as they were entered first in the category of peoples to have genocide practiced against them as part of major national policy. Most went to their deaths in gas chambers in a stupor of terror, fear, and confusion, as the mass graves and crematoriums of Treblinka, Chelmo, Maidanek, and Sachsenhausen filled with awful swiftness.

There were some, however, in the ghetto of Warsaw, who realized that a new Jew had to be born—in fire and blood, if necessary. Born he was in the desperate death grapple that was precipitated.

From April 19 to May 16, 1943, these driven, desperate people fought like men possessed in order to sell their lives as dearly as possible. No chance of victory existed, and they knew it. No quarter was possible, and they realized it. No monument mattered, yet they have one.

It is the spirit of the Maccabees reborn in this age. The spirit of defenders of Massada, who chose death by suicide rather than surrender and perish like cattle. It was that first bright flame of resistance and will to accept death in order to prove manhood and spirit that lit the blaze that roared so high and hotly that out of it was born a new State—Israel.

On May 15, 1948, Israel, a free nation, was born, conceived in a people's torment and dedicated to the proposition that the Jewish people shall live. Soon Israel will be 21 years old. Men and women of Warsaw's ghetto never lived to see her rise like a phoenix from the ashes of Europe's Jewry. Only their spirits knew, for they had touched off the first torch—with their lives.

If we seek their monument, look not in Poland, which still drives Jews in fear beyond its borders. Look instead to Israel—at her strong young heroes who nail victory to their banners over the prostrate forms and broken armies of dictators of today. If Nasser and his fellow would-be assassins seek their victory, let them look at spiritual forebears of the Israel Armed Forces. Let them contemplate the faces of those who will never enter today's gas chambers singing psalms. Let them gaze at those who will die before they surrender their heritage and right to live. That goes for any

so-called four power talks who seek to award a Nobel Peace Prize, Czechoslovakia-style, to Israel in 1969.

May the spirit of the Warsaw dead ever stand beside the people of Israel. May we never forget their ageless lesson that survives all. It is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees.

May Israel have long life and remain the beacon of enlightenment and refuge to the oppressed for many long and fruitful years to come. The Jewish people lives.

WAR ON INFLATION

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues, an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of March 29, 1969. I do so because the editorial expresses truths which should be faced up to by this Congress. Increasingly, we see evidence of actions by presumably carefully regulated industries which reflect a high degree of correlation in the decision-making process producing what is in every sense an administered price, virtually a private ability to levy taxes upon the consuming public.

It is my judgment that we have reached the point where serious re-evaluation of much of the underlying policy must be made by Congress if it is to discharge its responsibility to the American public.

The editorial follows:

WAR ON INFLATION IS FOUGHT ON OLD, COWARDLY, ASTIGMATIC LINES

The recurrent uproar about inflation has an almost Alice in Wonderland character. When people are not under the ritualistic dread of inflation, the greatest economic good is supposed to consist of full employment and full production.

Every so often, however, when the economy is moving toward those ends, the cry goes up that the "economy must be cooled off." The Federal Reserve System's chairman, William McChesney Martin, Jr., is always waiting just off stage to do his act when the economy becomes too productive.

After the usual warnings about how nations have been destroyed by inflation, Martin raises the rediscount rate to the banks. This means the banks have to pay more for the money they borrow and thus have to charge more to their borrowers.

Early this year the whole process of cooling off the economy through higher bank interest rates began. Recently bank interest to prime borrowers reached 7.5 per cent, about the highest it has been in several decades.

Of course, when prices rise faster than production and eat up purchasing power, inflation is a very real threat. It has to be stopped. But why must it be stopped by slowing down the economy? By more unemployment?

During the 1950s were three recessions caused largely because people could think of no way to curb inflation except by slowing down the economy. The result was to increase the unemployment rate to its highest figure since the 1930s. Billions of dollars were lost through underproduction.

Why do not the leaders of the nation ever confront the fact there are ways of checking inflation other than by high interest rates and fouling up production and employment?

One of the most obvious but rarely admitted ways is to lower prices by making the economy truly competitive. Monopolistic activities should be broken up. Yet the antitrust division has just dismissed an 11-year old fight to pump true competition into the gas pipeline operation. The "administered price" area of the economy whereby companies play follow the leader in fixing prices is left almost unscratched.

Rather than do any of these things, rather than buck the powerful interests involved, government as today constituted shows a disposition to step on the little fellow's toes as he waits out still another cooling off of the economy.

WILLIAM J. DRIVER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress, including myself, lauded President Nixon's publicly announced decision several weeks ago to conduct a nationwide talent search to fill high-level positions in the Federal Government. We were given to believe that it was the President's intention to continue the policy of President Johnson of bringing into the Government men and women of talent, experience, and good judgment irrespective of their partisan affiliation. We were also given to believe it was his intention to adopt the corollary policy of retaining in office those men and women who have proven themselves to be dedicated career public servants. We lauded that announcement, Mr. Speaker, because we believed it.

Now, however, we are told that the President, apparently bowing to partisan pressures, is about to drive out of the Government one of the most dedicated, impartial, talented, and sensitive men it has been my pleasure to know—the Honorable William J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Driver is a career man in Government. His service dates back to the 1940's. His talents and his desire to serve the veteran community of this Nation are seemingly limitless. Yet in one of the most outrageous, contemptible maneuvers devised by partisan politics, this man, this dedicated public servant, is being told to go packing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not even know what Bill Driver's political leanings are, and I do not really care. The solid, responsible administration of the Veterans' Administration is far more important than its Administrator's partisan affiliations. It really does not matter what his political affiliation is. What does matter is the fact that his removal is a blow to the morale of every career employee in the Federal Government and an affront to every veteran and veterans' organization in the country.

Bill Driver was brought into the Government by Gen. Omar Bradley. He has served under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. He has risen up through the ranks by dint of his ability, not through any "political clout." Yet even this background does not seem

to immunize him from the arrogance of the spoils system.

I am appalled, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the President will change his mind and retain Bill Driver as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

CONGRESSMAN'S HANLEY'S SENTIMENTS ON INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to express my sentiments on a number of the areas in the Internal Revenue Code where abuses have developed which are costing the Treasury considerable amounts of revenue.

I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will present the House with a comprehensive tax reform bill which will substantially increase the revenue available to the Federal Government without increasing at all the burden already imposed on our low- and moderate-income taxpayers.

I should like to relate some relevant thoughts on these matters.

CAPITAL GAINS TAXATION

Like many parts of the U.S. Tax Code, the provisions regarding capital gains taxation were written with some reasonable justification, but have since been abused to such an extent that it would be wise to once again examine them carefully.

The basic regulation, of course, is that long-term capital gains—realized on the sale of assets such as stocks or other income producing property held more than 6 months—are taxed at one-half the ordinary rate. In other words, if you are in the 20-percent tax bracket, \$1 additional revenue obtained from the sale of capital goods would be taxed only at a 10-percent rate. However, the maximum effective rate of capital gains taxation is 25 percent. This means that those in the 70-percent tax bracket pay no more on capital gains than those in the 50-percent bracket. So the very rich—those with taxable incomes on joint returns of more than \$400,000—pay just over one-third of their regular tax rate for capital gains, while those with lesser incomes—\$45,000 or less on joint returns—pay one-half of their regular rates for the same capital gain.

Another comparison will demonstrate the value of capital gains rates to those who can afford to utilize them. The ordinary worker drawing a salary of \$7,000 a year can expect to pay roughly \$1,100 in tax, while another taxpayer whose sole income is \$7,000 made from long-term capital gains on stock investments will only pay the Federal Government \$400.

It must be emphasized that the law which permits this kind of situation is not necessarily what has come to be known as a "loophole," because the reasoning behind some form of tax incentive to capital investment is sound. Obviously, an expanding economy needs capital investment and there must be

some sort of reward commensurate with the risk of this kind of investment. However, there is a big difference between the long-term investor and the stock market speculator who sells his stock at a profit after the 6-month minimum holding period.

The time has come to take a hard look at this capital gains provision, for, according to the annual report of the Treasury, this support of capital investment for just individuals alone costs the Federal Government \$4.5 billion yearly. Perhaps the minimum holding period should be extended to 3, 4, or 5 years, or perhaps the 25-percent maximum rate should be repealed so that capital gains would be taxed at half the ordinary rate up to a maximum of 35 percent. At any rate, when the revenue cost is so large, a complete review of the situation is in order.

The low capital gain rates have been used in specific ways which many tax reformers have branded as loopholes.

STOCK OPTIONS

The granting of special stock options to certain company executives has proved to be a most rewarding practice for those preferred employees, but a very costly one for the Federal Government. The Revenue Act of 1964 helped to close the door somewhat on the most serious abuses, but the opening is still wide enough to permit most executives to slip through this loophole, and further reform is needed.

According to present law, an executive can be granted "qualified stock options" which are supposed to be approved by the stockholders and must be exercised within 5 years. This option enables the executive to purchase a certain amount of stock, any time within 5 years after the option is granted, but at a price not less than the market value of the stock at the time he receives the option. In other words, say an employee was given an option in 1964 on stock worth \$50 per share. If that stock was selling today at \$200 per share, he could still pay just \$50, in effect realizing a capital gain of \$150. The law states that this executive must hold the stock for 3 years before sale in order to receive the special capital gains rates. However, if he waits until 1972 to sell his stock at, say, \$300 per share, he can realize a net gain of \$250 per share, taxable at the low capital gains rates. In contrast, if the ordinary employee received a \$250 bonus or raise, this addition to his income would be taxable according to the full tax bracket schedules. It is also worth mentioning that the executive is not obliged to purchase the stock, so that, if its value should decline during the 5-year period, he would simply not exercise his option.

CAPITAL GAINS ON ASSETS TRANSFERRED AT DEATH

One of the most outstanding loopholes and one attacked very frequently by tax reformers is the provision regarding taxation of capital assets transferred at death. The argument here is that this loophole violates one of the fundamental principles of our tax system, horizontal equity—the concept that those of equal wealth should pay approximately the same taxes. An example will clarify the

problem. Suppose that an individual buys \$100,000 worth of stock which appreciates in value till it is worth \$500,000 at the time of his death. If he leaves this stock to his heirs, the capital gain of \$400,000 will never be subject to any income or capital gains tax. And should his heirs sell the stock some time later for \$600,000, they will pay a capital gains tax only on the \$100,000 the stock has increased in value since the time of the transfer. The first individual has actually experienced a \$400,000 increase in his wealth on which he paid no taxes whatsoever. If another individual received \$400,000 in income in the form of wages or dividends, he would be subject to a very substantial tax. Of course, the value of the stocks transferred at death is taxed according to the estate tax schedules, but this does not resolve the inequity since the estate tax also falls on income accumulated after income tax.

EXCESS DEPRECIATION

Those people who are in a position to invest in rental dwellings, office buildings, or other such buildings, are able to take advantage of another lucrative loophole. According to present law, the owner of such an asset is allowed to calculate a certain percentage of its value as "depreciation", and deduct this amount from his adjusted gross income in order to compute his taxable income. Further, the owner has the option of computing a more rapid rate of depreciation for the first few years than would be determined according to a "straight line" depreciation. In other words, if a wealthy individual constructs an office building with a useful expectancy of, say 40 years, at a cost of \$5 million, his "straight line" depreciation would be 2½ percent or \$125,000 per year. However, he is allowed to take an accelerated depreciation in the early years of nearly twice this rate according to the "double declining balance" method or the "sum of the years digits" method. The latter method is slightly more advantageous to this investor and so this will be used as the more likely example. According to this formula, after 10 years, or one-fourth the useful life of the building, the owner will have been able to write off 43.3 percent of the cost of the building as depreciation. In other words, over this 10-year period, the owner would have been able to deduct \$2.16 million from his other sources of income before computing his taxable income. Put another way, this wise investor has realized over a 10-year period more than \$2 million of tax-free income.

All this would be equitable, of course, if the value of the building actually was decreasing at the depreciation rate used for tax purposes. But in reality, it is far more usual that real estate such as this does not decrease in value nearly this fast, and may even increase during the first few years. Assume, for purposes of simplicity, that in this case the market value of the building is still \$5 million, and our investor sells his property for exactly what he paid for it. The law requires that he pay a capital gains tax only on the difference between the market price and the depreciated book value,

or in this case, on \$2.16 million. At the maximum capital gains rate of 25 percent, his tax would be \$540,000.

If one examines the total profit enjoyed by a smart investor such as this, the magnitude of the injustice suffered by less wealthy taxpayers becomes clear. Over a 10-year period, the owner of this building has realized tax-free income of \$2.16 million and has paid a total in taxes of \$.54 million, for a tax-free, net gain, of \$1,620,000. Now, even if our assumption that the building still had a market value of \$5 million after 10 years was unwarranted, it remains true that as long as the market value of such real estate exceeds the depreciated book value, then to that extent the owner receives an undeserved tax break. The report on tax reform put out by the Treasury Department sums up the situation in these words on page 440:

These book profits reflecting the artificial writedown of the depreciable investment by accelerated depreciation represents deductions previously taken against ordinary income, so that the whole process represents a conversion of ordinary income into capital gain for tax purposes.

Of course, the figures used in the above example are only hypothetical. But the statistics published in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for fiscal 1968 are very real. The Treasury Department estimates the tax loss from excess depreciation of rental housing and other buildings to be \$750 million.

TAX-EXEMPT STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

The exemption from taxation of the interest on State and local bonds is another example of a situation which seems rationally justifiable on the surface, but cannot bear a more penetrating analysis.

This exemption was written into the original income tax law of 1913 in order to make it easier for State and local governments to finance capital improvements. By exempting the interest from these bonds from any income tax, the States and localities have been able to make their bond issues attractive, even though they pay a substantially smaller rate of interest than corporate bonds—approximately 4 percent as compared to 7 percent. In fact, investors find these issues so attractive that State and local governments are holding approximately \$100 billion in outstanding bonds at the present time. With this money, they are able to finance schools, roads, water purification plants, hospitals, and other public facilities.

However, there are two important drawbacks to this system. From an economic viewpoint, it costs the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars in lost tax revenues and, from the viewpoint of equity, it provides a tax haven for the very rich.

In considering the latter problem first, former Senator Paul Douglas, in a recently published article offered an instructive example. He noted that when Mrs. Horace Dodge, Sr., inherited \$56 million from the estate of her husband, she immediately invested the entire amount in State and municipal bonds. Assuming a 4-percent rate of return, this

would provide her with a tax-free income of approximately \$2 million annually. This is an extreme example, of course, but the fact remains that over 80 percent of tax-free bonds held by individuals are in the hands of the wealthiest 1 percent of the population. Senator Douglas estimates that approximately \$3.5 billion in interest is paid every year on such bonds, and it certainly seems anomalous, to say the very least, that each year \$2.8 billion of this tax-free income flows into the pockets of the wealthiest 1 percent of our citizens.

To return to the other problem, this tax loophole, according to the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, cost the Federal Government \$1.8 billion in fiscal 1968. Now it must be kept in mind that the tax exempt status for these bonds serves an important purpose from the standpoint of the States and municipalities, and it would be unwise to alter this provision without regard to their interests. But, fortunately, there is a relatively simple solution to this apparent dilemma which safeguards the interests of the States and localities, yet eliminates the tax shelter for the very wealthy and saves the Treasury a great deal of revenue at the same time. The answer is to tax the interest from these bonds at the regular rates, but have the Federal Government subsidize the State and local governments for the higher interest rates they would have to pay to make their bond issues competitive. This sounds at first like borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. But it has been estimated that, where the Treasury loses \$1.8 billion, the States save in lower borrowing costs only about \$0.9 billion. In other words, the Federal Government would come out comfortably ahead in this deal.

If the long-standing regulation permitting tax-free interest on municipal bonds was at least grounded in reason, the extension of this privilege to industrial development bonds by a 1954 Treasury Department ruling was completely unjustified. Under this ruling, communities were permitted to issue tax exempt bonds to finance the construction of plants and facilities for private corporations. The community would simply build the plant according to the directives of a particular company and then rent the facility back to this company, using the rental fees to retire the bond issue. Since the municipality is able to borrow money through bond issues at a significantly lower rate than could a private corporation, this represents a substantial saving to the corporation. Naturally, the reason a municipality would go out of its way to provide such a service is to attract industry to the community. And this practice was followed with considerable success by a number of Southern States. However, this practice forced other States to react defensively until presently there are 44 States which authorize such industrial development bonds. The result, of course, is that virtually no State has an advantage over another in this area. Now the only winner is the corporation which is, in effect, subsidized by the municipality, and the loser is the Federal Treasury, which recoups its losses out of the pockets of the average taxpayer.

MULTIPLE CORPORATION SURTAX EXEMPTION

Many large corporations have been able to slip through a very profitable loophole known as the "multiple corporation surtax exemption." While the name sounds imposing, the principle behind it is actually quite simple. The regular income tax rate for corporations is 48 percent, but, in order to assist small corporate businesses, Congress stipulated that the first \$25,000 of income receive an "exemption" of 26 percent. In other words, the effective tax rate for the first \$25,000 of corporate income is only 22 percent.

The problem with this regulation, however, is that its chief beneficiary has not been small businesses, but the very large corporations. Simply by dividing the corporation into a series of separate corporate units, each of which has an income of less than \$25,000, many large corporations have been able to take undue advantage of the lower tax rate. In fact, there is one case on record of a corporation that divided itself into 734 separately incorporated units, for an annual tax saving of nearly \$5,000,000. The 1964 Revenue Act attempted to narrow this loophole somewhat by adding an additional 6-percent penalty tax on the first \$25,000 of income of each corporate unit actually controlled by a larger corporate complex. The loophole has been narrowed, but not shut. And through this aperture will pass—according to Treasury Department estimates—\$235 million of uncollected revenue in 1968.

TAX-LOSS OR HOBBY FARMING

When is a loss really a gain? When is a farmer not really a farmer? The answer to both questions is when the nonfarmer is a wealthy businessman who runs a farm at a "loss" strictly for tax purposes.

The ordinary businessman is obliged to follow certain rigid accounting practices in determining his annual income and making such computations as the amount of current inventory or the rate of depreciation of investment assets. However, the Internal Revenue Code has long permitted liberal deviations from these regulations for the farmers in order to spare them the bookkeeping operations that would be necessary to comply with strictly correct accounting procedures. Those who wrote into the tax laws this exception to the rule acted rationally, but they could not foresee the abuse to which this provision would be subject.

For most business enterprises, the cost of a capital investment—including maintenance of the asset prior to its being used—is not deductible as a current expense, but may be written off gradually over the useful life of the asset according to a depreciation schedule. However, farmers have been permitted to deduct, as they are incurred, expenses which are admittedly capital investments. For example, a farmer engaged in raising livestock for breeding purposes may deduct these capital expenses from current income in order to compute taxable income.

The problem comes when wealthy individuals begin to take advantage of this provision solely for tax purposes. Those in the high income tax brackets

find it advantageous to engage in such farming activities as the raising of cattle in order to lessen their tax burden. Because an investment in livestock brings no immediate return, it is computed as a "tax loss" which can then be deducted from other nonfarm income, resulting in large tax savings. Of course, such a "loss" is nothing other than an investment which can be recovered at a later time, and the return on this investment will then be taxable only at the lower capital gains rates.

An example may help to indicate the real dollars and cents value of this loophole to those wealthy enough to take advantage of it. Suppose that a wealthy entrepreneur decides to enter the cattle-raising business, and this adventure costs him \$100,000 over some period of time. Under present law, he can set off this "tax loss" against an equal amount of nonfarm income, which in effect means that the first \$100,000 of his income over this period is completely tax free. It is hardly unreasonable to assume that our "farmer" could sell the herd for at least the \$100,000 which he had invested, and he would only pay a capital gains tax on this sale of a maximum of 25 percent.

As in the case of the excess depreciation on real estate investment assets, this whole process really amounts to a conversion of ordinary income into capital gains purely for tax purposes. And, naturally, the higher the tax bracket of the investor, the greater the incentive to become a nonfarmer. Suppose, for example, that in this case the individual was in the highest, or 70-percent bracket. At regular rates, he would have paid \$70,000 in income tax on this first \$100,000 of his income; using this tax dodge, he would only have paid \$25,000 in taxes, for a net gain to him of \$45,000 and a net loss to the Treasury of the same amount.

In addition to the revenue loss, which has been estimated at \$400 million per year, the Treasury Department notes two other serious consequences of this tax-loss farming by wealthy individuals. On the one hand, the true farmer who must support his family from his farm income faces unfair competition from the "gentleman farmer" who has no incentive to show a profit. And on the other hand, the attractive tax benefits that accompany this tax-loss farming enterprise have induced wealthy individuals to bid up the price of farm land beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy.

GIFT TAXES

Since gifts during lifetime are a natural alternative to bequests made at death, it was quite reasonable for the Federal Government to develop—in 1932—a system of gift taxes to supplement the already existing estate taxes. What appears now to have been less well considered was the decision to fix the schedule of gift tax rates at only about three-quarters of the corresponding rate for estate taxes. This disparity in rate schedules, compounded by certain other provisions pertaining to gift tax regulation, has created a situation where the very rich are the beneficiaries of unintended tax advantages.

The very wealthy are in an enviable situation simply because they can afford

to give away larger portions of their estates during life rather than disposing of the estate at death. Figures released in the "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals" of the Treasury Department show that, where the very wealthy transfer slightly more than 10 percent of their total wealth accumulations during lifetime, those with smaller estates transfer less than 2 percent of their property by means of lifetime gifts. Put another way, the evidence indicates that 52 percent of those with large estates—the estates were simply classified as small, medium, and large—made gifts during lifetime, but only 10 percent of those with small estates made lifetime transfers.

Even a cursory examination of gift tax regulation makes it easy to understand why those who can afford the luxury, prefer to transfer their estates during lifetime. To begin with, there are rather liberal exemptions that may be taken into consideration when computing the "taxable gifts" for any one year. The "per-donee" exclusion exempts the first \$3,000 of gifts to each recipient, and this exclusion jumps to \$6,000 where the spouse agrees to treat gifts made by the other spouse as having been made one-half by each. Also, the law permits an additional exemption of \$30,000 per recipient, spread over the lifetime of the donor or taken in any one year. And here too, this exemption doubles where couples agree to treat gifts made jointly as if they were made individually. These provisions mean that, over a period of 20 years, a wealthy couple would be able to transfer to each of their children a tax-free sum of \$180,000.

In addition, it is important to realize that while both the estate and gift tax rates are progressive, the estate tax rates are applied only to transfers made at death, without regard to lifetime gifts. This means that the person who can afford to make lifetime transfers reaps a double advantage: he enjoys the lower gift tax rates—including the liberal exemptions—and the remainder of his property transferred at death is subject to a new and very low beginning set of rates.

Finally, the lower gift tax rates—as mentioned above, approximately three-fourths of the estate tax rates—are applied to a different and smaller tax base than are the estate tax rates. According to present law, the estate tax is paid by the recipient as a certain percentage of the transfer. The gift tax, however, is paid by the donor, and the amount of the tax is never added to the gift before determining the principal against which the progressive tax rates are to apply. In other words, if an individual dies leaving a taxable estate of \$10 million, the Federal Government will receive \$6,088,200 and the heirs will get slightly less than \$4 million. But if another individual gives away the same \$10 million during his lifetime, he will be able to transfer approximately \$7 million to his heirs, and pay a tax of a little less than \$3 million. He can keep this additional 75 percent of the wealth within the family because the tax base for this gift is not \$10 million, but the \$7 million actually transferred to his heirs. The other \$3 million

is used to pay the gift taxes on the \$7 million gift. In both cases, of course, the original estate actually transfers the \$10 million, but the tax savings when the gift is made during lifetime are substantial.

Congressman REUSS, in title X of his bill, proposes a 25-percent increase in the gift tax rates to bring them in line with the estate tax schedules. He estimates that this would bring in \$150 million in extra revenues annually.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Private philanthropy plays a special and vital role in our society—

States the recently published Tax Reform Studies and Proposals put out by the Treasury Department. Private philanthropic organizations provide "financial aid to areas which Government cannot or should not advance—such as religion," and in doing so, "they enrich the pluralism of our social order." For these reasons philanthropic organizations, such as foundations, have been accorded a tax-exempt status under our Internal Revenue Code.

Beginning in 1961, however, and under the vigorous leadership of Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, critics have pressed the charge that some foundations have seriously abused their tax-free status. Periodically since 1961, in his positions as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foundations of the House Select Committee on Small Business, Representative PATMAN has issued reports documenting his charges of misconduct. In addition, in 1965, the Treasury Department, at the request of the tax committees of the House and Senate completed an extensive study into the operations of private foundations.

While emphasizing that the activities of most foundations are above reproach, the Treasury report also noted that some foundations were operating for the personal gain of a few individuals or had become involved in activities unrelated to the purposes for which the original tax exemption was granted. In view of these findings, and in light of the recently completed hearings on foundations by the Ways and Means Committee, it is altogether appropriate that Congress reexamine the tax-exempt status of private foundations when considering proposals for tax reform.

For purposes of simplification, the many objections to the present regulations pertaining to private foundations can be divided into three general categories. The three basic allegations are that: first, through the use of foundations, a great deal of revenue is lost; second, much of the resources of foundations is devoted to activities not related to charity; and third, foundations have accumulated a disturbing amount of wealth and economic power.

The first criticism, that the tax-exempt status of private foundations costs the treasury hundreds of millions of dollars in lost tax revenue every year, is substantiated by Representative PATMAN in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means—on February 18 of this year. He revealed that in 1966, the 596 foundations studied by his subcommittee had an estimated gross income in excess of

\$1 billion, and all of this, of course, was tax free. He suggested at that time that a 20 percent tax be imposed on the gross income of these foundations, bringing in more than \$200 million to the Treasury.

Also, in connection with loss of tax revenue, it is a well documented fact that wealthy individuals set up foundations to escape estate taxes and perpetuate family control over their assets. Thus, the Ford Foundation now controls more than 90 percent of the equity in Ford Motor Co. Representative PATMAN, in his recent testimony, presented a list of what he termed "a few conspicuous examples" of wealthy Americans who have died in recent years, and whose estates, valued at more than \$293 million, escaped estate taxes through the foundation route. Mr. PATMAN expressed his emphatic agreement with Stanley S. Surrey, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, who said in 1967:

The present resort of tax and business planners to the creation of a business enterprise so as to perpetuate the family control of that enterprise is a complete distortion of the policies and philanthropic motivations that underlie the tax benefits granted charitable contributions and charitable institutions.

And in recent years, the moderately wealthy, as well as the very rich, have learned that foundations can be useful in avoiding income taxes as well as estate taxes. In fact, in 1966 an organization called Americans Building Constitutionally—ABC—was founded to instruct the wealthy in this very art. The ostensible purpose of this group is to "help citizens of the United States make full use of the rights guaranteed them under the Constitution." But, apparently, the right considered most important by the ABC is the right to avoid paying taxes.

Full membership in this organization eventually costs \$10,500, for which the member is entitled to such services as a 30-hour seminar on foundations, instruction on the legal problems of establishing a foundation, and a manual which includes everything from relevant sections of the Internal Revenue Code to detailed advice on setting up a foundation, administering scholarship grants, and apportioning expenses between foundation and personal budget. That these services are valuable can be verified by the case of a midwest doctor. Acting on information provided by the ABC, a general practitioner from Aurora, Ill., set up his own foundation, appointed himself as "medical administrator" and continued to treat the same patients in the same office as he had done in his private practice. The difference was that the fees were now paid to his tax-exempt foundation. In return, the foundation paid him a relatively modest salary, but supplied—tax free—a house, a car, a retirement plan, and insurance. It also employed his wife as assistant medical administrator and sent his four children to college on educational grants. It goes without saying that this kind of activity cannot be allowed to continue.

The second general criticism is that too great a share of the resources of private foundations—both in time and money—is devoted to pursuits not re-

lated to the purposes for which the tax exemption provisions were originally enacted. Critics list several examples in support of this contention. For instance, in a 1966 report, Chairman PATMAN noted that the 575 foundations in his study had accumulated \$4.6 billion in receipts during the 4 years from 1961-64—this figure includes capital gains. While only 48 percent of this amount was used for gifts and grants, more than 10 percent went to operating expenses. In fact, in his recent testimony, Mr. PATMAN revealed that the Rockefeller Foundation spent half as much just running its New York offices—\$5.4 million—as it spent throughout the entire Nation in 1966. He also noted that, in fiscal 1967, the Ford Foundation paid out \$446,262 just for public relations. Figures like these raise serious questions concerning the abuse by foundations of their tax-exempt status. After all, the tax exemption provisions were adopted to encourage philanthropy, not underwrite the cost of huge office buildings or maintain a good public image.

Another argument in support of this second general criticism is that a disproportionate amount of the time and energies of the administrators of these foundations is devoted to the accumulation of wealth, not the distribution of charitable grants. In other words, a number of foundations have become so intricately involved in the complexities of their business deals that their charitable pursuits have really become secondary. This accusation will be discussed in another connection below.

"Self-dealing" schemes, such as those outlined by the ABC organization discussed above, are offered as still a further example in support of this general criticism that much of the tax free foundation money is not being used for truly charitable purposes. The "self-dealing" schemes, in the form of high salaries and large expense accounts, may also be partly responsible for the large percentage of foundation receipts used for "operating expenses."

And finally several critics have seriously questioned the propriety of foundations sponsorship of certain kinds of activities. They point out that the tax-exempt status of foundations really means that the foundations are subsidized by other taxpayers, and consequently, certain activities should be proscribed.

A great deal has been written lately about the involvement of the Ford Foundation in the controversial decentralization plan for New York City's school system. Certainly no one questions the right of any private organization to support the political party, project, or cause of its choice. But it is important to remember that the tax exemption which helps to make this support possible, is little more than a subsidy from the public funds, a subsidy which must be paid by the average taxpayer. It may be time for Congress to take a very close look at the kinds of activities supported by what are, in effect, public funds.

The third general criticism of foundations is that they have accumulated an enormous amount of wealth, and conse-

quently are in a position to wield tremendous economic power. According to the Internal Revenue Service, there are over 30,000 private, tax-exempt foundations in the Nation, and WRIGHT PATMAN's Subcommittee on Foundations has determined that 596 of the most prominent of these organizations have assets totaling more than \$15 billion. This represents an amount 41 percent greater than the \$10.7 billion capital funds—capital, surplus, and undivided profits—of the 50 largest banks in the United States. Of these 596 foundations—according to Mr. PATMAN's recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee—136 held stock in 288 corporations at the close of 1966 in amounts ranging from 5 to 100 percent of the outstanding shares of at least one class of stock. According to Chairman PATMAN, this heavy involvement of foundations in the business world and the stock market poses serious danger of various kinds of illegal or unethical conduct, such as self-dealing schemes, activities involving conflicts of interest, unfair trade practices, and unfair competition. Many of these activities are prohibited by statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission, the Antitrust Division, or the Securities and Exchange Commission. But, as Mr. PATMAN further points out, the IRS has not, and is not equipped to, detect possible violations because it does not presently collect the relevant information.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has introduced a bill based upon a three-point plan designed to correct the most serious of these abuses. As he told the Ways and Means Committee recently, according to his bill:

(1) Every privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would pay a tax in the amount of 20 percent of its gross income, including capital gains. Gross income would be comprised of the following: gross profit from business activities; interest; dividends; gross rents; gross royalties; gain or loss from sale of assets, excluding inventory items; and other income, *excluding* contributions, gifts, grants, etc., received.

(2) A privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would not be permitted to own more than three percent of the outstanding shares of any class of stock of a corporation or to own more than a three percent interest in the capital or profits of a partnership.

(3) The net income of every privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundation would have to be disbursed annually for the purposes for which it was organized.

Finally, though by means of less importance, is the matter of depletion allowances for oil and certain minerals. I would hope that the committee in its deliberations on overall tax reform proposals will give firm consideration to and will adopt measures rigidly scaling down the present depletion allowances and where practicable, will abolish those allowances completely. A number of published reports over the last few years leave little doubt that severe abuses resulting in tax inequities have occurred repeatedly in this field.

The Ways and Means Committee has already received substantiating testimony to that effect. No tax reform proposals will be either complete or equitable until this grossly imbalanced situation is brought under control.

ANOTHER COAT OF MANY COLORS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans organization is an outstanding organization. Its leadership is competent and effective. The membership of this great service organization is always well informed.

We are all familiar with the DAV magazine, the official voice of the Disabled American Veterans. Included in this monthly publication are Chet Huber's "Legislative Reports," John Keller's "Service Comments," excellent remarks by National Adjutant Dale Adams and DAV's outdoor sportsman, Bill Burton, and the story of the month authored by my good friend, James E. Rogers, national DAV chaplain.

Jim Rogers is well known to the people of South Carolina and to members of the DAV throughout our country. We are proud of him. He is the first South Carolinian to hold such high office in this national organization.

Chaplain Rogers is a tireless worker. He visits hospitals, and clinics; he seeks out the shut-in, and the housebound. He lives to serve his fellow man. He loves his country and those who work to make it a better Nation for all mankind. He is proud of the DAV, having served it faithfully for over 21 years.

In a recent issue of the DAV magazine, Chaplain Rogers eloquently defines the real meaning of his organization while paying tribute to some of its past and present selfless leaders. The article deserves the attention of every Member of Congress:

ANOTHER COAT OF MANY COLORS

(By James E. Rogers)

The day was cold, and most of the enlisted men of the Roman barracks of Amieus, France, had decided to stay in during the evening hours. Like the G.I. of today, they were far from home. Lonely and away from home they looked forward to the day they could return to their homes and friends. Most of them had seen the countryside and visited the historic spots of their time.

But on a particular evening, one man felt that he had to get out and walk, for he had much on his conscience. He was just a lad of eighteen years and far from his birthplace in Savar, Hungary. Born of Roman parents and a citizen of the world's greatest nation of his time, he had, in the eyes of his parents, committed the unpardonable by accepting the Christian religion.

Now in the year 334 A.D., he walked the streets of the city pondering the decision to leave the pagan religion of Rome and embrace the Christian religion which was unpopular among the troops of Caesar. Being a Christian in the Samarobriya of Caesar was a courageous act on his part. Many of his friends taunted him about his newly found religion. Some of his former friends refused to speak to or associate with him. This worried him greatly as he walked the streets of the city that night.

As he wandered from one intersection to another with his thoughts attached to home and parents, his mind was awakened by the cry of a beggar sitting by the closed gates of a residence. "Alms, good man, please, alms," the beggar cried out through the cold dark night. Looking down at the shivering, tattered, ragged beggar squatting in recessed darkness, the young soldier repeated as one

had said years before, "I have no alms, but what I have, I will share with you." Then with tears in his eyes the young soldier removed the cloak from around his own shoulders. Taking the sword from his side he cut the cloak in half. Taking half of the severed cloak, he placed it around the shivering shoulders of the beggar. The other half he placed around his own shoulders.

Thus, we find the first recorded act of human kindness by one who was later to become a great saint of the early church. When he arrived back at the barracks late in the evening he was questioned about the cloak. One soldier wanted to know if he had been in a fight with citizens of the country, while others cast aspersions. Under pressure from his comrades he finally explained what had happened in the city. While still on the receiving end of chiding, he fell asleep.

When young Martin was discharged from the Army, he decided to become a missionary. Because of his newly found faith he was not welcomed back home. From rural countryside to wayside villages he journeyed practicing the simple virtues of love—ministering to the sick, the orphan, the shut-in, the widow, the war-wounded and the needy—whenever the occasion should arise. Because of his love for others, as mirrored through compassionate empathy, he attained renown throughout France. His very name was an inspiration to others "to go and do likewise" in behalf of others.

Many honors came to this distinguished son of the church. He was hailed and greeted by the rich and poor, the intellectual and illiterate—truly a manifestation of the concerned heart of France and her people. While the Goths and Visigoths were fighting around Tours, he was seen everywhere ministering to the wounded and sick. During this period of his life he was elevated by the church to become Bishop of Tours.

He founded the first monastic institution in Gaul, a monastic institution which was for generations to join others across the breadth of Christendom to further the welfare of man. When "Martin of Tours" died around 400 A.D. a sorrow swept across France, a nation which loved him deeply. His death was also felt throughout the life of the church. A great man had died; a great apostle of love was called home.

The good friends of France refused to let the memory of this great man die. They rose from the altar of prayer and said, "How can we ever forget the love which radiated from the life of one so close to God—a man who by precept and example, lived so unselfishly in behalf of others?" Through their concern and prayers, the church proclaimed him a Saint and appropriately named him, "Saint Martin of Tours." They went further by erecting a small building in his memory. In this they placed a cloak close to the altar as a memorial—a remembrance of the day back in Amiens when he shared his cloak with another. Outside the building they placed a permanent guard to watch over the cloak. People came from all parts of the country to see the memorial to the great saint.

The French word for cloak is "cappella." The one who cared for and guarded the cloak was called "a capellani." These words, modified over the centuries, became "chapele" and "chapelain," respectively. Today, in English, the words become "chapel" and "chaplain."

To Disabled American Veterans there is a suggestive significance in the meaning of the life of this great Saint. We, too, like this one of yesterday, live to serve our fellowman. We have left the army of our day, even as he did, to go out into the countryside, the village, and city to find those who are shut-in, housebound, lonely, orphaned, widowed, and wounded—gathering them together in common purpose—the service to others.

The Disabled American Veterans wear the

likeness of that cloak around their hearts. Each time it is severed on the part of the individual in sharing with another, it grows even greater in dimensions of devotional love and loyalty.

Time weaves incessantly with threads of thoughtfulness its patterned movement across plain, seashore, and mountains. Within the cathedral of this great organization there stands high in the belfry of the heart the clarion call of humility monitored by the heartbeat of every disabled congregant. These are ever responding in sharing the cloak of love. No one individual wears the cloak alone, but it drapes every chapter and her membership. When used in the service for others, it reflects exquisite taste and beauty. It never seeks to harm, but is continuously found in a variety of color, forms, and movement to warm the huddled forgotten ones resting away from the beaten pathway of hurrying humanity. The threads of the fabric of the coat are woven again and again with succor, support, assistance, thoughtfulness, beneficence, kindness, relief, love—and as long as every member seeks, through prayer and labor, to weave such a cloak, the Disabled American Veteran will continue to be the best-dressed man in America. As long as the cloak is shared and shed for another the emblematic spirit of him or her who wears it will honor the true spirit which created and designed it before the altar of sacrifice and prayer. There are no seconds as found in some basement department store. These cloaks worn by the disabled congregants were purchased for a price found only on the top floor of human endeavor in that department owned and operated by America.

During this past convention in Philadelphia I saw again the evidence that the cloak is worn around the heart of those in attendance. (This I have noticed during my twenty-one years of membership.) When a bus load of members left the convention hall to journey to New York to honor one who had worn the cloak and shared a thousand pieces with others, observers knew that the cloak still is alive and is vibrant in honoring one who knew its meaning so well. When "P. D. Jackson of Buddy Chapter" of Texas stopped me in the lobby and said a delegation was going to New York to honor our beloved Past National Commander Milton Cohen, I could readily see that Comrade Jackson was taking a small bit of the cloak of love from every heart of the convention. The Disabled American Veterans are better, and America is better, because of men like Milton Cohen who fought in the 69th. When the last rites were held for Milton at the Forest Park Chapel at Queens Boulevard and Seventy-sixth Road, Rego Park, friends were there from across this great land. Hanging high in the hall of memory of everyone that called him friend is that multi-colored coat of love which he wore so proudly.

Another example of the breadth of this coat worn by those at the convention was depicted by friends of Danny Netwall of Columbus, Georgia. When Danny was stricken with a heart attack, Comrade Sheehan of Massachusetts carried him to the hospital and helped as much as any man does on the battlefield when life is endangered. When the Georgia delegation learned of Danny's sickness, there spread a labored concern of love, led by Johnnie Davis, through all hearts. The delegation made arrangements for Danny's wife and daughter to fly up to the city. As Senior Vice Commander of the State of Georgia Danny had wanted to attend one National Convention. This he did and while in Philadelphia he was called by God to a greater convention—a convening among old comrades in a better land where his heart was wrapped with the cloak of love by the hand of God.

Surely other evidences of this cloak of love were portrayed during the convention which the Chaplain does not know of or was

unable to see, but it was there for all comrades willing to see and hear.

Who stands guard over this cloak? Every Disabled American Veteran. This cloak is so precious to the heart of the organization that guards have been elected and appointed since the first congregants gathered in Detroit, Michigan, June 28, 1921. There are those within the bounds of the organization who know of her illustrious life better than I—such men as Captain Hogan and others, but the ones I have met have been men of broad stature and integrity—men who have been willing to shoulder a task with honor and meaning in giving a noble purpose to her growth and guiding her through valley and peak to the place where she stands tall like a mountain in the affairs of America today. When I have been able to shake the hand of men like J. L. Monnahan, Milton D. Cohn, General J. M. Wainwright, Howard W. Watts, Judge Alfred L. English, Floyd L. Ming, I know I have touched the hands of folk who have worked unselfishly in behalf of others. Men who have hands wide enough to encompass the total need of the height of the organization. When I have been privileged to hear the voices of men like Boniface R. Malle, Joseph Burke, David Williams, Bill H. Fribley, W. O. Cooper, Francis R. Buono, I know I have heard words of guidance and wisdom—words which give meaning to the life of the cloak. They are individuals who have given sustenance to the roots and branches of the ever encompassing cloak to warm the hearts of all persons searching for shelter and warmth. The acropolis character imparting security and peace to those principles which are just, praiseworthy, and pure and which inspire continuity of purpose in the displaying of this great cloak gleams from the lives of men like Peter Dye, Douglas H. McGarrity, William G. Dwyer, and Claude L. Callegary.

During the convention last year, under the leadership of John W. Unger, Sr., I was allowed to offer several prayers during the convention. For the thoughtfulness on the part of Father Joseph Lauro in sharing the moment of prayer from the platform, I shall ever be grateful. His politeness, his dedication, his address of thoughtfulness is an ever higher testimony of the esteem and love he has held in the heart of all.

During the past year, our past Commander in Chief, the Keeper of the Cloak of Service, Francis J. Beaton, has carried the office with great dignity. The philosopher Plutarch has said: "True and perfect friendship requireth these three things: virtue, as being honest and commendable; society which is pleasant and delectable; and profit, which is needful and necessary . . ." His has been a true and perfect friendship to all—not only a pleasant one, but all disabled veterans have profited because of his leadership. Beyond admiration, "Won't you agree with me" that he has through his passionate devotion to the office exemplified those high ideals which has thrust the service of the Disabled American Veterans to every nook and cranny where a disabled soldier could be found? He consecrated the office with tireless effort in extending his energy to the circumference of each and every demand he encountered. He surely leaves a legacy to the heritage of the organization which shall long be remembered.

The vastness of the purpose of the cloak of service in behalf of others carries with it required accouterments far reaching in scope and depth. The few who have guarded well the trust of the coat are affluent with strength and direction. These command the highest encomium from every listed member within the body of disabled congregants. Animating from the concerned heart of men like Chet Huber, John Keller, and Denzel Adams there have arisen a strength of direction and service unequal in the illustrious history of our organization.

The imaginative minds of all the service

officers should call forth an "Amen" from everyone. These consistently are draping the shoulders of the wounded wherever one can be found. They constantly depict a dexterity toward others unchallenged by any service organization in America.

One could easily call the roll of the membership and hear said: "I have felt the warmth of the coat of service and have, equally shared it with others. Moreover, one cannot attend the few National Conventions, as I have, without seeing the visible texture of the cloak of service in the great regard and affection all have for Joseph Harold . . . the qualities of friendliness of John Delaney . . . the ever thoughtfulness of "Johnnie" Davis . . . the persistence of "Brother" Burton . . . the attentiveness of "Paddy" Driscoll . . . the cheerfulness of Ah Kee Leong . . . the ever congenial John P. Geary . . . the quiet dignity of Raymond Neal . . . the Memorial Honor Roll under the excellent watchcare of Miles H. Draper, Esq. . . . the honored gentleman at all times and constant thoughtfulness of Henry Wentworth . . . the affableness at all times of Louis N. Stamas . . . sick and should be in bed but ever searching for new members, Cliff Lancaster . . . always having the time to have coffee with a friend, Charles W. Schamp . . . thoughtfulness toward others, A. Eddie Piazza—yes, a book could be written concerning the virtues displayed by the many convened in Philadelphia, but time and space are not available. But this I do know, that in every State, each day, a record volume is printed across the hearts of thousands who have found a haven of warmth wherever Disabled American Veterans are known. These will be bound by "Love for Others" and placed upon the shelf of time.

One above others stood before the convention and pledged himself in an unequivocal manner to exert his full energy in leadership to take this cloak of service to the naked—to the needy—to the orphan—to the widow—wherever they can be found. Our Commander Wayne L. Sheirbon, life member since 1947, has honored the cloak of service through pledged faith over these many years. Under his wise leadership we will continue to engage in a great and arduous struggle for fulfillment of the spirit and purpose of this preeminent organization. The breadth of his arms in lifting high the ideals will be longer when we uphold him with the strength of our arms. He will be able to see further into the future with the focused concern from our eyes. His heart will be able to beat louder when he shares the throbbing beats of our hearts. His footsteps will be firmer when he is able to hear the echo of cadence from the footsteps of the members. And his spirit will find strength when others join him daily at the altar of prayer.

Lord Tennyson said many years ago that "we are all a part of that which we meet daily in life." This being true, our Commander shall, this year, by the grace of God, share truly with others a cloak of love and service in behalf of others. May God give him that strength.

The cloak has no dimensions, no circumference, or height in its reach. There is a size for everyone. Its color is determined by the heroism of the spirit of the one who is willing to wear it. A cloak, a chapel, or a cathedral is determined only by assessment and vision in the testimony of service.

Pause again and study the Disabled American Veterans' symbol.

MISSIONARY WORK AND U.S. AID IN GHANA, TOGO, AND KENYA

(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, in the latter part of last year a good friend, Mr. George Tworoger, returned from a most interesting trip to the nations of Ghana, Togo, and Kenya. He was deeply impressed with the missionary work of the United Church of Christ as well as with the contributions being made through the American embassies and the U.S. aid missions. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like at this point to have published in the RECORD Mr. Tworoger's letter to me:

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 6, 1968.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Congress of the United States,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR CLAUDE: Thank you very much for your letter of July 8, 1968. I have just returned to Miami after a fascinating trip to Ghana and Togo and parts of Kenya.

To enumerate the details of this experience would take pages. May it suffice to say that I was tremendously impressed with the work of the missionaries of the United Church of Christ who are now working within an entirely different format than was true in colonial times.

The old missionary who was determined to baptize the heathen and put some clothes on him has vanished. In his place we have dedicated specialists who are concerned with improving agriculture and economic situations, health and education in addition to bringing the Good News to the people.

Our church sends missionaries only at the request of the indigenous church for specialized ministry and each missionary is pledged to do his best to train a native replacement to take over his function at the earliest possible time so that our missionary may move on to new and different challenges.

I do not want to close this letter without expressing my great admiration for the work the American Embassies and United States Aid Missions are doing in the countries I visited. We hear only too often of the waste and meaningless projects obviously conducted at the tax payers expense. I am certainly no authority on this subject, but the projects I was privileged to see at first hand and the people from the Embassies and the Chief of the United States Aid Mission on towards the field worker was that of dedicated people who are determined to put meaningful projects into effect under a constantly tightening budget.

Perhaps at a later date I will have an opportunity to report to you in person. In the meantime I want to send you my best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

GEORGE TWOROGER.

SECRETARY STANS ANNOUNCES REVISIONS IN THE 1970 CENSUS

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Secretary of Commerce concerning the 1970 census of population and housing. The Secretary has recommended a number of changes that affect both the conduct of the census during 1970, and the data that will result from the census.

Since the census is specifically required by the U.S. Constitution, since it touches every resident within our boundaries, and since we are dependent upon its results for knowledge about ourselves

during the next 10 years, it should not be ignored.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we will have the opportunity at a later date to discuss this letter in the proper hearings to be held before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this way it will lead to the enlightenment and understanding for all concerned. I include the letter at this point in the RECORD:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "DOC": I have recently received from various Members of Congress a number of questions about the 1970 Decennial Census. I am sure that you have been receiving similar inquiries from your constituents.

The main purpose of this letter is to advise you of some immediate changes in census procedure which I have ordered. These changes include a substantial reduction in the number of individuals who will be asked to respond to the longer census forms. Approximately three million households previously designated to receive a 66-question form will now receive a questionnaire containing only 23 questions.

Questions relating to the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom facilities have been reworded to remove any implication that the government is interested in knowing with whom these facilities may be shared.

The Secretary of Commerce is exercising greater supervision over the general operations of the Bureau of the Census and independent experts have been retained to advise on census matters.

The questionnaire which will be mailed to households in 1970 will be accompanied by a cover letter explaining the great need for census data and emphasizing the confidentiality of all responses.

In addition to these changes, which are being implemented immediately, these further steps will be implemented after the 1970 census: (1) proposed questions will be submitted to the appropriate Committees of Congress two years in advance of future censuses; (2) an increased number of representatives of the general public will be appointed to various advisory committees which contribute to the formulation of census questions; and (3) a blue-ribbon Commission will be appointed to fully examine a number of important questions regarding the Census Bureau, including whether or not the decennial census can be conducted on a voluntary or a partially voluntary basis. The Commission would also examine and offer proposals for modernizing and improving the operations of the Census Bureau.

Because the 10-year lapse of time between decennial censuses can result in unfamiliarity regarding their nature and purpose, I felt it might be helpful to provide you with some basic data and information concerning the questions to be asked in 1970, the scope of the data sought, and the uses to which the results are put.

Some of the most frequently asked questions, along with my answers, follow:

1. Question: *Is the 1970 census more extensive than previous censuses?*

Answer: No. The number of questions to be asked in 1970 is about the same as in 1960, less than in 1950 and 1940, and far less than in some earlier censuses. Of the average household heads to be queried in 1970, four of five will answer 23 questions, three of twenty will answer 66 questions, and only one of twenty will answer 73 questions. Under certain unusual circumstances, some household heads will be asked to answer 89 questions.

2. Question: Will the citizen's right of privacy be protected in the 1970 census?

Answer: Yes. Whatever a respondent reports remains strictly confidential under the law. Every employee of the Census Bureau takes an oath of confidentiality and is subject to severe penalties for violation of the oath. In the long history of the census, there has never been a violation of the confidentiality of the information given.

3. Question: Would the 1970 census yield adequate results if the response were voluntary rather than mandatory?

Answer: Voluntary response at its best falls far short of response to a mandatory inquiry. Since the first Decennial Census in 1790, response has been mandatory. It is so in every other country of the world where a census is conducted. Professional statisticians will testify that a voluntary census would be unreliable and practically useless. A voluntary procedure would yield distorted and deficient statistics for whole groups of people and for entire areas. This procedure would very likely be especially prejudicial to low-income groups.

4. Question: Who uses the census results?

Answer: Census data are used by every Federal government department, State and local governments, and the private sector. Many laws depend upon accurate census reports. Questions such as those on housing are specifically required by statute. Government programs on poverty, housing, education, welfare, agriculture, transportation, veterans, and senior citizens require and rely upon the census tabulations. Many of the decisions of the Congress would be almost impossible in the absence of reliable census data.

These questions are illustrative of those which have been asked in recent weeks. The answers are necessarily brief. Enclosed is a memorandum which explains in more detail the purposes and uses of census information. If you have questions concerning the 1970 census, we would be pleased to discuss them with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

MAURY.

MR. GUILFORD DUDLEY, JR.

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President has today announced that he is nominating Mr. Guilford Dudley, Jr. of Nashville, Tenn., as our U.S. Ambassador to Denmark.

In so doing President Nixon is submitting the name of one of this Nation's most outstanding businessmen and one of Nashville's most distinguished citizens.

Mr. Dudley is president of the Life & Casualty Insurance Co. of Tennessee. But, as is the case with so many men who have risen to prominence because of their special abilities, Mr. Dudley is more than a businessman. He is a community builder and civic leader and the honor which is now bestowed on him is richly deserved for he will serve, I know, with distinction and dedication. Mr. Dudley is to be congratulated as is President Nixon in this fine appointment.

Mr. Dudley's nomination was noted by the Nashville Banner in an editorial entitled "Congratulations, Mr. Dudley." I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

CONGRATULATIONS, MR. DUDLEY

Citizens of Nashville and Tennessee who are cognizant of his extraordinary qualifications and his desire to be of public service share a deep sense of pride in the selection of Guilford Dudley Jr. as United States Ambassador to Denmark. The important appointment, which White House sources indicate will be announced officially within a few days, reflects honor not only upon Mr. Dudley and his well-established record of achievements, but also upon his community and his state.

As president of Life & Casualty Insurance Company since 1952, Mr. Dudley has exhibited his qualities of leadership in guiding the highly-respected firm through a period of vast expansion, underscored by construction of the 31-story L&C Tower and by attaining a new high level or more than \$3.25 billion in life insurance in force.

One of the South's foremost financial and social leaders, Mr. Dudley has played a key role in the development of a progressive city, serving with distinction in numerous other business capacities over the years. Prominent in insurance circles throughout the nation, he also is known on both sides of the Atlantic for his ability as a host and as a skillful horseman.

A chief factor assuring the success of Mr. Dudley's diplomatic mission will be his charming wife, Jane, whose outstanding beauty and graciousness as a hostess will be unsurpassed in this country's embassies in Europe and elsewhere.

Despite Mr. Dudley's busy schedule in business, he has contributed significantly of his time, energy and resources to community endeavors. He also has served as state finance chairman, and in other posts, for the Republican party in which he has been active for many years.

Ambassador-designate Dudley will be an asset to the diplomatic service, a creditable representative of the United States to a foreign country at a sensitive time when they are needed most throughout the free world.

The Banner happily joins his multitude of friends in extending congratulations and best wishes for a successful and fruitful tour of duty.

CBS VERSUS SMOTHERS BROTHERS

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the controversy which has arisen over the Columbia Broadcasting System decision to cancel the Smothers Brothers' contract has drawn a great deal of attention.

Commenting on the CBS decision on April 11, was the Babler of David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn., in an editorial entitled "CBS Justified in Canceling Smothers Brothers' Contract."

Mr. Speaker, I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

CBS JUSTIFIED IN CANCELING SMOTHERS BROTHERS' CONTRACT

Congratulations go to Columbia Broadcasting Studios on the recent cancellation of the Smothers Brothers' contract.

At long last a major entertainment corporation has taken an unequivocal stand on what should be demanded of its performers in standards of good taste.

The high network rating of the Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour—a bright spot on

the television dial for many Sunday night viewers—did not deter CBS from taking the drastic action to maintain its right to preview programs that go out on its network, and to make top level decisions about what they may include.

For too long the entertainment industry has swung from standards that were established by its own executives. Seemingly, it was beginning to be accepted that the employees, the performers, were occupying the upper end of the totem pole instead of the employers, the networks.

Those who have the responsibility for financing, producing and staging entertainment certainly should have the responsibility for deciding what may or may not be presented under their billing.

It seems a shame that anything as big as the giant networks should have been swayed so long by anything as small as a group of performers who arrogantly assume that the public is at their beckoning call.

The Smothers Brothers have no one to blame but themselves for flaunting the desires—and stated regulations—of their employers.

That this particular move took an ace away from CBS' hand is all the more reason to admire the company for standing up for its rights and for what it feels is the good of the general viewing audience.

ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROPOSAL

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, before the Ways and Means Committee, Hon. Charles Walker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and Hon. Edwin Cohen, Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, extensively detailed the Administration's tax proposal which was yesterday hailed as a reform to "lighten the burden of those who pay too much and increase the taxes of those who pay too little."

Closer examination of the proposal indicates that it does not live up to this billing.

During the past months and for several years we have heard endless testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on tax reform. The overwhelming evidence has indicated the need for hard-hitting, revenue-producing tax reform which the average taxpayer can understand. In the face of this strong case which has already been established, the administration has submitted a proposal which completely overlooks the big loopholes which have perpetuated the injustice of our tax system.

Where are the proposals to limit or reduce the oil-depletion allowance? Where are the proposals to reach tax-free, long-term gains and corporation-held tax-free bonds? What efforts are being made to recover \$12 billion in loophole-sheltered revenue under the President's proposals?

MINIMUM INCOME VERSUS LIMITED TAX PREFERENCE

The administration's substitute of the limited tax preference for the minimum income proposal originally recommended by Treasury is a "nonlaw," a statutory nothingness. It increases the tax on

sheltered untaxed wealth at only 5 percent of the original Treasury recommendation.

The Treasury's minimum tax proposal would have taxed untaxed wealth at the rate of \$420 million—almost one-half billion per year. The administration's proposal reduces the bite on sheltered tax-free wealth to \$20 million in 1969, \$40 million in 1970, and \$80 million in 1971.

The carryover averaging provisions included in the administration's proposal encourages the indulgence in tax-free wealth rather than suppressing it.

TAX-FREE BONDS

The administration's proposal completely exempts corporate and trust holdings of tax-free bonds from its tax reform proposals. Treasury officials yesterday testified that these bonds are 35 percent held by individuals and 65 percent held by corporations and others.

The administration's proposal perpetuates and legalizes the large-scale holdings of tax-free bonds by corporations and banks, trusts, and insurance companies which are already heavily invested in these securities.

LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS

The administration's proposals are completely silent on the long-term gain loophole in which \$16½ billion escape taxation every year. Certainly there is a distinction—or should be—between capital gains tax preference on a 6-month holding as distinguished from a 25-year holding of an asset. There is every reason to extend the holding period of assets for long-term tax treatment from 6 months to 1 year or to provide graduated long-term rates, providing the most favorable rate to the asset held the longer time. Reform of the capital gains tax in a reasonable manner would yield over \$3 billion in additional revenue without destroying the essentials of incentive for investment.

The administration's proposals completely overlook the need for taxing long-term gains at death, a proposal which would yield \$2.7 billion in additional revenue.

In substituting the misleading limit on tax preference for reform on capital gains, the administration is settling a proper Government claim for \$3.5 billion for \$20 million or one-half cent on the dollar.

OIL AND MINERAL DEPLETION

Oil depletion, the sacred cow of the establishment—remains sheltered—practically untouched by the administration's proposal. The original Treasury proposal clearly provided that the revenue loss due to the excess over cost depletion for all extractive industries totaled \$1.3 billion, of which \$1.1 billion is due to corporations and \$.2 billion to individuals. The administration proposes increased taxes of \$200 million on oil—a \$200 million settlement on a claim of upward of \$3 billion per year by way of the depletion loophole.

LITTLE TAX RELIEF FOR THE POOR

While the administration's proposal is offered as a measure providing tax relief

to 2,000,000 taxpayers existing on so-called poverty income, in fact it provides only \$665 million in tax relief for the poor, compared with the original Treasury proposal of this spring which provided exactly twice as much relief at an annual rate of \$1,130 million.

The administration's proposal exempts low family income for a family of four with income below \$3,500 from Federal income taxes. This is based on the assumption that 1969 poverty levels are assumed to be 6 percent above the Health, Education, and Welfare nonfarm poverty level for 1966. This assumption is not realistic. The rate of cost-of-living advance in 1969 is almost 6 percent ahead of 1968. The present poverty level for a family of four is upward of \$4,000 because of the inflationary impact of the past 12 months.

CONCLUSION

The administration's proposal falls far short in meeting the need for effective tax reform. Too much is left out. Too much is deferred. This may be the best opportunity for tax justice. The patient taxpayer has waited long enough.

NEED TO PLACE BASEBALL UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was disturbing to note in press reports over the last few days the latest gross injustice that has been perpetrated by baseball's management—the refusal to rehire umpires Al Salerno and Bill Valentine who were fired for attempting to organize the American League umpires last September.

We have all witnessed our one-time national sport become what is today a big-business operation. The sport has suffered—some say enthusiasm is decreasing, primarily because baseball's management is no longer interested in pleasing the fans. Their main interest and primary concern is the dollar.

They have repeatedly demonstrated in recent years how profits can make them extremely callous to the wants and needs of the fans and the players. The firing of umpires Salerno and Valentine should help us realize that umpires fall in the same category.

Of course, the one instance with which I am most familiar was the move of the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. This move increased my concern over this problem. Therefore, I introduced my bill, H.R. 60, in order to remove baseball's exemption from the antitrust laws of this country.

At present, baseball considers itself, and actually is, above the law. It is virtually untouchable.

The summary firing of Al Salerno and Bill Valentine last September is only the latest example of baseball's flagrant violations of the law and of the rights of the players and umpires.

The two umpires were merely attempting to organize the umpires of the

American League; suddenly, they were fired for "inefficiency."

In my opinion, and in the opinion of the sportswriters and managers, they were fired for trying to organize a union. They were threatening the autocratic control of the baseball "bosses."

Baseball can ride herd over the rights of everyone—umpires, players, fans—and they can get away with it because the Supreme Court granted the sport an exemption from the antitrust laws in 1923.

More recently, however, the Court has had second thoughts about this exemption. The Justices recognize that baseball has changed with the times. When first granted its exemption from the antitrust laws, baseball was primarily a sport. Today, however, baseball is primarily big business, and only secondarily a sport. In recognizing this fact the Supreme Court has said recently that any change in baseball's exemption must come from Congress.

Both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission apparently in agreement, strongly endorsed my bill last year. Reports from both agencies cited the necessity of congressional action to eliminate the present difference in the applicability of the antitrust laws to baseball and other sports.

Until the Congress takes action, baseball will continue to flaunt certain laws of this country. It will continue to trample on the rights of its umpires, its players, and its fans.

What we must remember is that this is but one instance in baseball's history of injustices to its umpires, players, and fans. This is an issue that must ultimately be decided by this Congress.

Therefore, I urge that the Judiciary Committee take early and favorable action on bill H.R. 60.

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the many encouraging developments of the first 3 months of the Nixon administration is the attention being given to the difficult problem of international trade.

In a thoughtful address to the Baltimore chapter of the Maryland Bankers Association on April 17, my good friend and colleague, Senator CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., reviewed the current international trade picture, the decisions already made by President Nixon, and the questions which we will face in the coming months.

Senator MATHIAS' remarks show a keen understanding of the importance of expanding trade to our national growth and that of our State of Maryland, as well as a firm grasp of the complicated issues involved.

His speech deserves wide attention, and I would like to include in the Record

both the text of his address and an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of April 18:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MATHIAS

I did not come here, needless to say, to tell you what to do with your money. Under our system you should decide that, though some Democratic Administrations have recently been trying to control how much of it is spent overseas. Rather I want to discuss what the new Administration is doing to improve your chances of getting more.

President Nixon's moves to phase out constraints on the international flow of capital bode well for his Administration. If he brings to the key questions of international trade policy the same calm intelligence he has shown in cutting down the interest equalization tax and other Johnsonian restrictions on overseas loans and investments, his Administration's international economic policies will be auspicious indeed.

The President acted in the face of a balance of payments deficit that is continuing unabated into the first months of this year. He was under great pressures to continue the restrictive approach of his predecessors. But he showed a confidence in our free economic system rare in the Presidency in recent years. And he showed a recognition that foreign investment ultimately benefits our payments balance as well as world economic growth. It is actions like this that makes me happy to have a Republican in the White House.

Trade policy will pose a similar challenge to the new Administration. International trade accounts for less than four percent of the American gross national product. It is thus a marginal item in the statistics of the American economy. In some ways, in fact, its importance is diminishing as our technology produces synthetic versions of formerly indispensable raw materials.

It is even possible that—following a period of adjustment while we all learn to live without coffee for breakfast and diamonds in our engagement rings—the United States could make do without any foreign commerce at all. Even now, in some of our larger cities, police dogs are replacing diamonds as a girl's best friend. And bourbon has long been a popular breakfast beverage in some circles. Of course, such a self-sufficiency program might also require conversion of the Port of Baltimore—which is estimated to generate almost a billion dollars annually for the Maryland economy—into a wilderness area.

None the less I don't recommend that we start calling Secretary Hickel right away for birdwatching concessions at Port Covington and Dundalk.

International trade continues to be a key preoccupation of the Congress and the Executive. Despite the siren call of self-sufficiency, there seems to be little real inclination to turn the United States into a tight little island in the world economy. You may have heard about what the New York Times described as "the most bitterly fought jurisdictional battle in the new Administration."

This battle did not revolve around bourbon and diamonds; or around the Office of Economic Opportunity in charge of President Johnson's beleaguered War on Poverty; nor did it erupt between the State Department and Professor Kissinger's fogless foggy bottom in the basement of the White House. Rather the battle focussed on trade.

The issue was whether the making of Administration trade policy would continue to be centered in the office of the President's Special Trade Representative or be shifted to the Department of Commerce, reputedly more responsive to domestic industry's requests (and more bound in bureaucracy). As it turned out, Commerce Secretary Stans has failed to gain control for his department and the STR will retain its still vague authority under the excellent leadership of Carl J. Gilbert, an advocate of liberal trade. The intensity of the struggle, however, is a reflection

of the key role of trade policy in the deliberations of the Administration today.

Congress, with its ultimate responsibility for our economic policy, is also deeply embroiled in trade controversies. On the one hand we are besieged by pressures from firms threatened by imports, some of whom seem to want to take advantage of our potential for self-sufficiency. And, though the clamor is less, consumer groups, farmers, department stores, and export-seeking business push us for further liberalization. Trade, in fact, promises to be one of the most contentious issues in American politics over the next several years.

You are all aware of one of the chief reasons for current controversy: a 22 percent increase in American imports last year—to an estimated total of \$33 billion. Our exports also rose handsomely in absolute terms. Our nine percent increase kept pace with the increase in total world trade, also nine percent, and brought our total exports to \$34 billion. Nonetheless, the surplus in our trade balance was reduced to one billion dollars, less than one-quarter of the 1967 level, one-seventh of the 1964 level and far too little to compensate for our other foreign outflows. The Vietnam War alone, for example, caused a direct payments deficit of about \$1.5 billion.

Despite the previous Administration's restrictions on U.S. private and public foreign aid, investment, lending and travel—many of which I opposed—the situation does not appear to be getting better. The February international payment figures were the worst in recent years. Since trade accounts for more than half of total U.S. balance of payment transactions, most analysis of our payments predicament and with proposals for arresting imports or stimulating exports.

In resolving on a policy it is well to avoid panic. We should understand that the chief cause of the influx of foreign products is American inflation. Economists have demonstrated that when the GNP rises more than five percent at current prices, domestic production falls to keep pace with rapidly increasing demands and imports soar. Last year the GNP rose by nine percent, including about five percent inflation. This fact alone comes near to explaining our present plight.

Under the conditions of an overheated economy, rising imports may cause economic unrest. But, in general, they siphon off demand that otherwise would push up prices still further. Without the recent import surge, our inflation would have been even more serious. To the extent that the import rise is due to inflation—and as I said, this appears to be the chief cause—measures to exclude imports, therefore, are a little like bourbon for breakfast. The relief is temporary and expensive and may be habit forming. Though it is a difficult fact of our politics that pressures for exorbitant protection always increase during inflationary periods, I am inclined to recommend the think drink rather than bourbon.

This does not mean, of course, that I overlook the other causes of increasing import competition—lower wages, greater access to capital and advanced technology, and larger markets overseas which give foreign firms the economies of scale formerly restricted to the huge U.S. market. The American steel industry, in addition, confronts European and Japanese competition which is to some extent subsidized by government, and which is organized in cartels that would violate American anti-trust laws. Nor do I deny the need for more effective assistance to firms or industries—and employees—seriously hurt by import expansion brought about by changing federal trade policy. Current adjustment assistance criteria under the trade expansion act are so strict that no firm has yet qualified. Also of important concern are the non-tariff barriers, special surcharges and the like which are being em-

ployed to exclude our exports from European markets. Secretary Stans has just proposed open table meetings on the subject with our trading partners in Europe. I applaud this initiative.

But beyond the most exceptional cases of unfair foreign trade activity, which cannot be eliminated through negotiations, I believe that demands for special protection must be resisted. Although this boom period poses a major challenge, I am confident that both the President and Congress will resist the growing pressures. The appointment of Gilbert as special representative is a strong indication of the Administration's commitment to freer trade. I am hopeful, moreover, that the President's dual policy of gradual deflationary action and gradual extrication from Vietnam will together suffice to slow our spiraling inflation and bring our payments back into balance.

Developments in the world economy give opportune aid to the Nixon approach. The Common Market economies are entering a renewed boom period and growth in excess of five percent is now anticipated, along with a renewed inflationary push. New orders for capital goods in Germany are now 23 percent ahead of last year, employment demand is intensifying, and prices are climbing. The Netherlands is instituting price controls to fight the pressures. Elsewhere in Europe and in Japan, the story is generally similar. Altogether it means our chief trading partners are experiencing an expansion of domestic demand, which will tend to reduce pressure to export and increase the need for imports. Unless—in violation of all the rules of economics—the U.S. drive to reduce inflation fails entirely, our balance of payments problem should be substantially alleviated during the coming year.

This development will not solve all our domestic and international economic problems. The intractable poverty of the slums and of the underdeveloped countries will continue to challenge us. The question of our long-term trade policies toward the Communist world will remain. Our attitude toward new free trade area proposals continues at issue. But a reasonably stable balance of payments will give us a foundation for a sound and farsighted approach to all these questions.

The Nixon Administration has wisely eschewed the hundred day hysteria that engulfed previous administrations and the public in paper snow storms during their opening months. I trust it will also escape the payments panic which led the Democrats to ill-considered restrictions on the international movement of goods and capital. And if President Nixon does succeed in the perilous world of international finance, he will find his other problems much easier to solve.

The President told the Congress on Monday, "Unless we save the dollar we will have nothing left with which to save the cities—or anything else." It looks as if we already have a strong President among our national assets. I expect he can add to them a sound dollar with which to move against our formidable problems.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 18, 1969]

TANGLE IN TRADE

Senator Mathias speaks the simple and welcome truth when he says that the new administration seems too genuinely committed to freer trade. The time for the new President to show his flag on this point was the quarrel over continuing and then manning the Office of the Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations. Put in the White House in the Kennedy administration explicitly to protect it against protectionist politics, the office is now extended by the Nixon people and headed by one of the most notable free (or at least freer) traders in American business.

But all is not won by extending useful offices and making appropriate appointments. The Nixon administration has still to contend with an ultimate tangle in these days when national economies are all more or less planned by more or less welfare states. The welfare policies push inexorably for production and distribution programs often in conflict with international market forces. Yet any effort to blunt or evade the international market is, by definition, merely a cumbersome way of describing a curb on trade.

Mr. Mathias illustrated the rule by saying our imports have risen because domestic purchasing power had risen. Domestic purchasing power has risen in the service of domestic policies favoring lower-income groups. Higher incomes for some Americans are higher costs for others. The higher costs make American products harder to sell both at home and abroad. The high-cost producer, high-cost in response to attractive domestic policies, then has what he sees as legitimate claim to compensating protections. And those protections disrupt free trade.

How? Watch carefully when the European Economic Community farm experts meet in Luxembourg Monday to adjust EEC farm prices. They will be adjusted at many points to protect EEC farmers against the market: which means at many points against American farm exports.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, over the years, our forests have been discussed often in this House. Many of us, representing varied viewpoints, have debated the questions of timber management, watersheds, recreational areas, fish and wildlife, the many other facets of conservation, and matters involved with the science of forestry.

I hope that every Member of this House who has spoken on these subjects will make himself thoroughly familiar with the National Timber Supply Act, which I have the pleasure of cosponsoring this week. I feel very strongly that it must be passed by this Congress, and that its passage will be one of the most constructive acts ever taken by any Congress in the fields of forestry and conservation.

The National Timber Supply Act can open the way to a whole new array of benefits for this country.

The primary purpose of the bill is to make it possible for the Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to exercise all of its skills in the growing of timber on the commercial portions of the national forests. Other Members already have pointed out that this has been impossible in the past. The Forest Service simply has not had the funds that are necessary, and the high timber yield fund called for in this bill would correct that situation.

Introduction of the bill has become necessary at this point in time because of the housing goals this Congress has set for the Nation. Without better development of our forest resources, those housing goals are nothing more than empty hopes.

The National Timber Supply Act would enable the people of my district to make an even larger contribution to the hous-

ing needs of the rest of the Nation. We already make substantial contributions to our country's food supply, from the fertile lowlands of California's central valleys one of the great agricultural areas of the world.

By applying the same principles—converted to forestry terms and spelled out in this proposed legislation—we could duplicate the achievements of the farmlands in the forests of fir and pine that stand above them on the slopes.

And I believe we must do this, to provide the amenities of life that are possible only through decent housing.

But we can do more.

The National Timber Supply Act will not sanction or permit any alteration in the status of the lands in my district, or any other district, that are now dedicated to recreation.

Implementation of the act will not diminish the role of my district in its contribution to the recreation values that are so important to the quality of American life.

My district is an unusual one. In terms of sheer area, the district I represent contains more commercial timber land than any other in the contiguous States.

We have often discussed the millions of visitors who spend hours or days of their leisure time visiting the great outdoor recreation areas of this country. More visitors are recorded in the forests and parks of my district than any other in the Nation.

The fabled Sierra Nevada, Lake Tahoe, Shasta-Trinity recreation area, Mount Whitney, Mount Shasta, and all or portions of 13 national forests are found in my district.

All of this area is easily within reach of the urban population of San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the other major cities of California. Millions of visitors from other States travel long distances to enjoy the scenic beauty in these mountains and forests.

Passage of this act will give my district a greater role in this important area, and will make it possible for even more visitors to enjoy the pleasures of the forests.

Today, the hiker and the lover of wilderness has many areas set aside exclusively for his use. But for the average person, wilderness is literally impenetrable, particularly if he has only a short time to spend away from home.

Other Members have pointed out that many areas of our national forests are impenetrable, so far as logging, fire control, and forestry practices are concerned. There are no roads, because the Forest Service has not had money for them.

It is tragic that this lack of funds has made these commercial lands as impenetrable as wilderness to recreation seekers.

This will change, under the National Timber Supply Act.

Roads would be built that Forest Service teams would use to reach timber stands that need care. Fires could be prevented or stopped more easily. Insect control would be possible throughout the commercial lands. Stand improvement techniques would weed out the dead and dying trees, the weak and undesirable

species, and remove the toppled and rotting material that blocks and fouls the streams.

The benefits to this country are obvious and enormous.

The forests would make their full contribution in terms of lumber, plywood, other wood and paper products, and all of the byproducts of their manufacture. Watersheds would be more secure. We would, as a nation, be even more certain that our hillsides would remain green and that wildlife would wander in abundance among the trees.

And thousands of new recreation sites would be created, making the wilderness even more serene and remote, for those whose spirits require solitude and wildness.

Finally, and in a way, amazingly, the Federal Government would increase its return and profit, rather than its outlay and loss, on one of its major programs. The growing of timber in a profitable enterprise, as the earnings reports of many companies demonstrate.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly commend the National Timber Supply Act to the attention of all my colleagues, for the benefits it can provide to the people of their own districts and for the children of these citizens.

The forests can contribute to the quality of life everywhere through better and more economical housing and through the recreational benefits they can more easily provide with better management.

SUPREME COURT REACHES NEW PLATEAU OF RIDICULOUSNESS

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has reached a new plateau of ridiculousness with the twisted logic of their decision Monday striking down all waiting periods prior to becoming eligible for welfare benefits. This requirement, says the Court, unconstitutionally infringes upon the "right" of persons to travel about the country. In the first place, of course, there is no such right in the Constitution. And, even if one could be assumed, these waiting periods in no way prevent anyone from traveling. They may restrict their ability to travel, but certainly not their right.

This latest rape of the Constitution will no doubt be used as a basis for a future finding that State-imposed waiting periods before transients become eligible to vote are also unconstitutional. So would be, one supposes, the 3-day waiting period for a marriage license or, for that matter, the required period before obtaining a divorce. All these waiting periods hamper one's freedom to travel if they require you to wait around for something.

But then, the whole concept is so asinine that only the Supreme Court could have thought of it. Nine men of commonsense would have laughed the proponent attorneys out of the chamber.

I do not wish to take up more time of the Members today, so rather than

continue my remarks on the Court and for fear I will not be able to restrain my contempt for it, I would like to shortcut my remarks by inserting here in the RECORD a copy of my recent newsletter which will give my views of the Court in greater detail. I entitled it, appropriately enough I think: "Ship of Fools":

SHIP OF FOOLS

The Supreme Court, in a recent 7 to 2 decision, ruled that elementary school children have a full and protected right to participate in demonstrations against society and the established order. The only reservation spoken of by the Court was that such demonstrations must not "materially" disrupt classwork or involve "substantial" disorder. In other words, some disruption and some disorder created by sub-teenage agitators is permissible, as long as it is not "material" or "substantial" . . . whatever that means. In reality, these words mean whatever the Court says they mean on any given day.

With this decision, the seven approving Justices constitute themselves a Ship of Fools adrift on a sea of legal insanity.

Mr. Justice Black, one of the two Justices who disagreed, wrote an angry dissent from the decision in which he stated the obvious fact that this ruling heralded a "new revolutionary era of permissiveness fostered by the judiciary" and one which "subjects the public schools to the whims and caprices of their loudest-mouthed but maybe not their brightest students."

"One does not need to be a prophet or the son of a prophet", he continued, "to know that, after the Court's holding today, some students in . . . all schools will be ready, able and willing to defy their teachers on practically all orders. This is the more unfortunate for the schools since groups of students all over the land are already running loose, conducting break-ins, sit-ins, lie-ins and smash-ins".

The complete ridiculousness of the Court's decision can be appreciated only when one remembers that not long ago, this same Court prohibited prayers in these same schools. Thus, the Court is saying, children may protest in school but they may not pray. To follow this twisted logic, it would apparently be permissible for children to pray if their prayers were a form of protest or part of a demonstration. The Court thus protects absolutely the right of children to be led into temptation, but at the same time, the Justices see to it that they are not, however, permitted to petition the Almighty for deliverance.

This decision is an advanced stage of the social disease of libertarianism, spread by a Court which is dazzled by the magic of dissent. One wonders how long it will be before this same Court, in an obvious extension of this ruling, will hold that the toddler in his crib has these same rights against his parents and that temper tantrums and the right not to go to bed when told are also sheltered under the security blanket of permissiveness. Parents must wonder, too, how in the midst of Court-approved agitation, the quiet and earnest students who make up the majority are going to get the education they are earnestly seeking.

I cannot leave this disturbing subject without at least trying to answer the questions which I know are this minute in the mind of every reader . . . when will there be an end to all this lunacy espoused by the Court and what can be done to curb these nine men.

I hesitate more times than one to admit even the possibility that there is a flaw in the Constitution of the United States, so deeply do I revere that document. But, if there is a flaw, it is that the Justices of the Court are appointed for life and, in the words of the Constitution, "hold their Offices during good Behaviour".

Under these conditions of employment, there is no practical way the Justices can be held accountable for, their decisions. The three divisions of the federal government are separate and independent of each other, subject only to certain checks and balances. This is as it should be, under the ideal conditions visualized by the framers of the Constitution: each branch devoting itself to the betterment of our nation and the welfare of its people. But these "ideal conditions" do not prevail today. At least one branch, the judicial, cares less for society than it does for sociology . . . less for the victim than it does for the criminal . . . less for the will of the people than it does for social reform.

The Constitution provides that, if Legislators fail to heed the public mandate, they can be turned out of office every two years in the House, every six years in the Senate. If the Chief Executive does not respond to the will of the majority, the Constitution provides that he can be replaced every four years. But the Justices of the Supreme Court can, in their absolute lack of wisdom, flaunt the will of the people as long as the Justices live on this earth and they can escape judgment scot-free because they "hold their Offices during good Behaviour".

As a practical matter (and this is the only sense in which there is any use to consider the subject) the words "good Behaviour" defy definition in the finite sense necessary in order to remove a Justice from the Court. One would have to prove beyond any shadow of doubt whatsoever, some grave and continuing misconduct. Unfortunately, being a fool is not an impeachable offense.

The present Court sits as a continuously functioning constitutional convention, ever re-writing, erasing and penciling-in new concepts as they happen to occur to the Justices or their clerks. The Court has, in my opinion, done more to bring about domestic chaos and the resulting plaque of crime and disorder than any other body of men in the nation. Yet, there is no practical way to hold the Justices accountable for their stewardship. Theoretically, there are ways, such as impeachment and by constitutional amendments, but with sympathizing liberals in control of both Houses of Congress, an effort in either direction cannot be successfully carried out.

There is only one practical way to stop this endless string of decisions which fly in the face of the written law and all common sense. That is for the present and future Presidents to fill such vacancies as will be created by death and retirement with men who view the Constitution as an abiding instrument which says the same thing today that it said the day it was written, the same that it said on the day the Justices were sworn in and will continue to say the same thing into infinity or until amended by the people.

President Nixon will soon nominate a new Chief Justice to replace Justice Warren, a man who is, in my opinion, totally lacking in Constitutional scholarship, common sense or candor. Other vacancies will likely occur in the next few years. The President's choices to fill these future vacancies will determine in great measure whether this nation will return to its previous pattern of rule by law or will continue down the road of rule by men.

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. CONABLE (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK), for 30 minutes, on April 28; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK), for 30 minutes, on April 28;

to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) immediately following Mr. DELLENBACK's remarks in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. GUBSER in two instances.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. GUDE in two instances.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. LANDGREEBE in two instances.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. WATSON in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ADAMS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHIPLEY.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in four instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. STUCKEY.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. WATTS in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. MIKVA in six instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. HAGAN in five instances.

**BILL PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT**

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 23, 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:

694. A letter from the Director, District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for 1968, pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 313(c), of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

695. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project activities in Maricopa County, Ariz., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

696. A letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting a draft of an amended version of the proposed legislation to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, submitted under cover of letter dated January 17, 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

697. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of the publications "Typical Electric Bills, 1968," and "World Power Data, 1968"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 347. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of production of foreign-made goods competing with domestically produced goods and of new developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-149). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 17. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States (Rept. No. 91-150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 369. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4153, a bill to authorize the appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore

establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 91-151). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4229. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4239. A bill to amend item 802.30, Tariff Schedules of the United States, so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of racehorses purchased outside of the United States, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5833. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes (Rept. No. 91-154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9951. A bill to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10016. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap (Rept. No. 91-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 10370. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10371. 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. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10372. 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. COLLIER:

H.R. 10373. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 10374. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 10375. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the annuities and pensions

(and lump-sum payments) which are payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10376. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10377. 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.

H.R. 10378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10379. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10380. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 10381. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent, across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder (with a minimum primary benefit of \$100 a month), to provide for subsequent automatic increases in such benefits based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 10382. 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. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 10384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10385. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10386. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10387. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions on account of an individual's outside earnings will cease to be made from benefits based on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10388. 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.

H.R. 10389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 10390. 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.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 10391. A bill to encourage national

development by providing incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing and job-training industrial and commercial facilities in rural areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes or which have experienced or face a substantial loss of population because of migration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10392. A bill to make hospital insurance benefits available to uninsured individuals who attain age 65 at any time before 1983 (instead of only to those who attain such age before 1968 as presently provided); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10393. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 10394. 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.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 10395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1970 and 1971, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after 1971 such exemptions shall be \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 10396. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. DADDARIO):

H.R. 10397. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10398. 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. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 10399. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10400. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10401. A bill to amend the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the application of the public information and disclosure provisions of such chapter; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 10402. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK (for himself, Mrs. MAY, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. SIKES):

H.R. 10403. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to allow, under certain circumstances, the purchase of firearms by mail order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10404. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10405. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10406. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10407. 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. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10408. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide financial assistance for education and information programs relating to drugs and their abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10409. A bill to amend section 134 of title 23 of the United States Code to provide that the requirements of that section shall apply to urban areas of more than 100,000 population; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10410. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10411. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10412. 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. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BARING, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAYS, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KING, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 10413. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WATTS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ZWACHE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLD, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FLOWERS and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 10414. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the na-

tional emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HULL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. STUCKEY):

H.R. 10415. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 10416. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 10417. 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. WOLFF:

H.R. 10418. 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. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10419. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 10420. A bill to permit certain real property in the State of Maryland to be used for public purposes generally; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 10421. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. OLSEN, and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 10422. 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. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 10423. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10424. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expending, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10425. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses, to expand the deduction for moving expenses in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 10426. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal

Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. POEELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KYROS, Mr. CULVER, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 10427. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10428. A bill to amend 2 U.S.C. 7 to conform the election of Representatives to the election of the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10429. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the rate at which assistance allowances shall be paid for programs of education pursued in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 10430. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to require payment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 10431. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the educational and cultural exchange program of the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10432. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent, across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.J. Res. 668. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 669. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Con. Res. 210. Concurrent 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. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution terminating the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, relating to the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 370. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 371. Resolution creating a special committee to conduct an investigation and study into the legal, political, and diplomatic status of lands which were the subject of grants from the King of Spain and from the Government of Mexico prior to the acquisition of the American Southwest as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo concluding the Mexican-American War in 1848; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

129. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to suspension of the construction of the Sentinel antiballistic missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

130. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to legislation to limit the number of questions to be asked in the 1970 census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

131. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the payment of all medical expenses of members of the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

132. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to expanding the medicare program to include persons who are recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the social security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

133. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to expanding the medicare program to include drug costs; 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. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10433. A bill for the relief of Eduardo and Giovanna Malorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10434. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soo Ok Koo Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10435. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Pickering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 10436. A bill for the relief of Henry D. Espy, James A. Espy, Naomi A. Espy, Jean E. Logan and Theodore R. Espy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 10437. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael C. Shende; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10438. A bill for the relief of William W. Brady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 10439. A bill for the relief of ToppSav, Inc., formerly known as the Topp-Cola Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10440. A bill for the relief of Hilarion Ngayan, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10441. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lo Piccolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 10442. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 10443. A bill for the relief of Cesar Farrell and his wife, Dora Poussin Farrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10444. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ismael M. Naanep and his wife, Dr. Belen Fernandez Naanep; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 10445. A bill for the relief of Robert Harry Urch; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 10446. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jean Jacques Wodzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10447. A bill for the relief of Beatrix Francesca Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10448. A bill to provide relief for certain members of the U.S. Navy recalled to active duty from the Fleet Reserve after September 27, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10449. A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALABAMA NEWSMAN ELECTED TO GRIDIRON

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend James Free, Washington correspondent of the Birmingham News since 1947, on his recent election to the world-famous Gridiron Club.

As most of us know, the Gridiron Club is composed of 50 Washington correspondents and editors.

Jim Free becomes the 288th member to be elected since the club was organized in 1885. His election is well-deserved recognition of his very able and conscientious work as a newsman in Washington for more than 20 years.

As the Washington news chief for Alabama's largest newspaper, Jim Free is noted for his knowledgeable commentaries on Washington events. His fairness in handling the facts in his news articles is well known to my colleagues from Alabama and other States.

His many readers admire his ability to ferret out new trends and developments and frame them in a meaningful way.

Jim Free was born in Gordo, Ala., and attended the University of Alabama. He has published a weekly newspaper and has worked for the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the Washington Star, and the Chicago Sun-Times Washington Bureau.

He is a former cochairman of the standing committee that admits newsmen to the House and Senate press galleries. He is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional Journalism Society, and the National Press Club.

Jim's charming wife, Mrs. Ann Cottrell Free, is a noted journalist in her own right and devotes much attention to the conservation of issues. The Frees have one daughter.