

mittee has found after a four-year nationwide inquiry.

"Whatever effort has been made during the last 20 years of independence has not ended the Harijans' suffering," the committee said in a 1,000-page report on untouchability.

Harijans or children of God was Mohandas K. Gandhi's name for the untouchables or non-caste Hindus of India now numbering more than 75 million, one-sixth of the population. They traditionally are placed outside the four major Hindu castes because of their usually inherited occupations, including "dirty" jobs that other Indians will not do.

While the practice of untouchability was legally banned in 1955, one of the committee's findings is that police and even higher officials are unaware of the law.

REPORT TABLED

The committee, headed by an untouchable member of Parliament, L. Elayaparumal, tabled its report after an uproar in the lower house earlier this month over a defense of untouchability by one of the holiest men of India, the Jagadguru Shankaracharya or

great and learned teacher of Puri in East India.

The Shankaracharya, expressing the orthodox Hindu view of untouchability, criticized the legal ban on it and declared that people are born unequal, justifying the caste system and placing some outside it.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said in an obvious reference to the Shankaracharya that a strong movement should be launched against those who preach casteism and do not understand Hinduism.

But the parliamentary committee charged the government's social welfare department with hindering its work. It accused state governments of not bothering to implement the ban on untouchability.

BIAS IS CITED

The report gave numerous instances of discrimination against Harijans. It told of refusal by caste Hindus to let them use village wells or eat in the same places or even walk on the same street; refusal by barbers to shave untouchables and by laundrymen to wash their clothes, and refusal by pan-

chayats or village governing councils to let them attend meetings.

In one area of Madhya Pradesh, untouchables are not allowed to turn up their moustaches. In Bikaner in Rajasthan, students successfully boycotted their new Harijan teacher. Last year in Andhra Pradesh, several untouchables were burned to death.

Ironically, the committee found that Gujarat is among three states where the practice of untouchability is most widespread. India is celebrating this year the centennial of Mahatma Gandhi's birth in Gujarat. Vinoba Bhave, the foremost disciple of Gandhi, was quoted by the committee as saying: "We have not done much for the untouchables."

The committee calls for increasing the number of reserved government jobs for untouchables, ending the hereditary Hindu priesthood, encouraging intercaste marriages and providing a jail sentence for violation of the ban on untouchability. Financial and educational benefits also are urged.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 7, 1969

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

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.—I Corinthians 16:13.

All praise, honor and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, for Thy loving kindness and Thy tender mercies which have been ours all the days of our lives. Protect us in our freedom and preserve us in our faith by Thy spirit of truth made known to us as we pray.

Cleanse the strivings of our hearts and clear our minds of stress and strain that inner peace may be ours and enduring peace may come to our world.

In this dark day may we as a nation not curse the darkness but keep the candles of faith and hope and love alight that all may see the way to life with liberty and justice and peace for all.

"Dear Lord and Father of mankind,

Forgive our foolish ways;
Reclothe us in our rightful minds,
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence, praise."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CHAIRMAN PATMAN TO DISCLOSE SECRETARY KENNEDY'S FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House know, Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy has repeatedly refused to testify before the Banking and Currency Committee about his financial ties with the Continental-Illinois National Bank of Chicago.

The only comment has been in the form of a misleading news release issued by the general counsel of the Treasury

Department, Mr. Paul W. Eggers. Mr. Eggers refused an invitation to appear before the Banking and Currency Committee last Saturday morning to explain his release and to give the committee additional information concerning his knowledge of the Secretary's financial arrangements with the bank.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried since the time of Mr. Kennedy's confirmation to get these facts and to determine fully the extent of the conflict of interest that existed. All of these attempts to obtain this information on a voluntary basis have been answered in a highly arrogant fashion by the Treasury Department.

There comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when any further delay in the resolution of such vital public issues is not in the public interest. I feel that Secretary Kennedy has had sufficient warning and ample opportunity to place the facts and conclusions, as he saw them, on the record.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have obtained a special order for the purpose of making a 1-hour speech tomorrow afternoon—Thursday—on the subject of Secretary Kennedy's financial arrangements with the Continental-Illinois National Bank. The integrity of the Federal Government is at stake and this issue must be resolved quickly and firmly and openly.

THE SOVIET ABM SYSTEM

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, last night it was my pleasure to see the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on television as he discussed among other things the Safeguard ABM. I would recommend to my friend, Mr. FORD, that he obtain a different expert to brief him for it was obvious that he is still as misinformed as he was the last time he took to the airwaves to discuss the ABM.

He said, and I wrote his words down as he said them:

The Soviet ABM system today has provided an effective defense against missiles for Moscow itself.

If Mr. FORD's statement is true, then the statement of the Department of Defense's expert is false, for in the Department of Defense appropriations hearings for 1969 on page 454 of part 2, the following appears:

Mr. MAHON. What kind of attrition could the Soviet ABM system, which is based on the so-called Galosh missile and is deployed around Moscow, place on our ICBM's? Could we, for the most part, negate this system today without neglecting other important targets?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, to answer the latter part of the question, we can negate the Moscow system without neglecting important targets. The U.S. inventory, both current and planned for the future, is adequate to insure penetration of the Moscow area defense system by sheer exhaustion of the defenses.

Second, in his posture statement for fiscal year 1970, former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford stated in reference to the Soviet ABM that causes such trepidation for the minority leader:

Their Galosh ABM system resembles in certain important respects the NIKE-Zeus system which we abandoned years ago because of its limited effectiveness.

Third, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), forgets what President Nixon himself has stated, the defense of a major city against missile attack is simply not possible at the present state of the art. That is why the President said that he was abandoning the Sentinel system of the Johnson administration which allegedly was designed to protect our Nation's major cities.

Mr. Speaker, if the Soviet Union wants to squander its rubles on defensive ABM systems that do not increase its security, then let the Soviet Union do it. But we are certainly under no obligation to match those mistakes or to match the money it spends for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, we still have a chance to avoid making such a mistake. I have been informed that the decision by the

President to terminate the deployment of the Sentinel ABM system and undertake the construction of the Safeguard ABM system requires new authorization from the Congress before additional funds for deployment can be appropriated. I hope our decision will be not to make that mistake. Certainly, if we were to decide to build an ABM because of the existence of the Russian Galosh system about which the minority leader has expressed such concern it would be comparable to a decision by General Motors to build a car to match the Edsel.

CONTROL OF OBSCENE MATERIAL

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation proposed by the President to control the traffic in obscene material. The distinguished minority leader, 12 Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee and 10 other Members of this body have joined with me in cosponsoring this most important legislation.

Today we are confronted with a domestic crisis of gigantic proportions. The spiritual vitality of this country is being eroded and destroyed by the permissive attitude of a small minority bent on self-pleasure. That compelling problem requires our immediate attention and action. For far too long the decent citizens of this Nation have had disgusting and unwanted obscenity and pornographic advertisements foisted upon them and their children. The consequences of exposing impressionable young people to salacious, suggestive, and filthy literature and photographs are tragic. Whether through the mails or at the corner newsstand, it is impossible to calculate the devastating damage done by this material to the impressionable minds of our young people, who have not the emotional maturity of adults. I am pleased that we have an administration which recognizes how serious this situation really is. I commend the President for his forthright denunciation of these purveyors of filth and smut.

The first amendment to the bill of rights states:

Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech or of the press.

This right of the people has been a long cherished cornerstone of American liberty and democracy.

Throughout our history, freedom of expression has served to stimulate new ideas and give our society the inner strength to be the spiritual and moral leader of the world. Accordingly, we must carefully and deliberately weigh our efforts lest this most fundamental right be lost.

However, obscene material of whatever form is not now and never has been protected by the first amendment. In *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476 (1956), the Supreme Court noted that from this Nation's inception—

The protection given speech and press was fashioned to assure unfettered interchange

of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people. This objective was made explicit as early as 1774 in a letter of the Continental Congress to the inhabitants of Quebec:

"The last right we shall mention, regards the freedom of the press. The importance of this consists, besides the advancement of truth, science, morality, and arts in general, in its diffusion of liberal sentiments on the administration of Government, its ready communication of thoughts between subjects, and its consequential promotion of union among them, whereby oppressive officers are shamed or intimidated, into more honourable and just modes of conducting affairs." 1 *Journals of the Continental Congress* 180 (1774).

All ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance—unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion—have the full protection of the guaranties, unless excludable because they encroach upon the limited area of more important interests. But implicit in the history of the First Amendment is the rejection of obscenity as utterly without redeeming social importance.

After *Roth*, the Supreme Court in *Ginsburg v. United States*, 383 U.S. 463 (1966), *Memoirs v. Massachusetts*, 383 U.S. 413 (1966), and *Mishkin v. New York*, 383 U.S. 502 (1966), made it clear that material: First, whose dominant theme appeals to prurient interest; second, which is patently offensive because it affronts community standards; and third, which is utterly without redeeming social value cannot receive first amendment protection.

Moreover, the Court last year recognized in *Ginsburg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), that minors may validly be given special protection from exposure to obscenity. Consistent with the first amendment, Congress can enact a stronger law for children than it can for adults. Thus the Court said:

While the supervision of children's reading may best be left to their parents, the knowledge that parental control or guidance cannot always be provided and society's transcendent interest in protecting the welfare of children justify reasonable regulation of the sale of material to them. It is, therefore, altogether fitting and proper for a state to include in a statute designed to regulate the sale of pornography to children special standards, broader than those embodied in legislation aimed at controlling dissemination of such material to adults.

In light of the constitutional structure established by the Court in these various decisions, the President has moved with great care not only to preserve unsullied the right to free speech but also to control effectively the traffic in obscenity.

The President has suggested three proposals for our consideration. I am pleased to have the honor to introduce two of these. One bill would make it a crime to knowingly mail or transport in interstate commerce matter to minors—defined as persons under 18 years of age—which describes or represents, in actual or simulated form, nudity, sexual conduct or sado-masochistic behavior which is offensive to prevailing community standards concerning suitable material for minors and which is substantially without redeeming social value for minors. This bill would also

make it illegal to knowingly mail or transport in interstate commerce to minors matter containing advertisements for such material or information as to where it may be obtained. The other bill would prohibit knowingly transporting in interstate commerce or mailing any advertisement or solicitation designed to or intended to appeal to a prurient interest in sex. I consider passage of these bills to be mandatory.

The President's third proposal was introduced on Monday as title II of the Postal Revenue and Offensive Intrusion of Sexually Oriented Mail Act of 1969. This bill would allow any person, for himself or on behalf of his minor children under 19 years of age, to file with the Postmaster General a statement that he desires to receive no sexually oriented advertisements through the mails. The names of all persons filing such statements would be placed on a central list by the Postmaster General and it would be illegal to mail any sexually oriented advertisement to any person whose name had been on such list for 30 days.

Mr. Speaker, the moral strength and maturity of our young people is one of this Nation's greatest and most precious resources. This vitality today is threatened by the lascivious material which floods the mails and invades the privacy of American homes.

While the vendors of objectional literature smugly insist that their merchandise is aimed exclusively at adult markets, it is axiomatic that the caveat "adults only" serves merely to increase the material's allure for the adolescent. His curiosity is stimulated and the "forbidden" becomes all the more attractive by the very fact that it purports to be unavailable to him.

Parents should not have to worry that their children may be exposed to undesirable materials through the mails or that smut peddlers will give their children information on how they can obtain material which will be harmful to them. We should support parents in their efforts to build their children's characters by enacting legislation barring smut peddlers from sending harmful material to children.

But parents determined to make sure that their children are brought up decently have been virtually powerless to prevent the unsolicited pandering advertisements from penetrating the home. While Congress has acted in the past to permit parents to engage the Post Office's cooperation in removing the names of their children from mailing lists, it has yet to adopt a means whereby the initial enticing solicitation can be excluded. The administration's bills would do so.

Congress must heed the President's clear warning and must join with him and parents throughout the country to halt the traffic in this damaging and worthless material. It is about time that we stand up for decency in America.

WARNINGS FROM NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, President Nixon spoke to the Nation by medium of a press conference and discussed the latest atrocity by North Korea in shooting down an unarmed American plane over international waters.

Apparently seeking to differentiate that provocation from the *Pueblo* case of his predecessor, President Nixon stated that in the case of the *Pueblo*, warnings specifically directed at the *Pueblo's* activities for a 2-week period prior to its seizure had been given by North Korea. The President implied that in face of these warnings, the fact that the *Pueblo* was undefended was an error of policy that was not present when the plane was shot down. In fact, the President said, there were no warnings given in this latest incident:

Under these circumstances, it was a completely surprise attack in every sense of the word, and, therefore, did not give us the opportunity for protective action that I would have taken had it been threatened.

The precise words of the President relative to the alleged warnings and threats to the *Pueblo* were:

Also with regard to the *Pueblo*, in the case of the *Pueblo* the North Koreans had warned and threatened the *Pueblo* for a period of several weeks before they seized it. In the case of these flights, they have been going on as I have indicated, for years and during this administration without incident 190 of them have occurred this year.

Mr. Speaker, I did not recall mention of such prior threats and warnings concerning the *Pueblo* prior to President Nixon's comments.

I thought that such information was vital in our judging the nature of that act and the response dictated. I thought also that the failure to reveal these "threats and warnings" constituted a serious breach of responsibility on the part of President Johnson's administration. The credibility of that administration was called directly into question by President Nixon's comments.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I wrote the Secretary of State that very day, April 18, seeking to learn "when, by whom, and to whom those protests were made and in what manner they were given." I will include a copy of that letter as part of my remarks.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, May 6, I received a reply from William B. Macomber, Jr., of the State Department, stating:

In his comments at a news conference on April 18th, the President was referring to generalized warnings about "spy boats" and not to any specific warnings directed at the *Pueblo* or *Pueblo* type operations.

I will also enclose the entire text of that letter, Mr. Speaker.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the actual facts concerning this controversy in no way match the language President Nixon used in describing it. "Generalized warnings about South Korean spy boats" hardly equates with President Nixon's contention that "the North Koreans had warned and threatened the *Pueblo* for

a period of several weeks before they seized it."

Mr. Speaker, at the best, this incident illustrates the danger of a President announcing national policy in the give-and-take nature of a press conference. Imprecise language on important matters at least confuses and at most creates a dangerous misunderstanding.

At worst, this incident brings to mind charges that were too freely thrown about concerning a "credibility gap" in the prior administration. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, ample grounds here exist for a "credibility gap" charge against the present administration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the failure of this administration to provide protection to this surveillance plane, given the knowledge it possessed of the *Pueblo* incident, is really quite inexcusable.

The attempt to suggest that its failure to provide that protection is somehow more excusable than was the same failure in connection with the *Pueblo* falls flat given the knowledge we now have of President Nixon's mistaken recounting of that incident.

The above-mentioned letters and an article follow:

APRIL 18, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM ROGERS,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the recent press conference held by President Nixon wherein he discussed the subject of the unwarranted act of aggression by North Korea in shooting down an unarmed American plane that was not in violation of its air space, he also mentioned that the incident differed from the *Pueblo* incident in that the North Koreans had, to this Nation, protested several times for a period of several weeks about the *Pueblo's* activities and that therefore we had been forewarned that such action could be expected, as did, in fact, occur.

I recall no such statement being made prior to President Nixon's comments and desire to learn precisely when, by whom, and to whom, these protests were made, and in what manner they were given.

Please provide me with this information at your very earliest convenience as I desire to make a statement on the Floor of the House discussing this subject.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1969.

HON. JEROME H. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letters dated April 18 and April 28 concerning references by President Nixon to North Korean warnings prior to the seizure of the *USS Pueblo*.

In his comments at a news conference on April 18, the President was referring to generalized warnings about "spy boats" and not to any specific warnings directed at the *Pueblo* or *Pueblo*-type operations. Frequent warnings were made in association with charges of alleged activities of fishing ships and naval craft of the Republic of Korea, but none of them gave any indication that the North Koreans had our electronic ships in mind.

Of course, as you know, there were no warnings of any kind with respect to our airborne electronic operations.

I hope this information will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times,
Apr. 26, 1969]

WHEELER IMPLIES NIXON "PUEBLO" COMMENT ERRED—JOINT CHIEFS CHAIRMAN SIDESTEPS QUERIES ABOUT REPORTED WARNINGS BEFORE SEIZURE

(By Ted Sell)

WASHINGTON.—Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, strongly implied Friday that President Nixon was wrong in saying the United States had warnings that the U.S. intelligence ship *Pueblo* would be seized.

But Wheeler, asked at a congressional hearing if the President erred when he told an April 18 press conference there had been such warnings, sidestepped, saying that his commander-in-chief was wrong.

"I must ask the indulgence of the committee in this matter," Wheeler said.

The exchange took place during an open portion of hearings by a special House armed services subcommittee investigating the 1968 loss of the *Pueblo* and the April 14 destruction of a Navy EC-121 reconnaissance plane. The ship was seized at sea by North Korea and the plane was shot down by North Korean fighters.

DENIES ANY WARNING

Wheeler said that in neither the *Pueblo* nor the EC-121 incidents was there any warning of North Korea's intentions.

Rep. Alton Lennon (D-N.C.) noted that at his April 18 press conference, Mr. Nixon said:

"... In the case of the *Pueblo*, the North Koreans had warned and threatened the *Pueblo* for a period of several weeks before they seized it."

Lennon asked if that was an accurate statement.

"To the best of my knowledge," Wheeler said, "It is a true quote from the President's press conference."

Lennon persisted.

It was then that Wheeler, indicating he could not contradict his superior, the President, sought the subcommittee's indulgence.

"It is an unfortunate statement," Lennon said, "and I don't think the President meant to make it."

He further characterized the Presidential utterance as an unfortunate slip of the tongue.

In other testimony before the subcommittee headed by Rep. Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), Wheeler and other senior military officers reported that:

1—For a "considerable length of time" after the *Pueblo* was captured, U.S. reconnaissance flights in the area were escorted by fighter planes. Spy ship operations were canceled, but reconnaissance flights continued. The fighter cover was dropped when the intelligence flights were told to stay farther from the North Korean coast. No date for this was given.

2—Since the *Pueblo* incident, U.S. fighter planes in South Korea have been maintained on alert while reconnaissance flights were operating in the area. Fighters were scrambled 14 minutes after the lost EC-121 disappeared from radar screens. They arrived too late to do anything but help in the search for survivors or wreckage. There were no survivors among the 31 crewmen.

3—In Wheeler's words, "The intelligence we gain from such missions (the *Pueblo* and the EC-121) is absolutely essential to the security of our forces in South Korea."

The response came after Pike asked whether the information was worth the loss of 32 Americans (the EC-121 crew and one Pueblo crewman), the imprisonment for nearly a year of 82 Pueblo crewmen and the humiliation suffered by America in the two incidents.

THE ABM CRITICS

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as a steadfast opponent of the ABM system, I am devoting my best efforts toward preventing any further waste of funds on this new escalation of the arms race. At the same time, I realize that others hold different views on the desirability of the system, and I honor their right to express their opinion.

It is with considerable dismay, therefore, that I hear charges that those of us who oppose the ABM do not have a right to express this view—that such opposition is treasonous, or disloyal at best. Such an attempt to label ABM foes as unpatriotic should be denounced in a land where freedom of speech is a fundamental right. Our Government is based on the principle of democracy, with each citizen guaranteed the right to express his opinion in open debate.

The Honolulu Advertiser on May 1 published an editorial response to charges that ABM critics are somehow involved in a conspiracy to weaken the Nation. Because of its clear thinking on this matter, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THE ABM CRITICS

It's doubtful if either the cause of the antiballistic missile or rational debate will be furthered by charges that imply ABM critics are somehow involved in a conspiracy to weaken the nation.

Yet House Republican Leader Gerald Ford seemed to be doing this when he emerged from a White House meeting this week and demanded heatedly whether ABM critics "want to unilaterally disarm America in the face of a serious threat from the Soviet Union?"

He talked about "a certain concert" of opposition to the ABM, chemical and biological warfare research, and development of a manned bomber.

Ford is right that there is a growing opposition, but it is wrong to suggest that it is motivated by any desire to cripple the nation's defense posture.

Those opposing the ABM and questioning in Congress, a large number of scientists and biological warfare include a bipartisan group many distinguished former Federal officials.

What many may oppose most, in fact, is the kind of thinking that equates disloyalty with opposition to proposed military programs.

The post-World War II growth of what's called the military-chemical complex has a basis in Cold War needs, but its growth and momentum to what some feel dangerous proportions stem in part from just such a scare atmosphere.

Fortunately, there are a growing number of Americans who feel that our many national requirements must be kept in balance and that security is not served by constantly escalated overkill.

Labor Leader Walter Reuther made the point here the other day when he said the ABM should be held up because of questions about its workability, the fear that it will just add to the nuclear arms race more than

increase security, and because funds are more needed for social problems.

We are among those who oppose the ABM on such grounds. We also recognize there can be legitimate debate on the question. But there cannot be such debate if the atmosphere is clouded with charges that critics want to hurt the nation.

EXTENSION OF CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of this body are in favor of more milk for our schoolchildren. Prompt action by the House Committee on Agriculture in reporting out a permanent extension of the special milk program attests to our general agreement of this goal.

The Johnson and new Nixon administration both have recommended a budget which eliminates the special milk program altogether as a separate program. Instead of providing \$104 million for milk as in the current year, or \$125 million as proposed in H.R. 5554, the budget offered by President Nixon only allows \$20 million fiscal 1970 for milk for summer camp and similar programs, and for schools without lunch programs.

These proposed cutbacks made House action on this legislation all the more necessary in order to offer stability to this program. The trend in the new administration seems to be juggling the budget around instead of providing for the additional funds needed to take care of the poor.

Another example of this administration's approach is the order to close 59 Job Corps centers and use these so-called savings to 30 miniskill centers located in urban areas.

Currently we are spending \$10 million on special assistance to needy schoolchildren; President Johnson asked that this be raised to \$90 million in fiscal 1970, but the new administration cut this in half to \$44,800,000. If the new administration really wanted to do more for the poor, I submit they should have proposed at least the \$90 million for this program which is so clearly underfunded. The special milk program has been criticized as a subsidy for the dairy industry yet the new administration asks that the current \$44 million budget for school lunches under the commodity donation program be raised to \$89 million.

The administration tells us that the new emphasis is on full lunch programs, rather than milk, and a shift in aid more toward the needy. This may be a fine goal, but Congress should insure that programs now benefiting all of our children are not curtailed in the process.

The special milk program is not the milk served with school lunches. Rather the bulk of the program is for milk for those children who have no lunch program, who bring lunch from home, and for milk sold after school, for summer programs, and so forth. The Government pays part of the cost of this milk, and the student pays a reduced price. The new administration would eliminate this

assistance to millions of children. I would hope that our Nation is rich enough to continue what we have been doing for the health and nutrition of all of our children, and at the same time commit additional funds for the special needs of our poor children so that they can have free milk by providing an adequate budget for this program under the other provisions of the Child Nutrition Act.

H.R. 5554, which passed the House yesterday, would make the special milk program permanent and increase the authorization by \$5 million a year to \$125 million.

It is poor policy to amend H.R. 5554 to limit the program only to needy children and cut off a national effort to provide milk to the benefit of 17 million of our children. I am pleased that the House defeated this amendment.

I believe that we should adequately provide for the needs of the poor in America without cutting out funds already being spent.

I supported H.R. 5554 and hope that it will be enacted into law very soon.

ABM EFFECTS ON WILDLIFE

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President's unwise decision to proceed with an ABM system will affect many people in many ways. The American taxpayers will be a little poorer because of the huge expense this decision will cause. The wealthy corporations of the military-industrial complex will be considerably richer. And all of us will lead more frightened lives, since the cause of world peace will be set back by this new escalation of the arms race.

All of this is well known. Not so publicized, however, is another effect of the ABM decision—the possible destruction of irreplaceable wildlife in the underground nuclear blasts which will start in October to test the ABM.

One conservation loss due to the ABM is discussed in an article by Philip D. Carter, Washington Post service, which was published in the April 13, 1969, Honolulu Star-Bulletin. As the article points out:

The remote and windswept island of Amchitka, proposed site of the largest underground nuclear blasts in history, is a critical link in the vast Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge and a precarious haven for some of nature's most severely endangered species.

The article goes on to describe the struggles of the rare bald eagles, sea otters, and other wildlife to survive against the onslaught of man. For them, the detonation of test ABM's may be the last chapter.

Some of the island wildlife deserves special consideration, such as the protection to be given under the endangered species bill now pending before Congress. The objectives of this legislation, H.R. 248 and H.R. 4812, have my strong support.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

ALEUTIAN WILDLIFE PRESERVE NEW NUCLEAR TEST SITE

(By Phillip D. Carter)

WASHINGTON.—The remote and windswept island of Amchitka, proposed site of the largest underground nuclear blasts in history, is a critical link in the vast Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge and a precarious haven for some of nature's most severely endangered species.

When the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) begins the three H-Bomb tests planned for the island next fall, probably no one will squawk louder than the rare bald eagles, sea otters and dwindling subspecies of Canada geese which live there.

Across the nation, concerned conservationists already are objecting loudly.

The controversy swirling around the choice of a wildlife refuge for testing the ultimate in nuclear weaponry—giant warheads for antiballistic missiles—is as thick as the fog and mist that enshroud the vital little island most of the year.

The implications posed by what the island's friends call "the rape of Amchitka" reach far beyond the immediate fate of a few rare creatures. History, technology, and cold war politics have transformed the distant animal refuge into a laboratory of the larger ecology of man.

Amchitka was born eons ago in a fiery cataclysm of lava through a fissure in the earth's convulsive crust. Today the island, with others in the 1,200-mile-long Aleutian chain marks the geologically unstable northern perimeter of the Pacific Ocean where it blends into the Bering Sea.

UNLOVELY ISLANDS

Amchitka and the rest of the Aleutians have never been very hospitable to man. The foggy islands, some still actively volcanic, are surrounded by treacherous shoal waters and fierce tidal currents. Earthquakes are frequent.

Long ago the region's wet and relatively temperate oceanic climate made it a haven for northern birds of all descriptions and hardy sea otters and seals.

Eventually, men came, too.

The first were the Aleuts, or their precursors, aboriginal flotam of the great prehistoric migrations from Asia to North America.

They lived in quiet harmony with the islands and the sea, in balance with wildlife and weather. With no weapons more potent than fish hooks and harpoons, they couldn't have destroyed their environment if they had tried.

They were followed by men who almost succeeded. In the summer of 1741, two ships of the great Russian-backed Danish explorer, Vitus Bering, reached the archipelago, and the rape of the islands began.

Throughout the islands and along the coast of the Alaskan mainland, white men from Russia and North America were soon engaged in wholesale economic warfare for domination of the vast region's fur trade.

PILLAGERS ARRIVE

The Russians came first, slaughtering the native Aleuts, pillaging the waters of sea otters and seals. Even decades after the Aleutians and the rest of Alaska had passed from Russian to American hands in 1867, the carnage of wildlife continued.

By the early 20th century, the sea otters had been all but exterminated. Finally, in 1913, President William Howard Taft proclaimed Amchitka—and all but seven of the other islands in the Aleutian chain—a national wildlife refuge.

The Aleuts by now had been decimated. Scarcely a single full-blooded native survived, and the mixed breeds who did were riddled with the Western diseases of alcoholism, tuberculosis and syphilis.

With the belated help of a nation slowly awakening to the destruction of its wildlife

and natural resources, the sea otters and other endangered island species started coming back.

Basic ecological problems lingered. The blue fox, introduced to many of the islands as a cash fur crop, was devastating wildfowl nesting grounds. The Norway rat, western man's close companion, infested islands the trappers and traders had long abandoned.

Before those problems could be solved, the islands were overrun again—this time by the contending armies of the United States and Japan. Nature suffered major reversals.

By war's end, Amchitka and other island outposts were littered with all the junk and detritus of modern warfare: rusting quonset huts, miles of coiling barbed wire, heaps of empty cans of Spam and smashed bottles of Japanese sake.

UNDOING THE PAST

But other men came, dedicated men from the Department of Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, who somehow saw in the 40-mile-long waste of Amchitka a chance to undo the past.

Slowly, patiently, a handful of biologists and other wildlife experts went to work. Within 20 years after the war, Amchitka was emerging as a classic example of what can happen when a major ecological interruption is repaired and the native ecology restored.

The island's sea otter population increased by the scores to its normal optimum. The Aleutian Canada goose—which previously survived solely on one small island in the chain—came back after the alien blue foxes had been destroyed.

And bald eagles—the living symbols of America—once again coursed the island unthreatened by the idle poaching of bored GIs. Amchitka was on its way back.

Early in this critical process, there were alarming danger signs. In the spring and summer of 1950, strangers from the Mainland landed on Amchitka and began probing its ancient geological heart.

The strangers, it developed, had been sent from Washington. They wanted to bury an atomic bomb on the island and explode it.

Then they left, and for 14 years they stayed away.

MEN AND MACHINES

In March of 1964, alert residents of the populated islands far to the east learned of a major, highly classified project soon to begin on Amchitka. During the spring, heavily loaded military aircraft started landing on the island. Technicians and roustabouts began erecting a giant drilling rig about a mile southwest of Lonely Cyril Cove.

Immediately, not-so-subtle pressures started disrupting the island's ecology once again. "Mud" used in the drilling process seeped from its holding pits into the salmon spawning beds of Amchitka's streams. The clayey gunk filled the interstices in the gravel and smothered eggs deposited there.

A great deal of the island was soon sacrificed by heavy machinery and laced with ditches. Earth was scraped away for campsites. That was just the beginning.

On March 18, 1964, the Defense Department's Atomic Support Agency announced that Amchitka would be the site of a deep underground, low-yield atomic blast. The explosion, it developed was designed to test methods of detecting underground nuclear tests in the Soviet Union, just 600 miles across the Pacific from Amchitka.

In the Department of the Interior, high officials—including Secretary Stewart Udall—were secretly, but strenuously, objecting.

The Defense Department assured Udall and the others that the atomic shot—called "Long Shot"—would be the island's last. Besides, they insisted, the blast itself would not harm the island's wildlife.

In its announcement of the test, the department mentioned only the probable effects on sea otters and commercial fishing.

"None of these interests will be jeopardized by the experiment," the statement declared. DOD ignored the other effects of the bomb-testers' presence on the island.

BOMB WAS "TINY"

Compared to the two megaton-range devices the AEC now plans to test on Amchitka, the bomb finally exploded in October, 1965, was miniscule. Shock effects were negligible. The bald eagles scarcely ruffled their feathers.

Ironically, Senate ratification in 1965 of the nuclear test ban treaty intensified the pressures on Amchitka. The treaty did not cover underground tests, and both the United States and Russia—the major signatories of the treaty—accelerated their underground testing programs.

The weapons tested grew in size even as the pressures to test more weapons intensified. In Nevada, the tremors triggered by blasts at the Hot Creek site eventually grew strong enough to startle gamblers in Las Vegas, 180 miles away.

By 1966, it was apparent to the decision-makers at the AEC and Defense Department that new test sites were needed. Amchitka was an obvious choice.

In March, 1967, the AEC awarded contracts for new holes on Amchitka, and by the end of the year the drill rigs were in operation.

Finally, after the new drilling had already begun, the AEC let a contract for the island's first full-scale ecological survey. And the Interior Department arranged the transfer of a few token sea otters and geese to safer havens.

Throughout, both agencies earnestly insisted that nothing harmful would happen to the island. Sea otters, it seemed, would learn to love the bomb.

The fate of Amchitka, it soon became obvious, was directly connected to the fate of the nation's controversial program to develop an anti-ballistics missile, or ABM. The imperiled little island became a microcosmic mirror on an imperiled world.

For a time there was hope for Amchitka. Test blasts originally planned for last fall were postponed as opposition to the ABM mounted in the United States.

For a time at least, the new Nixon Administration deferred its decision. It even appeared to some hopeful friends of Amchitka that the Soviet-American arms race, like the 19th century fur trade, might simply die away.

It didn't. On March 14, President Nixon announced the "compromise" safeguard ABM system. The first tests are planned for October, far away and out of sight, beneath a scarred little, sad little island.

MERCHANT MARINE TRADE BILL

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to remedy an unintentional hindrance to Hawaii's economic development.

I refer to section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, more commonly known as the Jones Act. This law prohibits the transportation of merchandise between American ports on foreign vessels.

The law is aimed at protecting American shipping and American seamen from competition they cannot possibly meet. Our high standard of living inevitably brings higher costs of operation, and without special protection or subsidy, our shipping industry would not survive. This law is necessary, therefore, to maintain our domestic waterborne trade.

American carriers with American ships are now serving the contiguous United States because of the Jones Act. Unfortunately, the act also blankets trade between Alaska and Hawaii—two States which are isolated from the other 48 States and depend heavily on water transportation to meet many of their needs.

No purpose is served by the application of the Jones Act to trade between Alaska and Hawaii, because there is no such trade. Indeed, under the present laws, there is no prospect of any trade in the foreseeable future. The cost of constructing vessels in American shipyards makes any such trade uneconomical. Thus, the operation of section 27 does not in this instance promote American shipping, but rather prohibits American trade. In effect, it has become an obstacle to economic growth in Hawaii and Alaska.

There is, however, great opportunity for trade if the Jones Act application can be removed. The discovery of huge fields of natural gas in Alaska has opened the way for far-away cities to obtain a cheap, clean heating fuel. The Honolulu Gas Co., after study, concluded that if the gas had to be transported in American-built ships the price of gas would be raised to a prohibitive point where the service would not be economically feasible. Thus, the Jones Act is stifling potentially beneficial trade between two States.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to legislation introduced in the 90th Congress. It would exempt Alaska-Hawaii trade from section 27 of the Jones Act, thereby allowing low-cost fuel to be brought to Hawaii with a resulting drop in the cost of living there.

Recently the American Gas Association, through the Gas Men's Roundtable, of Washington, D.C., sponsored a seminar on the present and potential impact of liquefied natural gas on the natural gas industry. One of the major topics discussed was the Jones Act, and in an address to the seminar, Mr. Carl E. Bagge, Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission, endorsed the easing of the Jones Act to allow the transport of liquid natural gas between Alaska and Hawaii.

Because of the importance of Mr. Bagge's statement, I am inserting that portion of it relating to this matter in the RECORD:

BENEFITS TO HAWAII AND ALASKA

A national policy for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) does not end with sorting regulatory matters into place. There are still other considerations. A significant one is to assure that all areas of the Nation and all segments of the populace share the fruits of the new technology. And, of course, this includes the non-contiguous states—Hawaii and Alaska.

At present, the prices of gas in Hawaii are the highest of any state in the Nation. It is not the fault of Hawaii's suppliers. It is the result of the unavailability of natural gas and the need to distribute higher-cost LPG and manufactured gas. What the gas consumers and suppliers of Hawaii need is a meaningful choice—the logical one now is LNG.

Alaskan natural gas is at the heart of this. The technology exists for the exportation of LNG by tanker from Alaska to Pacific ports. In a matter of months, LNG will be exported in tankers by Phillips and Marathon from

Alaska to Japan. There is no technological reason why LNG could not be transported to Hawaii also, either as part of the Alaska-Japan shipments or independently.

The economics of such a venture are favorable—but the law, that is the Jones Act, is not. I am convinced that the new LNG technology and the benefits it could bring to consumers in Hawaii and the natural gas suppliers in Alaska require an amendment to the Jones Act—one which would permit LNG trade between these states in foreign vessels. This would not be without precedent. In the past, Congress has exempted specific ventures from the strictures of the Jones Act. The rationale is equally persuasive here.

The primary purpose of the Jones Act was to develop a permanent American Merchant Marine—built in American shipyards by American labor, manned by American seamen, flying the American flag, carrying American products, owned by American citizens. Designed to enhance the commercial growth of the United States, it was intended to protect the stability of domestic industry in times of peace and to provide for the Nation's defense in times of national emergency.

The Act became law in 1920, when a large tonnage of government-owned ships was available for sale. Congress anticipated that the Act would encourage the development of a merchant fleet capable of carrying a major part of the United States' foreign trade and a fair portion of the world's carrying trade. Contrary to expectations, however, this did not follow. And recent figures show that while in 1947 United States flag ships carried over 57% of the Nation's commercial waterborne export-import trade, they carried only 7% of that total in 1966.

Efforts to implement a more productive maritime policy have been notably unsuccessful. In 1968, former Secretary of Transportation Boyd offered remedial legislation to the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Among the items he proposed was a provision to amend section 27 of the Jones Act. The purpose of this amendment was to authorize the transportation of goods in domestic trade on foreign-built vessels—so long as an administrative determination could be made that there would be no serious effect on other vessels in the trade. No bill embodying this proposal, however, was introduced in Congress.

In 1967, Senators Fong, Inouye, and Gruening introduced S. 2454 to amend section 27 of the Jones Act. Their bill proposed the exemption of "the transportation of merchandise between points in the State of Alaska and points in the State of Hawaii." Senator Gruening's statement described the complementary relationship of Alaska-Hawaii trade, the planned export of Alaskan LNG to Japan in Swedish-built ships, and the proscription of section 27 which prohibits these ships from delivering Alaskan LNG to Hawaii—a detriment to both states. The bill was referred to Committee but no hearings were held.

But section 27 has not been sacred. Congress has granted a limited number of statutory exemptions to the requirements of that section. Section 27 does not apply to the coastwise transportation of empty containers under certain conditions. It does not apply to the coastwise transportation of passengers and merchandise on Canadian vessels under conditions. It does not apply to certain foreign-built vessels which were engaged in United States coastwise trade during the First World War. It does not apply to merchandise carried in part over Canadian rail lines under certain conditions. In addition, section 27 has been suspended for temporary periods to permit the transportation of merchandise or passengers in certain foreign vessels over specified routes.

Indeed, section 27 could also be amended to accommodate Alaska-Hawaii LNG trade.

An amendment exempting Alaska-Hawaii LNG trade from the proscription of section 27 could take a variety of forms—from a broad exemption in the image of S. 2454 to a narrow exemption for a single ship. Possibilities include the type of amendment proposed by Secretary Boyd, or that relating to water transportation between specific points or that providing a temporary exemption. Whatever the form of the amendment, I believe that it is a necessary means of extending the benefits of LNG technology to the citizens of Hawaii and Alaska—and an indispensable element of national LNG policy.

Transporting the untapped reserves of Alaskan gas to the contiguous states in the form of LNG is still another exciting possibility. Its potential value as a competitive source of supply to the West Coast market should not be overlooked by industry and government policy-makers. The Jones Act, however, also operates to deter this development. While I believe that an Alaska-Hawaii LNG exemption can now be achieved, an Alaska-West Coast exemption appears to be more difficult because of the size of the market and the potential volumes involved. In the absence of legislation making such movements economically feasible, technology appears to afford the only means of surmounting this artificial barrier by achieving a breakthrough in costs.

THE DARTMOUTH SERIES

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, almost daily the communications media fans the fires of prejudice, violence, and hate by giving front-page publicity to loud-mouthed students, agitators, and distorters of American culture.

Yet somehow overlooked by the news media people was a meeting at the Westchester Country Club, Rye, N.Y., in January of this year which brought two Soviet officials together with several American citizens who are conspicuous because of their enormous wealth, political prestige, and their announced goal of reducing the American people to a "one world" conglomerate ruled by an "elite" clique.

Subsequent rationalizations for not reporting the Dartmouth series meeting is that it was "private and unofficial."

It must be remembered that it is a crime for any American citizen, not authorized by the U.S. Government, to negotiate domestic and foreign problems directly with agents of a foreign government—which even includes Soviet Russia—and makes no exception for talks held under the pretext of negotiating world peace.

I ask, How can we expect the American people to be intelligently self-governed unless news such as this meeting between private Americans and Russian officials is openly reported to the citizens by a responsible communications media?

I take this means of reporting this incident to the Justice Department and urge appropriate criminal action by the U.S. Attorney General.

I am further requesting the Secretary of State to advise the nature of the visas made available to Georgi Zhukov and Yuri Arbatov.

I am including with my remarks a letter from UPI addressed to Mr. J. C. Phillips, editor of the *Borger News-Herald*, of Borger, Tex., which Mr. Phillips has sent to me along with his inquiry as to the names of those who attended and whether the meeting was financed by the Ford or Rockefeller Foundation, or Carnegie Endowment for Peace.

The letter referred to follows:

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1969.

Mr. J. C. PHILLIPS,
Editor, *Borger News-Herald*, Borger, Tex.

DEAR J. C.: It took me a little time to dig into the "Dartmouth Series" meeting in Westchester last January, and this was compounded by some internal problems here to cause some delay in replying to you.

The meetings you referred to took place at the Westchester County Club, Rye, New York, in January. They were attended by Georgi Zhukov, a prominent Russian journalist and commentator for *Pravda*, and Yuri Arbatov, Director of the Institute of U.S. problems in the Soviet Academy of Sciences. These men acted as co-chairmen of the Soviet delegation which included other individuals from the arts, government and science.

These UN official talks were part of a series which originated at Dartmouth College—hence their name, although they have no official connection with the college. They began in 1959 and meetings have been held in the Crimea, at Andover, Mass., Leningrad and at Rye, New York.

U.S. co-sponsors attending the Rye meeting included David Rockefeller, Norman Cousins and Arthur Miller. Zhukov and his group also met with Arthur Larsen, Merrill Staines, James Gavin, Patricia Harris and James Linen.

The complete list of people who attended the series is not immediately available.

Whether we carried a story on the Rye meetings, I do not know. I doubt very much that we would have carried a piece on national circuits, although we might have done so locally, since the talks were completely private and unofficial.

Again, apologies for my delay in replying. With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACK FALLON.

THIS IS YOUR LIFE, ABE FORTAS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine should be commended for the great service it has done our country in breaking the Abe Fortas affair which took place during late 1965 and in 1966. The Life magazine article was released in May 1969.

In September of 1968, Justice Fortas was under consideration for elevation to the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The question arising in the minds of many is, did Life magazine know in mid-1968 of this latest indiscretion of Mr. Fortas? If so, why did Life magazine wait until 1969 to tell the American people about Mr. Wolfson's tender of a \$20,000 fee to Justice Fortas? Would Life magazine having known of the "deal," deliberately remain silent and permit Justice Abe Fortas to become Chief Justice?

If so, many people wonder why. Then too, why did Life magazine wait to break

the story until this particular time? Was it solely to wait and see if Justice Fortas recused himself on the Wolfson case? Could he not also have recused himself if he were Chief Justice?

Howbeit, the public service that Life magazine has rendered could but leave to any man of honor and conviction in high position in Government but one decision—resign from public office.

"JUSTICE" (?) ABE FORTAS

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the recent acknowledgement by Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas that he was "tendered" a \$20,000 fee and kept it 11 months before returning same, if not unethical, is at least highly questionable.

Although there is no law or regulation prohibiting a member of the Court from receiving outside income, the propriety of the action leaves much to be desired.

In February of this year, Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, and I jointly sponsored a bill to require Federal judges and Justices of the Supreme Court to file financial statements with the Comptroller General, a requirement of all Members of the House and U.S. Senate. Failure to file such a report would subject the judge to impeachment by Congress. Even the members of my staff, earning far less than a third of Judge Fortas' salary, are required to make such a report.

I opposed the nomination of Fortas to the Court in the first place, and again when he was so unfortunately nominated to become Chief Justice.

The controversial Justice Fortas, most certainly has involved himself in dealings that do not reflect favorably on the highest court in the land. The Members of Congress should not permit this incident to fade away and be forgotten.

In Bacon's essay of judicature is written:

The place of justice is a hallowed place; and therefore not only the bench, but the foot-pace and precincts and purpose thereof, ought to be preserved without scandal and corruption.

DARTMOUTH'S OBLIGATION TO EXPEL

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report to the House that when a few students at Dartmouth College yesterday willfully violated college regulations and criminally trespassed upon a college building by taking it over and refusing a lawful request to release it to college authorities, that they have been promptly removed. The Governor of New Hampshire, the court, and the college administration have acted commendably and promptly to meet this challenge to the very structure of this proud and distinguished institution.

Shortly after the takeover college authorities asked for and obtained from the

New Hampshire Superior Court a court order restraining the illegal activity. The students when advised of this refused to get out. Thereupon the college requested the assistance of enforcement authorities through the Governor of New Hampshire, himself a Dartmouth alumnus. Within a few hours this request was granted and the offending students were removed before dawn this morning.

The use of unlawful means to express protest or dissent is foreign to our system of government whether by students or anyone else. The law is the protector of the family, home, property, and the very lives of every man, woman, and child in America. Those who deliberately break it—who flout it—must face the consequences of their acts.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be the end of the chapter for those students who have in fact mutinied against their college. They should promptly be expelled without equivocation. Students who engage in this type of criminal conduct should not be allowed to remain in the college no matter whose son they are or the color of their skin. If they are now expelled, once and for all, Dartmouth will have provided a constructive example to a nation in which unlawful student activity has become an urgently serious problem.

CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER INTRODUCES SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the following package of legislative proposals relating to the social security program:

First. A bill to provide for automatic adjustment of social security benefits to corresponding changes in the cost of living.

Second. A bill to provide full benefits for widows.

Third. A bill to increase the earnings limitation from \$1,680 a year to \$3,600 a year.

There are more than 18 million Americans over the age of 65. When we talk of "forgotten Americans" we should include our senior citizens who often are overlooked and forgotten.

Today's inflation places a heavy burden upon all Americans, but it is especially cruel to the elderly and retired who must live on fixed incomes.

Each day my mail and the mail of other Members of Congress reflects the difficulties which many people living on social security are having in making ends meet.

The Nixon administration and the Congress are committed to waging war on inflation. However, we also must review the adequacy of present social security benefits and make necessary changes.

Mr. Speaker, during the 90th Congress I sponsored legislation to provide for the automatic adjustment of social security benefits corresponding to changes in the cost of living. Today I have introduced a similar bill which will increase social

security benefits whenever the consumer price index rises by 3 percent or more.

At the present time, a beneficiary who earns more than \$1,680 a year receives a reduced social security benefit. There is no more basic a right than the right to work. It is, therefore, wrong to penalize people who want to work and to keep them from social security benefits toward which they have contributed for years. To correct this situation, I have introduced a bill to increase the earnings limitation from \$1,680 a year to \$3,600 a year.

Finally, the Social Security Act at present discriminates against widows and widowers of primary beneficiaries. Under existing law, a man can draw 150 percent of his monthly benefits if he is married. If he is a widower, he receives his full benefits—100 percent. However, if he leaves a widow, she can receive only 82½ percent of his total allotment. This situation creates a serious injustice. A widow's expenses are hardly less costly than a man's.

My bill will permit the surviving spouse of a primary beneficiary to receive 100 percent of the social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we should not wait until 1970, an election year, to act on social security legislation. The need is now, the time is now. Senior citizens should no longer be "forgotten Americans."

PRESIDENT'S WAR ON OBSCENITY

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's program to combat obscenity and pornography offers real hope to Americans who have long thought that traffic in smut should be curbed.

This is an area that has disturbed me greatly. My office is receiving an increasing amount of complaints about pornography. There is no question that it is on the rise.

We have a duty to protect our children from this filth. Censorship and obscenity are very delicate constitutional areas and we must be careful that no one's rights are transgressed. But, at the same time, we must perform our duty to protect our children. The task should not be beyond our capacities. I think I know the feelings of any responsible parent. The American people want to see public officials stand up and put a stop to the filth that is being mailed and otherwise distributed to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Nixon's message to Congress on this subject. I am pleased to see that he has suggested legislation very similar to H.R. 6755 which I introduced earlier in the session. My bill is an almost exact copy of a New York statute. Recognizing the unique status of minors, the New York law has been judged constitutional by the Supreme Court. Implementation will not impose restrictions beyond those absolutely necessary. My bill, like the President's proposal, will make it a crime to sell or distribute pornography to children under 18 through interstate commerce and the mail.

This legislation is vitally necessary. We have been lax long enough. The time for action is now. I hope that this legislation, along with the President's other proposals in this area, will be given top priority status by the leadership of both parties.

ACTION AGAINST THE GLUT OF SMUT

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, along with millions of responsible and concerned Americans, I am pleased that the President is exerting positive moral leadership in acting to stem a bombardment of obscenity and perversion unparalleled in our history. The President's recent message and proposed package of bills recognizes that we have reached a new low in filth and that there is a distinction between freedom of expression and pandering for profit.

In a time that cries for moral leadership, the Nixon administration has demonstrated that it has the courage and capacity to act positively for the majority of Americans. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that most Americans object to the nauseating wave of filth that engulfs us, especially when it comes through the mails into their homes and directly to their families.

The truth, and it is time that pseudo-sophisticates recognize the truth, is that the pornography that pours from printing presses and photographic laboratories has nothing to do with freedom of expression. It is merely a cold, calculating, and unprincipled rush to reap profit from perversion.

The President correctly observes that the ultimate answer lies with the people and, perhaps, it is also time that some of our so-called moral leaders turn some attention to demonstrating against this erosion of the very character of our society.

I hope the Congress will act quickly and affirmatively to pass this needed legislation to take the profit out of pornography, and halt the revolting glut of smut that is a blight upon our society.

LOYALTY DAY HAS SPECIAL MEANING IN 1969

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 1, 1969, millions of Americans observed Loyalty Day. The event is sponsored each year in thousands of communities by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Loyalty Day has special meaning and great significance in 1969. Its celebration, quite simply, is a dignified response to the anarchy and anti-Americanism which has erupted with violence and invective on dozens of campuses and in many communities.

Patriotic parades, special flag ceremonies, school essay contests, patriotic

meetings and banquets commemorated the sacrifices which millions have made and are today making to insure the survival of liberty in a dangerous world.

LOYALTY DAY SIGNALS RENEWED DEDICATION

But the events which call for a Loyalty Day are more than a tribute to the veterans of our Nation's wars. They are more than a recital of patriotic commitment. These events—this year perhaps more than ever before—signal a renewed dedication to protect the American way of life.

Our way of life is challenged at home by disillusion and dissension and, in small isolated instances, by anarchy.

Our way of life is challenged abroad by outlaw states, such as the regimes of Cuba, North Vietnam, and North Korea. Americans are felled in battle by the North Vietnamese and in murderous ambush by the North Koreans. Cuban outlaws have allied themselves with our adversaries only 90 miles from our shores.

The anarchists in America, a small and wretched collection of social misfits, do not by themselves represent a serious threat to the Government. The outlaws abroad, by themselves, do not possess the capacity to dominate America from without.

But these enemies have succeeded in disrupting all too many colleges and have succeeded in murdering and incarcerating thousands of Americans abroad. Thus, while they cannot overwhelm us as a people, they can and do endanger and disrupt our lives as individuals, in or out of uniform.

The response provided by Loyalty Day is a proper response. It is positive, proud, patriotic, and prudent. Observance of Loyalty Day unites untold millions of Americans under one banner—for one common purpose.

That purpose is to speak out for what is right about America.

Mr. Speaker, even as Loyalty Day is celebrated and our tributes are paid to the VFW for an excellent contribution to our patriotic heritage, we cannot forget that the essence of Americanism is to right the wrongs which beset us as a people.

AMERICAN SYSTEM PROVIDES FOR REFORM

There are, without question, conditions in American life which demand improvement. Farmers do not get a proper return for their produce, our welfare system is a national disgrace and embarrassment, our servicemen in the lower pay grades receive insufficient compensation for their contributions to the national defense.

Our center cities and rural areas are suffering from widespread depression and inadequate opportunity. Our small colleges are being crushed in a cost-price squeeze. There are many other problems which citizens, local communities, the States, and the Federal Government must overcome.

But we rejoice in our American heritage for we can freely criticize and reform the inequities which we recognize in our society.

Self-criticism and popular reform are the characteristics of a free people. In observing Loyalty Day, we should be es-

pecially proud that, through nearly 200 years, our people have retained the capacity to effect change and improvement through orderly procedures set down by the Constitution.

The bravery of our soldiers demands our loyalty. The religious faith of our people demands our respect and loyalty. The maintenance of a republican form of government by all the States under the Constitution demands our loyalty. The fair dealing and open competition of our businessmen deserve our loyalty.

But most of all, the opportunity each of us has to influence the destiny of his government and thus his own destiny through orderly procedures set down by the Founding Fathers deserves our special loyalty.

The anarchists would subvert this opportunity, for they know their program for change cannot survive analysis by a free people.

This year is truly an appropriate year for a fully national involvement in Loyalty Day principles. I know each American who loves his country joins in supporting these principles.

MIZE URGES DESIGNATION OF EISENHOWER INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 I introduced legislation which would designate the Interstate Highway System of America as the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. Since that day, General Eisenhower has passed from this life, leaving behind a legacy of public service and dedication to principle unparalleled in this century.

I take this opportunity to again urge my colleagues to favorably consider this proposal in honor of the memory of our 34th President. Of all the suggested tributes, this perhaps would be most fitting. President Eisenhower's leadership caused the Interstate System to be built.

The bold adventure that became our highway system involved delicate negotiation, good-faith compromise, and a vision of an America fully united and interconnected. Geographic isolation and natural barriers were overcome to promote the accessibility of all America and all Americans.

The precedent of the Interstate Highway System cannot be forgotten during the coming decades when the United States comes to deal with the crisis in urban transportation and the impending crisis in airport congestion. President Eisenhower, and the Congress of that time, provided us with a blueprint for productive Federal-State cooperation for mutual benefit and advancement.

Abilene, Kans.—the general's boyhood home, and now his final resting place—is served by Interstate 70, a major artery of the system. As millions of Americans travel the interstate during coming years, many will pause at Abilene to pay their respects and pray for peace and for their country in the chapel where he is buried.

I think it would be appropriate for

those millions, as they continue their travels, to reflect from time to time on the contributions this great American made in war and peace.

The Eisenhower Interstate Highway System, if it is so designated by the Congress, would serve as a lasting reminder of the national scope and permanence of those contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to take appropriate action to designate our highway system as the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System.

PROPOSAL TO EXEMPT "ONLY SONS" FROM INVOLUNTARY SERVICE IN A COMBAT ZONE

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I frequently receive letters from distraught parents—as I am sure other Members of the House do—who request my help in keeping their only son—recently drafted or facing induction—from being sent into a combat zone. Their requests do not stem from a lack of a sense of duty. Rather, they desperately want to try to preserve the life of the only male heir so that the family name can be carried forth to a new generation.

Unfortunately, I can offer these parents no hope of relief from their dilemma unless the son can qualify under the Defense Department's "sole surviving son" policy—that policy wherein the only remaining son in a family in which the father, another son, or a daughter has been killed or has died as the result of injuries sustained while in the military service.

Mr. Speaker, to remedy this situation I am today introducing legislation to exempt "only sons" from involuntary service in a combat zone. I emphasize that this legislation, if enacted into law, will not exempt persons from military service—only service in a combat area if he so desires. An "only son" could still volunteer to serve in these areas.

Such a restriction should neither pose an undue burden on the Department of Defense, nor should it impair our defense posture. To the contrary, it would make more uniform the application of existing defense regulations.

I believe that this measure will serve to alleviate an undue burden which is placed on the parents of "only sons."

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS TO MEET HUNGER AND NUTRITIONAL DEFICIENCIES

(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, the President's proposals announced yesterday to meet hunger and nutritional deficiencies in the United States are timely and reassuring.

He was right when he described the existence of hunger in the United States as both embarrassing and intolerable.

What makes it especially embarrassing and intolerable is that it exists at a time when the Government is spending about \$3 billion a year in payments to farmers for not growing food.

How can the Government of a civilized society permit children to go hungry when food abundance is so great farmers get from the Government individual payments ranging into the hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to curb production?

President Nixon is on sound ground in proposing the reform and expansion of the food stamp program.

The initial steps he proposes will cost \$270 million in the 1970 budget. It is interesting to note that Dr. John A. Schnittker, former Under Secretary of Agriculture, recently estimated that a ceiling on farm payments which would not seriously impair the functioning of the commodity programs would result in budget savings as high as \$300 million annually.

Therefore at least the initial cost of the President's nutrition improvement program can be fully offset by establishing a realistic ceiling on payments to individual farmers. I will offer an amendment establishing such a ceiling, mine will specify a limitation of \$20,000, when the agriculture appropriation bill reaches the House floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOOD STAMP PROPOSAL

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the administration on its proposal to combat hunger in the United States as outlined in the statement made yesterday by President Nixon and his assistant for urban affairs, Dr. Moynihan.

The plan to broaden the food stamp plan will, for the first time since the inception of food stamps, provide an adequate diet to poor families. More important, at this time of increasing concern over the effects of inflationary pressures, the President's proposal is not expected to increase the budget. It calls for a reprogramming of funds to implement this needed upgrading and expansion of the food stamp program.

The Presidential message stated:

The moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time. It is a moment to act with vigor; it is a moment to be recalled with pride.

I heartily concur with these sentiments, and add that it is also a moment to pay tribute to the Member from the State of Missouri, Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN. Without her diligent perseverance over the years, this program might not be where it is today.

Back in February of 1954, Mrs. SULLIVAN offered the first amendment to create the food stamp program. On that day, after listening to her presentation and having been aroused by the misuse and waste in the handling of surplus foods in my own district, I supported and voted for the amendment. We have

come a long way since then—the battle to keep the food stamp program alive has been a never-ending struggle. Less than a year ago, we extended the plan after a long and intensive debate. The persistence and foresight of Mrs. SULLIVAN and many of our colleagues has made the food stamp program one of the achievements of a commitment to bring to an end the cruel hunger which besets many of our fellow citizens.

In my opinion, the best way to end poverty in America is to make sure that every citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, has an adequate and sufficient diet. The food stamp program presently in force, combined with the President's new proposals, should take a giant and necessary step toward eventual eradication of hunger in America. I heartily endorse the President's plan and comment it to our colleagues for implementation at the earliest possible moment.

ESCALATING MEDICAL CARE COSTS ARE SHOCKING

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, all of us are conscious of the revised budget sent up by the new administration, which provides among other things for a cut of approximately a half billion dollars in Federal grants under the medicare program.

As we nod our heads in agreement over the need to reduce spending wherever we can, I hope we will not lose sight of the human factors with which we must also deal.

This past week, I was shocked to learn just what the rising costs of medical care amount to. A friend of mine brought me the hospital bills covering a portion of the period of his wife's terminal illness. On November 21 last year she was admitted to one of the better known hospitals in California for open heart surgery and she remained there until January 4 of this year. The hospital bill for this 44-day period was \$25,930. The doctor bills were something on the order of \$1,300 more. A time spent in another hospital nearer home, plus ambulance costs, and so forth, brought the total bill to \$29,036.50.

Without presuming to pass judgment on the charges levied by the hospital for the services it rendered, I intend to ask the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to review them to see whether they are in line with customary charges.

Irrespective of that, however, the important point is that an illness of this magnitude can reduce a man to a state of poverty. In the case of my friend, he is like millions of other Americans in that he is neither rich nor poor, but when he is confronted with a bill of this kind he is, or will be, poor.

The final irony, I believe, is the notation at the bottom of the hospital bill which says that if the balance is not paid within 30 days, interest on the unpaid balance will be charged at the rate

of 1½ percent per month. On a bill of this size, that amounts to almost \$300 a month for interest alone.

I hope that in its deliberations on the costs of medical care and the costs of our medical care programs, the Congress will not lose sight of the fact we simply must find some way to take care of the major medical catastrophes which befall all too many Americans at one time or another.

BILL FOR EQUITABLE RECLASSIFICATION AND SALARY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill for an equitable reclassification and salary for all postal employees. I have already introduced a bill, H.R. 10000, to bring about a fair salary schedule for craft employees. My new bill will extend this same equitable salary to all levels in the postal field service.

This bill is appropriately numbered H.R. 11000 since its passage will result in a salary of approximately \$11,000 per year for the majority of the postal supervisors just as H.R. 10000 would mean a salary of \$10,000 per year for the majority of the postal clerks and carriers when they reach the top step. The introduction of the new bill is based on the fact that certain salaries cannot be upgraded without distorting the salary schedule. My bill, H.R. 11000, will keep a proper differential among all levels in the postal field service.

The present Reclassification Act, Public Law 86-68, was enacted in 1955. Since that time, there have been major changes in positions in the postal field service. There was no mechanization and automation in 1955. There was need for key positions in the railway mail service at that time. This has changed considerably in the intervening years due in some cases, to rather precipitous actions by the Post Office transportation officials.

Section 1 of my bill updates and upgrades the various positions by establishing 53 key positions instead of the present 49 and basing the salary levels on present-day duties and responsibilities. This section also provides that those employees placed in a higher step will not lose the credit already earned for automatic step advancement.

Section 2 amends the definition of "Revenue Units" and includes the postage and fee values of any mail deposited without postage affixed, as, for example, by Federal agencies.

Section 3 gives credit to the local postmaster for mail deposited without postage and fee affixed in determining the number of revenue units to be credited to the originating post office.

Section 4 provides that if an employee is assigned to higher level duties, he shall receive the higher level pay immediately. At the present time such determination is optional with the Postmaster General and in many cases employees work long

periods of time at higher level duties without receiving the higher level pay.

Section 5 provides that when the majority of the factors used in ranking positions would place such a position at the midpoint or higher between two key or standard positions, the position be ranked in the higher level. This section also provides that any assistant to the principal, such as Assistant Postmaster, and so forth, be ranked only one level below the principal. This is necessary since these assistants often perform the work of the principal without any increase in pay.

Section 6 provides that all step increases be automatic after 52 calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

Section 7 provides that if changes in the numerical steps or levels would otherwise occur on the effective date of the act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

This section also contains some necessary technical amendments in the present law regarding overtime payments and compensatory time.

Section 8 contains the new salary schedules and also establishes longevity grades A, B, and C of \$500 each after the completion of 8, 11, and 14 years of service, respectively.

Section 9 increases night differential from the present 10 percent to 20 percent.

Section 10 gives full credit for prior satisfactory service in establishing longevity grades and in placing the employee in the proper step of the salary schedule.

Section 11 makes the bill effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment.

It is very important that any legislation passed contain an incentive to make employees desire promotion. By establishing substantial salary differentials and desirable salaries, it is my opinion that we can recruit and retain better people and also provide an incentive so that more of the capable employees seek promotion to supervisory and postmaster positions. Under the present postal field service salary schedule, it takes 21 years for a craft employee to reach the top step of his level and many supervisors never reach the top step since it is necessary to remain in each step above step 7 for 3 years before advancing to the next step. My bill cuts down the number of steps and provides 1-year step increases in order that most postal employees, regardless of their position and salary level, can reach the top step which is so important not only concerning their earnings, but also concerning their retirement annuity.

INFLATION IN THE GRADE STRUCTURE OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be an inflationary trend in the pay structure of our Classification

Act employees. More and more of our 1.3 million Federal employees in the general schedule appear to be moving upward in pay grades.

Over a 10-year span—1958 to 1968—the number of personnel working under the Classification Act increased by 35 percent, but the number in the top six pay grades—GS-13 through GS-18—increased by 156 percent. In 1958, there were some 56,000 employees in the top management jobs in the departments and agencies or 6 percent of the total so-called white collar employment. Today, there are 143,000 in these top jobs, paying from \$14,400 to \$30,000, representing 11 percent of the total.

There are undoubtedly several reasons for this rapid expansion in the number of high level jobs in the Federal Government. I realize the growing complexity of Government. As compared to 1958, we now make greater use of automation; we use more sophisticated hardware in our defense effort and our space exploration; and we probably have more complicated social and economic problems to be solved. However, I doubt very seriously that the sum total of these several factors justify the magnitude of increases. The Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in studying this personnel item over the years, has noted the upward revision of position descriptions and reorganizations to create higher grades without any real changes in work or responsibilities.

In 1959, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, testifying before our subcommittee, indicated that so long as the Congress was slow in granting pay raises there was a strong tendency on the part of management in the executive branch to rewrite jobs into higher pay grades. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this particular inflationary trend should no longer be permitted. Since 1958, Congress has provided eight pay raises of Classification Act employees. For example, a GS-14 employee today is making 68 percent more than in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission to look into this inflationary spiral and report back to the subcommittee as to causes and suggested changes in this personnel administrative area.

REPORT ON THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a group of distinguished scientists and scholars, headed by Dr. Jerome Wiesner, issued a 344-page report on President Nixon's Safeguard proposal and concluded that among other things, it probably would not work and that it will appear to the Soviet Union to be an escalation of our arms race.

They further concluded that there is no need nor reason to deploy an ABM system now even if the technical problems could be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to read this 344-page document very carefully and I am sure we will all find it helpful.

I believe it is very important to continue the dialog on the ABM since it involves a major decision affecting the very survival of our country. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as I can ascertain from official quarters, both from the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense, none of the authors of this report has been given a security briefing on the ABM Safeguard and consequently are not at all versed either on the latest intelligence of Soviet and Red Chinese capabilities nor on the latest research in the ABM Safeguard system itself.

I do not question the motives of anyone, but it appears to me that the report would have a great deal more validity and we could certainly ascribe to it a great deal more credence if, indeed, those who had prepared it had participated and had taken advantage of security briefings to ascertain and familiarize themselves with all of the latest information, both about the Soviet Union's expansion of their planned ABM system and similar progress being done now in Red China.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago, Dr. Weisner, who headed this task force, publicly stated here in Washington that he had purposely removed himself from security briefings some 6 months ago because he wanted to be free to criticize the ABM system.

I imagine Dr. Weisner believes there is some validity in his position, but I suggest that there is another side of the coin.

I do not see how one can participate in such an important subject as the very survival of this country without having all of the information possibly available to him before he makes his final conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, it would certainly seem to me that those who say they do not want to participate in security briefings because they want to be free to criticize the system are, in effect, saying, "We do not want to be confused by the facts." I do not believe the best interests of America will be served under such one-sided procedures.

I could give a great deal more validity to this 344-page report and its conclusions if I were satisfied in my own mind that the author of this report did indeed have the same latest security information that is available to us who strongly believe that the country ought to proceed with the President's safeguard system as quickly as possible.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COST OF THE SAFEGUARD ABM

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, according to an article by John W. Finney in yesterday's New York Times, the Department of Defense now acknowledges that the \$6.6 billion it has repeatedly cited as the cost of the administration's proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system does not include the cost of equipping the system with nuclear warheads. According to figures supplied by the Atomic Energy Commission, the cost of developing and producing the hundreds of nuclear warheads required to equip the Safeguard will run at least an additional \$1.2 billion.

In view of the controversy that the development and deployment of the Safeguard has provoked in Congress, it seems incredible that the cost of such a basic component of the system as warheads could be deleted from the projected cost to the American taxpayer.

According to the Defense Department, the failure to include the cost of warheads in its cost estimates for the Safeguard was occasioned by the fact that the nuclear warheads are provided for by the budget of the Atomic Energy Commission and, hence, apparently of no concern to the Department of Defense.

Are we to believe that neither Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard nor Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird regarded the development and production of warheads as a part of the overall cost of the Safeguard proposal when they cited \$6.6 billion as the total projected cost of the system? Or is it simply the case that they thought the system would look more attractive to Congress if the little matter of the cost of warhead acquisition were omitted? One wonders how many other parts of the Safeguard have been farmed out to other Government agencies—like NASA—in order to conceal the true cost of the program.

A few weeks ago during the course of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the ABM system, there was the extraordinary phenomena of the Deputy Secretary of Defense invoking the name of a famous scientist with whom he said he had "consulted," and who he claimed had concurred in the decision to proceed with the development of the Safeguard system. A few days later, when that scientist himself appeared before the committee, it was learned that he had never consulted with Mr. Packard and that he had serious reservations about the development of any ABM system. Now the actual cost of the Safeguard has been underestimated through the exclusion of an integral facet of the system; namely, the warheads which are to be used to equip the Spartan and Sprint missiles.

In light of the enormous cost of the ABM and the concerns many Congressmen and Senators have expressed that its deployment may further aggravate the arms race, it does not seem too much to ask that Congress receive accurate information on the exact and total cost of the Safeguard system from the Depart-

ment of Defense. Recent behavior on the part of the Department of Defense amounts to more than a credibility gap; it constitutes a veracity gap of serious proportions. Congress should make it clear to the Department of Defense that its prerogatives do not include the twisting and concealing of vital information from Congress.

COMPEL FORTAS, OTHERS TO FILE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Members of the bill, H.R. 7211, which I introduced on February 19 of this year, which would require Mr. Fortas, as well as all Justices of the Supreme Court and Federal judges, to file annual financial statements with the Comptroller General of the United States.

Included in the formation required to be filed would be the name and address, and type of practice of any business or professional organization, corporation, firm, or enterprise in which the judge reporting, or his spouse, was an officer, director, partner, or employee, or served in an advisory capacity, from which income was derived during the preceding calendar year, and the amount of such income.

A judge would, in addition, have to list any gifts in the aggregate amount of \$50 or more and he would be required to provide the Comptroller General with a copy of his income tax return each year.

This information would be retained in a sealed file until such time as either House of the Congress, by resolution, requested it.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my bill would go a long way toward putting the brakes on activities such as those of Mr. Fortas.

I note with satisfaction that our distinguished minority leader has now expressed his support for legislation in this area.

I would merely remind him, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that my bill was introduced almost 3 months ago, and I would hope that now we can see some action on it.

LET'S NAME INTERSTATE SYSTEM AFTER GENERAL EISENHOWER

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1969, I lost a close and personal friend, but more important, the world lost a great leader and soldier who dedicated his life to peace—Dwight David Eisenhower.

As a memorial to this magnificent man, I am today introducing a bill to name the Nation's Interstate Highway System after General Eisenhower, whom history will record as one of our finest Presidents.

Under this legislation, the program which was set into motion during Gen. Eisenhower's second term would be designated as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System." It is now known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

The Interstate Highway System as we know it today was chiefly the work of General Eisenhower. It was from his notes that the then Vice President Nixon presented this concept to the National Governor's Conference in 1954.

It was from this presentation that the Federal Highway Act of 1956 evolved. This was the key that unlocked the problem of overlapping jurisdictions and has provided the United States, in General Eisenhower's words, "a properly articulated highway system that solves the problems of speedy, safe, transcontinental travel."

Before the Interstate System came into being, we had Federal, State, county, township, and other governmental systems participating in roadbuilding in the United States. Crossing State lines or even from county to county within a single State brought changes in the quality and type of highway. There was little, if any, coordination nationally.

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 brought the whole program together and recognized interstate highways as Federal rather than State responsibilities. It also placed them on a pay-as-you-go basis with the cost paid by the highway users. No revenues from general taxes, such as the income tax, are used to finance Federal aid for highways.

Mr. Speaker, we shall remember General Eisenhower for many things—as a great leader, a soldier dedicated to peace, and the architect of the world's finest highways. I feel, therefore, that the Interstate Highway System should bear his name.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE NATION'S EFFORTS TO PROVIDE HUNGRY AND MALNOURISHED CITIZENS WITH OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE DIET

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States unveiled a proposal to significantly expand this Nation's efforts to provide our hungry and malnourished citizens with the opportunity to obtain an adequate diet.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and commend the President and his administration for this bold and imaginative attack on one of our most critical domestic problems. "Embarrassing" and "intolerable" are two adjectives President Nixon chose to describe the anomaly of hunger in this food-rich country, and to that I could add "completely unnecessary."

But the President was also especially accurate in his statement that hunger "is an exceedingly complex problem, not at all susceptible to fast or easy solutions." There are, in fact, no easy or simple solutions. This is a challenge most

difficult to meet, but meet it we must, and President Nixon's recommendation for a responsible and achievable Federal food aid effort represents a major step forward.

The issue of malnutrition and hunger in the United States has reached deeply into the social consciousness of the more fortunate and affluent of the American people. Weekly, or monthly, food expenditures are a matter of no small concern to the great majority of our families. But authenticated stories of real hunger in this land of plenty have carried real shock value. It is less important in the national scale of values that food, for the average family, costs less than 1 day of work from a 5-day workweek; that no other similar-size population group in all history has obtained their food with so small a fraction of their total production effort; or even that our overall national affluence has reached the present high level. More important, to most of us, is that hunger—and hidden hunger—should exist among our fellow citizens, and show in the faces and bodies especially of children.

Furthermore, I commend President Nixon for his announcement that he will hold a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition, involving executives from the Nation's leading food processing and food distribution companies and trade unions. I am particularly gratified that the President has included as a key portion of his program the necessity of private sector involvement. This program is particularly well suited to a creative Government-industry partnership of the kind the President has advocated in other important areas of national concern.

Decades ago, when this country was faced with a severe hunger and malnutrition problems associated with the depression, the food marketing industry responded with great enthusiasm and effectiveness in adding extra nutritional benefits to traditional foods and literally selling the American people on the idea of better diets. The leadership of the food industry at this time can again provide a significant contribution to our efforts to come to grips with this similar national need.

Agriculture Secretary Hardin and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch are both to be highly commended for the significant part they played as architects of the President's food assistance proposal. They will have the difficult and important job of working out the legislative details to implement this plan, and the momentous responsibility of administering it so that its objectives can be achieved.

To the cadence of the cries that will rise from one group saying "not enough," and from another group saying "too much," I hope that the majority of my colleagues and the American public will join together and carry this program through to success, and that they will do this because they recognize that it is a balanced, responsible, and responsive approach to this critical national problem.

POPULATION CONTROL

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am quite honored to have been appointed chairman of the task force on earth resources and population control for the House Republican conference research committee.

One of the objectives of the task force will be to help educate the American people, as well as Members of Congress, on the need to prepare for population increases and for the reclamation and recycling of our resources. Along with the other members of the task force, I will, from time to time, be putting remarks in the RECORD that are educational and informative.

Such an article is "Malthus Revisited," an editorial in yesterday's New York Times. The writer makes a most important point. Reduction of birth rates must be the policy of the developed as well as the underdeveloped nations. We must tend to our own affairs before we dictate to others. We must show by example that people in a free society can accept the duty and responsibility of managing their population without the need for coercion. We must exert forthright leadership to confront the cold fact of life that the underlying cause of future crises will be the ever expanding population.

We live in one world and we must do so responsibly if we are to avoid the future famines which the demographic and ecological prophets foretell. I include this noteworthy editorial in the RECORD at this point:

MALTHUS REVISITED

Were he alive now, Parson Malthus would have found much that was familiar in Robert S. McNamara's eloquent plea at Notre Dame for a sharp cutback in birth rates in the underdeveloped countries. Many of those nations are "treadmill economies" forced to divert already inadequate capital resources to the care of "mounting waves" of children whose immediate needs leave little left over for raising abysmally low standards of consumption and health. The choice, as Mr. McNamara correctly stated it, is between reducing birth rates humanely or letting the cruel forces of famine and war or other violence solve the population problem in their usual grim fashion.

The bleak statistics of the population crisis ahead are simple enough. If recent trends continue, humanity's numbers will double in the next thirty years—from about 3.5 billion now to 7 billion at the turn of the century—and reach 14 billion by 2035. Of the prospective increase between now and the year 2000, 85 per cent or more could be accounted for by larger numbers in the underdeveloped nations. If this arithmetic is the pattern of the future, then chaos and suffering on an almost unimaginable scale are certain.

Mr. McNamara may be too optimistic, if anything. He sees the current rapid advance of agricultural productivity as sufficient to buy two decades during which the world will have time to take measures needed to prevent catastrophe. But the increasing hundreds of millions in the underdeveloped areas want more than merely enough food to fill their bellies. Understandably they want a standard of living that will approach more closely the standard taken for granted in the developed countries. But this requires precisely the capital that is being eaten up by the ceaseless flood of new-born life.

Strong as the case is for a systematic effort to reduce birth rates, the difficulties are formidable. There are great shortages of the

funds and manpower needed to mount the required educational campaigns and to provide mechanical, pharmaceutical and other means of birth control. Even more fundamental is the resistance in many areas to the idea of reducing births. That resistance arises partly from religious taboos, partly from deeply grained cultural patterns grounded in the now obsolete wisdom of a past age, and partly from fears spread by demagogues that Western talk of birth control is really inspired by the desire to commit genocide and "demographic imperialism."

Mr. McNamara's campaign for population control should apply to all nations, the developed as well as the underdeveloped. Food is not the limiting factor in the former; but already important questions are being raised about how much this small planet's air, water and land can absorb in the way of automobile fumes, insecticides and other poisons, radioactive wastes and the other effluvia given off massively in modern industrial societies. The more people and the higher the standard of living they enjoy, the greater the volume of damage to the world environment as a whole. More, and more effective, measures of birth control are as essential in the have as in the have-not nations, and only their broad acceptance throughout the world during the next generation will prevent a convulsion that will make all questions of population control academic because then there won't be enough population left to control.

At this time I would also like to call the attention of my colleagues to the profound statement made by the Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Oceanography.

In discussing the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, Mr. ANDERSON pointed out:

As people become more and more numerous and as land and resources become more and more scarce, we must seek new ways to cope with this imminent crisis. In the upcoming decade the ocean holds great promise and high adventure in man's quest to meet his growing needs on this last great frontier on earth—a frontier spanning over two-thirds of the earth's surface yet one which we have barely skimmed.

I commend my colleague from the landlocked district of Illinois for his farsighted conclusions and include his full statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANOGRAPHY, MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE BY HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON, OF ILLINOIS, MAY 7, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

I am most grateful for this opportunity to appear before you today and discuss with you the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, "Our Nation and the Sea."

When I first indicated an interest in the Stratton Commission report earlier this year, someone expressed to me his surprise that a congressman from land-locked Rockford, Illinois should be excited about oceanography. But it's really not so unusual when you consider that my district borders on the Mississippi River and my State on Lake Michigan, both of which received some attention from the Commission. But moreover, I am deeply concerned about the problems and needs of our nation, and indeed, all mankind. We are all linked by our land-air-sea environment and we are all linked by the shrinking nature of our planet and the problems this portends.

As people become more and more numerous and as land and resources become more and more scarce, we must seek new ways to cope with this imminent crisis. The upcoming decade of the oceans holds great promise and high adventure in man's quest to meet his growing needs on this last great frontier on earth—a frontier spanning over two-thirds of the earth's surface yet one which we have barely skimmed.

The Congress recognized this potential back in 1966 with the passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act calling for a national ocean program. This committee is to be commended for the excellent leadership it has exerted and continues to exert in this area, and the Marine Resources Council and Marine Science Commission deserve our highest praise for the fine work they have done to date.

But the Commission has expired and left us with an impressive report and set of recommendations and the life of the Council has been extended for only one year. We must now decide what to do about the Stratton Commission report and what direction our national ocean program will take when the Council is disbanded.

It is obvious that if we are to proceed with a national marine policy in an orderly and unified fashion, we must seek new organizational means to bring such order and unity to our efforts; we need both a national and a rational approach. For this reason, I fully endorse the recommendation of the Stratton Commission to create a new, strong and independent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to coordinate and direct our national marine policy in the years ahead.

I refrain from the temptation to call this a "wet NASA" as some have done since the analogy just doesn't hold water. As Dr. Wenk has pointed out, this is not a crash program, nor is it an exclusively Federal program. Industry, Academia and State and local bodies all play key roles in ocean-related research and development, and this is as it should be.

At the same time, there is a definite need for Federal leadership in this area, for a national plan of action based on a coherent and unified national policy. There is a need to draw together for proliferation of marine missions scattered throughout our sprawling Federal bureaucracy. There is a need to give some central direction and support to marine missions being conducted in industry, by universities and by State and local groupings. In short, there is a need to provide for a means for undertaking a full range of marine-related activities geared to broad human needs; or, as the 1966 Act put it, "to develop, encourage and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind."

I really don't see how these needs could possibly be met without a strong, independent agency like NOAA. NOAA is central to the success of a large number of the Commission's recommendations and the Commission has therefore urged its "immediate adoption" if we are to "mobilize the resources of our Government in the most effective manner to lend strength and power to the Nation's marine commitment."

I concur with this assessment and respectfully urge this distinguished Committee to give priority attention to this proposal of the NOAA.

I think it is significant to note that the Commission has chosen not to adopt the wholesale consolidation of all marine activities within a single structure. It has recognized that some of these programs provide close operational support to the departments and agencies in which they are presently located and should therefore not be moved. These include the National Science Foundation's marine and atmospheric science programs, the Interior Department's fresh water, seashore and mineral resource programs, the Army Corps of Engineers' coastal and

waterways programs, the Smithsonian Institution's biological and geological oceanography studies, the activities of the Office of Naval Research and the Naval Oceanographer, and the marine-related nuclear energy programs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I think the decision to keep these out of NOAA is realistic, at least for the time being, since they are major components of their parent bodies. At the same time it is most vital that NOAA exert some type of coordination and planning role over these as the Commission has recommended.

For example, the Navy is way out in front as a leader in oceanographic research and development work, especially with the "Man in the Sea" program begun last year. Much of this work has spin-off civilian benefits of great value to our civil marine program. I am most concerned that NOAA has some built-in mechanism to catch such spin-off benefits and to avoid duplication. I think any legislation to create NOAA should clearly define its role with relation to civil marine programs outside the agency and provide an effective means for their coordination.

Hopefully, this will be one of the primary responsibilities of the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans under NOAA, as was proposed by the Stratton Commission. I question whether the head of NOAA could directly assume the sole responsibility for inter-agency planning and coordination as the Commission report has suggested.

However, there are marine programs within various Federal departments and agencies which are peripheral to the primary missions of their parent bodies and in their present form are too small to have visibility and impact. Instead, they breed insularity, overlap and competition and are obstacles to an integrated national approach. These are the components which must be brought together in a strong independent agency of our government, an agency like NOAA.

The Stratton Commission recommends that NOAA should be comprised of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Environmental Science Services Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the U.S. Lake Survey, the National Sea Grant Program, the National Oceanographic Data Center, certain programs of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and possibly the National Center for Atmospheric Research and support for the United States Antarctic Research Program.

This reorganization would shift some 55,000 employees under the roof of NOAA as well as 320 seagoing ships. The Commission is also recommending several new programs under NOAA as well as the development of an undersea capability.

The proposed bureaucratic shifts are bound to raise some controversy, especially among those who tend to jealously guard their bureaucratic preserves. This is understandable and the full implications of such shifts should receive a thorough airing by this committee. But, as Dr. Stratton so ably pointed out in his testimony last week, we must look beyond mere bureaucratic interests; in his words, "The real issue here is the national interest." We must think in terms of the human problems and needs such an approach addresses itself to.

In the words of the Commission report: "How fully and wisely the United States uses the sea in the decades ahead will affect profoundly its security, its economy, its ability to meet increasing demands for food and raw materials, its position and influence in the world community, and the quality of the environment in which its people live."

The time for decision has arrived. Will we turn to the sea and work together to meet its challenges and realize its potential; or will we turn our backs on the sea and reject the opportunity to improve our environment and constructively utilize its resources?

The Commission has stated: "The Nation's stake can only be realized by a determined national effort great enough for the vast and rewarding task ahead."

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I urge this Committee to spur the great national effort that is needed by establishing an agency capable of carrying out the mandate of the Stratton Commission.

PRESIDENT NIXON HAS OFFERED A COMMENDABLE PROGRAM TO REDUCE THE INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN OBSCENITY

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most welcome messages which the Congress has received from President Nixon was the message of Friday, May 2, on the subject of obscenity.

The great public need for legislation and citizen action to reduce the interstate traffic in salacious materials to our children is timely as well as basic to our democratic society.

The President's message, coupled with legislation of which I am today becoming a cosponsor, is both restrained and thoughtful.

There is no effort at thought control. On the other hand, there is a frank recognition of the Nation's obligation to prevent interstate channels from being used to peddle pornography among the youth of our Nation.

In addition, the President has urged legislation to prohibit the use of the mails for advertising of sex-oriented materials. Finally, the President has urged enactment of legislation which would enable citizens to enlist the cooperation of postal authorities in keeping such offensive advertising materials from their homes.

Quite obviously, the task is not simply one for Federal legislation. It is one in which the States, the municipalities and the individual citizens must join.

I hope that all will join in a great national effort to "turn back the tide of obscenity in this country," as President Nixon has urged. As a part of this joint effort, in invite the earnest support of my colleagues for the legislation which the President has called for and which is being introduced today. Enactment of these measures can go a long way toward the task of stopping the traffic in pornography.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 12

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he can advise us of the program for the balance of this week and next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished Re-

publican whip, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

On Tuesday there are five bills which will be called up under unanimous consent from the Committee on Armed Services. They are as follows:

House Joint Resolution 677, to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969;

House Concurrent Resolution 207, relating to Gen. Omar N. Bradley;

H.R. 8020, providing round trip transportation to home port for a member of the naval service on permanent duty aboard a ship overhauling away from home port;

H.R. 6790, authorizing an increase in the number of Marine Corps Reserve officers who may serve in active status in combined grades of brigadier and major general; and

H.R. 8018, amending title 10, United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of "dependent."

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

S. 1011, authorizing appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4152, to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, subject to a rule being granted.

In addition, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) has advised that bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means previously announced for this week will be put over, and that he will call them up next week by unanimous consent. A list of the bills follows:

BILLS REPORTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

H.R. 9951, to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments, etc.

H.R. 2718, extending for additional temporary period suspension of duties on certain classifications of silk yarn.

H.R. 4229, continuing for temporary period suspension of duty on heptanoic acid.

H.R. 4239, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of racehorses purchased outside the United States.

H.R. 5833, continuing to June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

H.R. 7311, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes.

H.R. 8644, making permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

H.R. 10015, extending to July 15, 1971, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum.

H.R. 10016, continuing until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap.

H.R. 10017, continuing for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

H.R. 8654, to provide combat pay income tax treatment for the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW TO MONDAY, MAY 12, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have finished the legislative program for this week, and have announced the legislative program for next week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 7, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 5:57 p.m., on Tuesday, May 6, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President concerning hunger and malnutrition in America.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN AMERICA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-115)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
We have long thought of America as the most bounteous of nations. In our conquest of the most elemental of human needs, we have set a standard that is a wonder and aspiration for the rest of the world. Our agricultural system produces more food than we can consume, and our private food market is the

most effective food distribution system ever developed. So accustomed are most of us to a full and balanced diet that, until recently, we have thought of hunger and malnutrition as problems only in far less fortunate countries.

But in the past few years we have awakened to the distressing fact that despite our material abundance and agricultural wealth, many Americans suffer from malnutrition. Precise factual descriptions of its extent are not presently available, but there can be no doubt that hunger and malnutrition exist in America, and that some millions may be affected.

That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable. But it is an exceedingly complex problem, not at all susceptible to fast or easy solutions. Millions of Americans are simply too poor to feed their families properly. For them, there must be first sufficient food income. But this alone would only begin to address the problem, for what matters finally is what people buy with the money they have. People must be educated in the choosing of proper foods. All of us, poor and non-poor alike, must be reminded that a proper diet is a basic determinant of good health. Our private food industry has made great advances in food processing and packaging, and has served the great majority of us very well. But these advances have placed great burdens on those who are less well off and less sophisticated in the ways of the modern marketplace. We must therefore work to make the private food market serve these citizens as well, by making nutritious foods widely available in popular forms. And for those caught in the most abject poverty, special efforts must be made to see that the benefits of proper foods are not lost amidst poor health and sanitary conditions.

The Council for Urban Affairs has for the past three months been studying the problem of malnutrition in America, and has assessed the capacities of our present food and nutrition programs. As a result of the Council's deliberations, I am today prepared to take the following actions:

1. FAMILY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Federal government presently provides food assistance to nearly seven million needy Americans through the Food Stamp and Direct Distribution programs. Though these programs have provided welcome and needed assistance to these persons, both are clearly in need of revision.

The present Food Stamp program also can be greatly improved. I shall in a short period of time submit to the Congress legislation which will revise the Food Stamp program to:

- provide poor families enough food stamps to purchase a nutritionally complete diet. The Department of Agriculture estimates this to be \$100 per month for a typical family of four.
- provide food stamps at no cost to those in the very lowest income brackets.
- provide food stamps to others at a cost of no greater than 30% of income.

— ensure that the Food Stamp program is complementary to a revised welfare program, which I shall propose to the Congress this year.

— give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to operate both the Food Stamp and Direct Distribution programs concurrently in individual counties, at the request and expense of local officials. This will permit the Secretary to assist counties wishing to change from Direct Distribution to Food Stamps, and to meet extraordinary or emergency situations.

It will not be possible for the revised program to go into effect until sometime after the beginning of the calendar year 1970, that is to say after the necessary legislative approval and administrative arrangements have been made. The requested appropriations will then permit the establishment of the revised program in all current Food Stamp counties before the end of the fiscal year, as well as a modest expansion into Direct Distribution counties, and some counties with no current programs.

This program, on a full year basis, will cost something in excess of \$1 billion per year. (Precise estimates will only become available over time.) This will be in addition to the \$1.5 billion for food for the hungry which I have requested for the forthcoming fiscal year, making a total program of \$2.5 billion. In the meantime, \$270 million is being reprogrammed within the forthcoming budget to permit the program to begin as soon as legislative and administrative arrangements can be made and other necessary measures taken.

While our long-range goal should be to replace direct food distribution with the revised Food Stamp program, the Direct Distribution program can fill many short-range needs. Today there are still over 440 counties without any Family Food Assistance program, and this Administration shall establish programs in each of these counties before July 1970. The Direct Distribution program will be used in most of these counties. In these and other Direct Distribution counties, the most serious criticism of the program will be met by ensuring that all counties offer the full range of available foods.

To strengthen both current Family Food Assistance programs, efforts will proceed on a high priority basis to establish more distribution points, prompter and simpler certification, financing arrangements, mailing of food stamps, and appeal mechanisms.

2. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

Serious malnutrition during pregnancy and infancy can impair normal physical and mental development in children. Special effort must be made to protect this vulnerable group from malnutrition.

The Special Package program, which provides needy women and mothers with packages of especially nutritious foods, was designed to meet this need. But the program has encountered logistical problems which have severely limited its success. I am therefore directing that a substantial portion of the Fiscal Year 1970 budget for this program be used to establish pilot programs that make use

of the private food market. Under these programs, needy pregnant women and mothers of infants will be issued vouchers, redeemable at food and drug stores for infant formulas and other highly nutritious special foods. If such a program seems workable, and the administrative problems are resolved, the program will be expanded later on the basis of that experience.

3. ADMINISTRATION OF FOOD PROGRAMS

I am directing the Urban Affairs Council to consider the establishment of a new agency, the Food and Nutrition Service, whose exclusive concern will be the administration of the Federal Food programs. Presently the food programs are operated in conjunction with numerous other unrelated programs. The creation of a new agency will permit greater specialization and concentration on the effective administration of the food programs.

4. PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

I shall shortly announce a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition, involving executives from the nation's leading food processing and food distribution companies and trade unions. I shall ask these men to advise me on how the private food market might be used to improve the nutritional status of all Americans, and how the government food programs could be improved. I shall also call on these men to work with the advertising industry and the Advertising Council, to develop an educational advertising and packaging campaign to publicize the importance of good food habits.

5. INTER-AGENCY EFFORTS

Although most of the current food and nutrition programs are administered by the Department of Agriculture, other agencies are critically involved. I am therefore establishing a sub-Cabinet working committee of the Urban Affairs Council to promote coordination between the food and nutrition programs and other health, educational, and antipov-erty programs.

At the present time, I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to take a number of immediate steps.

I am asking the Secretary of HEW to:

- work with state agencies to ensure that the Medicaid program is fully coordinated with the Special Package and pilot voucher programs for pregnant women and infants, so that vitamin and mineral products can be made available to those diagnosed as suffering from nutrient deficiencies.
- expand the National Nutrition Survey, presently being conducted by the Public Health Service, to provide us with our first detailed description of the extent of hunger and malnutrition in our country.
- initiate detailed research into the relationship between malnutrition and mental retardation.
- encourage emphasis by medical schools on training for diagnosis and treatment of malnutrition and malnutrition-related diseases.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, with its exclusive commitment to the problems of poverty and its unique "outreach" among the poor themselves, has an especial role to play. I am asking the Director of OEO to:

- work with the Secretaries of Agriculture and HEW to establish a greatly expanded role for the Community Action Agencies in delivering food stamps and commodity packages. Volunteers working in the VISTA program will also aid in the delivery and outreach process, supplementing the efforts of the Agricultural Extension Service.
- redirect OEO funds into the Emergency Food and Health Service program to increase its food, health, and sanitation services for our most depressed areas. Presently, health and sanitary conditions in many of our most depressed counties are so poor that improved food services alone would have little impact on the nutritional health of the population. The Emergency Food and Health Service has provided invaluable services in aiding these areas, and its good work should be substantially expanded.

More is at stake here than the health and well-being of 16 million American citizens who will be aided by these programs and the current Child Food Assistance programs. Something very like the honor of American democracy is at issue. It was half a century ago that the "fruitful plains" of this bounteous land were first called on to a great work of humanity, that of feeding a Europe exhausted and bleeding from the First World War. Since then on one occasion after another, in a succession of acts of true generosity—let those who doubt that find their counterpart in history—America has come to the aid of one starving people after another. But the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself. For all time. I ask this of a Congress that has already splendidly demonstrated its own disposition to act. It is a moment to act with vigor; it is a moment to be recalled with pride.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 6, 1969.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON HUNGER

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon in his inaugural address said:

No people has ever been so close to the achievement of a just and abundant society, or possessed of the will to achieve it. Because our strengths are so great, we can afford to appraise our weaknesses with candor and to approach them with hope.

The Presidential message on hunger in America contains a full measure of both candor and hope. There is candor in the recognition that hunger and malnutrition are facts of life for millions of Americans. The tougher test of candor is the President's understanding that there

is no cheap or easy solution to this extremely complex problem. Our best estimate at the moment is that it will take more than \$2.5 billion annually to put an end to hunger in America for all time.

Fundamentally however, the President's hunger message is one of hope for the 16 million Americans who will benefit from the programs which are being proposed to eliminate hunger. The President has seized the initiative in formulating a massive frontal attack on hunger in America. That these conditions should be permitted to exist amidst unprecedented material abundance and agricultural wealth is both embarrassing and intolerable.

Indeed as the President stated, "the honor of American democracy is at issue." I feel confident that the Congress will accept this challenge and vigorously support President Nixon's program to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in America.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to go on record in support of a new national goal—an end to both hunger and malnutrition in America.

Hunger is directly related to poverty. Malnutrition may be present even when sufficient funds are available to maintain a proper diet.

The hunger and malnutrition problems therefore are twofold, and the malnutrition problem is especially complex.

The answers are adequate funding, the most efficient possible channeling of nutritious food to low-income Americans, and the educating of insufficiently informed Americans regarding proper diet and its relationship to good health.

The program proposed by President Nixon in his message to the Congress on hunger and malnutrition seeks to resolve many of the complexities involved in feeding the poor and feeding them properly.

No program coming before the Congress in this or any other year can be more important than this Nixon administration proposal for properly meeting the food needs of low-income Americans.

The President has said the expanded program will go into effect sometime after next January 1. I would urge that it be implemented as soon as possible. The task of providing the administration with the necessary legislative authority, the reprogramming of funds and the other administrative arrangements necessary to carry the expanded program forward should be attended to in a spirit of the greatest urgency.

I applaud the decision to double the food stamp program. I applaud the decision to establish a family food assistance program before July 1970 in the more than 440 counties now lacking it.

These decisions in themselves deserve the highest praise, but I would point out also that President Nixon will go far beyond these actions to seek additional improvements in Government food programs—by calling a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition aimed at promoting good food habits, by redirecting Office of Economic Opportunity funds to increase food, health, and sanitation services in our most depressed areas

where improved food services alone are not the answer, and by issuing various other White House directives to Government departments.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has been praised as a pragmatic administration which is bringing careful thought and keen analysis to the great problems this country faces as we approach the decade of the seventies.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with this message on hunger and malnutrition President Nixon has clearly demonstrated that his administration has not only a head but a heart.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I think that Members on both sides of the aisle will agree that President Nixon's announcement of a new offensive against hunger in America is a welcome development. By laying the groundwork for an expanded food stamp program, and maintaining sufficient direct distribution of food to communities not participating in the food stamp program, the administration has moved forcefully and effectively to combat hunger and insure adequate nutritional standards for all Americans.

Special attention has been paid to the needs of expectant mothers and mothers of infants unable to provide themselves with a wholesome diet.

Greater efforts at interagency and Federal-State cooperation will help to speed relief to many who were denied help in the past because of intergovernmental squabbles and delays. Costs and overall efficiency can be maintained at the most acceptable level, and new research into long-range solutions to malnutrition, volunteer action through cooperation with the VISTA program, and stepped-up health services all round out this well-planned Government assault on hunger and malnutrition.

With the help of the Congress, President Nixon can inaugurate this drive to end hunger in America, not with political oratory and fanfare, but with sound, reasoned solutions to the problem.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, an article in last Sunday's New York Times pointed out that if all the food in today's world were distributed evenly among its 3.5 billion human inhabitants, every one of them would go hungry.

Sometimes we in America forget how truly fortunate we are. With only 6 percent of the world's population this country has set a standard of agricultural production and distribution without equal anywhere on the globe.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, many Americans today remain the victims of hunger and malnutrition. While the solution to this problem is not to be found in any instant program expected to eradicate overnight the blight of malnutrition and insufficient diet, it is clear that we must pursue an effective and well thought out course of action to remedy this unsatisfactory situation.

In this regard, I believe that the President's food assistance proposals merit serious consideration. The President has recognized that while many Americans are simply too poor to feed their families properly, the providing of sufficient food income alone is not a panacea for the problem. What matters finally, in the President's words, is what people buy with the money they have.

Mr. Speaker, poverty has teamed up with a stronger ally in the form of ignorance to oppose the fight against hunger and malnutrition. Too often, people have the resources which could conceivably provide them with a satisfactory diet if allocated wisely, but continue to suffer malnutrition due to the fact that they are not sufficiently equipped to understand and, hence, to avoid the causes and consequences of nutritional deficiencies. In the President's words, people "must be educated in the choosing of proper foods."

In this connection, volunteers experienced in matters of health and nutrition could perform a real service, as they have in my own State of Arizona, by helping to eradicate ignorance in whatever form it may assume; whether this be in matters of nutrition, or the closely related areas of health and disease, conditions of sanitation, or of family limitation.

Hunger is our present adversary, but ignorance is our real enemy. I believe the President's proposal is an important one in this regard.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks immediately following the President's message on hunger and malnutrition.

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

There was no objection.

LURLEEN B. WALLACE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AND TUMOR INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago today a courageous lady, Alabama's only woman Governor, Lurleen Burns Wallace, died of cancer.

And today in Alabama the fight is on, led on by Gov. Albert Brewer, to defeat the disease which last year robbed not only Mrs. Wallace, but thousands of others in the State, of life.

A \$15 million cancer hospital, to be built in Birmingham as a part of the medical center complex, is in the planning stages and a fund drive is underway to raise \$5 million of this sum from public contributions.

It is fitting that this facility will be named the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital and Tumor Institute, for, during her short 41-year lifetime, Alabama's late Governor continuously sought to aid the physically and mentally ill.

Upon graduation from high school, she attempted to enter nurses' training, but was too young and turned instead to business school. Still shy of the age minimum to go into nursing following the completion of her business training, young Lurleen Burns went to work in a Tuscaloosa dime store where she met George C. Wallace, whom she later married.

Her compassion for the ill did not end,

however, because her ambition to become a nurse was thwarted.

During her year-and-a-half term as Governor, Mrs. Wallace visited many hospitals in the State and was instrumental in improving conditions for the patients.

While waging this public crusade, she carried out a private battle of her own—a war which began in 1961 against cancer.

Through several early operations, she continued to believe she would be cured of the disease. In 1966, several months after one of these operations, Mrs. Wallace and her doctors both felt optimistic enough about her chances to believe her health would permit her to become a candidate for the governorship of our State.

On November 8, 1966, Lurleen Burns Wallace became the first woman in Alabama history to become Governor.

During the early months of her administration, Mrs. Wallace was an active Governor, giving much emphasis to the need for improvement in hospital facilities.

But her hoped-for cure of her own illness was not to be.

Not one to shirk her duties, Mrs. Wallace remained at the State capital whenever possible, making frequent visits to Houston where she underwent operations and received treatment at the M. D. Anderson Cancer and Tumor Institute.

On May 7, 1968, Lurleen Burns Wallace lost her last great battle, but her courageous fight will long remain in the hearts and minds of Alabamians.

It is not only Mrs. Wallace who fought courageously against this most dreaded of diseases. And an estimated 9,000 other Alabamians will begin this year their battle against cancer—a fight which will end in death for some 4,800 in 1969 alone.

The State has the highest death rate from cancer of the cervix in the Nation and also ranks high in deaths from lung and breast cancer. A nearby hospital can provide early diagnosis and treatment and possibly save more lives.

And so, it is for these cancer victims and the estimated one-quarter of the State's population, young and elderly, poor and wealthy, who will eventually fall victim to some form of the disease, that the hospital is dedicated.

The cancer and tumor institute will not only treat cancer victims, but will undertake research to find out what causes the disease and what can be done to cure it more rapidly and in more cases. Currently about two-thirds of the State's cancer victims die from the disease.

Many could be saved by treatment.

The hospital will serve all people in Alabama, as well as those in neighboring States, with a 200-bed facility, possibly to be expanded to 500 beds in the future. An additional 150,000 persons can be treated on an outpatient basis.

That there is a need for such a hospital is unquestionable.

Currently there is no hospital in Alabama or neighboring States which can administer totally to the needs of cancer patients. There are facilities which have limited cancer programs, but none to provide the full facilities for surgery, X-ray, and other treatments, diagnosis and

outpatient care which the cancer and tumor institute will supply.

The new hospital will serve other purposes outside of administering to several hundred bed patients and additional thousands of outpatients.

It, as part of the medical center complex, will be a learning institution where doctors, nurses, and paramedical staff will be trained to care for cancer patients.

Equally important are the research facilities which the hospital will provide. For, if cancer is to be conquered, like other once-dreaded diseases such as infantile paralysis, research must be carried out to determine the causes and cures.

Treatment for some types of cancer have been discovered and are effective if the disease is diagnosed in time. There are many others for which there is no cure and for which doctors do not even know the cause.

A center of this size and with this potential could be expected to draw some of the Nation's foremost physicians, technologists, and researchers—quality professionals who are needed if persons in the State are to benefit from the hospital.

Under the chairmanship of Governor Brewer, a fund drive is currently underway to convert this dream into a reality. Five million dollars is needed from the public and an additional \$10 million will come from private and Federal sources.

To date, about a third of this sum has been raised since the drive began in January. Although at least five counties—Tuscaloosa, Cullman, Barbour, Chambers, and Pickens—have passed their goals, the remaining 62 have not and more money is needed.

Governor Brewer, in his talks across the State in support of the Lurleen Wallace Cancer Crusade has often said, "Wouldn't it be wonderful if a cure for cancer could be found here in Alabama."

The answer is a resounding "yes." But the new facility will also give many people in Alabama something they have never had, the opportunity to receive early and complete treatment for cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the distinguished dean of the Alabama delegation (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when Alabama's late beloved Gov. Lurleen Burns Wallace lost her battle with cancer exactly 1 year ago today, a movement was started in her memory that may one day save thousands of lives.

Amid the grief of a saddened people, the Courage Crusade was born. It was the beginning of a drive to build a great hospital in which the dreaded disease that claimed the life of our Governor will be attacked through treatment and research.

Because of our late Governor's deep feeling for people and the generous and warm response that she received in return from all touched by her exemplary life, it is fitting that the hospital will be named the "Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital and Tumor Institute."

The need for this hospital, to be located in Birmingham, Ala., is clearly established. Nothing like it exists in the entire Southeast, a problem which necessitated many long and tiring trips to M. D. Anderson Hospital in Houston, Tex., for Governor Wallace during her ordeal.

The alarming pervasiveness of cancer is evident in estimates that one in four persons will have some form of cancer during their lifetime.

The real "builders" of this citadel of hope for cancer victims will be the great and the small who knew and loved Alabama's great and courageous first lady.

Gov. Lurleen Wallace had compassion for others who suffered, especially the mentally ill in my State, although she refused to shroud herself in a cloak of self-pity during her own suffering. She would have been greatly honored to have her name permanently enshrined in the hospital that Alabamians and people all over the country are seeking to build.

Within its walls may come survival for many through the discovery of a cure for this great killer—a cure that Lurleen Burns Wallace hoped for but did not live to see.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point House Joint Resolution 5 adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom did call unto Himself our beloved Governor, Lurleen Burns Wallace on May 7, 1968, the Tuesday before Mothers Day. It was especially fitting that many memorial services were held for her in churches throughout Alabama on Mothers Day. Her love for others, her devotion to her family, her compassion at the suffering of others, her willingness to give of herself even to the point of giving her very life for her State and its people, her endurance of suffering, her gallant courage, and her willingness to stand up for the children of Alabama exemplify motherhood at its highest pinnacle:

Now, therefore, we do mourn the death of our beloved gallant Lurleen Burns Wallace, and we do designate and set aside Mothers Day as a memorial day for Lurleen Burns Wallace, and we do request and entreat men of good will everywhere to observe and hold memorial services and pay respects on Mothers Day to Governor Lurleen Burns Wallace.

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Congressional Delegation from Alabama, to the Governor of each sovereign state of these United States, and to the Chief Executive Officer of each County and Municipal Governing Body in the State of Alabama, and to the family of Governor Lurleen Burns Wallace.

Adopted by the House of Representatives April 1, 1969.

Concurred in and adopted by the Senate April 1, 1969.

Approved by the Governor May 2, 1969.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to honor the memory of our late beloved Governor, Lurleen Wallace, whose death from cancer a year ago today saddened all Americans.

Although her term of office lasted just 14 months, she found a permanent place in the hearts of people everywhere.

The people of Alabama will not soon forget how much she cared for them. They will not easily forget her graciousness, her gentleness, her humility, or her heartfelt interest in the welfare of each and every one of them. And, they will never forget her courage—for it is the memory of her courage which has inspired the Lurleen Wallace Courage Crusade.

The Courage Crusade is a dedicated effort on the part of the citizens of Alabama to create a living memorial as the most fitting tribute they could pay to this gallant lady who fought so bravely for her life against overwhelming odds.

The crusade is a drive to raise \$15,000,000, with which to build, equip, and staff the most modern facility for cancer care and research in the Nation, the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital and Tumor Institute.

A challenging goal. To offer the best care for patients with cancer; to serve as the finest training center for all types of health personnel relating to the care, research, education, and control of this dread disease; to offer the most modern research facilities; to put into practice new methods of surgery and different approaches to radiation and other forms of therapy.

As Alabamians, we are determined to participate fully in the founding and completion of this institute. Because cancer is the common enemy of all of us and because we as a nation have never failed to join together in any effort to overcome a common enemy, we invite all citizens everywhere to join us in accomplishing our goal—to the memory of one, for the benefit of all.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker, and gladly yield to my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL).

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just 1 year ago today a gracious, gallant lady, the late Honorable Lurleen B. Wallace, lost a courageous battle against cancer.

I rise now, Mr. Speaker, to add my support for, and to ask for, financial assistance for the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital and Tumor Institute. Presently a group of dedicated Alabamians are leading a drive to raise \$5 million to help build and equip this hospital.

No one has to point out the need for such a hospital. The statistics speak only too well. In my State of Alabama, more than 900,000 people now living will eventually have cancer; that is 1 in 4 according to present rates. Cancer will strike approximately two of three Alabama families over the years. This year it is estimated that 4,800 Alabamians will die of cancer; that is 13 Alabamians a day, more than one death every 2 hours.

This proposed project has been strongly endorsed by Gov. Albert Brewer, the Alabama Medical Association, the dean of the University of Alabama Medical School, The National Cancer Institute, and the State of Alabama Department of Health.

The Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital and Tumor Institute would result in better care for patients with cancer. It would also:

Serve as a training center for all types of health personnel related to the management of cancer.

Provide a consultation center available not only to all the people of the State of Alabama, but to the entire Southeast.

Make available a research facility to further the understanding of the cause, treatment, and cure of cancer.

The ultimate goal, of course, is to arrest the spreading growth of this malignant disease.

Today there is no method for curing all cancers. There are treatments, surgical procedures, radiation techniques that can cure some cancers when detected and treated in their early stages. Similar techniques provide additional years of pain-free survival to those with widely disseminated disease.

Gov. Lurleen Wallace was an outstanding individual, unique in her courageous devotion to her family, her State, and her country. She possessed a quality of character that strengthened her in the face of overwhelming adversity. From that quality of character has come an outpouring of public response to build this hospital and institute. No more fitting tribute could be paid this gracious lady.

The challenge is formidable. But the need is urgent. We must do all that is within our power; we must fight back with everything at our command. Completion of this project will mean much in the continuing battle against cancer.

But in order to succeed, we need help. The people of Alabama are asking the people of every State in the Union to join them in this effort. Contributions can be made to the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital Fund, Inc., 185 Lee Street, Montgomery, Ala. 36104. Detailed information with respect to the current status of the project and specific information concerning its goals can be obtained from the same address.

As we remember Lurleen Wallace on this significant day, may we all make a generous financial response to this most worthwhile cause.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman who has just spoken in the well, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) is a close friend of the Wallace family and a former floor leader in the State legislature for Governor Wallace.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my esteemed colleague from Birmingham for yielding. I wish to commend him at this time for setting aside this special hour to honor a very great lady.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago today the people of Alabama lost our beloved Governor, Lurleen Burns Wallace. Although she served only 18 months as our chief executive, she was admired and respected by all Alabamians and, indeed, by all Americans.

Governor Wallace was a dedicated public servant, but above all she was a

devoted wife and loving mother who loved people and had a particular feeling for the less fortunate of our State. It was through her efforts that legislation was passed providing better care for the mentally retarded people in Alabama.

During the later months of her life she fought a constant battle with cancer. As she did, the people of Alabama fought with her. When she finally lost the battle a part of Alabama died with her. A few hours after her death I visited with her grief-stricken husband, Gov. George Wallace in our Governor's mansion along with hundreds of other close family friends. I was reminded of the words of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to Timothy, and thought how appropriate Paul's words were in Governor Wallace's case:

She has fought a good fight, she has finished her course and she has kept the faith.

Hundreds of thousands of Alabamians and many others throughout the Nation loved and respected Gov. Lurleen Wallace for her courage and devotion and for her belief in the moral and spiritual qualities which have made our's a great Nation.

But today it is not our purpose to mourn the death of this great lady, but rather the people of Alabama are today dedicated to perpetuating her memory through the Lurleen B. Wallace Courage Crusade. The purpose of this crusade is to construct the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital. When completed, the hospital will serve not only the people of Alabama but people throughout the Southeast.

Through this crusade the people of Alabama will be continuing Governor Wallace's efforts on behalf of the less fortunate and those who are affected by the disease which took her life. I know that no other memorial would have pleased her as much as this one.

This undertaking will not be a simple one. A minimum of \$15 million will be required for construction of the facilities of the hospital. This facility will be operated in connection with the University of Alabama Medical Center in Birmingham.

The Courage Crusade is going well. The people of Alabama can and will raise the necessary funds to build this hospital, but we also invite others who believe in this effort to join us in furthering the battle against cancer. Although construction of this hospital will be a lasting memorial to Gov. Lurleen Wallace, there could be no greater tribute to her than to have a cure for cancer discovered through research at this hospital.

The entire Alabama congressional delegation takes great pride in inviting other Members of the Congress and Americans throughout this country to join in the Lurleen Wallace Courage Crusade.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

I am glad to yield now to my distinguished colleague from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me at this time and for taking this

special order to allow those of us who had such great respect for our late Governor, Lurleen B. Wallace, to speak out in behalf of this crusade that is going on in our State.

Mr. Speaker, out of pain, misery, and suffering there is some good that can come. Certainly our late Governor did suffer grievously. A year ago today she died. As a result of that suffering and of that death, our State has now embarked upon a project that might well be one of the greatest memorials that we have ever seen in our State. If ever there was disunity, there is unity in this project. There is unity in the fact that people in all walks of life all over our State are pulling together to see that this project is carried out to completion.

If ever there was a nonpartisan project, it is the project to develop the hospital and the institute.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to stand with my colleagues today and not only pay tribute to this wonderful lady, but to the work that is being done by those she left behind in the State of Alabama.

The Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Hospital will result in better care for patients with cancer. It will serve as a training center for all types of health personnel relating to the management and the proper treatment of cancer. It will provide a consultation center available not only to all the people of the State of Alabama but to the entire Southeast. It will make available a research facility to further understand the causes and treatment and the care of cancer. The ultimate value of the cancer institute and hospital is that the benefits developed at the center will filter out not only in Alabama, but to all parts of this country. Therefore, it is important in my opinion that the country realize the benefits that can be obtained from the development of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in not only urging all Alabama citizens to participate in this great project, but I also urge the people of this great Nation to pay their respects to our former Governor and to show their desire to find the answer to this problem of cancer.

Mr. Speaker, a dollar, \$5, \$10—yes, whatever amount—will be put to good use as we build this addition to the great medical center in Birmingham to the memory of our former Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) for his contribution.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FLOWERS. I thank my distinguished colleague from Birmingham for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the death of Lurleen Burns Wallace, 47th Governor of Alabama. Her life was untimely short, yet her courage and dedication to duty provides an inspiration for countless millions through-

out the world. Governor Wallace, the only native-born Tuscaloosa Countian to achieve that high office, and only the third member of her sex so elected in the history of all the States of this Nation, was a great lady of ability and compassion. She conducted the affairs of State with regal grace and in so doing, indelibly impressed the stamp of her administration on the pages of history.

Perhaps her greatest accomplishment was the heritage of courage and determination that she left with us. Her gallant fight for life against the ravages of one of our most dreaded diseases, cancer, provides an example for all mankind. The people of Alabama who loved and revered her with the devotion given only to a select few are, even now, engaged in a massive fundraising campaign appropriately entitled "Lurleen Wallace Cancer Crusade."

The proceeds from this drive will build and equip a 200-bed cancer institution—later to be expanded to 500 beds—dedicated to the treatment and eradication of this disease. This facility, in addition to providing better care for patients with cancer, will serve as a training center for all types of health personnel in this field and provide a consultation center available, not only to the people of the State of Alabama, but to the entire Southeast.

The Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital, costing some \$15 million, will be a research facility dedicated to the further understanding of the cause, treatment, and cure of cancer. Its construction will pay fitting tribute to this great Alabamian and her devotion to her State and its people.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of the late Gov. Lurleen Burns Wallace, of Alabama, and to the great and noble effort of the people of the State to raise a worthy memorial in her name.

Gov. Lurleen Wallace, the 47th Governor of Alabama and one of the few women elected to that high office in any State of the Union, died a year ago today after serving less than half of her term.

She had been elected to Alabama's highest office at the age of 40 by the largest majority ever received by an Alabama Governor. To the Governor's chair she brought the dignity of a gracious, noble woman and the understanding and compassion for others of a loving mother. She was especially concerned with the mentally ill and the mentally retarded and did much to focus public attention on the great needs in this area.

Concern for the needs of others had been a hallmark of her life. She had ambitions of becoming a nurse after she completed high school at the age of 15. Marriage and a successful career as a wife and mother intervened.

During the last couple of years she faced the personal challenge of cancer, a

dread disease too prevalent today. Her obvious courage in this long, sad struggle was an inspiration to all Alabama citizens.

It is fitting and proper that the people of Alabama are today engaged in an effort to raise \$5 million in donations for a memorial to our late beloved Governor Wallace. This will be used to match Federal programs for construction of a \$15 million Lurleen Burns Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital in the outstanding medical complex in Birmingham.

I wish to commend this statewide endeavor to provide a memorial which will have such great meaning and usefulness to others whose suffering may be eased or corrected through the talents which this facility can bring together.

Her own life was a testimony of service to others. I believe it would be her wish that any memorial reflect that noble ideal.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I first came to know Lurleen B. Wallace as a quiet and gentle wife and mother who tended to stand well out of the limelight, and simply be a source of strength and inspiration to her illustrious husband. I watched with growing wonder, therefore, on her inauguration day, as from early morning and well into the evening she conducted herself with poise and dignity which would be a credit to any public official. I saw her stand for many hours in the Montgomery sun reviewing the bands of high schools and colleges of our State passing in review to honor her, and then deliver with considerable force a very fine inauguration address late that afternoon. And as she began her work it became apparent that Alabama had elected a true leader, the only woman Governor of her time.

Her death came as a tragic loss to every citizen of Alabama, and yet in the providence of God it is sometimes possible that even the greatest tragedy can be turned somehow toward human betterment.

And so the people of Alabama in this Courage Crusade, as they join hands and hearts with each other and with concerned friends around the country, are working to make the courageous life of this great Governor of our State, and her tragic death as well, work toward bringing to reality our dream of a healing, teaching, and research institution of the first order to deal with the dread disease of cancer, and hopefully to contribute to its permanent eradication. Out of her life and death therefore shall come new life and new health for thousands of her fellow citizens whom she so greatly loved, and so wonderfully served as their Governor.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my Alabama colleagues for bringing to the attention of the House the humanitarian efforts of the people of their State to establish a teaching and healing facility for cancer patients dedicated to the memory of former Gov. Lurleen Wallace.

Additionally, I want to add my endorsement of this undertaking and wish

it every measure of success. Certainly, it is incumbent upon all Americans to join in a collective effort to find a cure for the dreadful disease of cancer. If this goal is accomplished, it will require participation by all levels of government, the medical profession, the scientific community, and individual citizens.

Mrs. Wallace was a gracious, courageous, and able leader. So I think it is most fitting that this worthy project is being conducted in her honor and memory; and more so because she suffered and died from cancer.

The late Mrs. Wallace and her husband, who preceded her as Governor of the great State of Alabama, have made extraordinary contributions to the economic, social, and cultural development of their State and Nation. Therefore, I enthusiastically support the Lurleen Wallace Cancer Crusade and, again, commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) and members of his delegation for taking this time to acquaint other Members of this noble endeavor.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

CRUEL DECISION ON JOB CORPS WRECKS YOUNG LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, the President sent to the Congress a message on the Economic Opportunity Act. That message was a lofty, reasoned and thoughtful document, designed to inspire confidence in the future of this country's war on poverty. We were assured of this administration's continuing concern for the poor, of their intention to maintain an agency in the executive branch whose specific concern was the poor. It talked also about the efficiencies, the economies and the better program management that was to be expected from a projected delegation of the Job Corps to the Labor Department. Implicit in that message, moreover, was an indication that, with respect to that delegation, and other changes, time would be afforded the Congress to study and debate fully the future of the Nation's war on poverty.

Hard on the heels of that message, however, came the announcement that the administration was cutting back drastically on the Job Corps. The Job Corps funds, in fact, were to be reduced by about 45 percent. The number of conservation centers were reduced by two-thirds, from 82 to 32. The men's and women's urban centers were reduced by

one-third. Seven women's and two men's centers, the administration announced, would be closed forthwith. All attempts to slow down, or indeed to discuss this arbitrary and unilateral decision met with indications from the administration that this matter was not open for discussion. The Labor Department was quite explicit in its testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that they simply would not wait to give the Congress a chance to act on matters of this kind. "The oars are in the water," Secretary Shultz said before our committee.

At the same time the administration was promising to consult the Congress, it absolutely refused to do so.

Our committee has, for some weeks now, been examining this Job Corps decision. It is fair to say that the results of that examination are not encouraging, nor are they designed to inspire confidence in the future program judgment of this administration.

Implicit in their decision to continue a substantial number of Job Corps centers is the determination that the Job Corps program works. The administration is, in fact, quite explicit in their statements that a Job Corps program is needed and that it functions well for the youngsters in need of its specialized kind of service and assistance. But they say to increase its effectiveness, we will cut out the least efficient.

What they do not say is that they are abandoning almost \$80 million of capital assets in those closures and incurring termination costs of another \$27 million. Some of these capital assets, to be sure, are on Federal lands. Even in those instances, however, it is open to serious question whether American taxpayers will ever get use and value of the money invested. Not a small amount of this capital investment, however, was in private property. When such a center is abandoned, that investment is irretrievably lost. If it is true, as they say, that the operation of these centers was not all that it might have been, it would seem to make a good deal more sense not to abandon the capital investment, but to work especially hard to improve the operation of those camps. If the Job Corps works well in most centers and most camps, obviously it can be made to work elsewhere. Rather than throw away \$80 million it seems that we might be better advised to have tried to find means of using that capital investment. This administration does not inspire the American taxpayer by abandoning \$80 million worth of investment, simply because it was the last administration that invested it and they are now ready to fly off on a different tack.

This administration intends to reduce by some 36 thousand the annual opportunities for young men and young women to benefit from the Job Corps program. They intend to program one-eighth of this number of enrollees—only 4,600 in 30 urban-located minicenters. They claim to have based their decision on experimental centers which had been in business for some time. They mention

the center run by Hull House in Chicago. This camp, located outside Chicago, enrolls neighborhood youth corps boys with a need for residential support. It is, in fact, a prevocational training operation which, while it has placed a few youngsters in jobs, basically was designed to prepare them for placement in other manpower training programs. Mr. Homer Bishop, acting director of the Hull House Association, said before our committee that their program was in no sense a substitute for the Job Corps.

The Administration cited the New Haven Boys' Center as another prototype upon which they intended to build. But here again, Dr. Ira Goldenberg, Director of the Training and Research Institute for Residential Youth Centers and founder of the center, said quite explicitly that his type of operation could not conceivably be expanded and still be effective beyond the number of boys he is presently operating with, which is only 25.

The Labor Department presented some comparative costs between the Job Corps urban centers and those of their E. & D. operation in New Haven. The annual per capita cost of the urban men's center, they say, is \$7,241. The New Haven boys' center, by contrast, they proudly point out, costs only \$5,784. I submit for the record the comparative chart which the Department provided the committee. The cost differential is very impressive. It is, however, as impressive for what it does not say as for what it does say. It does not point out, for instance, that while the men's urban center is self-contained, providing both residential, supportive, educational, and vocational services to the youngsters, the benefits of the New Haven operation are only of a supportive nature. It is a bunkhouse operation. This is made clear in their presentation. Their new minicenters were designed, in fact, in each case to be "linked to such existing programs as CEP, NAB, JOBS, MDTA skill centers, and so forth." That word "linked" is a very interesting one. What it means is that the \$5,784 of cost must be added to the factor necessary to provide the actual vocational training and education. On the average, this will be at least \$900 a year. For the youngster in an MDTA institutional training operation, we have to add \$1,451. For the youngster residing in a minicenter but participating in an on-the-job training program, we have to add \$660. For those involved in CEP—the concentrated employment program—\$1,220. The costs of education and training are not contained in the costs of the centers.

There are other costs that also must be added. We have not had the opportunity to explore these in detail, but the \$5,700 figure for New Haven does not include medical or dental fees, which in the Job Corps experience was about \$336 per youngster. It does not contain any number of other things which the kids needed and which the Job Corps provided. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I submit a comparison of man-year costs for Job Corps and Inner City Centers prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor:

COMPARISON OF MAN-YEAR COSTS—JOB CORPS AND INNER CITY CENTER

| | Job Corps "Urban" Center | Labor E. & D (New Haven) ¹ |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Center operating expenses..... | \$2,429 | \$1,864 |
| Enrollee expenses..... | 1,176 | 1,124 |
| Operations and maintenance..... | | 740 |
| Other operative expenses (including rent)..... | 1,253 | 1,000 |
| Center staff expenses..... | 3,114 | 3,320 |
| Staff salaried and benefits..... | | 2,880 |
| Travel..... | | 240 |
| Contracted services..... | | 200 |
| Enrollee direct cost..... | 1,447 | 40 |
| Allowances..... | | 0 |
| Travel..... | | 0 |
| Insurance..... | | 40 |
| Total Center and enrollee direct cost..... | 6,990 | 5,224 |
| Capital investment..... | 251 | 560 |
| Rehabilitation..... | | 240 |
| Equipment..... | | 320 |
| Grant total, Center cost..... | 7,241 | 5,784 |

¹Includes staff cost of services to families of the Center residents and followup of graduates.

²Residents are required to contribute one-third of earnings as rent for room and board. Amounts vary according to hours worked (out-of-school youngsters earn more than in-school). Rent receipts are used to pay food costs, which explains why this figure is so low.

³Residents are not paid allowances because they are expected to hold jobs which can be either public- or private-sector jobs.

It is easy to see that the savings contemplated by this new decision are more apparent than real. The total cost of the minicenters will certainly exceed the average Job Corps cost.

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

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I support the position the gentleman from Kentucky has taken.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a leader in this House interested in conservation of our natural resources and in the conservation of our human resources. I believe no one has made a greater contribution in these respects than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I have known him for many years.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. It is clear, in spite of the claims made, that a reduction of \$100 million in Job Corps is not going to provide more training. We are not getting "more bang for a buck" this year either.

Nor is this new direction going to reduce the cost per trained youngster. Neither can we anticipate that the new minicenter will have substantially greater success with the youngsters than the Job Corps. The Hull House Center in Chicago placed less than 25 percent of its youngsters in jobs. The rest of those

that were placed went into other training programs—MDTA, NYC, back-to-school. Indeed, it is interesting to note that some of their youngsters went into the Job Corps.

They also had their problems with dropouts. The Hull House dropout rate, in percentage terms, was not substantially less than Job Corps. And like the Job Corps, some of their youngsters ended up, unfortunately, in jail.

I submit for the record a review of their results with 94 trainees over a 12-month period, based on their presentation to the Committee. We have no reason to believe that the minicenters will have as much success as the Job Corps has had in retaining and placing the hard-core youth.

The Hull House experience with 94 trainees handled in a 12-month period:

| | |
|---|-------|
| To employment..... | 25 |
| To Jobs Now (manpower training)..... | 10 |
| To Neighborhood Youth Corps in city..... | 9 |
| To school..... | 5 |
| To armed services..... | 4 |
| To Job Corps..... | 2 |
| To Division of Vocational Rehabilitation..... | 1 |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 56 |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Left camp (no contact)..... | 11 |
| Left camp (unemployed)..... | 9 |
| To jail..... | 4 |
| Family moved from city..... | 2 |
| Underage..... | 1 |
| Deceased..... | 1 |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 28 |
| Remained in camp..... | 10 |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Total | 94 |

I say these things not to depreciate the efforts of the Hull House operation or the New Haven minicenter, or any others, but simply to point out that these are difficult youngsters to deal with. There are no simple solutions, and the administration's determination to start off in a new direction is, I think, misplaced.

One of the real costs of this change, which the administration likes to minimize, is the cost to the youngster who was in the program at the time the announcement was made. The administration committed itself to transfer any enrollee who desired it to another Job Corps center or, in the alternative, to afford them another training opportunity in their home community. Even while that promise was being made to the committees of the Congress, at some centers as many as half of the youngsters had abandoned hope and abandoned the Job Corps. Of about 170 youngsters at Clam Lake in Wisconsin, approximately 70, I am told, had left the camp by the time the Secretary was testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As to them, that promise was easy to make. It is also easy to make the promises that those who remain in closed centers will be given an opportunity for training at home. Unfortunately, training opportunities do not exist in most of the rural and smalltown areas of this country. Most Job Corps enrollees came from such areas. It is inconceivable that training opportunities will be available to them, a fact which the Secretary must

have or should have known at the time he made the commitment. Even in the urban areas, availability of such training programs to the type of youngster who is in the Job Corps is extremely limited.

In a great show of concern, teams of employment service people have visited most of the centers. My information is, however, that, as often as not, they have not talked to a significant number of the kids and to those whom they have spoken, they have said, "See your local employment service." This, to young men and women, in communities where there is no employment service or for whom the employment service has represented something less than a sympathetic institution. I predict that, before this transition is completed, less than 10 percent of the kids in the Job Corps centers that are closed will have been transferred to other centers or would have participated in any other training program. That was a cynical promise, cynically made.

The unseemly haste with which the administration has insisted on closing centers, months before even the planned-for miniurban centers will be open, means that hundreds of youngsters will have passed the time when they might have gone into the Job Corps. Job Corps recruitment has stopped and will be stopped for some time to come. For many kids the curtailed recruitment now and later will be an opportunity missed.

The real waste and the high cost to this Nation for abandoning Job Corps centers lies in the reduced productivity of those youngsters who will not have the benefits of the Job Corps. This can be demonstrated in real measurable cash terms. Evidence before our committee indicates that for Job Corps enrollees who completed their course of training, their earning capacity increased by 30 percent and unemployment among Job Corps graduates dropped 21 percent.

The unseemly haste of the Administration to close down Job Corps centers has been costly in other ways, too. Some of the closed camps have arrangements with labor unions which helped with the training programs and took Job Corps graduates into apprenticeship programs—a guaranteed way out of poverty. It is likely to be some time before such relationships are reinstated. Some of the programs like the police training unit at Camp Kilmer, having been terminated, are unlikely to be reestablished at all. Many cities have Kilmer graduates on their police forces now.

The reduction in conservation centers means a substantial reduction in conservation work and natural resource creation that the corpsmen were contributing to our national wealth. The National Education Association and numerous educators have testified to the contribution of Job Corps to the teaching profession through the development of techniques and the exchange of personnel between Job Corps and numerous school systems. That contribution will be diminished with the curtailment of the Job Corps.

A couple of other points are, I think, useful to make in connection with the change in direction which this administration has planned in connection with residential training programs. The substantial reduction in conservation cen-

ters and the movement toward the urban residential center implies and promises a reduction in training opportunities for the youngest of the needy youths and a reduction of opportunities for the youngster from rural and smalltown communities.

In spite of the myth that the Job Corps was filled with kids from urban ghettos, the majority of the youngsters have been from rural and smalltown areas. Since, by definition, the new urban minicenters will not cater to youngsters from more than a few miles away, these centers will not be available to youngsters from outside the urban and metropolitan areas in which they are located.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the most cynical defense that has been made of this unilateral, arbitrary, unfortunate, and ill-advised decision. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the newspaper leaks to the effect that the administration has "confidential reports" which indicate that there has been narcotics used at one center, homosexuality at another, rapes at some, and racial incidents at still others. It is hard to conceive just what exactly the administration hoped to achieve by these "back door revelations." Did they really believe that those of us who understood the problems of America's youth would be shocked or blackmailed into reducing our efforts in their behalf by the revelation of such information?

Did they hope to convince the American public that these kids were unworthy of assistance? Did they really mean to indict the 200,000 or more youngsters that have been through Job Corps? Or did they really mean that this Nation should close down institutions where such things occur?

I can hardly believe that is their intention.

I did not hear any calls to close down the University of Texas when a demented sniper shot some 22 people there. I have heard no calls to close down the public secondary school systems of Montgomery and Fairfax Counties because there is some traffic in narcotics out there. Rumors and myths of homosexuality and lesbianism periodically spring up around every girls' school and every university in the country. Are we in the Congress expected to react hysterically to such rumors? I cannot believe it.

No, Mr. Speaker, the world we live in is a harsh place and the kids that the Job Corps deals with are unfortunate youngsters. They suffer from most of the ills, indeed, it is fair to say they suffer in greater degree from all the ills which afflict our society as a whole. We will not shrink from that fact. Nor is it a reason to abandon these kids.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at the cynicism of those who would use means such as this to attempt to defend or excuse the decision to close down the Job Corps camps. It is, however, an indication of the kind of decision this was. It was a cynical decision, cynically presented to the Congress, and now cynically defended.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to submit for the RECORD excerpts from the Appropriations Committee hearings on the Interior and related agencies appropriations for 1970. I am grateful to the

distinguished lady from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, for bringing this information to my attention. But for a pressing engagement she would be here today to present it.

The material referred to and a newspaper article follow:

HEARINGS EXCERPTS

JOB CORPS

The Job Corps has been in the news and, of course, we are deeply involved in Job Corps work. We manage over 45 of the civilian conservation centers and we think it has been a successful program.

Contributions of Job Corps

Mrs. HANSEN. What contributions do you feel the Job Corps has made to forest management?

Mr. CLIFF. These Job Corps enrollees, of course, spend half of their time in education in the classroom and training in the vocational shops and half of their time on work programs. They do many kinds of work which contribute to the development and management of the national forest. They plant trees, they thin timber stands, they develop campgrounds, and they build ranger station buildings. They are used on certain types of road work and on other jobs. Of course they are learning when they are on the job.

I don't have a summary figure on the total investment in various categories of work, but I would be glad to supply it for the record.

The following is the total investment in the various categories of work Corpsmen have accomplished from the inception of the program to December 31, 1968:

National forest activities

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Recreation—camping and picnic site and development and improvement | \$6,263,395 |
| Roads and trails—construction and reconstruction | 6,076,290 |
| Buildings and bridges—construction and reconstruction | 7,535,080 |
| Forage—range improvements | 1,690,576 |
| Timber—tree planting, cultural improvements (thinning release, etc.) | 610,379 |
| Wildlife—fish and game habitat developments and improvements | 905,232 |
| Watershed—stream bank-gully, erosion control | 443,715 |
| Protection: | |
| Fire suppression | 743,928 |
| Insect and disease control | 94,000 |
| Fire hazard reduction | 51,995 |
| Subtotal | 24,414,690 |
| Civilian conservation center activities | 10,137,700 |
| Community service activities | 796,610 |
| Grand total | 35,349,000 |

Mrs. HANSEN. Isn't this true that these people are not included in the personnel ceiling?

Mr. CLIFF. The overhead, the people who are on payrolls—

Mrs. HANSEN. The supervisors. But the work of the boys themselves?

Mr. CLIFF. The instructors are charged against our personnel ceilings. The work of the boys themselves is not.

Mrs. HANSEN. Under the present personnel limitations, would it have been possible for the Department to have hired the same number of people to do the work that the boys have done?

Mr. CLIFF. Not with the personnel ceilings that we have, no.

Mrs. HANSEN. That is my point.

Mr. CLIFF. Our 45 centers that we manage can accommodate a little over 8,000 young men at one time. The population now is almost at capacity, right around 7,600. Dur-

ing fiscal year 1968, 5,558 men from Forest Service-operated centers were placed in jobs, schools, or the military. Of this number, 4,467 were placed in jobs, 626 returned to school for further education, and 465 were accepted for military duty. A total of 4,010 youth completed the defined program of education, social adjustment, and vocational training at our centers last fiscal year.

We think these data are a measurable, tangible benefit gained by the male youth under our direction. You can't get involved with this class of youth and see what is happening to them without being deeply touched and enthusiastic about what's being accomplished.

It is expensive, it has been criticized because of the cost, but when you compare what it would cost to support these kinds of people either in a correctional institution or on relief for a substantial part of their life, the cost seems quite justified.

These men, some of them never worked a day in their lives, they don't know how to work. We have to start teaching them the ABC's. Nearly 30 percent of them are illiterate, can't read or write when we get them. They are almost all dropouts. And the average reading level is third grade. It is just about the most poorly trained level of material, raw material, that you can imagine to start with. And they are deprived kids and most of them want to get a new start.

Mr. McDADE. How many of them are volunteers?

Mr. CLIFF. It is all voluntary. They are recruited, however, by the Labor Department, the State employment services. They have to be volunteers.

Mr. McDADE. None of them are there under gentle persuasion from juvenile courts or anything like that, are they?

Mr. CLIFF. Occasionally, perhaps. Some of them have had—

Mr. McDADE. They might have had a previous record of some kind?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, but they are not hardened criminals although we have had a few. About a third of them have had some brush with the law. Most of them are just deprived kids. They have had no chance and this is the first opportunity that many of them have had to make something of themselves.

And some of them don't make it. But we had 5,558 enrollees who did make it this last year out of a camp population of around 7,500. Some of them are really making good citizens.

Mrs. HANSEN. In other words, you have put those people into the economy so they are able to earn a living?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes. Now I appreciate that this committee does not handle the Job Corps items—

Mrs. HANSEN. No, but we do handle the appropriations that may have to be provided in lieu of the Job Corps if they are abolished, to do the work in the forests that is necessary.

Mr. CLIFF. I just wanted to express a hope that this work can be continued, because personally, from deep personal involvement, I am convinced it is very worthwhile. About the only other public institutions that are available for them are the reform schools or penal institutions. And if you compare the cost of supporting them there with the cost of putting them through this program, the value of these centers is clear.

Mr. McDADE. You are going to give us those figures, aren't you?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Staff enrollee ratio

Mr. McDADE. One other matter I always talk to you about in this connection is staffing, the ratio of your staff to the number of Job Corps personnel that you have. What does that look like this year?

Mr. CLIFF. Well, the staffing is heavy, and we discussed that last year.

Mr. McDADE. And the year before.

Mr. CLIFF. And the year before. For a 200-man camp, the overhead, which includes the schoolteachers, the educators, the counselors, work project foreman, clerical personnel, and the supervisory people that live in the dormitories with them amounts to around 50 people per camp. This is heavy staffing. You have to have people on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at these camps. It is almost a tutorial system. The staffing—this is one reason for the costs. These costs also included the cost of materials for their work projects and equipment.

Mrs. HANSEN. Isn't part of the necessity to have this staffing as great as it is because you are trying, within the year, to bring them up to the equivalent of fifth, sixth, seventh grade students?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Mr. REIFEL. Might I ask a question, Madam Chairman?

Mrs. HANSEN. Yes.

AVERAGE COST PER ENROLLEE

Mr. REIFEL. What is the average cost for an enrollee for 1 year when you include the personnel as well as the installation costs that might be expressed out over a period of years?

Mr. CLIFF. The cost, if you include everything that is involved in operating the centers, such as education, feeding, medical care, clothing, the work project materials and equipment, personnel and housing, is running about \$6,000 per enrollee per year. This is the cost that has been criticized. The amortization of facilities is about \$575 per man-year.

Mrs. HANSEN. Will you place in the record a typical example of the salary they accept or are offered when they leave?

"Program completers from Federal Civilian Conservation Centers were placed at an average of \$2.12 per hour in fiscal year 1968. The following are the average wages paid, based on a nationwide survey, to corpsmen apprentices and workers for some of the work skills obtained at our training centers:

| "Job: | "Dollar rate per hour |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Carpenter | \$3.50 |
| Heavy equipment operator | 3.75 |
| Masonry | 3.15 |
| Painter | 2.60 |

Mr. CLIFF. We have some rather dramatic examples of that. We have entered into agreements now with three labor unions, the Carpenters and Joiners Union, the Painters Union, and the International Union of Operating Engineers. The unions are conducting courses in selected camps. The boys that complete the operating engineers courses, learn to run heavy equipment; it is a very popular program. We have this in two camps—Jacobs Creek in Tennessee and Anacosta in Montana. These heavy equipment trainees are able to get jobs running heavy equipment with a starting wage of \$3.50 an hour, \$4 and up an hour; \$3.75 an hour is average.

The carpenter graduates set out as apprentice carpenters and draw apprentice carpenter wages. This program, too, is popular. We have this in six camps.

We are just starting the painters union projects. Boys that don't have the capacity to be carpenters or operating engineers can learn professional painting. House painting pays good wages. We are placing our cooks fairly well, too, and skills of this kind—

Mr. REIFEL. May I pursue this, Madam Chairman? The reason I want to pursue it further and I hope you would agree with me, if we can develop this so that we can lift it out of the record and get it to the other agencies of Government that are concerned with this, because there is a great deal of displeasure with the Job Corps and

I think it comes from the places where they have tried to implement them and here you have in the Forest Service, and in the Park Service and Bureau of Land Management and other places, an environment in which this can be pursued with the greatest kind of benefit to the individual.

Now in your general statement what you say here is very meaningful, when you have this many placements out of the numbers that have gone through the training, and in addition to that, you have pointed out that several of your center directors who opened the centers in 1965 are now supervisors of national forests.

Mr. CLIFF. This has proved to be one of the best places for training our professional people that we have ever had.

Nationality mixtures

Mr. REIFEL. What is the nationality mixtures in the centers? Negroes, Indians, and Spanish-Americans, whites and so on?

Mr. CLIFF. We have all races. We have Spanish-Americans, both out of the metropolitan areas and the Southwest. We started with a fairly well-balanced center population as between whites and blacks. Right now the population is running about 70 percent Negro. The other races, we have some Indians as well, are running about 30 percent now.

Mr. REIFEL. If we are going to reach the hard core, and we have been talking about this, the inner city people, it isn't going to be cheap.

I grew up in an area where I know what it means, people who are a part of the hard core, and I think people who are going to be developing programs with respect to reaching the hard core and they must be reached, or we are going to be in greater difficulty than we are now, I think here is an example of where the Forest Service is making a tremendous contribution, but at the same time the American public must realize that it can't be done with a pittance of money.

And yet at the same time as the program has evolved, it is demonstrable here that the American community is going to get its money back. And if we haven't developed that sufficiently at this point, Madam Chairman, I would like to suggest the Chief rework his testimony or his answers in such a way that this really is clearly set out.

I think you suggested he do this.

Necessity for Job Corps program

Mrs. HANSEN. As you are well aware there has been a great deal of criticism of the Job Corps. Quite to my surprise I noticed in this morning's paper that the Job Corps conservation camps are to be eliminated. This rather surprised me, in view of the fact that if you want to manage the national forests, it is necessary to do one of three things, contract for personnel, hire additional personnel if you can get around personnel ceilings, or forget about managing our national forests, which I don't believe the American public will endure.

I think the record should be made plain that the committee is very interested in the continuation of the policies that have been a component part of allowing the Forest Service to use these people for forest management. This is one way of educating young people for production jobs in categories of labor that are in rather short supply.

Isn't that true, Mr. Cliff?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Mrs. HANSEN. You have added to the income of the United States through this \$6,000 investment. You have added immeasurably to the tax revenue that is going to be returned from these people who are not in a reform school, but are working. Is this not correct?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, Madam Chairman; I think that is very correct.

The cost-avoidance features of this are that you can make productive citizens, so they are not on the relief rolls, or are not public

wards of some kind in institutions. Over the lifetime of these men, they are going to save the American public money.

Mr. MARSH. At that point could you insert in the record some statement that you might get from the Federal Bureau of Prisons as to how much it costs to maintain an inmate in a U.S. Federal institution?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, I would be glad to do that.

Mr. MARSH. U.S. Federal penal institution.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

(The information follows:)

The U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, 1967 Basic Data Book reveals an operating cost per inmate day of \$8.223—annual cost about \$3,000.

Mrs. HANSEN. Would you also place in the record, the amount that would annually be spent per person for an unemployed person on general welfare assistance?

Mr. CLIFF. I would be glad to do that.

(The information follows:)

"The nationwide average for aid to families with dependent children is \$2,292 annually. It represents and is based on the monthly cost standard for basic needs of a family consisting of four recipients and amount paid to such family by State. The data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, NCSS Report D-2(4/68).

"Based on a straight projection, if a family receives \$2,292 annually, the cost for 30 years will be \$68,760 and the cost for 40 years will be \$91,680.

"Sixty-three percent of entering Corpsmen come from a home where the head of the household was unemployed. Twenty-seven percent of the parents of Corpsmen enrollees were on relief at time of enrollment."

Mr. CLIFF. In relation to Congressman Marsh's question, I was told, I can't verify this or vouch for it, but I was told it costs the State of Georgia about \$6,000 to maintain an inmate in their penitentiary system.

Mr. MARSH. For 1 year.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Mr. MARSH. What is the average length of stay of an inmate in an institution? Because you would have to take the \$6,000 and multiply it by 5 or 10 years.

Mr. CLIFF. I have no idea.

Mr. MARSH. Maybe even 20 years.

Mr. REIFEL. I think that would be very helpful information.

Mrs. HANSEN. Also provide for the record the number of returnees to the prison once they have been released. The prison doesn't offer the training to put them into a job for life, it only offers them a record that will keep them out of military service and keep them out of jobs. Isn't this correct?

Mr. CLIFF. That's generally right.

The information follows:

"The Cost of Correcting Youthful Offenders," a research report prepared September 1968 by the District of Columbia Department of Correction provides the following data:

"Criminal records of youth studied reveals an average of four juvenile arrests and six adult arrests, extending over an average period of 9 years.

"The median cost per youth was about \$31,000.

"The average age of the subjects was 23 years."

Cost of program

Mr. WYATT. The chief has referred to the program completers in fiscal year 1968, I think it would be germane to put the total cost of the program, including supervisors and all costs in connection with the program for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. CLIFF. We can do that for the part of the program we manage.

Mr. WYATT. Well, you say that during fiscal 1968 "Our Centers produced 5,558 program completers."

Mr. CLIFF. That is essentially right.

Mr. WYATT. Those are your centers.

Mr. CLIFF. Our 45 centers.

Mr. WYATT. Forest Service centers?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Mr. WYATT. So you would be able to give us a total figure that relates to these 5,000-some odd program completers?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Mrs. HANSEN. And list the 45 centers.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

The information follows:

"The total cost of the Job Corps program operated by the Forest Service for fiscal year 1968 was \$45,979,495.

"The average civilian conservation center program completer stays in the program 9.6 months. The total of all costs incurred by the Forest Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity for a program completer is \$6,743 according to a recent study (A&R Report No. 11, Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity). Table A-3 from that study gives pertinent benefit/cost information."

TABLE A-3.—JOB CORPS BENEFIT/COST RATIO: FEDERAL CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS, FISCAL YEAR 1968

| Months in Job Corps | Average Corps member costs | Job Corps earnings | Control group earnings | Net Job Corps gain | Net lifetime ¹ benefit | Benefit ratio B/C |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Categories: 4.9 | Net..... \$3,187 Total..... 3,915 Less transfer..... 1,332 Plus lost earnings..... 3,604 | \$1.86 | \$1.44 | \$0.42 | \$19,225 | 6.03 |
| Category I: 9.6 | Net..... 5,193 Total..... 6,743 Less transfer..... 2,734 Plus lost earnings..... 1,184 | 2.12 | 1.45 | .67 | 30,650 | 5.90 |
| Category II: 6.1 | Net..... 3,675 Total..... 4,571 Less transfer..... 1,648 Plus lost earnings..... 752 | 1.73 | 1.44 | .29 | 13,275 | 3.61 |
| Category III: 2.1 | Net..... 2,046 Total..... 2,364 Less transfer..... 577 Plus lost earnings..... 259 | 1.71 | 1.39 | .32 | 14,650 | 7.16 |

¹ Estimated lifetime earnings computed on the basis of 88 percent working for 47 years with a 6.5 discount rate offset by a 3.5 percent wage compensation gain.

² Food, clothing, pay, and allowances and appraised work value.

³ Estimated average yearly earnings of all entrants, 53 percent working at an average of \$1.34 throughout year.

Forest Service Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers:
Alder Springs, Elk Creek, California.
Alpine, Alpine, Arizona.
Anaconda, Anaconda, Montana.
Angell, Yachats, Oregon.
Anthony, Neola, West Virginia.
Arrowood, Franklin, North Carolina.

Blackwell, Laona, Wisconsin.
Blue Jay, Marienville, Pennsylvania.
Boxelder, Nemo, South Dakota.
Branchville, Branchville, Indiana.
Cass, Ozark, Arkansas.
Cedar Flats, Koonskia, Idaho.
Cispus, Randle, Washington.
Clam Lake, Clam Lake, Wisconsin.

Clear Creek, Carson City, Nevada.
 Cottonwood, Cottonwood, Idaho.
 Curlew, Curlew, Washington.
 Dickinson, Dickinson, North Dakota.
 Fenner Canyon, Yalermo, California.
 Five Mile, Sonora, California.
 Flatwoods, Coeburn, Virginia.
 Frenchburg, Frenchburg, Kentucky.
 Golconda, Golconda, Illinois.
 Grants, Grants, New Mexico.
 Heber, Heber, Arizona.
 Hodgens, Hodgens, Oklahoma.
 Hoxey, Cadillac, Michigan.
 Jacobs Creek, Bristol, Tennessee.
 Los Pinos, Elsinore, California.
 Luna, Las Vegas, New Mexico.
 Lydick Lake, Cass Lake, Minnesota.
 Mountainair, Mountainair, New Mexico.
 New Waverly, New Waverly, Texas.
 Ojibway, Marenisco, Michigan.
 Ouachita, Royal, Arkansas.
 Pagosa Springs, Pagosa Springs, Colorado.
 Pine Knot, Pine Knot, Kentucky.
 Pine Ridge, Chadron, Nebraska.
 Poplar Bluff, Poplar Bluff, Missouri.
 Schenck, Pisgah Forest, North Carolina.
 Sly Park, Pollack Pines, California.
 Timberlake, Estacada, Oregon.
 Trapper Creek, Conner, Montana.
 Vesuvius, Pedro, Ohio.
 Wolf Creek, Gilde, Oregon.

Proposed budget amendments

Mr. CLIFF. That completes my summary, Madam Chairman. Before we proceed with the questions, I would like to call attention to one more thing that is of great interest, I am sure, to this committee.

About 10 days to 2 weeks ago, the President appointed a cabinet-level task force to look into the problems of lumber prices and timber supplies and to make recommendations to him on short-range and long-range actions that could be taken to alleviate this problem. This task force has been at work and has made some recommendations to the President on short-range actions and I was informed just before coming over here that the President will be sending promptly to the Congress both a supplemental and a budget amendment for increasing the sale of national forest timber and for timber access roads.

Mrs. HANSEN. Approved by the Bureau of the Budget or yourselves.

Mr. CLIFF. It has Bureau of the Budget approval for around a half million dollars for fiscal 1969 to get moving on a program to provide in the neighborhood of an additional two to three hundred million board feet of timber sold.

Also, there will be a budget amendment for increased timber and road financing for fiscal 1970. This may be for about \$10 to \$15 million for roads and in the range of \$3 to \$4 million for additional timber sales.

The action has not been completed on these requests, but it has been announced that they would be forthcoming shortly.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Cliff, the committee welcomes this.

Mr. CLIFF. And the task force is looking further into long-range needs. But they gave priority to the short-range items.

Mrs. HANSEN. The committee has been most interested in the past of having recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget on items that would increase this short term as well as the long-term programs. But our difficulty has been compounded by budget limitations.

Thank you very much, Mr. Cliff, for an excellent statement.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 7, 1969]

TREAD SOFTLY ON THE JOB CORPS

The basic mistake the Nixon Administration may be making about the Job Corps, as it seeks to close 59 of 109 centers and to

shift the rest from OEO to the Labor Department, is in assuming that it is only a job-training program. Anyone who has ever been at a Job Corps center the day a batch of recruits piled off the bus will know it isn't. Unkempt, unsociable, unwell, unlearned, their condition adds up to a frozen unfitness for anything, not to mention job-training.

Officials dealing with the poor are fond of the term *the disadvantaged* in describing Job Corps youth. Disadvantaged? They read and add at fifth grade level. Fifty per cent have never seen a doctor or dentist. Sixty-four per cent have been either thrown out or pushed out of school. Sixty per cent lived in substandard housing. Sixty per cent are from broken homes. Add to all this the fears, neuroses and suffering that statistics can't get to, and the term *disadvantaged* becomes a put-on. At best, the average Job Corps youth is seriously sub-disadvantaged, so far at the bottom of society's barrel that until Job Corps, no scraping was thought possible.

The Administration, sensitive to charges that some 13,000 trainees will be thrown to the wolves when the 59 centers are closed, has busily given assurances to everyone that those trainees unable to be placed in jobs or other centers will be absorbed into existing manpower programs. But this is unrealistic. One reason Job Corps was created in the first place is that it is a human renewal program, a last-stand try at reclaiming the broke and broken youths when other programs can't or won't. Programs in the Manpower Development and Training Act and Concentrated Employment Program are meant for the pleasantly "disadvantaged," not the unpleasant kind in Job Corps.

Sides have been forming in recent weeks on the fate of Job Corps. Last week the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee cleared a resolution calling on the President to hold up the shutdown.

It is scheduled for the Senate floor Monday. Meanwhile, Nixon aides are now holding confidential files alleging a high incidence of gang rapes, homosexuality and drug use at the Job Corps centers. Presumably, the Administration may use this information, if things get tight, as a trump card to persuade Congress that it's better to let Job Corps die.

Aside from the cheapness, the tactic would be based on a distortion. The headlines describing the files may say, for example, that the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey had 22 cases of narcotics in the first six months of 1968. Yet Kilmer's 22 narcotics users represent a relatively small proportion of the 1700 total in the center, whose officials should be congratulated if that's actually the full dimension of their drug problem.

The genesis of all this is President Nixon's trimming of the \$280 million budget currently set for Job Corps by the House and Senate to \$180 million. This cut allows him to tell taxpayers of another \$100 million saved. But next to defense and space money, the saving is ridiculously small. Job Corps never had the funds it needed in the first place. Economy driving now only adds fiscal insult to social injury.

As for the injured, a few showed up here last week. A busload of students, faculty and Job Corps trainees on a 25-hour ride from northern Michigan testified before the House Education and Labor Committee. They said simply that the Job Centers are worth preserving.

Reports from individual centers around the country reveal that trainees at the axed centers are shocked and depressed at the Administration's action. Others, too beaten by the odds to react, have slipped off quietly. They may have misinterpreted the signal from on high as an invitation to get lost. But that is how they read it, nevertheless. And the message the Job Corps centers are sending back to the Administration in return is in the words of Yeats: "Tread softly, because you tread on my dreams."

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), for his leadership and his dogged determination to see to it that these young men and women, who were beginning to have some hope that perhaps theirs could be a happier and more productive life, did not have that hope taken away, to see to it that we do not permit this Republican administration to snuff out that very frail hope.

The gentleman from Kentucky and a number of the rest of us went to a Job Corps center in Kentucky just a year or so ago. It was almost enough to make one cry, to talk to the young men at that camp. They were young men who had two strikes on them the minute they were born, young men who really had given up on the notion that there could be a better life for them, but young men who felt as a result of this opportunity that perhaps they could make something of themselves.

Their words were very much more articulate than any I have heard on this floor or elsewhere. They conveyed with their eyes and their emotions and their feelings, which they transmitted to us, that it was so very important this program be continued, so very vital not only to them but also to people like them who were waiting their turn to go to the Job Corps centers. They literally beseeched us to use whatever influence we had to see to it that these programs were maintained.

I regret to say that I believe this administration has not moved so quickly before they had an opportunity to gain some first-hand experience. I regret to say that it was rooted in inexperience more than in callousness, I think. However, the result is the same. This administration has taken a very tragic step backward.

I have been inundated by requests that our own Job Corps centers in the Bay area, which was formerly the Parks Air Force Base, be kept open. The job placement ratio there is most favorable.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is an unthinkable tragedy that these young men and women are confronted with the disaster which is about ready to be visited upon them. I cannot commend too highly our own dogged chairman who day after day, hour after hour, week after week since the administration's announcement was made public has rendered such an important effort in this direction. We all hope that a successful effort to see that the Job Corps program is not gutted will come to fruition.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to thank my distinguished friend and agree with him it is a tragic mistake which was not thought through and they did not realize the consequences of the actions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his efforts in my behalf. I am under the

impression that you have a majority of the Members of the House who agree with you. At least I hope so. I am very patient. I want to be flexible with respect to the Job Corps. I have been to our own Job Corps group at Kilmer on several different occasions in connection with studies. I want to tell you that in that Job Corps training center the best minds in our county are at work. Our newspapers, our League of Women Voters, and other concerned citizens agree with you 100 percent that they have not come up with a good substitute for it. Keep up your good work, and you will find many of your colleagues in the House are with you 100 percent.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me at this moment.

Some weeks ago I inserted in the RECORD, on page 10146 a rather detailed statement with respect to the projected closing of the Job Corps center at Poplar Bluff, Mo. At this point I want once again to emphasize that I am not going to quarrel too much with the administration's desire to save \$100 million. They claim that they will save that much. Of course, I realize the distinguished chairman of the committee has made a good record to show that they cannot and will not actually do that. The point I want to make is if there is to be a cutback in the Job Corps, it ought to be made on the basis of efficiency and effectiveness. Those who are the least effective and least efficient should be those dropped from the program if any are to be dropped.

I wish to point out further that the Job Corps center at Poplar Bluff, Mo., has been considered to be a model program throughout the months and years it has been in operation.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that the Poplar Bluff operation in Missouri has been outstanding. There was no earthly excuse for them closing it down under the criteria they use, and if we are able to bring the director of that conservation center in here under a subpoena, we are going to show that the cost is not what the Department of Labor states it is for the operation. That is the reason why we are trying to get at the facts and the criteria used.

So, they just wholesale started to cut all the conservation centers out, when the majority of those replacements indicate the fact that they are just as good as the urban centers and this proposition in my opinion proves to me that someone made a decision without regard to the facts or the consequences of their actions. We are going to get the facts, and within a year from today it is going to turn out that if they are spending any money for this type of enrollee, it is going to cost at least 30 percent more than it is now presently costing; that is, if these enrollees are the type that the Job Corps now serves.

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

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

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for yielding to me at this time. I realize that the time of the chairman who is now in the well is limited, but I would simply like to associate myself with his statement and to agree with the views that the gentleman has expressed.

I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor for the job he is doing as chairman of that committee and particularly in connection with this issue.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) for his contribution.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, regardless of his chosen occupation, his background, his environment, his personal interests, there is not an American anywhere who can escape from that noisy and vivid display which we call "campus unrest." Like a "bad trip," it has penetrated the inner psyche of the Nation—threatening to unhinge the delicate nervous balance which the American people have sustained through nearly a decade of domestic crisis.

Many campuses have been reduced to a carnival for a brassy minority at play. But it is dangerous play: buildings seized, property destroyed, files rifled, people injured, paramilitary battalions of dissent forming and marching and chanting.

The volume of mail which pours onto the Hill, the reports from the national pollsters, the preoccupation of the media in their coverage of every collegiate fray, the evidence is clear: campus disorders are the No. 1 national concern.

The hearings which the Special Subcommittee on Education is now conducting reinforce my conviction that there are no simple analyses and no quick solutions for the "confrontation on the campus." Testimony of the highest quality from educators around the country has been offered for the members of the subcommittee. I hope that all Members of the House will have an opportunity to review portions of this testimony when the hearings are completed and the transcript is printed and made available.

In the meantime, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues two very provocative statements delivered to the subcommittee by Mrs. Sylvia A. Davidson, and Dr. John Bunzel. I feel sure that you will concur that these remarks will be part of a collection of outstanding comment on campus violence—when the dust has settled. And "settle" it must.

STATEMENT BY SYLVIA—MRS. C. GIRARD—DAVIDSON OF PORTLAND, OREG., BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, MAY 7, 1969

Almost everytime I watch television, I hate kids.

So do you. Except the few lucky ones who possess a 100% old fashioned American teen-aged boy with a haircut, who is serious about his education, intends to serve his hitch in the service, and marry—not shack up with—the girl next door.

If he just gets a haircut, you are pretty lucky.

But I suspect many of us think we have such a paragon of the virtues—give or take a few points—and that "other people's" kids are raising hell in colleges, defying The Establishment, smoking pot, and living outside campus in some relaxed arrangement with a member of the opposite sex.

We are shook up. Never before ours, has a parental generation tried so hard to be all things to all offspring; and, certainly, none before has played the Good Fairy so lavishly. Contrary to current folklore, I do not believe the magic wand was wafted only over blazers from Brooks Brothers and Schwinn bikes. In an historically unprecedented way, families today have expressed togetherness in all activities, including mealtimes and recreation. While some have lapsed from instilling moral values in the antique sense of church-preachiness, most even minimally educated families have been concerned with planting the seeds of social consciousness, both by imitation of life—through their own concerns and activities, and/or presenting the festering problems of our day to the young through the omnipresent media.

Obviously, a little bit of knowledge was a dangerous thing.

A smattering of soul searching over dinner on our failure to end poverty in Appalachia; years of sitting stupefied before the television set inhaling the "demands" of every hung-up person in the world; the appealing idea of being a pilgrim and a revolutionary without having to be a student or worker—and, above, having a jolly, exciting band of Robin Hood's merry men to join with in a psychedelic sensitivity session—all these "medium is the message" stimuli—have, indeed, produced a generation with instant vision, which can bypass all conventionalities, most particularly history.

The medium is so exciting it could almost replace sex. We watch SDS, all 2% of a student body, paralyzing the other 98% of students in a college, locking out the President, defecating in his office, burning his papers, halting classes. Then the yuppies, more—or is it less—involved with international revolutionary movements, come along with a few refinements for chaos—but all, eventually overshadowed by the Black Student Union, which is more visible, more specific, and has more authenticity to its claims—enough to engage the silence, if not the help, of the passive masses.

Never before ours has a generation so wallowed in collective guilt. The Nuremberg trials, I'm sure, didn't stir up a quantum as much the conscience of Neo-Nazis, as the manning of the academic barricades has imposed on us the silence of conscience.

The world may long remember (in the approaching New World of the new Left) our generation as the last of the educated mind and the educated heart—so sensitive in understanding, so wretched over failures, so modest about our triumphs, so permissive with everyone who wanted to do his own thing, that we let civilization go to hell without any curiosity about what would replace it.

There are harsh words, and, obviously, I don't mean them literally and specifically; but I do mean that the tyranny of the minority raises questions about students and teachers in the world-wide revolution, and what we can do or should do to stand for meaningful change in a way that does not invite the more violence and retaliation.

As a Time editorial pointed out recently, a little revolution is a dangerous thing. And even though the revolution by terror will fail because it is being held at the wrong

time by the wrong people, it will also cause the stagnation or retardation of movements that should succeed—and that is bad.

Most of us have lived through a nightmare period in history where the big lie seemed so ridiculous it didn't deserve attack. Because so many "good" people were so quiet—there are millions and millions buried in Spain, Auschwitz, Leningrad, Omaha Beach and Okinawa, millions who thought that Hitler and Mussolini were Charley Chaplin until the movie didn't end.

S. I. Hayakawa says the lesson of Hitler's Germany caused him to study semantics so he could cope with the big lie when it arose again—he likens the tactics of the far left to Hitler youth who disrupted meetings, spread confusion, and used violence.

We have been told so often that we are the establishment, that our cause (military-economic imperialism) is being served by administrators or trustees of universities—that we have begun to believe that our system was designed by Satan instead of growing like Topsy.

We are a decent generation, and a listening generation. We believe that almost anything can be changed for the better. Change is inevitable in a ballooning world, and we are not fighting it; we are fighting blackmail.

The danger of turning the delicate process of change over to arrested adolescents is that, in either their innocence or purpose, the baby Trotskys, Kerenskys, and Gueveras, howling for their father image, Ho Chi Minh, are really howling for a goose stepping, authoritarian government that will make the military industrial establishment look like paradise lost.

I do not belittle the idealism of today's youth that cries out against social injustice, and which is impatient and intolerant of bureaucratic quagmires and boondocks. But the more perceptive, patient young, who will work to equip themselves to invent a more viable society, are already weary of the infighting fractured left. What they must not do is let their general concern for their beleaguered colleagues interfere with the serious business of their own education.

To help us distinguish "heat" from "light" in the rhetoric of the young, we must realize that the leaders want to politicize education. Instead of revolutionizing education, which they should do. They are trying to use education as an instrument of revolution. We must recall that the hardware of battle gets worn-out or discarded; and I don't think many of us really want education to become obsolete before it becomes improved.

Educational drop-outs in the fray of battle are unable or unwilling to communicate in intelligible terms. If, in addition to locking out the opposition, they continue to speak in jargon, nothing good can ever be accomplished. As at other schools, Reed experienced the belligerent students who wanted to negotiate their "non-negotiable demands." Obviously, the words don't mean the same to us, and confusion compounds frustration.

I have the good fortune to be on a goals commission at Portland State University. I say good fortune because I have learned a lot, and I know the students and faculty members, too, have simmered down considerably as they came to see that members of the decadent establishment were often more practical and purposeful about making changes than they were. I would say a rough classification in the attitudes of citizens vs faculty-students is that citizens understand the democratic process better. Those who don't understand the process or the people, assume that no one who has "made it" in our freaky society, is open-minded or fair.

I don't mean this is a battle of semantics, but I do think language will eventually help separate the minority of committed revolu-

tionaries from the majority of students who want to serve a just and democratic society.

The act of communication is most central to the issue, because the student, *led by the young faculty zealot*, synthesizes the fearful, alienated individual in an increasingly automated and impersonal world. And the student's link with reality at this stage of life would formerly have been with adult faculty members.

But faculty and student radicals alike are going to have to develop more substantial and worthwhile forms of group therapy than throwing molotov cocktail parties.

Nothing is more repudiated today than the liberal of my generation, and it is true that many of our causes were incomplete, or the nature of the world has changed their direction. The solid achievement, fought against great odds, at a time when it was very un-chic and sometimes downright dangerous to fight the cause, have long been forgotten. For some reason, we are the scapegoats, not the heroes of the past, as if, perversely, those who staved off enlightenment and justice, did better than those who worked to effect it.

The trouble with writing off history before one has read it, is that endless repetition is inevitable. Life can't be one perpetual bastille day—thank God—but the psyche of the revolution demands that one be "high" all the time. There are some drills and discipline in learning that the most advanced and innovative educator will admit are less than exciting no matter how nobly rendered. I am all for making the learning of the multiplication tables all fun and games, but life will not be a constant "happening". To use the word of the moment, I don't see how any kind of education can be "relevant" unless the student gets the idea that lots of the days of one's life will be tedious, and that work, friendship, and marriage are not leaping from the peak of one Mt. Hood of desire to another.

As if we lived in a banana republic, strikes and destruction in colleges, junior colleges, and now high schools, have become the disorder of the day, and no one knows what to do about it.

Who is to blame? The laundry list is endless. Dr. Spock, Vietnam, our materialistic society, Martin Luther King's murder, American imperialism, the pentagon, television, McNamara (Johnson's McNamara, not Kennedy's McNamara), the bomb, the pill, lack of communication between generations, too much parental hovering between generations. If a family prayed together, they should have played together, and vice versa. It's like calling out the police. We engage them to protect society from violence, but they are no damned good if they stop people from being violent.

Like most members of the middle class, middle aged liberal establishment, I have a visceral reaction against police on campus. But reason, ascending over gut cowardice, tells us that students are not beyond the law if they break the law. And to carry the concept of student immunity from police to its logical conclusion, why not eliminate police from all society and return to the do-it-yourself law of the frontier—A shoot-out in the town hall at high noon; an oxbow incident every twilight in times square, and any other such cowboy-Indian fracas as we see on a tour of a Universal studio set.

The groups that generate ferment range from the far left to the far right, and it is another cliché of the day to say this whole mess polarizes the extremes. It does, indeed, because it is hard for people to retreat from public positions and statements, no matter how carelessly uttered or under what provocation. And once you are against the sin of law-breaking or the sin of "doing business as usual"—*you are committed*.

We must take cognizance of the fact that faculty leadership, in its several components, is central to the revolution. None other than Saul Alinsky, the renowned labor revolution-

ary, told one of the members of the board of higher education in Oregon that he would never see a student protest that wasn't led by a faculty member.

Jacques Barzun's latest book, "The American University" does a good job of explaining the changing school. He asks, "what is being fought against on our campus?" The answer, apart from the explicit opposition to the war is: The whole of modern life. Not all agitators are against all of life, but some are, and the rest single out detested parts. The cause is simply to ruin the going scheme—the U is the best place because that is where the students are. "The U. being an establishment, acts like that great bugbear, the establishment—wealthy friends there, pull with government, secret links and secret funds. It is the only corporation left that spells power."

Granted that the academic system could use an overhauling, most of us aren't prepared to indict society for first degree murder. After all, Professor Marcuse, Jerry Rubin, and all—is the world worse than it was five years ago—or ten?

Acute sympathizers feel this generation is uniquely aware of experiences from other cultures than the white, middle class milieu. They seek honest symbols, which, quote, "might illuminate the searing, unprecedented experiences of their youth. Their seeming nihilism is often weariness, from having confronted since their memory first awoke, crises too vast for them or anyone."

Much worse, of course, than victims of the Spanish inquisition, the crusader's sword, the black plague, the civil war, or Auschwitz.

Barzun recognizes that the young feel they have no models. But he points out that, "in this apocalyptic feeling that the end is near, students are abetted by many of their religious counsellors. Hatred of the world, certainly, is an emotion that religious prophets thrill to find, and it is but a step from hating to destroying, still in the name of Revelation. Other familiar sides of this spontaneous movement akin to early Christian behavior are: the abandonment of ego (facade manners) in contacts with others; an indifference to clothes and cleanliness; a distrust and neglect of reasoning (drugs help here), a freedom in sexuality, which is really a lowering of its intensity and value—and—most symptomatic—a free field given to the growth of hair."

The student's lack of constructive criticism, and his inability to become a model of anything himself, imposes certain hardships on the older generation which is trying so desperately to learn.

Barzun also speaks of the "morality gap," wherein students expect honesty and truthfulness from teachers and administrators, but not from themselves, as evidenced by the prevalence of cheating and plagiarism. Likewise in the matter of unpaid loans to the University, and stealing of books from libraries—the idea seems to be that sabotage is a medium of communication and free from boomerang effects.

A certain selfishness also characterizes the demands of students today to make all administrative decisions. At a recent Reed Alumni meeting, a young professor said he really shook up some protesting students when he pointed out that their "confrontation" should be with the alumni of 1945-1950. In reply to a howling, *why* he quite properly pointed out that if those alumni had asked for and got authority to hire and fire teachers, that today's faculty would have been selected by their own parents, God forbid!

One of our natural revulsions to the holier than thou attitudes of those whose love-ins are more like hate-ins, is their unwillingness to take the consequences for their actions. Time was that revolutionaries understood they could get shot for shooting. But today's young heroes don't understand cause and effect, and act like that most immature of

all little goodnks, he who runs away from home if he can't get his goodies.

As the cost of education mounts, and the difficulties and competition to get into top schools becomes more severe, parents all over are asking why and how there seem to be so many students who aren't studying. Not imagination, but hard core evidence with disciplinary cases after riots, is that most often rebels and propagandists have given up all pretense of attending or passing courses.

Is education a right to be administered to the passive beneficiary like vaccination?

Barzun is horrified by demands from earnest students that the U teach them "values." "The wish," he says, "is not as laudable as it sounds, being only the wish to have one's perplexities removed by someone else. Even if this were feasible or good, the practical question of what brand of values should prevail would be insoluble. It is a sufficient miracle if a college education removes a little ignorance. Values are not taught—they are breathed in—or imitated.

Now is the time that all the naysayers pity the poor kid who has no one to imitate because his parents are money grubbing—only interested in buying new color television sets and sending him off to war in Vietnam. The cop-out of blaming everything and everybody for his own unwillingness to make himself is pretty bad. The identity crisis, the whole bit of "finding himself" is ignorant. Life is not a game of hide and go seek where the Easter bunny hides a true you in your inwards and school gives you radar to detect it. We make not find a self.

It is also worth noting, that while this generation theoretically rejects the vulgarity of parent and teacher alike, it is a generation with unprecedented dependence upon society for all manner of protection and guidance in and out of school, and is big on seeking psychiatric help. Educators who are being summoned constantly to provide more bounty, underwriting of projects, assistance in extracurricular projects that were formerly self starting and self supporting, are therefore puzzled at the attack on the University for acting in loco parentis, although the U will gladly subtract that chore from its obligations.

But parietals continue to be a smoke screen, and I, for one, would like to see them out of the way so we can get to the guts of the matter. I'm sure perpetual intervisitation and communal living will get to be a nuisance and invasion of privacy (after all, a girl does want to put her hair up in rollers). I don't really think there will be much of a demand for Swahili in years to come. But that doesn't make any difference. It is a smallish investment of time and money to heal deep, psychological wounds, and I believe we should be prepared to pay the costs of many a noble experiment. I don't see how students can run colleges, but almost no one objects to their participation in a share of the decision-making process, a share that will bore and irritate them in time as does all the deadly dull work of governing any society.

What then, if we have Black Studies programs, eliminate grades, bless cohabitation, behead publish or perish professors, permit entry of any moron or non-student into college, glamorize undergraduate teaching, and blockade the University to spys from the CIA and Dow Chemical—what then is all the fuss about?

For most of the students, not much. What we must do is reorder our priorities. If we want to preserve this civilization until we develop something better, then let us concentrate on that issue and give up on fighting the new immorality and tastelessness that sprang from new inventions and freedoms of our time.

In other words, I will trade intervisitation and the study of the sex life of Cuban refugees for a society under law. A society under

law must not be confused with "law and order". There should be law and there should be order, but not with the tragic connotations the far right has extracted from that now so ugly phrase. It must not be a mask for privilege.

We must be willing to experiment and make some mistakes. We once faced the fact that the world wasn't flat, and now we may have to learn it isn't round. But an open mind and an open heart doesn't mean we cave in to unreasonable demands at gunpoint because we feel guilty about wrongs we didn't commit. Most of us have always worked for the poor, the black, the underprivileged, and we will continue our efforts, even if young enthusiasts are undermining them tragically by so flagrantly inviting extreme opposition to progress.

We must not delude ourselves into thinking the end of the Vietnamese war will end campus violence. The war was a catalyst, but the need for a constantly renewed society will not disappear with the peace we desire so passionately. Our several mislabeled revolutions will stand naked, true to themselves, once the most emotional bête noir of our time has been removed.

Automation-alienation have indeed raised lots of why's with the mobility of people and communications, the flashing screens for instant learning, it is quite possible that English grammar is obsolete, and we should all learn an international phonetic . . . get paid in beads for services rendered, and halt scientific research in case we really do find a man on the moon.

But none of these accommodations to a new world answer the hard core activists of the international Far Left, and lest we have any illusions about its existence, let me quote from "Obsolete Communism—The Left Wing Alternative" by the brothers Cohn-Bendit, who say as a preface that publishers have commissioned their book without being bothered by the fact that their cash will be used for the next round of Molotov cocktails.

We cannot pat ourselves on the back like palsy old liberals, and say, "I'm with you." The Messrs. Cohn-Bendit, along with thousands around the world, including the USA, reject liberals of our ilk as their worst impediment.

In fact, Mr. Cohn-Bendit, says of the Dean of the Sorbonne at Manterre whom he "did in"—"He was not what the Nazi people made him out to be, but a good man of the Left. Our struggle was no one against Fascism as such, but against bourgeois authoritarianism."

To Cohn-Bendit, the unshakeable resistance of the North Vietnamese and the Cubans alike has proved that a super-organized and super-armed capitalist society were not invincible. He is happy to report that in Madrid the students made common cause with the workers committee in the fight for a social revolution: the Italian students demonstrated against a university that does not challenge capitalist society; and at Berkeley and Columbia, the students "sickened by the imperialist policies of their country made known their refusal to become privileged members of the American bourgeoisie."

Cohn-Bendit may be big on Madrid and Italy, but he needs a guided tour of America where his dream of world revolution led by a coalition of students (intellectuals) and worker-peasants is rather quaint.

I can't think of anything more ridiculous than the idea of the American blue collar worker joining up with the intellectuals to burn up the schools. Our workingmen have three kids in college; and everytime they see a riot they see their tax dollars go up in smoke. "Danny the Red" sure doesn't know his American "peasants." Someone should tell him the Park Avenue penthouse liberals are more likely to be soul brothers (until they find out too late they can't buy back their comfortable world).

He is slightly more on target with his analysis of discontent.

"We have said a University is supposed to be a seat of learning and rational inquiry. How can an economist talk seriously about the rational distribution of goods in view of the glaring contradiction between the affluence of the highly industrialized countries and the misery of the Third World? How can a young industrialist psychologist help self questioning when he sees that the object of his discipline is to fit the man to the job, and that the job itself is deadly and quite futile? How can a young physicist ignore the theoretical crises that is shaking the very foundations of contemporary physics, and tell himself that his research is of benefit to humanity, in an age which has produced the H-Bomb?"

Some of these biting statements hit home, but the author falls far wider of the mark when he claims the universities only recruit the poor because the market demands them. The present bid for students among the lower classes, according to Cohn-Bendit, only means there are more automaton like jobs to fill in the new world. The truth is—the population is greater, the education explosion is enormous, financial help is widely available, and that is why more poor are going to school in this country.

Articulate and charismatic as he may be, Cohn Bendit's utopia is even more vague than that of other visionaries whose utopian reflections were doomed to failure. We know what he doesn't want, but no one seems at all sure what he does want; and I can assure him there is a great interest in the future among all potential revolutionaries out of swaddling clothes.

I say that in no snide spirit, because every parent feels aching empathy for the bright and yearning young who want a better world to live in, as believe it or not, do we. But we do not think this can be achieved by a return to the days of chivalry when moral issues were resolved by trial and combat.

The suffering, martyred American today is not the protester with his placards or guns. That guy is having a ball, a catharsis, acting out his fantasies at the expense of the education of many.

We parents are the misunderstood, and the agonized. We know that the real test of the integrity of one's beliefs is to enforce them against people with whom we sympathize; and we are now at the point of no return in this confrontation.

Since I cannot speak for anyone but myself, I plead for the leadership, strong leadership of reason. I plead for freedom of expression for everyone, even the moderate, the so-called "Uncle Tom" or the dull. And I plead for civility and compassion for those who do not believe a mushrooming cloud will blow us all away the day after tomorrow if a young man down the hall wishes to be interviewed by IBM.

If rational discussion is out and violence is in, then I see no reason why the violators should not be expelled. If some of the faculty believe that roughing people up, or intimidating them into silence is a preferable way of life, then they are surely free to depart also.

It is beyond the pale in my circles to say the ultimate, but I think this attitude is like the story of the Emperor's clothes. The ultimate, obviously, is that private schools, at least, cannot maintain their costly presence as a battlefield for totalitarian dissent. If it continues, they will die of poverty and exhaustion, if nothing else.

In the days when I went to school, students subscribed to a reasonable contract, upon acceptance and admittance, indicating the limits of behavior expected by the institution. The limits are almost limitless now, so there is no reason why any well motivated individual should hesitate to agree to abide

by the laws of the school, or go elsewhere, or stay home.

One can only ask, emotionally, where will this end. . . . All this fanaticism, unreality, and rigidity on all sides? If violence and destruction continue, then, of course, private schools will be forced to close. Public universities will be denied funds by frustrated legislators and taxpayers. And, in the end, the State will maintain some institutions of higher learning. . . . A fascist dead end one cannot bear to contemplate. "Those were the days, my love". . . the days of Mussolini and Hitler.

I do not really think the revolutionaries of other lands can truly know what a great equalizer education has been in America.

Separated once by the social and economic distance from Groton to Gresham, USA, the American dream of education encompassed longshoreman and corporation executive; held captive in its same golden thrall the swingers of the 1900's whose Magic Carpet was steered, and the WASP's whose ancestors wore the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval from the Mayflower.

Indeed, only the American Indian and Eskimo, indigineous to North American soil, escaped the chicken-soup love which exacted from every newborn infant the expectation of college degrees from State universities if they were stupid or poor, and accolades from more venerable Ivy League institutions if they were smart enough or swank enough.

If our rejected generation of middle class liberals had one genuine hang-up, it was the Great Depression. No son or daughter of this affluent society can know what it cost in toll by oneself or family to attend college, or how many bright and hungry-to-learn young men and women never could afford the coveted tuition, which government not so long ago never dreamed of making available to so many or all.

We are the generation which remembers breadlines, the NRA eagle, the Okies and Grapes of Wrath. We are told patronizingly that the agonizing abstract art of today preceded this revolution because art is more perceptive than life. The revolutionaries must remember that ours were the novels of social protest, and the paintings of Ben Shahn, and photographs of hungry people with swollen stomachs, and the barren earth.

A modicum of common sense should tell the impatient young that it was our anxiety for another Third—the third of America that was "ill housed, ill clothed, and ill fed," that exposed and improved the human condition in this country to the point where reforms on a more relevant human scale could be recognized and realized.

And so I abjure collective guilt, and the silence of guilt, and say—while we give our children a still hungry America, a world in turmoil, polluted cities—we also give them unprecedented facilities for health and education—unheard of and even un-yearned for opportunities to create a world of beauty, and even one of peace.

Our parents gave us less, and their parents before them less yet—but we didn't despise them for not furnishing the world with wall to wall perfection.

Like every woman here, I resent the implication that every woman over 40 who has a charge account at Magnins is Mrs. Robinson. In fact I despise "The Graduate" and all so-called art of its ilk, because it is the easiest and cheapest kind of satire.

One thing we all agree—the godawful parents, the swinish police, the filthy administrators, and the adorable and idealistic young—that satire on the early show and the late, late show, that shoddy imitation of life with the Mace and the Molotov cocktails. That show must go—it is a "bad trip" and takes us nowhere on the journey of making a heaven on earth, the "good trip" we all want in our most splendid moments.

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN H. BUNZEL, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 25, 1969

I wish to express my appreciation to the Members of the Committee for their generous invitation to appear here today.

I would like to address myself to some of the problems which have emerged on our campus (but not ours alone) as a consequence of certain developments which in my judgment need serious attention. Put briefly, I am deeply concerned about the intrusion of politics onto the campus and the enormous strains and tensions which an increasingly wide range of political activities are creating for our academic communities. This issue, it need hardly be said, transcends one's political allegiances and party loyalties. Nor is what I am talking about a liberal issue or conservative problem. I have in mind, rather, the delicate and complex idea of academic freedom in the most profound sense of that term and, more specifically, the political pressures and passions which are now being generated at such a fever pitch on our campuses that the climate conducive to orderly procedures and rational inquiry is now in jeopardy.

The situation at San Francisco State, if one can step back from the immediacy of day-to-day events and their attendant difficulties, is a clear case in point. We have had to pay a terrible price for the mindlessness that has run rampant on our campus, to the point where threats, intimidation and violent behavior have become part of our way of life. The consequences of disruptive demonstrations, bomb scares (as well as real bombs), arson, roving bands of vandals, breaking into classes that are in progress—these are only the most dramatic but nonetheless real occurrences which have worked to politicize our campus, to polarize the faculty, and to charge the atmosphere with passion, bitterness and enmity. The tragic irony, of course, is that San Francisco State, once so open and free to everyone, is now exposed like a raw nerve—exposed to anyone who wants to tear it apart. What must be understood is that the academic community rests and depends on very fragile understandings. It has no elaborate mechanisms of self-protection, which is simply to say it is all too vulnerable to those who would use power, pressure and the muscle.

Let me turn now to certain dimensions of our general malaise and try, at the risk of great oversimplification, to illuminate what to me at least are some of their major implications for both the short and the long run. If nothing else emerges, I hope it will become clear that I have a tender regard for what a university community is and the special values it represents. At the very least my idea of an academic community is very different from those who want to turn it into a political staging area or who insist that it become exclusively an instrument of social reconstruction.

Consider the recent teachers' strike at San Francisco State. I opposed the strike, although I have been a strong trade union supporter most of my life. For one thing, I have felt that a strike, if it is to be effective, should have solid backing—and that is precisely what the striking teachers did not have and have never had. A year or so ago the AFT union was specifically rejected in a democratic written secret ballot at the faculty's bargaining agent, and during the strike about two-thirds of the faculty voted against it. Besides, I have some reservations about a teachers' union treating a college in the same way an industrial trade union might treat a reactionary employer. The use of confrontation, the weapon of the strike by a minority against the majority of its

faculty colleagues, the withholding of students' grades at the end of the semester as if students were an economic commodity—these tactics could do serious damage to an academic community if they became a permanent way of life.

But there were even more serious reasons why I felt this was the wrong strike at the wrong time—and led by the wrong people. A single incident will serve to make the point, especially since it outraged the great majority of the faculty and also resulted in many resignations from the union. The president of the teachers' union, in a letter sent to all of the members of the faculty, arbitrarily divided them into (his words) "friend versus enemy." Arrogantly and belligerently he pronounced the union's attitude: "You will not have the luxury of nice distinctions or Byzantine excuse," he told us, overlooking the fact that a community of scholars has a specific responsibility to make distinctions, nice, Byzantine or otherwise. "He who observes our picket line is a friend—anyone who plans to cross will be subject to moral force." I for one was subject to more than moral force, unknown in origin but revealing the conditions which, unhappily, have become all too familiar. One night after my wife and I had gone to bed someone slashed the tires of both cars and painted all over them "facist scab."

My argument should not be misunderstood. Some of the demands of the union were and are shared by many members of the faculty, but that is not the point. As one of the oldest members of the union put it himself, "I think it is not intellectually honest for us to argue that the Trustees should negotiate with us. How righteously would we scream if the Trustees sat down and negotiated with AAUP, for example? Our right to negotiate for the faculty is no better founded than theirs. I am sorry that this is true. But it is true. And, as long as it is true I cannot honestly argue that we have a right to expect the Trustees to bargain with us. . . ." For me and most of the faculty a significant and overriding question has been clear from the beginning of the strike: by what right did a small minority feel it could try to impose its ideology on the rest of us? These were the political moralists who, with little support from their colleagues, regarded every rejection of their demands as further confirmation of their right to call a halt to all teaching and to suspend the academic program. The real danger lay in their wish and determination to politicize the College or, failing that, to shut it down.

Or take the student strike which began last November when the Black Students Union and the Third World Liberation Front presented fifteen "non-negotiable" demands. Apart from the demands themselves, some of which are reasonable and others of which are not, the key term is "non-negotiable." No one on this Committee needs to be told that there is no such thing as a non-negotiable demand if one is seriously interested in realistic, achievable goals. Reasonable men who have differences and disagreements have a better chance of accommodating each other if they can discuss concrete issues which can lead to concrete results.

I think it has to be made clear that San Francisco State has been a victim of exploitation by intransigent radicals. When I say this I have some specific thoughts in mind about the tactics that have been used on our campus. Many student groups on other campuses around the country have used a variety of tactics designed to bring about reforms in the educational system at their college. They wanted to make changes, and they wanted to be a part of those changes. But on our campus the militant student leaders from the beginning have used tactics which were intended not to bring about changes but to shut the place down. The dis-

tion is important, and it has to be understood if one wants to understand what has taken place here.

Whatever the faults of our College—and we have plenty of them, from the typical administrative lethargy that is slow to change to a lack of urgent attention to many legitimate student grievances about the curriculum—we are not a reactionary place. It is, on the contrary, very liberal. The faculty is liberal, the student body is liberal; in fact, I have never seen a place with so much permissiveness and so few rules. But for the hard core revolutionaries on this campus that is not enough. To put it simply, they have to use confrontation tactics on the College so that they can confront its power. More than that, they must force the power of the College to show its ugly face. They know, of course, that the College, because it is liberal, wants to show a friendly and moderate face; it wants to discuss, to hold meetings, and to have forums and convocations. But the radicals also know that this whole method of convocations and discussions will help to maintain the evil system. Thus what they have to do is make the College show that it is an ugly fascist beast. How do they do this? By forcing the College to call the police, and then by forcing the police to use clubs and violence. Stokely Carmichael once said that any demonstration in which police are not involved is a failure for demonstrators.

One expects this kind of exploitation and tactics from such groups as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). What has been more perplexing is the militant black leadership on our campus: it does not precisely fit the pattern of behavior of black militants on every other campus around the country. What has been missing among the hard core black leadership here is an operating principle of reality—a clear, realistic sense of what is possible and achievable. This is what I mean when I say that no one with any real political sense would insist that their demands were "non-negotiable." As a matter of fact, there are already some signs that, finally, the militant student leaders have discovered that "non-negotiable" demands are, in fact, quite negotiable. If and when this happens, it will be a big step forward from the tiresome intransigence of "Either we get all our non-negotiable demands met or we will shut you down."

In a small way my own case may be illustrative here. For many years I have been committed to the development of a sound program of ethnic studies at San Francisco State. However, the problem this year has been that my concern for some measure of academic substance and integrity in a program of Black Studies has gotten lost in the fierce level of rhetoric in which the bullhorn replaced conversation and listening gave way to diatribe. At the beginning of the fall semester I was informed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs that I might become a "target" in the months to come. As it turned out he was right. My troubles started with an article I had written on Black Studies at San Francisco State in which I was critical not of the idea of Black Studies but of the particular perspective of Nathan Hare who put together the proposal for Black Studies. Mr. Hare has been very clear about the kind of program he wants—this was long before he was suspended for jumping up on the stage and interrupting President Hayakawa's address to the faculty. He has said he wants teachers in his model of a Black Studies Department who will work solely within a "black revolutionary nationalist framework" (his words). "I don't want any assimilationists," he says, by which he means "Negroes." My article simply raised questions about his approach because I do not agree with it. In a public speech a few months ago Mr. Hare said, "I think this is a time for hate." I do not agree with that, and I am not persuaded

that that sentiment has any place in a college program. But in the kind of polarized, combustible environment we have had on the campus, one either supported Mr. Hare's program in its entirety or he was tagged an enemy.

One morning in October around 8:30 a bomb was found leaning against my office door by one of my colleagues who happened to pass by and heard it ticking. The building was immediately evacuated and the demolition crew from the nearby Army post was called. Fortunately, no one was hurt. I have no idea who put the bomb there, nor have the police ever found out. But the important point is this: in an academic community it is ideas that should triumph, not power, or some group's interests or demands, or the tactic of physical pressure or emotional duress.

My most recent experience demonstrates, I think, the extent to which this delicate and complex notion of academic freedom can be endangered in the classroom itself by those who have no understanding of or commitment to the right to free intellectual inquiry in the pursuit of knowledge. During the pre-registration period at the opening of this semester about fifty students, including many of the leaders of the Black Students Union, the Third World Liberation Front and other student radicals and known supporters of the four month old strike, enrolled in my upper division course on "Community Power and the Politics of Leadership." The next day majors in political science and others who wished to take the course were admitted into the class, bringing the final enrollment to one hundred.

At the first meeting it immediately became obvious that about half of those present had no legitimate interest in the course and were there for other reasons. I attempted to begin the course and explain what it would be about but never got beyond the first sentence when the room erupted into shouts and other forms of verbal abuse from twenty-five or so militant students. One student jumped to his feet time after time and shouted quotations from Chairman Mao. Others were more shrill and personal in their denunciations. For some twenty minutes I tried to make myself heard over their torrent of invective. Unsuccessful, I finally had to dismiss the class.

On Wednesday I tried again, this time to begin the first lecture. I indicated that I would remain at the end of the hour to answer any and all questions. But the barrage of invective commenced once more, and after a half hour of asking the disrupters to permit me to speak I had to dismiss the class for the second time. On Friday the disruptive tactics started again. The students this time were warned that if they did not stop their continuous and purposive interruptions disciplinary action would be taken. They did not, at which point two students were suspended. Another was suspended in my class the next day for similar behavior.

Mr. Ernest Besig, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, was an invited guest in the class on Friday, February 21, and observed what took place. He was a witness to the disturbances in the classroom and has told me he was amazed that only two students were suspended. It is his belief that eight or ten others could have been suspended for disrupting the class and for interfering with the academic freedom of the professor and the other students. He has informed me that the American Civil Liberties Union will not intervene in behalf of those who have been charged with disruptive behavior in my class.

The paramount issue is unequivocally clear and of fundamental importance to the academic community, which includes faculty and students alike. The inviolability of the classroom is a principle which cannot be compromised. It involves nothing less than

the integrity of the academic process and, in the most profound sense, is at the heart of academic freedom.

What is particularly distressing to me and, I am sure, the great majority of the faculty is that this view and commitment is not unanimously shared by our colleagues. I find this personally very disturbing. During the week of my difficulties a resolution was introduced in the Academic Senate reaffirming the right of the student to learn and the teacher to teach in the classroom. It further asserted that any denial of such rights is not acceptable to the college community and that the Senate will support the obligation of the college administration to protect these rights. Nineteen members of the Senate voted to support the resolution; four voted against; eight abstained. No phraseology of a resolution is ever completely satisfactory. But surely the principle at issue here far transcends in importance any other divisions among us and is an irreducible minimum deserving support of every member of the faculty. I find it hard to believe, but, regretfully, not surprising, that twelve members of the Academic Senate could not support the resolution. If the faculty cannot agree that the classroom is inviolate, then I think we have moved a step closer to turning the academic community into a cockpit of ideologues.

I come, then, at this precise juncture, to the nub of the issue of academic freedom. When freedom to teach and freedom to learn are imperiled; when libraries are ransacked; when professors are harassed by anonymous phone calls; when ungovernable passions are deliberately inflamed; it is not for us, in the words of my colleague, Professor Philip Siegelman, "to inquire too much whether such extraordinary attacks come from the far left or the far right. They become facts of our existence and we would be criminally negligent to condone or approve them because of their particular source." On this particular point it should be noted that while the militants of the left have always jealously guarded against any incursions from the far right, they have not shown an equal determination or readiness to react to the more novel threats in this area coming from within their own ranks. In my own view this moral duplicity and double-standard has the suggestion of fanaticism at its worst.

I take it as an article of faith that has its roots in the long history of the liberal tradition that when freedom is attacked or suppressed, liberals must take their stand in opposition. It used to be that the severest threats to academic freedom came from above and outside—in a word, from the avenging furies of the far right, with the result that the faculty was almost instantly united. But now, when the assaults come from the inside and from the new brand of left-wing political moralists, the faculty is just as instantly divided. In the blunt words of a perceptive associate, if the threat were white and right instead of black and left, we on the faculty would always be close to unanimous. The attack on academic freedom from the left, of course, is by no means always tied to black militancy and extremism. But the basic question remains: when principles which are fundamental to the academic community are cynically exploited by the extremists of the left, why do the liberal and moderate members of the faculty not stand firm in their opposition to those who would impose their will by threats or coercion? It is a phenomenon which deserves more than passing notice.

For one thing, there is a failure of nerve, a lack of moral courage, on the part of many members of the faculty who become, consciously or unconsciously, victims of a form of psychological and moral intimidation exercised by the left-wing radicals. It has the immediate and practical result of silencing the middle, or, to put it another way, of

engendering the feeling on the part of a great number of the faculty that there is something shameful about speaking out or being in opposition. This has nothing to do with physical coercion. It is a subtle but powerful control over people who might normally speak out but who, in an increasingly politicized and polarized arena, impose their own self-restraints and remain silent or otherwise preoccupied. Some resolve whatever personal dilemma they may feel by simply withdrawing altogether—"the problems are too massive."

There is, however, another consideration which must also be noted. Traditionally, college faculties have never been organized for internal self-defense. Thus when an academic community is faced with student demands that are accompanied by the "body on the line" tactic, it responds, not surprisingly, in the only way it knows how—by concessions, by pleading for time, by setting up committees, by trying to persuade the radicals of its good faith and intentions. But what we have all discovered is that the university is simply not equipped to deal with the well-organized groups of political students, encouraged by their faculty supporters, who know that the vacillating and clumsy responses of the administration are no match for their politics of confrontation.

Let me return to the minority of striking professors at San Francisco State to make a point. Those members of the faculty who went out on strike will now carry on their union activities *inside* the campus, welded together, as it were, by the high-intensity heat of the strike. The tactic will be to operate as an organized political party—to run committees, to organize politically within departments, to try to take over the Academic Senate, to call faculty meetings where they will turn out their troops and try to make college-wide policy decisions; in short, to bend the College to their own political purposes.

The cost to the college community will be heavy, essentially because such concerted tactical behavior can only increase the politicization and polarization of the campus. Instead of being concerned with educational programs and problems, we will constantly be involved in political activities that will divide the faculty into ideological groups which in turn will deepen the hostilities and divisions. In order to oppose the faculty minority on even remotely equal terms, the rest of the faculty will have to organize, in effect, a political party of its own, something most faculty members are reluctant to consider because they feel strongly that the amount of time, energy and commitment it would take to organize politically runs counter to the very reasons they are there, on the faculty. That is not why they went into teaching, which is to say they regard political activism and ideological factions as contrary to the purposes of a university.

One additional observation should be made, particularly in relation to the feelings and predispositions of those on the faculty who are committed to the liberal persuasion and outlook. There is today a complicating matter which most faculty members simply would prefer not to have to deal with and over which they certainly do not want to feel in any way compromised; namely, any organized opposition might immediately be manipulated in such a way that it would be tagged as racist and regarded as further evidence of the establishment's antagonism to the needs and aspirations of black students on campus.

It cannot be emphasized too much—and this goes to the heart of my principal concern—that faculties around the country are for the most part liberal in their basic orientation. With this in mind, the point I am trying to make is that the assaults on academic freedom today are likely to come not only from within the Academy but, more important, from individuals and groups with

which most members of the faculty have some overlapping sympathies. To use a term that has some currency among social scientists, faculty members with liberal values become extremely cross-pressured. There are other values with which they are in general sympathy, e.g. an academically defensible program of ethnic studies, the equalitarian ethic, social justice, and so on. In other words, they share these same values with many of their colleagues on the faculty who, however, at this point in time make up a well-organized political minority that insists on the moral superiority of its goals and seems bent on the total politicization of the university. It is the kind of cross-pressure which elicits in many members of the faculty the desire to remain "uninvolved."

I have been talking, rather randomly I am afraid, of the consequences which accrue to an academic community when its members are increasingly forced to make decisions and choices in the heightened political atmosphere that characterizes my own campus today. The fundamental proposition I have been advancing is that academic freedom is seriously and directly threatened in a highly politicized environment. Reasoned inquiry gives way to passion and partisanship, and the end result is polarization and confrontation. The signs are everywhere. At San Francisco State the college community is being torn apart from the inside by the militants of the left, while off campus, watching and waiting, are the forces of the right. The striking teachers and student radicals keep saying that what they have been doing all year is "saving" higher education in California. The political truth of the matter is that they have helped galvanize all of the conservative and reactionary forces in the state into a kind of mass public that is motivated to act with interest, patience and constructive concern but out of fear, anxiety and anger. When the student militants on campus keep shouting "Power to the people", I get depressed when I think of the people who really have the power.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDERSON of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF JOB CORPS CENTERS TO STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed that all Job Corps centers be transferred to State vocational education administrators, and continued as part of their State plan for development of residential skill centers.

The administration's proposal to shut down 58 Job Corps centers and have the Labor Department replace them with near-city and in-city residential manpower centers is a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I find nothing in the proposal by the Labor Department to reconstruct the Job Corps centers which would indicate to me any meaningful improvement. The only criticism I might have with the present Job Corps operation is that it transports youngsters too

far from home for Job Corps assignments.

The Federal Government already has a multimillion-dollar investment in the existing Job Corps centers. It would be in my judgment the height of folly to junk these centers when Congress has urged the individual States to develop their own residential centers.

Congress unanimously passed the Vocational Education Act of 1968, which if fully funded could provide the States with meaningful tools for residential skill centers, and all of the other programs intended to help young people obtain meaningful training for employment.

Under the 1968 Vocational Education Act, State vocational education agencies could, and most probably would, take over existing Job Corps centers in their respective States and develop them into successful skill centers not only for indigent youngsters, but for all youngsters desiring such training within the States.

The Labor Department is proposing to set up new urban residential manpower centers in or near 30 cities during the coming year.

The Labor Department admits that its proposal is essentially a pilot venture seeking experience with various types of centers in a variety of settings to help gauge whether and what further development is feasible and desirable.

The three types of centers to be developed, according to the Labor Department plan, to serve the urban area near or in which they are to be located would include 10 centers providing work training in a residential setting close enough to the city to permit weekend commuting home.

The plan also calls for establishing five such centers to provide training for both residents and nonresidents and residential support for some youth enrolled in other local training programs.

Finally, the proposal calls for establishing 15 in-city small residential support centers to provide round-the-clock residential and other supportive services for selected youth enrolled in local training programs.

All told, the 30 new centers would have a capacity of about 4,625 youth. It is estimated the average enrollment will be less than 6 months, which is roughly the present Job Corps experience, and it is estimated the 30 centers could handle approximately 10,000 enrollees a year. The proposal calls for establishing 18 of the 30 centers for men, eight for women, and four will be tried on a coeducational basis with separate residential quarters for men and women administered centrally.

The Labor Department estimates the average annual operating expense per student at \$5,250 a year which, if these figures stand up, would be slightly below the Job Corps cost.

It is anticipated these new centers will recruit, train, support, and place youth in their home area as against the away-from-home community assignment customary in present Job Corps practice.

The program content would be similar to that of current Job Corps centers. There will be variations by centers but each center would provide a strong program of work experience and/or voca-

tional training, education, counseling, planning recreation and cultural activity, and physical rehabilitation and development.

It is anticipated that enrollees would be in residence only 5 days a week and then commute home by special bus on weekends. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the \$5,250 annual cost per student is based on a 5-day week while the present Job Corps houses and feeds youngsters 7 days a week.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that there is great merit in the Labor Department's program but I submit that they are robbing Peter to pay Paul and there is nothing here to assure us any more success with this new restructuring of the Job Corps than we have had heretofore.

On the contrary, we now have ample evidence that many of the conservation Job Corps centers scheduled to be shut down have done a tremendously impressive job in not only restructuring the young people they housed, but provided essential conservation services to the areas where such centers are located.

I believe that State vocational education agencies would want to retain most of the conservation centers now scheduled for shut down and probably would want to develop them into agricultural-technical training centers.

May I remind this House that agriculture is still the biggest single industry in America, and provides most of the jobs in the American labor market.

I respect the efforts of Secretary Shultz but I submit that he is being very badly misled in his current proposal to restructure the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, last year both the House and the Senate unanimously passed the Vocational Education Amendments Act of 1968.

After a great deal of careful deliberation and study, the Congress restructured the whole concept of vocational education in this country and provided the tools under which every single young American can develop a marketable skill during his learning years in school.

We provided 10 basic programs, including State grants for on-going programs which date back some 50 years, and have had a long history of success in this country.

We also set up State advisory councils to help develop more meaningful programs.

We earmarked 15 percent of State grants specifically for disadvantaged youngsters, another 15 percent for post-secondary education and finally 10 percent for handicapped youngsters. This 40 percent set-aside categorically earmarked for special needs gives assurance that State vocational programs will start reaching the youngsters of greatest need.

Mr. Speaker, every single Member of this House and every single Member of the Senate—on both sides of the aisle—realized the tremendous need for vocational education in this country and so we doubled the previous authorizations for State grant programs and provided \$508.5 million for State grant programs alone.

The Congress was well aware of the huge problem which we find in career

training among the disadvantaged and so in addition to the 15-percent set-aside in the State grant programs, Congress authorized an additional \$40 million expressly for vocational education programs among the disadvantaged.

We also recognized the need for developing better programs of career training and so we authorized \$57.5 million for exemplary programs.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, to hear some of the people in the Labor Department talk these days, you would think they discovered the concept of residential skill centers.

Actually we included skill centers as early as 1963 in the vocational education act amendments of that year. Then we reemphasized the need for residential skill centers in the amendments of 1968.

So I hope no one is foolish enough to think that the so-called new look that the Labor Department wants to give to the Job Corps by referring to these things as residential skill centers is some new concept. About the only new thing in their concept is now they are calling them mini-skill centers and maxi-skill centers.

Apparently some girl watchers in the Labor Department have come up with some Madison Avenue slogan for the new Job Corps.

This Congress was well aware of the need for residential skill centers and recognized the role they could play in helping young people who do not have access to vocational education in their immediate community, or to any other youngster in a State and so we authorized \$55 million for residential schools.

The Congress realized the value of cooperative education where a youngster can learn and earn. Under this program young people can attend school for their classroom instruction and then get a part-time job relevant to their classroom instruction with the employer joining in a training program. We authorized \$35 million for cooperative education and another \$35 million in fiscal year 1970 for work-study programs which help create jobs for young people within the school and community environment to help keep them in school.

Congress also realized that there has to be forward movement in curriculum development and so we authorized \$5 million for this project and another \$50 million for research in order to bring to vocational education the most modern techniques. Finally, we realize the huge shortage of teachers in vocational education and so we created a special program for teacher fellowships and training institutions and authorized \$35 million for this express purpose alone.

All told, Mr. Speaker, Congress last year authorized \$821 million for a new thrust in vocational education and I understand that this whole program was approved without a single dissenting vote.

I submit it is the tragedy of our time that the Johnson administration could not see the great strength and promise of vocational education and recommended in its budget message for 1970, a total of only \$266 million for all the programs I have described in my remarks today. It is an even greater tragedy that the new

administration under Mr. Nixon has likewise failed to see the great promise and has not in any way as of now increased its budget request to carry out this program of vocational education.

I submit it would be a great mistake for the Secretary of Labor to proceed with his program of urban skill centers and in effect set up a competitive educational system in our large cities.

If this administration really wants to do something to help the young people of America and to restore relevancy to American education, it will transfer whatever savings are made in the phase-out of Job Corps centers to the U.S. Office of Education and specifically allocate their funds to the authorizations incorporated in the 1968 Vocational Education Act.

There is a very deep-rooted principle involved here which I believe the House should understand. The establishment of these urban centers by the Department of Labor is not a simple continuation of the Job Corps program. It is an actual intrusion of the Federal Government into educational processes of the individual States.

We here in Congress have always fought a takeover by the Federal Government of our local school institutions and as chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education here in the House, I intend to continue that fight.

One thing is certain, the U.S. Office of Education has never tried to usurp the prerogative of local school systems. That is why I believe we should keep these educational programs in USOE.

I do not intend to see the Federal Government usurp the prerogatives and privileges of local school administrators in the establishment of education programs in these communities. The very strength of America's system lies in its pluralism, and I have no intention to sit by idly and watch the monolith of the Federal Government in Washington start dictating to every school board and every school district in this country what kind of schools we are going to have and how they will be run.

I say to Members of the House and the Congress, what we are seeing here in this seemingly innocent proposal to transfer the Job Corps to urban school centers is the beginning of Federal involvement in the operation of local schools throughout America. I think the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle ought to be apprised of the full consequences of the proposal now being carried out by people in the Labor Department, when they know full well the job of education clearly belongs to USOE.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for the statement he is making.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has never told us who would do this training. I take it, there may be at this time many agencies competing for mini-center training contracts, in the various cities of the country. The administra-

tion has only the vaguest plan presently, or at least the committee has never been told if there are any specifics. The fate of thousands of boys and girls who had hope for the first time is up in the air.

Moreover, there are not the training facilities available in the Nation to call for this reckless abandonment of our investment in Job Corps facilities.

Before the committee today we had a representative of the Lincoln Job Corps Center, where a few years ago the center was closed down and facilities were brought into the District of Columbia and a contract was entered into with the Washington Board of Trade and a subcontract with the Department of Labor. It is costing those people, with one of the so-called skill centers—and it is not a residential center—on an average approximately \$4,000, they said.

In these so-called mini-centers there will not be the other necessary facilities—medical and dental—and no beds for enrollees. In short, we have yet to see an effective substitute for the Job Corps in this country. That we can effectively prepare so called "hard core" young people through the Job Corps program have been demonstrated and documented by evidence before the House Education and Labor Committee this session.

We have all kinds of problems. We have transportation problems with the so-called mini-centers. It has never been thought through. I am hopeful that somewhere along the line the administration will change its course of direction and not turn its back on these youngsters they are now throwing back on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, let me again thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his comments.

The gentleman from Kentucky is the father of vocational education legislation in Congress. He was the initiator or innovator of the 1963 amendments, which gave the main thrust to vocational education in this country, and the 1968 amendments were amendments to his basic legislation of 1963. The gentleman from Kentucky properly points out, as was pointed out in the Washington Post this morning, that the Job Corps center is something more than just a home for youngsters out of work.

In these Job Corps centers they give youngsters medical help and dental help and a lot of other assistance they have never had. They have to literally start restructuring a human being who has lived in an environment all his life which has made it difficult for him to adapt to society.

There is nothing in what we have seen in any discussion of the Labor Department that they plan to carry on as an adjunct to skilled training this restructuring of human individuals to make them members gainfully employed in organized society.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no doubt in my mind that the administration will be able to fill some of these so-called minicenters, but they will fill them with a different type of individual from those

the Job Corps now serves. They will never fill them with the hard-core youngsters who really deserve priority.

The reason I state that is because we are short of training facilities everywhere. The MDTA program is only taking care of about 20 percent of the applicants. It is that way in the vocational schools, with only 20 percent of the applicants. These students usually are those most motivated and trainable.

The vocational educators will tell anyone that one of their chief problems has been trying to discover ways and means to deal with the hard-core youth. Through our experience with the Job Corps, we are gaining the techniques and the knowledge to do an even more effective job. Now it is proposed to abandon this successful approach and in its place embark on a much smaller program which cannot reach or properly serve those youngsters who are now being served by the Job Corps.

I find it hard to believe the administration has carefully thought through the effect of its proposal.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is why I said here today, if they are going to shut these Job Corps centers down, rather than shutting them down and rather than losing these millions of dollars we now have invested in these Job Corps centers, I would recommend that we fully fund the 1968 Vocational Education Act and turn these centers over to State vocational administrators to continue operating them as State residential skill centers under the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968.

One reason why I make this proposal is, if there is a shortcoming in the present structure of the Job Corps it is only that it brings to a Job Corps center 200 or 300 or 400 or 500 children who have one thing in common; they all come from very poor families and disadvantaged communities culturally depressed. Therefore, the youngsters are not helping each other any.

I submit it would be much wiser to have a State residential skill center to which children from all walks of life could come, to help each other in the learning process, with the integration of cultural values, of ethnic values and of economic values, to help uplift the disadvantaged faster and more successfully than anything else we can do. That is why I think it would be a tragedy to close these Job Corps centers now.

Mr. PERKINS. It would, indeed, be a tragedy.

A few days ago, in the congressional district at Ashland, Ky., we dedicated a \$1.5 million vocational education facility, one of the best in the Nation for its size. The problem there is the fact that it can only enroll about 15 percent of its applicants, or less. For instance, in the graduating class there this year at Paul Blazer High School we had 50-some-odd who wanted to take welding and 50-some-odd who wanted to take machine shop.

But this new school that has just been completed and dedicated is not able to enroll more than 10 out of that great school system. With the shortage of facilities in this Nation today, vocational

education facilities and other skill centers, it is a tragic waste to close down these Job Corps centers, because we do not have any other centers that can take care of this type of enrollee that the Job Corps is serving. We first ought at least to see these mini-centers in operation. Let us see how they are going to take care of this type of enrollee. When we have proof of the enrollment capacity and the program to take care of the very special needs of hard-core youngsters, then I think we could give the proposal our legislative blessing. However, until that time comes I do not feel, as responsible legislators, that we should go along with the proposal and say to these youngsters in the country who need top priority that "We do not intend to give it to you and we have no place for you in our Nation."

I do not think that Congress should countenance this waste of needed facilities and the abandonment of this effective approach to the needs of our hardest-to-reach youth.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, for his contribution. It is important for us to remind this Congress and this Nation that we have a commitment which was unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress on both sides of the aisle. We have a national commitment to vocational education. To hear these people in the Department of Labor talk today, you would think that the existing Job Corps centers can be phased out because there is no further need for them. The fact of the matter is that there is not only a need for the existing centers and also a need for the proposed skill centers, but there is a need for full funding of the 1968 act, because of the needs of vocational education are so overwhelming.

Mr. Speaker, if there is unrest in the schools of America today and if parents are voting down bond issue after bond issue with reference to education, it is because the American parent has become disenchanted with the kind of education his youngster is getting in most communities in this country. That is why I said when I pleaded for the 1968 act and why I say again today that if we are to restore some meaningful balance to American education, we have to move forward with vocational education. That is why it is my hope that the Secretary will not think of shutting down the Job Corps centers. They talk about having secret reports about all of the horrible things that have happened in the Job Corps centers. If there are indeed these kinds of disorders there, the thing to do is to get rid of the administrators and bring in a new team that can manage the centers in a responsible manner. It is the height of folly to suggest that because you have problems there you are going to shut down the centers. This is like surrendering to anarchy. What kind of responsible government is that? Does that mean every time there is a problem somewhere we shut down the institution? I have not heard anybody suggest yet that we shut down Harvard University or any of the other big colleges that have been having

upheavals. That is the logic the administration will follow if we shut down the 58 centers because they are having some problems or not all doing a good job. I wish that the President would read the testimony of the distinguished majority leader of this House, the gentleman from Oklahoma, CARL ALBERT, when he testified before my committee and told of the great work that is being done by the two centers in his State of Oklahoma.

For the first time in several decades meaningful work is being done in the forests of that State and on the roads of that State and in various other conservation projects that has never been done before simply because they did not have the manpower.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there have been shortcomings in the Job Corps. It is a new program. The Job Corps was never intended as a finishing school for fine young ladies or fine young men. The Job Corps is a repository for individuals who have some of the most deep-rooted social problems in this country, young people addicted to dope, young people who participate in the use of narcotics, young people who have never had a decent upbringing in their homes, young people who have no sense of value or judgment.

Mr. Speaker, this is why this Congress of the United States passed the Job Corps Act in the first instance. I remember well the reasons voiced and raised in this Congress who said we have got to do something, we have got to find a sanctuary or haven for these young Americans who are aimlessly walking the streets with no training or supervision.

Mr. Speaker, all of us remember the success of the CCC—the Civilian Conservation Corps—during the depression years and all over America people said that we ought to have these Job Corps camps.

I remember well the Gallup poll and the other public opinion polls in which the American people spoke out and said, "Yes, this is the kind of program we need in order to get these youngsters off the streets."

We have people in these Job Corps centers who for the first time in their lives know what it means to sleep on a bedsheet, young people who come from an environment where four, five, six, or eight people sleep in one bed, and then they slept in shifts. That is the kind of people with whom we are dealing. We are trying to restructure these individuals so that they may take their place in our American society. And I wish I had the means to tell the American people what is happening here, because it is their money that is being squandered in shutting down these centers; it is their money that built them, it is their money that equipped them, and it is their money that built the classrooms. Now someone in the Department of Labor has decided that there is another way of doing it. So they are going to shut down the 58 centers and try another experiment—mini-centers and maxi-centers. Yet they are not even able to tell us what these are going to do.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a national commitment voted by the Con-

gress of the United States to the young people of America. Last year every one of us answered the rollcall on both sides of the aisle when we said that we stand four square behind the Vocational Education Act of 1968. And we knew what we were doing. This was one of the best discussed bills that has ever been under consideration in this Congress. I remember very well the discussions and the debate on that bill. Then it passed unanimously, without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, what a tragedy of our time when young people walk into my office and say, "Congressman, can you help me get a job? I need a job to help pay my way through college." Here are young adults, young people who have just graduated from high school, or in their early years in college seeking this type of assistance.

And you say "Of course, young man, I would like to help you. What can you do?"

And he looks at you with a blank look, and shrugs his shoulders and says, "Nothing."

What a tragedy of our times when young people are not given any idea of a marketable skill in 12 years of education.

I have the highest respect for our Secretary of Labor. He is a fellow Chicagoan and a man who brings to Washington a brilliant record of achievement. It is for this reason that I hope he will consult with Secretary Finch and Commissioner Allen in the Office of Education and then agree that if we are to address ourselves to the totality of the problem facing America's young people, we will fully fund the Vocational Education Act of 1968 and then let the people who have had the most experience in this field—the State vocational educational directors—carry out the work of establishing residential skill centers and all the other programs necessary to give every young American a marketable skill.

There are those who continue to fight vocational education, unmindful of the fact that while 50 percent of the chil-

dren of this country go on to college, only 10 percent actually graduate.

More than 80 percent of the young people of America never complete college or even get a chance to get near a college.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that if Mr. Nixon really wants to make a contribution to American education he will closely associate himself with the great promise that vocational and technical education offers America—this, the greatest industrial empire in the whole world, this Nation is reaching for a trillion-dollar economy. By early 1970 or 1971 the gross national product of America is going to exceed \$1 trillion. We are going to have a labor force of 100 million people. Our only problem is having enough skilled people to keep the wheels of industry moving to sustain this trillion-dollar economy. Even today we are suffering serious labor shortages.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me somewhat academic to be involved in a huge struggle with the Labor Department as to whether or not we should close 58 Job Corps centers on the one hand, and create 30 mini- or maxi-residential urban skill centers on the other hand. In either event, we are dealing with only a fraction of the problem.

I say to the President, to the Congress, to the Committee on Appropriations, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to our Education Commissioner, if you seriously want to make a contribution to the young people of America, take a look at the 1968 vocational authorization, and then in a supplemental appropriation fund the 1968 act. Give the teachers of this country the tools they need to develop meaningful vocational educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, following is a table which shows what money Congress appropriated for the Vocational Act for fiscal 1970 and what the Johnson administration recommended. I hope President Nixon will join in the needed supplemental to get this program going.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1968

| | Fiscal year 1970 authorization | President's budget | Needed increase to meet minimum levels |
|--|--|--------------------|--|
| 1. State grant programs..... | \$508,500,000 | \$234,216,000 | \$75,020,000 |
| 2. State advisory councils..... | (1) | 1,680,000 | 2,000,000 |
| 3. Programs for disadvantaged..... | 40,000,000 | None | 40,000,000 |
| 4. Exemplary programs..... | 57,500,000 | 13,000,000 | 17,000,000 |
| 5. Residential schools..... | 30,000,000 15,000,000 15,000,000 | None | 30,000,000 15,000,000 10,000,000 |
| 6. Cooperative education..... | 35,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 21,000,000 |
| 7. Work-study..... | 35,000,000 | None | 35,000,000 |
| 8. Curriculum development..... | 5,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| 9. Research..... | 50,580,000 | 1,100,000 | 13,900,000 |
| 10. Teacher fellowships and training institutes..... | 35,000,000 | None | 35,000,000 |
| Total..... | 821,580,000 | 265,996,000 | 296,920,000 |

¹Such sums as may be necessary.

²Same as fiscal year 1969, but 40 percent of State grants fund for 3 special purposes: (a) 15 percent for disadvantaged, now about 1 percent; (b) 15 percent for post secondary, now about 3 percent; (c) 10 percent for handicapped. We have only 60 percent for funding present program. We will need at least \$75,000,000 to maintain present level of State grant programs.

IMPROVING THE OLDER AMERICANS' ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legis-

lation embodying the administration's recommendations for extending and improving programs to meet the needs of older people under the Older Americans Act. Joining me in sponsoring this legislation are Congressmen AYRES, QUIE, BELL of California, ERLBORN, SCHERLE, DELLENBACK, ESCH, ESHLEMAN, COLLINS, and HANSEN of Idaho. This is a most urgent piece of legislation, since several authorizations under the present act expire on June 30 of this year.

This bill not only renews the national commitment to a better life for our senior citizens, but proposes positive measures to improve upon the present efforts. The central provisions of the bill would strengthen the State agencies on aging, provide greater flexibility for the States to support community projects, establish the foster grandparent and senior companion programs on a permanent basis.

State agencies would be strengthened by requirements for statewide planning, coordination, and evaluation, and by providing additional resources to carry out these activities. A separate authorization of appropriations for planning, coordination, and evaluation and grant program administration emphasizes the importance of these activities. A shift from a 50-50 sharing basis to a 75 Federal-25 State sharing formula would put the aging program on the same matching basis as the rehabilitation program and the social services component of the public assistance program. These amendments should enable the State agency on aging to provide leadership in the analysis of existing programs serving older persons; the identification of gaps and weaknesses in services; the development of plans to achieve more coordinated comprehensive services, and the persuasion of public and private agencies to cooperate in the implementation of the plans.

Greater flexibility would be provided by dropping the specific time limit on Federal support of title III projects, and permitting the States to make the determination as to the length of time for which funding is appropriate after careful periodic evaluation. This will guarantee continuation of the best projects.

A new title VI establishes the foster grandparent and senior companions programs on a permanent basis. The President, in his economic opportunity message to Congress, indicated that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would take over the foster grandparent program. Since the program is already administered by the Department, this means placing the funding and the responsibility for it in one agency. Through the establishment of the senior companions program, opportunities would be extended for older persons to provide personalized care and services for other older persons in need of assistance, as well as for children in hospitals or homes. The Secretary would give preference to projects in which priority is given to older people of low income who are no longer in the regular work force. Older people other than those of low income can be enrolled as voluntary participants in these activities.

These amendments will enable State agencies to better direct and coordinate

programs of services to older people in the communities and to give the leadership which is essential to achieve maximum effect with limited funds.

At this point in my remarks I would like to include a copy of the bill.

H.R. 11048

A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration, to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969".

EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 301 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary for each of the next 3 fiscal years".

(b) The second sentence of section 603 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3053) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary for each of the next three fiscal years".

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF PROJECT SUPPORT

SEC. 3. (a) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, the last sentence of section 302(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended:

(1) by inserting "such percentage of the cost of any project as the State agency (designated or established pursuant to section 303(a)(1) may provide but not in excess of" before "75 per centum";

(2) by striking out "the third year of such project" and all that follows down to but excluding the period and inserting in lieu thereof "the third and any subsequent year of such project."

(b) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 303(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3023) of such Act is amended by striking out "after termination of Federal financial support under this title".

STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4. Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 303(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended by striking out ", and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible" in clause (3); by redesignating clauses (4) through (8) as clauses (5) through (9), respectively; and by adding the following new clause after clause (3):

"(4) provide for statewide planning, coordination, and evaluation of programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary after consultation with representatives of the State agencies established or designated as provided in clause (1);"

GRANTS FOR STATE PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 304 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3024) is amended to read as follows:)

"PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 304(a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next 2 fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for making grants to each State, which has a State plan approved under this title, to pay such percentage, not in excess of 75 per centum, as the State agency (established or designated as provided in section 303(a)(1)) may provide, of the costs of planning, coordinating, and evaluating programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act and of administering the State plan approved under this title.

"(b)(1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under subsection (a), the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa shall each be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum or \$25,000, whichever is greater, and each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to 1 per centum of such sum.

"(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

"(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this section shall be equal to the sum of the amounts allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2); except that if such sum is for any State, other than the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa, less than \$75,000 it shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing such sum for each of the remaining States (except the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa), but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent such sum for any of such remaining States from being reduced to less than \$75,000.

"(c) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for meeting the costs in such State referred to in subsection (a) shall be reallocated from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in meeting the costs referred to in subsection (a) for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (b) and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts for meeting such costs during the period for which the original allotment was available. Such reallocations shall be made on the basis of such need and ability, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b).

"(d) The allotment of any State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year shall be available for payments pursuant to this section to State agencies which have provided reasonable assurance that there will be expended for the purposes for which such payments are made, for the year for which such payments are made and from funds from State sources, not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

(b) Subsection (a)(3) of section 302 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended by striking out "title" and inserting in lieu thereof "section". Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title" and inserting in lieu there-

of "for grants with respect to projects in the State under this title".

REALLOTMENT

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 302(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended by striking out "the State notifies the Secretary will" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary determines will".

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND TRAINING PROJECTS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 401 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3031) is amended by striking out "any such agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "any agency".

(b) Section 501 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3041) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, for the specialized training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act."

FOSTER GRANDPARENT AND SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

SEC. 8. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is further amended by redesignating title VI as title VII, by redesignating sections 601 through 603, and references thereto, as sections 701 through 703, respectively, and by inserting after title V the following new title: "TITLE VI—FOSTER GRANDPARENT AND SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM"

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR PERSON-TO-PERSON SERVICE PROJECTS

"SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary shall carry out a program of grants and contracts in accordance with this title. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next two fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the development and operation of projects designed to provide opportunities for persons aged sixty or over (to be known as 'Foster Grandparents' in the case of services described in clause (1) and 'Senior Companions' in the case of services described in clause (2) or (3)) to render personal services on an individual relationship basis—

"(1) to children receiving care in hospitals, homes for dependent or neglected children, or other establishments providing care for children with special needs;

"(2) to older persons receiving institutional care in hospitals, nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, or homes for the aged; and

"(3) to persons in need of special personalized assistance because of physical infirmities or other special circumstances.

"(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"CONDITIONS OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"SEC. 602. (a) The Secretary shall not award any grant or contract under this title for a project in any State to any agency or organization unless, if such State has a State agency established or designated pursuant to section 303(a) (1) such agency is the recipient of the award or the project application has been submitted to such agency for review and recommendations.

"(b) In administering this title the Secretary shall—

"(1) give preference to projects in which priority will be given in the enrollment of

participants to older persons of low income who are no longer in the regular work force;

"(2) award a grant or contract for a project only if he determines that the project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

"(3) award a grant or contract for a project proposed to be undertaken in (and to be limited to) a single community served by a community action agency only if—

"(A) such agency is the recipient of such award or has been afforded a reasonable opportunity to apply for and receive such award; and

"(B) in cases in which such agency does not receive such award, the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that the project has been developed, and will to the extent appropriate be conducted, in consultation with, or with the participation of, such agency;

"(4) award a grant or contract to any agency or organization for a project in which older persons other than those of low income (as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary) are to be enrolled as participants only upon reasonable assurance that such enrollees will not receive reimbursement or compensation from such agency or organization with respect to such participation except for incidental expenses such as transportation and meals.

"(c) The term 'community action agency', as used in this section, means a community action agency established under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

"SEC. 603. In administering this title, the Secretary shall consult with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and any other Federal agency administering programs related to the program under this title with a view to achieving optimal coordination of the program under this title with such other programs and shall promote the coordination of projects under this title with other public or private programs or projects carried out at State or local levels. Such Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary in disseminating information about the availability of assistance under this title and in promoting the identification and interest of older persons whose services may be utilized in projects under this title."

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 9. For the purposes of section 701 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, payments made to or on behalf of any person under a project (of the kind formerly carried on under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) assisted under the title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965 added thereto by this Act shall be deemed to be payments made to or on behalf of such person under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

EVALUATION

SEC. 10. The title of the Older Americans Act of 1965 herein redesignated as title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 704. Such portion of any appropriation under title III or VI or section 703 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1969, as the Secretary may determine, but not exceeding 1 per centum thereof, shall be available to the Secretary for evaluation (directly or by grants or contracts) of the programs authorized by this Act and, in the case of allotments from such an appropriation, the amount available for such allotments (and the amount deemed appropriated therefor) shall be reduced accordingly."

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

SEC. 11. (a) Sections 102(3) and 302(a) (1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C.

3002, 3022) are each amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "Guam."

JOINT FUNDING PROJECTS

SEC. 12. The Older Americans Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after section 704, added by section 10 of this Act) the following new section:

"JOINT FUNDING OF PROJECTS

"SEC. 705. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to an agency, organization, institution, or person assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose."

CREDIT INSURANCE ABUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, merchants who require customers to pay for credit life, health, and accident insurance when they buy products on time are picking their customers' pockets to the tune of \$220 million each year.

Customers are not only forced to pay more for the merchandise, but they end up paying two to three times as much for the credit insurance as well.

In my own district in Queens Village, Long Island, a constituent who shopped carefully for a new car found himself in the end paying \$90 for credit insurance that should have only cost \$30.

In order to deal with these and other such deceptive practices, I am introducing legislation today that would give the Federal Reserve Board the power to set maximum premium rates for life, health, and accident insurance purchased as part of credit transactions.

This legislation is vital if we are to adequately protect our consumers. A purchaser has no bargaining power when he buys insurance and he can easily be deceived into paying more because the insurance cost is small in relation to the primary cost of the transaction.

But make no mistake—repeated purchases on credit multiply the total cost to the customer, to the extent that customers are duped into paying some \$200 million a year in excessive charges.

The statistics are staggering. It has been estimated that nearly 35 percent of all credit income to finance companies comes from these charges. Not only is insurance a major source of finance income, but it touches almost all credit purchases—and that means that most of us are being bilked.

Consumer credit insurance arose as a means of protecting the creditor by guaranteeing recovery of the amount owed him in the event of death or disability of his debtor.

In the past years, self-interest motivated most lenders to pay the premiums

themselves, because they believed it was good business to do so.

But today not only do businessmen require that the customer purchase the insurance, but they encourage insurance companies to set the highest possible rates on premiums, because they receive a kickback in one form or another of all premiums remaining after payment of claims and expenses.

What this means is that many finance companies have found a way to circumvent the usury laws and truth-in-lending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Congress must act with a sense of urgency; \$18 million a month is a lot to pay for nothing.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of H.R. 5554, the extension of the special milk program for children because I believe it has an excellent potential for providing needed supplemental nutritional aid to low-income children.

Unfortunately, the program as it has been operated does not benefit those who need its assistance most—the poor child who does not get enough milk at home.

Because the program lays down no standards for eligibility, it is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget that only \$7 million of the almost \$104 million being spent for the program this fiscal year will go to poor children, those whose families earn less than \$3,000 per year. Instead, the program has been operated to extend benefits across the board to rich and poor alike, to those who need it and those who do not.

The Department of Agriculture has the administrative discretion to direct the benefits of this program to those who need it most. With the American people so concerned with the problem of hunger and malnutrition, I am surprised that the administration has not moved in this direction on its own.

To remedy this, I introduced an amendment during debate on H.R. 5554 to provide funds on a priority basis to schools participating in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and within those schools to provide benefits first to children from households which have no income or have income below the poverty index as established by the Social Security Administration. The establishment of such criteria would have insured that the benefits of this program will go to those who need them most. Although this amendment was defeated, I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will, nevertheless, undertake to redirect the program so that it may become one aspect of the war against hunger in the United States.

I realize that both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, because of the current budget squeeze, advocated the elimination of this program with \$80 million of the current \$103 million going for free and reduced school lunches for fiscal 1970.

I hope the Appropriations Committee

will not construe the extension of this program as a mandate to cut the \$80 million in new funding for the school lunch program in order to restore it to the special milk program.

When the budget loosens up, I think appropriations should be provided for the milk program, but in the meantime, I think that far greater benefits can be gained by spending that \$80 million for free and reduced cost lunches for poor children. If that is done, lunches can be provided to 1.45 million poor children

HOUSE RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO URGE THE SOVIET UNION TO PROCESS REQUESTS OF SOVIET CITIZENS FOR REUNIONS WITH THEIR FAMILIES WHO ARE OUTSIDE THE U.S.S.R.

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

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today 61 Members of the House have introduced a resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of more than 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.

This resolution was initiated at the request of the American League for Russian Jews, Inc., a branch of the International League for the Repatriation of Russian Jews, Inc. It is the hope of the league that the President will be able to use his good offices to prevail on the Soviet Government to proceed with the processing of the past and current requests for family reunions with their brethren outside the U.S.S.R. It has been the stated policy of the Soviet Union to permit Russian Jews to be reunited with their families abroad, but approximately 50,000 requests remain unprocessed.

The list of cosponsors follows:

Frank J. Brasco (New York).
 Brock Adams (Washington).
 Joseph P. Addabbo (New York).
 Frank Annunzio (Illinois).
 Mario Biaggi (New York).
 Jonathan B. Bingham (New York).
 John Brademas (Indiana).
 Phillip Burton (California).
 James A. Byrne (Pennsylvania).
 Emanuel Celler (New York).
 Shirley Chisholm (New York).
 John Conyers, Jr. (Michigan).
 Emilio Q. Daddario (Connecticut).
 Dominick V. Daniels (New Jersey).
 James J. Delaney (New York).
 John H. Dent (Pennsylvania).
 Edward J. Derwinski (Illinois).
 Thaddeus J. Dulski (New York).
 Don Edwards (California).
 Joshua Eilberg (Pennsylvania).
 Dante Fascell (Florida).
 Michael A. Feighan (Ohio).
 Hamilton Fish, Jr. (New York).
 Donald M. Fraser (Minnesota).
 Robert N. Giaimo (Connecticut).
 Jacob H. Gilbert (New York).
 William J. Green (Pennsylvania).
 Seymour Halpern (New York).
 James M. Hanley (New York).
 Richard T. Hanna (California).
 Augustus F. Hawkins (California).
 Henry Helstoski (New Jersey).
 Frank Horton (New York).
 James J. Howard (New Jersey).
 Edward I. Koch (New York).
 Peter N. Kyros (Maine).
 Allard K. Lowenstein (New York).

Richard D. McCarthy (New York).
 Spark M. Matsunaga (Hawaii).
 Abner J. Mikva (Illinois).
 Joseph G. Minish (New Jersey).
 John M. Murphy (New York).
 Robert N. C. Nix (Pennsylvania).
 Richard L. Ottinger (New York).
 Claude Pepper (Florida).
 Otis G. Pike (New York).
 Bertram L. Podell (New York).
 Melvin Price (Illinois).
 Roman C. Pucinski (Illinois).
 Ogden R. Reid (New York).
 Henry S. Reuss (Wisconsin).
 Howard W. Robison (New York).
 Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (New Jersey).
 Benjamin S. Rosenthal (New York).
 William F. Ryan (New York).
 Fernand J. St Germain (Rhode Island).
 Frank Thompson, Jr. (New Jersey).
 Jerome R. Waldie (California).
 Lester L. Wolff (New York).
 John W. Wydler (New York).
 Gus Yatron (Pennsylvania).

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, within the span of 3 short days, May 1 to May 3, we commemorated two occasions which typify man's endless quest for a just and humane society. On May 1, we observed Law Day; on May 3 we celebrated the 178th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It is of the latter I speak today.

That expression of liberalism, the Polish Constitution of 1791, has stood the test of time despite the physical oppression of the Polish state. The concept of national sovereignty firmly embedded in that document also clearly reflected the Polish people's embracement of human rights. Their constitution has served as a beacon for all freedom loving people.

Americans in particular have a special feeling about Polish Constitution Day—not only Polish Americans, but Americans of all backgrounds. For it was only 2 years after our Nation adopted its Constitution that Poland began her venture as a free nation swathed in a constitutional framework, much like the United States, dedicated to the principles of equality and justice for the individual.

We have been more fortunate in that our Nation has not been subjected to foreign rule. But the fate of Poland has not denied her lasting impact on the Western World, or the heroic and monumental contributions of her people. The fields of art, literature, music, drama, science and medicine, public service, and sports are but a few where the sons and daughters of Poland have bequeathed lasting contributions to the rest of the world.

Many Polish Americans have retained the charms and customs of their homeland—adding greatly to our Nation's rich cultural heritage. We are a people rich in diversity of thought, expression, and feeling. Our pluralism has been a source of strength in our national fabric, not a weakness as some contend. It is true that today we are faced with rapid social change which is straining the threads of our diverse unity. But, as in the past, I am confident that the forces of change will be directed realistically, the emerg-

ing social groups assimilated into the mainstream of American life, and the Nation's business conducted purposefully.

The Polish American has demonstrated this process, yet retaining his pride, his identity, and his self-concept. We can all take lessons from him and I am certain that those who are now seeking their rightful place in society will profit from the experience of many Polish Americans who have bridged the gap and have become citizens of full standing. And I am certain our Polish Americans will help these people.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children, which passed yesterday, May 6, 1969.

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

There was no objection.

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. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESCH) to address the House and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), for 20 minutes today; 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. GROSS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESCH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS in three instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. WECKER.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. SCHNEEBEL.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in five instances.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. RYAN in four instances.

Mr. VIGORITO.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 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:

744. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ended March 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

745. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the use of missile procurement funds to finance research and development efforts, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

746. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

747. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

748. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9233. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to pro-

mote the efficient and effective use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission in connection with certain functions of the Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 677. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969 (Rept. No. 91-189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. House Concurrent Resolution 207. Concurrent resolution, Gen. Omar N. Bradley; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-190). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 11004. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11005. 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. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 11006. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11007. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11008. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11009. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11010. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 11011. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit-sharing plans as those presently provided for employees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11012. 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. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 11013. A bill to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 11014. 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. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HICKS, Mr. KING, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 11015. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the only son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. POBELL, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 11016. A bill declaring public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches, and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 11018. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 11019. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11020. 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.

H.R. 11021. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11022. A bill to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 11023. 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. HALPERN:

H.R. 11024. A bill to protect consumers from abuses relative to excessive charges for life, health, and accident insurance pursuant to consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11025. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11026. A bill to permit the Federal Government to further assist the States in the control of illegal gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 11027. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deduction from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 11028. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 11029. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 11030. 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. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. POFF, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BOW, Mr. MINSALL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 11031. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. POFF, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BOW, Mr. MINSALL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 11032. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By McFALL:

H.R. 11033. A bill to amend section 228 of the Social Security Act to provide that every uninsured individual who is otherwise qualified shall be eligible at age 72, without regard to when such age is attained, for the special monthly benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11034. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11035. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11036. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11037. A bill to provide equitable access to the U.S. market for imported textiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11038. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, in order to exempt from the provisions of such section the transportation of merchandise between points in the State of Alaska and points in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11039. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11040. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11041. A bill to provide for nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for public assistance, to provide for a supplemental family allowance program, and to provide that the cost of public assistance under the Social Security Act shall be fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11042. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 11043. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities failing to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith when experiencing campus disorders, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11044. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal share of a State's expenditures under the public assistance programs (including administrative expenses) to 90 percent, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards for aid or assistance thereunder, and to repeal the freeze on the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the AFDC program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11045. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the widow's and widower's insurance benefits payable thereunder to individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 11046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,600 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 11047. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. AYERS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. ERLÉNBOHN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 11048. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration, to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11049. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11050. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 11051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$2,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11052. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 11053. 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. WOLFF:

H.R. 11054. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution proposing amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or

Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution, International Conference for Territorial Seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr.

ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAMMO, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 395. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr.

HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. ROBINSON):

H. Res. 396. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr.

RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Res. 397. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 398. Resolution authorizing a Representative in Congress who is a member of

a certain committee to designate one of his employees to be cleared for access to classified information available to the Representatives in his capacity as a member of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 399. Resolution to provide funds for the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 17; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

157. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a uniform welfare system, which was referred 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. 11055. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Armetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11056. A bill for the relief of Despina Legakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11057. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo and Agatha Sgroi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11058. A bill for the relief of Suriya Sompunth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 11059. A bill for the relief of Chan Cheuk Kuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11060. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 11061. A bill to provide private 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. NIX:

H.R. 11062. A bill for the relief of Gonzalo Pino and his wife, Anna Maria Pino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11063. A bill for the relief of Zofia Chajduk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

104. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jay Creswell, Orlando, Fla., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL OF WAKAMATSU TEA AND SILK COLONY AT GOLD HILL, CALIF.

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1 month from today, on June 7, to be exact, a California historical landmark will be dedicated at Gold Hill, in El Dorado County, to mark the site of

the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Colony, the first recognized settlement of Japanese immigrants to the continental United States.

This observance will also officially inaugurate the Japanese immigration centennial commemorating the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the first Japanese for permanent residence in this country.

Gov. Ronald Reagan, Japanese Consul General Seiichi Shima, and national president of the Japanese American Citizens League—JACL—Jerry Enomoto will be among the featured participants in the dedication ceremonies.

A bronze plaque, to be fitted into a 17-ton granite boulder, will carry the inscription:

Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Colony. Site of the only tea and silk farm established in California. First agricultural settlement of pioneer Japanese immigrants who arrived at Gold Hill on June 8, 1869. Despite the initial success, it failed to prosper. It marked the beginning of Japanese influence on the agricultural economy of California. California Registered Historical Landmark No. 815. Plaque placed by the State Department of Parks and Recreation in cooperation with the Japanese American Citizens League and the El Dorado County Historical Society. June 7, 1969.