United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Monday, January 19, 1970*

The 19th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 91–182, 91st Congress, first session, for the meeting of the second session of the 91st Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The second session of the 91st Congress will now be in order and will be led in prayer by the Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D.

The Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, attune to Thy divine will and purpose the minds and spirits of all who resume their labors here. By Thy pervasive presence make this room in the year before us not only a legislative chamber but a temple of freedom under God, and a sanctuary of the soul, where the welfare of all the people is the highest concern. Make us to know we work not alone but with Thee.

As we pray for ourselves, so also we pray for the whole Nation. May there come upon this Nation a mighty movement of the Spirit, investing all the people with pure religion and lofty patriotism. Restore us in the ways of moral rectitude and kindle in the people such a love of the spiritual verities and the discipline of prayer as to make us great and good and strong, a bastion of spiritual power for all mankind.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 1 Leg.]

Aiken	Cotton	Hartke
Allen	Cranston	Hatfield
Allott	Curtis	Holland
Anderson	Dole	Hruska
Baker	Eagleton	Hughes
Bellmon	Eastland	Inouye
Bennett	Ellender	Jackson
Bible	Ervin	Jordan, N.C.
Boggs	Fannin	Jordan, Idaho
Brooke	Fulbright	Kennedy
Burdick	Goldwater	Long
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Gravel	Mansfield
Cannon	Griffin	Mathias
Case	Gurney	McClellan
Church	Hansen	McGee
Cook	Harris	McGovern
Cooper	Hart	McIntyre
Metcalf	Percy	Spong
Miller	Prouty	Stennis
Mondale	Proxmire	Symington
Montoya	Randolph	Talmadge
Moss	Ribicoff	Thurmond
Murphy	Russell	Tydings
Muskie	Saxbe	Williams, N.J.
Nelson	Schweiker	Williams, Del.
Packwood	Scott	Yarborough
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Young, N. Dak.
Pearson	Smith, Ill.	
Pell	Sparkman	

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—John J. Sparkman and James B. Allen.

Alaska.—Ted Stevens and Mike Gravel.

Arizona.—Paul J. Fannin and Barry Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—George Murphy and Alan Cranston.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and Peter H. Dominick.

Connecticut.—Thomas J. Dodd and Abraham A. Ribicoff.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and Edward J. Gurney.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye.

Idaho.—Frank Church and Len B. Jordan.

Illinois.—Charles H. Percy and Ralph T. Smith.

Indiana.—Vance Hartke and Birch E. Bayh.

Iowa.—Jack Miller and Harold E. Hughes.

Kansas.—James B. Pearson and Robert Dole.

Kentucky.—John Sherman Cooper and Marlow W. Cook.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—Joseph D. Tydings and Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

Massachusetts.—Edward M. Kennedy and Edward W. Brooke.

Michigan.—Philip A. Hart and Robert P. Griffin.

Minnesota.—Eugene J. McCarthy and Walter F. Mondale.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Thomas F. Eagleton.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Norris Cotton and Thomas J. McIntyre.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Clinton P. Anderson and Joseph M. Montoya.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Charles E. Goodel.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio.—Stephen M. Young and William B. Saxbe.

Oklahoma.—Fred R. Harris and Henry Bellmon.

Oregon.—Mark O. Hatfield and Robert W. Packwood.

Pennsylvania.—Hugh Scott and Richard S. Schweiker.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell.

South Carolina.—Strom Thurmond and Ernest F. Hollings.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and George S. McGovern.

Tennessee.—Albert Gore and Howard H. Baker, Jr.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry F. Byrd, Jr., and William B. Spong, Jr.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—William Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and Clifford P. Hansen.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 304) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 304

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. SCOTT the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 305) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 305

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. KENNEDY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 306) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 306

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES BILL, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is the conference report on H.R. 13111, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, 1970.

The Chair states to the Senator from Montana that the conference report does not come down automatically at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A conference report on H.R. 13111, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The majority leader has an important announcement to make. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the leadership's intention to operate on a Monday through Saturday basis as long as there is major legislation on the calendar ready for consideration. There is presently a good deal of proposed major legislation on the Senate Calendar; thus, this week we shall be working a full 6-day week. The proposed schedule for this week and next includes not only the consideration of the pending conference report, but there will be forthcoming sometime soon the conference report on the foreign aid bill.

Following that, there will be the organized crime control bill (S. 30) under the managership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN).

Following that—and of course, all of these will be after the Crime Control Act, but will not necessarily be in this order—the Drug Control Act, S. 3246; H.R. 14465, a bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, and for other purposes;

S. 1520, a bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers;

S. 3154, a bill to provide long-term financing for expanded urban public transportation programs, and for other purposes.

It is my understanding that the elementary and secondary school education bill will be reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Wednesday, January 21. That measure will be considered with the others mentioned as a first priority measure without delay.

So, what we intend to do—and this meets with the approval of the distinguished Republican leader—is to try to keep abreast of the needs of the times as they become apparent, to try to accede to the President's requests for the type of action which he desires, and to try to work out a schedule which would hopefully get us out of here by Labor Day.

I hope that this year any message sent by the President will be followed very shortly thereafter by specific proposals.

Last year, it was difficult for the Senate and the House of Representatives to consider some of the legislation and budget requests, because they did not arrive until November or December.

If we do not finish by Labor Day this year, it is our intention to stay in session until 2 weeks before the election and then come back immediately afterward and stay in session until there is nothing left to be done.

I would hope that the same type of accommodation and cooperation that was so evident last year between the Senate and the House and the President and Congress will continue this year, although, it is unlikely, this being an election year, that politics will be held to a minimum.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished majority leader for his obvious determination that we begin working in this session.

It is the first time in my long experience that a session has opened and we have gone to work at once, which is refreshing and a good omen in the interest of getting legislation through, and in accordance with the desires of the President of the United States that his program be fully considered and, hopefully, favorably acted upon.

Many of the measures which the distinguished majority leader refers to as the pending order of business on January 19 were indeed submitted by the President in messages last April or May and have been—I do not know whether it is proper to say—languishing or residing or resting in committee, but certainly they have now come to life, a condition which we all welcome.

I was told last year, and I believe it to be a fact, that in every case when a message came up from the White House, it was followed promptly—and that means immediately or within a few days—by reports from the necessary agencies of the Federal Government.

There hundreds of cases when reports were not sent that promptly because they referred to individual bills such as relief bills or small claim bills and the like. And in those matters which are not submitted by the administration, the reports run through a bureaucratic maze and take a long time.

The President asked for action on the tax bill last April, on the Crime Control Act in May, and on the Drug Control Act some 7 or 8 months ago.

In each of these matters, I have no recollection that he had delayed until November in getting any reports to us. If there was a delay, I would like to know why they were not asked for. It is true that the tax bill did take up most of the year. And it has some relief in it. There are some who would say that it has too much relief and not enough reform. Those that want relief say that it has too much reform, and not enough relief.

In my judgment, it was a pretty good bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Never in my memory have the appropriation bills been so de-

layed as in the last session. Is that by any stretch of the imagination the fault of the administration in waiting for bills or reports on what should go into those appropriation bills?

Mr. SCOTT. I would be glad to respond by saying the appropriation bills are not the function of the executive department but they are the function of the legislature; and it is in no sense the fault of the executive branch if appropriation bills are delayed until November or December.

The distinguished majority leader made a public suggestion which I applaud and in which I strongly concur, and that is that the majority leadership in both bodies give most careful and urgent consideration to expediting money bills in this session so they may be considered as promptly as they may be.

We are all aware of the fact that money bills are sometimes delayed by delays in authorization bills, and, therefore, in working out such plans as the majority leadership has in mind, and in which the minority leadership also has concern, getting authorization bills acted upon is obviously of the greatest importance. But I want to assure the majority leader and the majority party that we will cooperate in doing all that is necessary. The members of the Committee on Appropriations on the minority side have been diligent in attending to their job. We will continue to support the majority in getting early action on money bills.

I suggest that if the majority leadership wishes to consult with the minority leadership in these two bodies, perhaps we can all agree on a plan, submit it to the White House, and see if we can have the kind of operation the public would applaud, in spite of the fact that this is an election year and we are all subject to the kinds of temptations which resolutely we should seek to avoid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the tone and the temperateness of the distinguished Republican leader in the remarks he has made. I also express the hope that the cooperation and accommodation which existed between the two parties in this body last year will continue through the present year. I have always operated on the theory that the welfare of the Nation comes first, that the responsibility of the Senate comes second, and that the welfare of the political parties comes third. I think if we acted in that manner, as we tried to do this past year, that we all benefit, and the Nation not least of all.

Again I wish to express the hope that there will be a minimum of politics in this political year. It is a vain hope, perhaps, but I would look forward to an accommodation which would seek to place first not our individual successes but rather the welfare of the Nation, the needs of the people, and the responsibilities we have, the real responsibilities in various parts of the world.

(At this point the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) assumed the chair.)

Mr. SCOTT. I think the President established that same thought when he said in one of his messages that we in these two bodies, and our two political parties, and the executive also, should compete not in accusing each other in what we have not done, but in constructively acting on legislation, and that we should compete for public favor on the basis of what we have done.

I would like to add one further thought. I do support what the majority leader said, with the suggestion that perhaps this year we forego the August recess. That is not a popular suggestion in all quarters, I am sure; but that we forego the August recess, as he strongly hinted, in the hope that we can terminate our labors around Labor Day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not intended to enter into this discussion, but in defense of the Committee on Appropriations I should make perfectly clear that we have not delayed any of the appropriations bills for any unreasonable length of time. As Senators know, the other House claims the right to originate appropriation bills. We expedited them after they reached us. If there has been any committee in this body that has operated completely on a nonpartisan basis, it has been the Committee on Appropriations. The President did not send us some of his messages until rather late. I do not say that in any critical sense, because he had his problems and I am well aware of all of them. But I think the Senator might have been a little critical if we had presumed to pass several appropriation bills without having any statement from the President with respect to his opinion on the amount of the bills or various activities included in them.

There has been delay in appropriations. Where the blame lies, I shall not undertake to debate, but the Committee on Appropriations, on a completely nonpartisan basis, acted very expeditiously when all of these bills reached us from the other body.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Washington will yield further, I am sure we are all in agreement that no committee is held in higher respect than the Committee on Appropriations; that its nonpartisan approach to measures is greatly helpful to the country and Congress; that much of the delay is due to the fact that there has been delay in authorization bills, and the fact that the other body reserves to itself the assertion that it has the right to submit and to initiate appropriation bills.

Perhaps the majority leadership may be able to persuade the other body that this is an antiquated and archaic process and delays public bills, and that the Senate has a function it is willing to share with the other body. But I am aware of the fact that up to now this body is to a degree inhibited by the contention of the other body that it has the sole right to initiate appropriation bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. Many years ago the Senate did undertake to initiate appropriation bills and it got a little further than the door of the other body. I think they did receive them and they went to a desk there. But since that time the attempts of the Senate have been futile in that regard.

The defense appropriation bill was the largest of all the appropriation bills, involving one-half of the budget. We received that bill on the 9th of December and we passed it about the 15th or 18th of December, so we certainly did not lose any time with that bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would like to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I hope we will take a good long look at a matter which I presented to the Congress about having a legislative session and a fiscal session. I have always thought we could save a good deal of time if we had joint hearings and, then, if one party would go back and write up the bill on the basis of what they think they heard. The real problem is that the House goes through weeks of hearings on the defense bill and hears witnesses; and then, the House acts, and hardly any of them like what the House did. So we have to give them the courtesy of hearing them all over again.

The Senator from New Hampshire and I heard over 400 witnesses and that takes time. The Senator from Louisiana had to wait for the House before he started hearings. The public works bill never has less than a thousand witnesses. Perhaps there is some way we can do this to at least hear the public witnesses in shorter time. I have often thought it would be better if we heard all of the outside witnesses first with respect to what they think should be done and then call in representatives from the departments and ask them, "What do you have to say about the testimony of so and so?" But surely, as I said, there must be a better way.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Washington, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I agree with many of the suggestions that have meen made. It is perfectly true that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate can start hearings without waiting for a bill to come from the House——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say, as the Senator knows as well as anyone, we do.

Mr. COTTON. We do. It is true we have budget recommendations. The budget is sent up by whoever is President at a reasonably early date. Of course, there are supplemental items that are sent up from time to time. So the Appropriations Committee works under those conditions.

As a Member of the Senate who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to strongly sustain and agree with everything my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) has said. The Appropriations Committee has not been dilatory in its work. But the greatest stumbling block

is the authorization problem. Some of us intend to offer in the Senate a bill—a similar one is already on the House Calendar, or in the House; it may not be on the calendar—that there shall be a deadline, whether it be the first of June or the first of July—the first of June preferably—and that after that deadline, the Appropriations Committee need not wait for an authorization. It will proceed, of course, unless the legislative committees get on their horse and move. It may confer on the Appropriations Committee some authority we do not want, and that many of us might not want it to have. But after the first of June, if we have not had an authorization, if the Appropriations Committee can proceed to authorize and appropriate, I think the greatest stumbling block can be overcome. That can be done right in the Senate and the House on a bill, if approved by the President. It would not require reorganization or place a strain on the present procedure, and would take care of perhaps 60, or at least 50, percent of the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the so-called Magnuson proposal, which we have discussed here many, many times, and which we ought to be able to pass here, because we have over 65 sponsors, unless some of them run out on it.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator is right. I think he has a great idea.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not new.

Mr. SCOTT. It is not new, but it is good. I think this 3-week recess demonstrates how in the Senate, with a proper amount of rest, we come back with a lot of good resolutions and ideas for reform. That is an argument for recesses from time to time, as well as reform.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree that too often Congress is gaged by some kind of scoreboard on the kind of bills passed. Conceivably, a Congress could have passed very few bills and historians would say it was the best Congress we ever had. Sometimes it takes as much time to kill a bill as to pass it—sometimes much longer. But there is always some kind of a scoreboard. I am sure no administration would want Congress to deal blindly with its requests. Administrations deal with legislative people. Most of the requests are very often a combination of ideas that have been gathered here among legislative people. So it is not something new.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a school of thought that the earlier that Congress adjourns, the greater the service it performs for the American people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right. So perhaps there should be no scoreboard at all; but the money bills have to be passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since we are discussing the relations between the President and Congress, I have prepared a short statement I would like to read. We appropriate a lot of money, but a good deal of it is not spent. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield for that purpose.

APPROPRIATIONS, PRIORITIES, AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on December 20, 1969, I inserted in the RECORD a summary of congressional action in the first session of the 91st Congress. That table was based on the amounts enacted by Congress on each bill except Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare and the foreign assistance appropriations bills. For the latter two bills the conference agreement amounts were used. That tabulation showed that new obligational authority totaling $135.2 billion was made available during the session. That amount was $7.5 billion below the budget estimates submitted to the Senate. The reduction shown on that table included $1.2 billion for fiscal year 1971 for advance funding for Elementary and Secondary Education under title I. The reductions in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1970 amounted to $6.3 billion.

After extensive hearings by both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and full debate on the floors of both Houses, the Congress approved some estimates, reduced some, and increased others.

Congress has the responsibility of raising public funds through taxes, and authority through the authorization and appropriation procedures to declare how public money is to be spent.

The President has the authority to veto any bill, including an appropriation bill, that he does not like. In fact, he has already advised the Congress that he proposes to veto the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

Under our system of checks and balances the Congress, by a two-thirds vote of each House, can override a Presidential veto.

The President, apparently, is unhappy with congressional actions on other appropriation bills which he signed into law. In these instances he proposes to follow a very different procedure.

With respect to the public works bill for instance, I have received reports that he proposes to place the congressional increases over the budget estimates in reserve. The budget is required to apportion the funds made available in an appropriation bill.

Although the apportionment of the 1970 funds has been made, inquiry to the Bureau of the Budget with respect to 1970 funds placed in budgetary reserve resulted in only the following general statement:

> The general policy is to hold in budgetary reserve all congressional add-ons for construction, planning, and surveys until all bills are signed and the President has reviewed these add-ons in connection with his 1971 budget submission.

I recognize that the budget proposals for fiscal year 1971 are confidential until released; however, I cannot understand the reluctance of the Bureau of the Budget to reveal the fiscal year 1970 funds that have been impounded.

Congress is being charged with fiscal irresponsibility in the handling of the appropriation bills. This charge is not borne out by the facts I presented to the Senate on December 20, 1969. The Congress made substantial cuts in the appropriations requested by the President for fiscal year 1970.

The real problem here is that the Congress and the President have expressed different views with respect to the priority of various programs. The net effect of the President's action in impounding funds appropriated is to deny the Congress the right to exercise its independent judgment as to the priority of needs. I believe that the Congress as the elected representatives of the people are in a better position to evaluate these needs than are the appointed advisers of the President. These appointed advisers are isolated from the grassroots and are therefore less able to judge the relative needs of the various programs.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Public Works held extensive hearings on the water resource program. These hearings revealed the inadequacy of the budget estimates to meet the needs of the Nation. On August 26, 1969, I wrote the President and asked that he review his requests for water resource projects, including hurricane protection, flood control, and water pollution control. I also stated that I could not help but feel that our priorities are out of balance. I concluded that letter by offering to meet with him, either alone or with a small bipartisan group of interested Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President, to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD at this point, with attachments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C. August 26, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past several weeks, the nation has witnessed several natural disasters and near-disasters which have worked extreme hardship on our people. For example, note the following:

The brutal hurricane Camille that wrecked the Gulf Coast and resulted in more than 250 known deaths and perhaps half a billion dollars of property damage in Mississippi and Louisiana alone.

The water shortage that threatened our Capitol City in midsummer, followed immediately by severe flooding in the Washington metropolitan area.

The current floods on the James River in Virginia which may result in as many as 200 lives lost and missing and $150 million in property damage.

Although we do not have the means totally to prevent such natural disasters, this great and wealthy nation certainly does possess the means to fortify our most vulnerable areas against these ravages of nature and to minimize their toll of damage and human suffering.

We do have the know-how to minimize the effects of severe drought on our municipal and industrial water supplies. We do have the ability to prevent flooding of our great river valleys. We do know how to minimize the impact of the tidal waves which accompany coastal storms.

The fact is, however, that we are doing far too little either of a preventing or of a de-

velopmental nature and are in fact annually *decreasing*, rather than increasing, our actual effort in the field of water resources and flood control projects.

This unfortunate situation seems to me to call for a reevaluation of our priorities in the allocation of Federal funds. In effect, the Congress and the Administration must become as generous and as urgently concerned in our efforts to guard against damage resulting from hurricanes and floods as you yourself have been in your recent efforts to bring relief and rehabilitation to those who have suffered so gravely on the Gulf Coast and in Virginia.

Appropriations for water resource development has been a matter of concern to me for a number of years. On April fourteenth of this year, the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator Randolph, discussed on the floor of the Senate a statement which Budget Director Robert P. Mayo had made before the Senate Committee on Finance, indicating that he was considering a freeze on public works construction. I joined in the colloquy that followed Senator Randolph's statement, at which time I discussed my growing concern over the delays in the completion schedule on most of the going public works projects which had been revealed to our Committee during the hearings on the Public Works appropriation bill. I concluded my remarks by restating my belief that we must do what we can to protect our two most important resources, land and water. If we failed to do that, our country will sustain great losses.

Subsequently, in May, I addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Convention, at which time I pointed out that in 1964 the construction program of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was $1,188,428,700, or about 1.09% of the 1964 budget. I noted that for fiscal year 1970, the original budget request for these two agencies was $1,038,920,000, or about .49% of the budget.

The request for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was subsequently cut by your Administration by $181 million. The revised budget represents a dollar reduction in the past six years or about 15.39%. When you take into account the rise in the cost of construction, the level of appropriations in the revised budget for these agencies represents a drop in construction capability of about 50% since 1964!

Similarly, the efforts being made by the Federal Government to control air and water pollution are completely inadequate to cope with the severe damage these problems are working on our environment and, in fact, on the very health of our citizens. For instance, in the last few years that the Federal Water Pollution Control program has been under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have noticed an increased disparity between the authorization for construction grants for sewerage treatment facilities and the appropriations requested, as indicated below:

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation requested in the budget	Percent of authorization request in budget
1968	$450,000,000	$200,000,000	44.4
1969	700,000,000	203,000,000	29.0
1970	1,000,000,000	214,000,000	21.4

I have received well over 1,000 letters from individuals and organizations urging the Committee on Appropriations to provide the full amount authorized for construction grants for fiscal year 1970. Most of these letters point out the extent to which the states and their political subdivisions have approved bond issues to finance the non-federal costs, relying on the Federal Government's ability to meet its share of the cost.

In spite of the fact that next to the air we breathe, water is our most precious resource, it seems the Bureau of the Budget first looks to the water resource program for a disproportionate share of any contemplated cuts whenever there is a need to reduce Federal expenditures.

If we are to meet the water needs of the 300 million people that you recently estimated will occupy our land by the year 2000, we must not only support adequate annual appropriations for the orderly development of these resources, but it is also essential that the unrealistic and arbitrary restrictions placed on project evaluations be removed.

For instance, the basis for the benefit-to-cost ratio for water resource projects had its origin in the 1936 Flood Control Act, where the policy was established that the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of rivers and other waterways for flood control purposes in the interest of the general welfare if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated cost and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected.

The terms, "benefits" and "costs", have no meaning in the abstract. They must be related to objectives in order to give these terms meaning. Since the passage of that Act, the technicians have chosen national economic efficiency as the sole criteria for project evaluation and have disregarded the phrases, "in the interest of the general welfare" and "if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected".

The result of such an interpretation has been that as far as flood control and hurricane protection projects are concerned, we have become a "cow society". If, for instance, a thousand cows were lost in a flood or hurricane, we could consider the economic loss involved since a cow has an economic value in the market, and the monetary losses sustained can be used in the justification of protective works. On the other hand, if a thousand human lives were lost, it would not add one dollar to the all-important economic evaluation of the project. The loss of life and human suffering associated with the havoc wrecked on the Gulf Coast by Hurricane Camille transcends the imagination.

Fortunately, the Water Resources Council is attempting to find a way to deal with this problem of recognizing loss of life and misery associated with disastrous floods, by setting up four separate accounts which recognize national objectives other than economic efficiency such as regional development, environmental benefits, and the well-being of man. The Council's efforts along these lines are to be commended and they deserve and need your personal encouragement.

Had the center of Camille been 50 miles east, the damage to New Orleans in terms of lives lost and property damaged would have been incalculable. Yet, despite this near miss and in spite of the constant threat of hurricane damage to the New Orleans area, the hurricane protection project for Lake Pontchartrain will continue to drag along with been incalculable. Let, despite this near miss inadequate appropriations, unless the Administration loosens the purse strings and cooperates with the Congress in revamping the national priorities vis-a-vis such projects.

The budget estimate for this project for fiscal year 1967 was $450,000 for planning, at a time when the Corps of Engineers had a capability of $1,600,000, which would have permitted the initiation of construction. Recognizing the potential danger to New Orleans, the Congress provided the full capability of the Corps of Engineers.

For fiscal year 1968, the original budget was $2,300,000, which was subsequently revised to $3,260,000, at a time when the Corps' capability was $4,500,000. Again, recognizing the potential loss of life and property, the Congress approved the $4,500,000.

For fiscal year 1969, the budget estimate was $7,800,000, compared with a Corps capability of $10,800,000. But in view of the expenditure ceiling contained in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, the Committee, although recognizing the risk involved in not moving forward expeditiously on this project, did not increase the budgeted amount for this project or any other project in the bill.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget estimate is only $6 million, compared with the Corps' capability of $8,500,000. Neither New Orleans nor the nation can afford the gamble of procrastination on this project.

Similarly, the hurricane protection project, New Orleans to Venice, proceeds at an alarmingly slow rate. Since 1967, the estimated completion date for this project has slipped from June 1975 to December 1977.

Two years ago, I secured authorization for a study of the Louisiana coastal area, looking toward hurricane protection, the protection of the physical features of the coastline, and reestablishment of the former ecology of the area which contributed so much not only to the wildlife but to the marine resources of the entire Gulf Coast. Naturally, I was disappointed this year to find that the budget provided only $60,000 for the continuation of this study in fiscal year 1970. At least double that amount will be required for satisfactory progress on the study, and I intend to urge my subcommittee and the Congress to expedite the project to this extent, at a minimum.

A few weeks ago, this nation—indeed, the whole world—was thrilled when man first set foot on the moon. In reflecting on this accomplishment, I had occasion to recall the hearings which I had recently completed on the Public Works appropriation bill, where the effect of the budget cuts which your Administration made in an already austere budget submitted by President Johnson were graphically revealed to the Committee.

Among the most serious cuts that I recall were those affecting the Southern Nevada Water District, the Folsom South Canal in Southern California, the Bonneville unit of Central Utah Project, the Chatfield Reservoir in Colorado, the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers Project in New Jersey, the Wynoochee Reservior in Washington, the New Melones Reservoir in California, the Lake Kemp Reservior in Texas, and many more.

In a number of cases, we are finding that the expenditure ceilings imposed on the Corps will not permit contractors to pursue their work in accordance with the terms of the existing contracts even though in many cases the funds are available or requested. Failure to provide funds and expenditure ceilings adequate to permit accomplishment of existing contracts inevitably will increase costs on all Government contracts and could even result in legal actions being taken by the contractor against the Government. I cannot help but feel that our priorities are out of balance.

These thoughts led me to a review of the requests for research and development appropriations requested by President Johnson for the NASA program, and I found that he had requested $3,051,427,000. Further research revealed that in the review of the 1970 budget, your Administration recommended a reduction of $45 million in this program, of about 1½%. In contrast, the "Construction, General" appropriation request of $769,420,000 for the Corps of Engineers was cut $142,415,000, or about 18½%. I realize that our space program is based on a national objective—but so is our water resource program.

It would require a good deal of imagina-

tion to attempt to identify the tangible benefits that will result from man's flight to the moon. Any attempt at a monetary evaluation of those benefits would be almost impossible. If, however, these benefits could be identified and evaluated, the realization of most of the benefits would be projected far into the future.

If we applied the same economic principles to the benefit-cost evaluation of our space program as are required in our water resource program (where future benefits are discounted at a rate of 4⅞ percent) the benefits expected to result from the space program would shrink drastically. For instance, benefits evaluated at $1 million to be realized 25 years from now would be worth only $304,200 in terms of economic justification for a project under today's regulations. A $1 million benefit to be realized 50 years from now would provide justification for the expenditure of only $92,600 today. Such a system would probably kill the space program, just as it is now strangling our vital water resources, flood control and hurricane protection programs.

I am enclosing a list of selected hurricanes and their damages, compiled from information provided by the Office of Emergency Preparedness. It should be recognized that many hurricanes of earlier years are not listed. In fact, during the recorded history of Louisiana alone at least 150 hurricanes or tropical storms have battered or threatened the coast of my state.

I think it is interesting to note that, based only on the partial statistics available to us, the average damage from hurricanes since the turn of the century is over $85 million per year. During the last 30 years, the damage averaged $185 million. During the last 20 years, the damage averaged $200 million and during the 10-year period from 1958 to 1968, the damage averaged about $320 million. If this progression continues, we can expect average damages of $500 million a year (or a total of $5 billion) over the next decade.

Such damage tabulations are always on the conservative side because, by their nature, they tend to exclude many categories of physical and economic loss. As I have already mentioned, the loss of human life is a factor that is incalculable in monetary terms. In addition, there are the inaccuracy of complete inventory estimates, the impossibility of fixing replacement costs, the loss of business and trade to local enterprises and to the local economy in general, the loss of employment income, the loss of earning ability by those who are too old to "get started" again and who instead become public charges. All of these factors and many others add substantially to the damages estimates that are ascribed to various hurricanes.

Yet, even these staggering figures tell only part of the story of the "cost" of hurricanes, for they generally do not include the multimillion dollar rehabilitation expenditures by Federal, State and local governments following the disaster. In the case of Camille, the Army, Navy, Air Force, NASA, SBA, HUD, HEW, GSA, USDA OEP and numerous other federal agencies are spending large sums to assist in the recovery effort. Also in terms of the federal costs, over the next several years both individual and corporate tax payers will be deducting from their income taxes considerable sums to which they are eligible as a result of the hurricane damages suffered.

All things considered, we might properly *double* the so-called "damage estimates." In order that you might see the disparity between these enormous damages and the feeble efforts being made to provide protection, I am also enclosing a status report of the authorized hurricane protection projects for your review.

In view of the magnitude of the floods that this nation has experienced this year, the recent hurricane, and the lack of adequate progress being made in meeting the water resource needs of our expanding population, I expect that our Committee will respond to the needs of the Country. I cannot help but feel that you also will want to take another look at your recommendations for water resource development projects, particularly those relating to health, safety and the protection of human life, prior to the time the Congress acts on the Public Works appropriation requests you have submitted, and I urge that you do so.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you personally, or with a small bipartisan group of concerned members of the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works.

AUTHORIZED HURRICANE PROTECTION PROJECTS

Project	Year authorized	Total cost estimated	Federal cost	Appropriation to date	1970 budget	Capability of Corps
Freeport, Tex.	1962	$19,000,000	$13,300,000	$4,637,000	$2,200,000	$2,200,000
Port Arthur, Tex.	1962	59,900,000	41,600,000	8,557,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Texas City, Tex.	1958 and 1968	44,714,000	31,200,000	15,132,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Lake Pontchartrain, La.	1965	166,000,000	113,562,000	12,498,000	6,000,000	8,500,000
Morgan City and vicinity, Louisiana	1965	6,067,000	4,180,000	347,000	150,000	200,000
New Orleans to Venice, La.	1962	43,400,000	25,885,000	1,654,000	950,000	1,400,000
Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana	1965	11,310,000	3,393,000	408,000		0
Hillsborough Bay, Fla.	1968	13,088,200	9,163,200			15,000
North River Dike, North Carolina	1966	500,000	358,000			(1)
Top Sail Beach and Surf City, N.C.	1966	2,500,000	1,430,000			(1)
Brunswick County Beaches, N.C.	1966	24,400,000	14,400,000			110,000
Hyde County Dike, North Carolina	1966	3,272,000	2,290,000			60,000
Neuse River Barrier, North Carolina.	1965	15,900,000	11,100,000			100,000
Ocracoke Island, N.C.	1965	2,150,000	1,880,000	109,000		500,000
Bodie Island, N.C.	1966	16,400,000	8,880,000			(1)
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, N.Y.	1960	68,600,000	33,900,000	3,578,000	500,000	500,000

[1] Awaiting action by local interests.

RECENT HURRICANES AND TROPICAL STORMS

Name	Date	Areas affected	Deaths	Estimated damage (millions)
Carol	August 1954	North Carolina to Maine	60	$461
Edna	September 1954	New Jersey to Maine	21	7
Hazel	October 1954	South Carolina to New York	95	252
Connie	August 1955	North Carolina to New York	25	46
Dianne	August 1955	North Carolina to New England	184	832
Ione	September 1955	North Carolina	7	88
Audrey	June 1957	Texas and Louisiana	390	150
Donna	August 1960	Florida to New England	50	500
Carla	September 1961	Texas and Louisiana	46	408
Great Atlantic coast storm.	March 1962	Florida to New England	33	200
Cleo	August 1964	Florida	3	129
Hilda	October 1964	Louisiana	38	100
Betsy	August 1965	Florida and Louisiana	75	1,420
Alma	June 1966	Florida	7	7
Beulah	September 1967	Texas	15	500
Gladys	September 1968	Florida	5	7
Camille	August 1969	Central gulf coast and Virginia	500	750

Mr. ELLENDER. On August 29, 1969, I received an acknowledgement from Eugene S. Cowen, Special Assistant to the President, stating that he would bring my letter to the attention of the President. I have received no further direct reply to that letter.

On September 4, 1969, the President announced a 75-percent cutback on the award of construction contracts. This was followed by a decision to place all congressional add-ons in budgetary reserve. Perhaps these are the only answers I will receive.

I might point out that about 80 percent of the funds requested by the President in the second supplemental for fiscal year 1970 were the direct result of Hurricane Camille. In spite of this fact, the additional funds provided for hurricane protection projects have been impounded.

Although a good deal of my remarks relate to the public works appropriation bill, I would like to emphasize the fact that the general policy of placing all congressional add-ons in budgetary reserve applies to all appropriation bills.

So I conclude by stating that although the President has signed all of the appropriation bills, he has, through the use of his power to impound funds, in effect exercised the item veto over the appropriations approved by Congress. I hope he will change the method of allocating these funds, and have them budgeted as Congress directs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, who is most experienced in these matters.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I address myself to that question, as well as to the question of the Senate agreeing to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 50, 51, 56, and 83.

I do not think that I need to explain the necessity for postponing action until today on this conference report when we left to go home for Christmas. We all know the reasons. They have been well stated today, disappointing as they are. Why it is that the President has chosen this appropriation bill for a confrontation with Congress I, of course, cannot say, although he did address a letter to us about 2 or 3 days before Christmas, suggesting that he would veto the bill.

This, of course, was a great disappointment to many of us, that he would veto a bill that would provide greater health care and better education for the American people and, at the same time, as has been so well pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana, is part of a total national budget which is approximately $5.6 billion-plus below the President's requests, as shown by all the figures that have been sent to the desk by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The fact is, Mr. President, that this bill is not inflationary. On the contrary, it is noninflationary. Improved educational methods and programs of education surely result in a better educated people. Those people then earn more and pay more taxes, and they do not drain the economy by going on welfare. More highly trained and skilled professional medical personnel will not drive up the costs of health care.

Everyone knows, I am sure, that such people in health services are now in short supply in this Nation, and if we do have a crisis in health care, which is a prime target of this bill, the primary reason is that they are in short supply, and that the delivery of health services to the American people is not as good at it can be or should be; and that factor is the primary reason for the rapidly advancing costs of health care. Costs which have almost trebled, and in some cases have increased five or six times over what we might call the normal inflationary rate. You do not cut out essential supplies and the people to deliver supplies and health care services in this field when you are trying to lower costs and curb inflation.

I do not think it is sound economy, either, to close off avenues of medical research which may lead to the discovery of cures for such dread killers, to name only one or two, as cancer and heart disease, and all the other diseases involved in medical research and covered by this bill. Beyond their toll in human misery, those diseases add to the financial burdens, not only of the afflicted families, but of the community, State, and Nation as well.

The White House, however, has apparently informed the Republican leaders in Congress that the President still intends to veto this bill when it reaches his desk. As far as I know, he has cited two principal reasons for his intended veto: First, an attempt to curb inflation; and second, the fact that his legal advisors indicate that he may have to spend the money appropriated in the bill.

So, Mr. President, I wish to remark further on these two areas of concern, but first let me say that I think we all understand that the appropriation and impounding processes have been going on for a long time. No President has reached a decision that all moneys provided by Congress must be spent. However, of course, if President Nixon does conclude that that is necessary, and allows these funds to be spent I for one would respect and applaud that decision.

The House, initially approved H.R. 13111 on July 31 by a vote of 393 to 16, and prior to that action they added over a billion plus for education on a vote of 293 to 120.

Here in the Senate, we approved our version of this bill by a vote of 88 to 4. And then the House, on December 22, approved the conference report by an overwhelming 261 to 110.

When Congress appropriates money and approves action by a majority of its 535 elected Members, it expects the money to be spent. The intended recipients of the funds have the same expectation. Congress is well capable of recognizing the needs and the problems of this Nation.

The extra money added to this bill by Congress for education and health will meet only a small portion of those needs and what must be done.

I am sure that the administration does not think—or perhaps it does—that its budget estimates presented to Congress are always absolutely correct or that any change made by Congress is incorrect. We have made some changes. We do so in all budget estimates. I think our changes in this particular case have improved this measure, both from the viewpoint of meeting national priorities and fighting inflation. We have decreased some items and increased others where we thought a change in priority was essential, and that is our duty.

Congress has considered 14 appropriation bills in fiscal 1970 and has appropriated $129,595,765,115. The total requests for these 14 appropriation bills sent up by the administration was $135,200,040,881. These amounts include the estimates and the action taken by the conference agreements now pending before us.

Congress is, then, close to $6 billion under the Nixon request, which was put in the RECORD by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa, as well as a good many others, I think, is confused about the matter of the $6 billion under the Nixon budget. It is my understanding that we have to be pretty careful about what budget we are discussing. First, the President came along with what might be called a Nixon budget, in April of 1969, and this particular phase of the budget cut President Johnson's budget by $4 billion. The Senator might be referring to that budget. I do not know.

But then, the next in the sequence was that, in July, a revised budget was sent over by the Nation administration which cut an additional $3½ billion from the first Nixon budget. I think that to consider this budget in perspective we should make clear what budget we are talking about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Iowa had better add that subsequent to July, several other budget requests came up—individual budget requests. We had approximately seven in this bill alone. The last one came up in the latter part of November. Here are the figures.

The budget requests that were considered by the House—at that time, the Senator is correct, they had the so-called Johnson budget. But part of the revised budget had not shown up in some of the departments, and that is understandable, because they had a review and they had to make recommendations. That was $132,607,000,000.

Mr. MILLER. What is the date of that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This was made up this week.

Mr. MILLER. I mean, what is the date of the——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Approval by the House?

Mr. MILLER. No, not the date of approval by the House, but the date of the submission by the Executive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are all different dates. Then the House, up to that time, appropriated money, and in some cases they did not have a revised budget, but they had some inkling of the so-called two budgets. The House appropriated $126,213,000,000. After that, the budget that came to the Senate, to be considered by the Senate, contained administration requests of $135,200,000,000.

Mr. MILLER. By what date would that have taken place?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would have been up to the time these bills were passed. They are all listed. The Senator can get the dates on the back of our calendar.

The Senate finally approved $130,317,000,000. Then the conferences—all the conferences agreed, except foreign aid—and cut that to $129,000,000,000, which makes, for the 14 I talk about here, $5.604 billion over the budget request sent up by the administration to the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield. We will put all this in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that. The only trouble is that it is important for people who look at the record and look at these figures to know exactly what is going on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know how anyone can be confused about this. The budget requests to the Senate—let us just take the Senate—by the administration in this review total $135 billion.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator says that the budget requests were $135 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I know it.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator say that there were no subsequent revisions to those requests?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. These are the ones that were sent up to the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I understand, but does the Senator say——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those are all final figures.

Mr. MILLER. There were no subsequent requests from the executive for a lowering of these figures?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. MILLER. If that is so, may I ask why it is that the executive claims that the amount of the President's final budget requests—I am not talking about preliminary ones or middle ones; I am talking about the final budget requests—are $7.5 billion less less than the original Johnson budget requests?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That may be true. I am not talking about last year's Johnson budget. I am talking about this one.

Mr. MILLER. We are talking about the Johnson budget requests for the same year we are talking about now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me answer.

The final budget requests sent up here by the administration were $135 billion, and to the House, by the time they passed on the bills, $132,600,700,000. I have no comparison here with last year's Johnson budget. But we cut the Nixon budget and the requests down to below $130 billion. That should not be confusing.

Mr. MILLER. That is not confusing if that is all there is to it, may I say to my colleague. But I do not want to get a previous year confused in here. When I talk about the Johnson budget requests, I am talking about the budget requests of former President Johnson covering the same year we are discussing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We were not considering that at all. We are considering the requests sent up by the Nixon administration.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate my colleague trying to be responsive to me.

I do think it would help for the RECORD to show what the Johnson budget request was vis-a-vis the $135 billion Nixon administration request to which the Senator just referred and the $130 billion action to which the Senator just referred.

I think one other point may be helpful to all of us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Johnson is not down there now, as I understand it, and we are just acting on Nixon requests.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am not going to dispute the fact that President Johnson is no longer down there.

I should like to bring out this point: Why does there seem to be a concern that what we are about to accomplish here, taking all these appropriations actions, is to put Congress on record as having passed a resolution last spring that there would be a ceiling on Federal expenditures of $192.9 billion, and that it looks as though Congress is going to exceed that, by mandatory spending, by several billions of dollars? Can the Senator provide some light on that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we will exceed it. I will get the figures for the Johnson budget.

Mr. MILLER. I am not talking about the Johnson budget now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is trying to make a comparison.

Mr. MILLER. I am not talking about the Johnson budget now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator was just talking about it.

Mr. MILLER. But we were off that and on this other point.

Last spring, Congress said, "We are going to put a limit on spending. We are going to be very prudent and not allow the expenditure of more than $192.9 billion." It is my understanding that as a result of subsequent appropriation actions by Congress, we are going to exceed that figure, on a mandatory basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. I do not know whether the administration is going to exceed it or not.

Mr. MILLER. It is not the administration. It is Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me answer. All I know is that we have cut what the administration wanted to spend by almost $6 billion, and the impact of all of this would reduce expenditures at least by $3 billion.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is referring to $135 billion, and then he says we come up with $130 billion, but the resolution by Congress talked about $192.9 billion. I am trying to reconcile those figures. I do not believe that the Senator——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be up to the administration.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe that the Senator has showed us how Congress has reconciled the figures. Does not the Senator say that if the Congress by resolution said we will not spend more than $192.9 billion that the appropriations are not going to exceed that amount?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure they will not. The appropriations for this year are going to be around $192.9 billion.

Mr. MILLER. I am afraid that the Senator and I are not talking on the same wavelength because the Senator will remember, I am sure, that we acted in the Senate by resolution of Congress calling for an expenditure ceiling of $192.9 billion for the executive branch of the Federal Government for this year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is talking about $130 billion and $135 billion. I want to have him talk about the $192.9 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those are prior commitments which have nothing to do with this appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLER. I am not talking about this appropriation——

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I am only here to talk about this one.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand the figures being referred to by the distinguished Senator from Washington, they are the funds requested by the administration for $135.2 odd billion, and then the funds which have actually been agreed to, on which the Senate has exercised its judgment, for the $129.59 odd billion—which represents a $5.6 billion cut in actual appropriations. It that not correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. May I add this, that as the present administration sent up the $135 billion, that would be the figure. That would be under what we said. We even cut that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Actually, as I understand it, what the Senator is talking about, are those resources, those funds, those taxpayers' dollars which Congress can exercise some discretion about and some control over in terms of annual appropriations. In this context, he has referred both to those programs which have actually been acted on and signed into law, and also to HEW and foreign aid, which have not yet been finally acted on and signed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. KENNEDY. So that what we are really talking about now is the discretionary figure in terms of how Congress itself can exercise its judgment, and not the mandatory figures. In the discretionary figures, we see that Congress has appropriated some $5.6 billion less.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The administration, when it sent up the $135 billion must have taken into consideration the ceiling the Senator from Iowa is talking about. They must have considered that. We cut those requests, so they have got even more flexibility to get by under the ceiling.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Massachusetts, in his colloquy with the Senator from Washington, has put his finger on the difference between——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mandatory spending.

Mr. MILLER. There is a great amount of confusion on this subject in the press and also, I would venture to say, among Senators and certainly among the general public, when someone comes out and says Congress has cut appropriations by $5 billion over what the Nixon administration requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. MILLER. Then we find, in the next breath, someone from the Nixon administration saying that Congress has not been doing a very good job because it passed a resolution putting a $192.9 billion Federal expenditure ceiling on the executive branch, and because of their appropriations actions have increased uncontrollable expenditures.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will be at least $3 billion under that ceiling. They wanted even more.

Mr. MILLER. Sir?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The administration wanted more.

Mr. MILLER. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Iowa will read it, the administration asks for $135 billion.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Washington says that they have revised that asking?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. This is the latest updated figure.

Mr. MILLER. What is the date on the late figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Every appropriation has—here is one for the Senator, if he will sit down and read it.

Mr. MILLER. Well, I do not doubt that there is a date on the original asking, but I would guess that some of the people down there at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue would say that this was

the original request and that it was subsequently revised.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. MILLER. There was no subsequent revision?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those figures are the latest revisions of what they requested of the Senate. I am pleased to say that there are no typographical errors in here, because we checked it.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not worried about typographical errors but we have got to make absolutely certain that we are not talking about two different requests.

I suggest to my distinguished colleague from Washington that while he says—and I am sure he does so in good faith—that this figure of $135 billion is the final and unrevised asking by the executive department——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER (continuing). That he will find that there have been some adjustments during the time since the original request was——

Mr. MAGNUSON. They might have wished that they had made some, but this is the one that we had to consider.

Mr. MILLER. Not wishes, but requests.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is a request from the administration.

Mr. MILLER. But the administration can request in February, March, or April.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no. This is right up to date.

Mr. MILLER. I do not see the date. That is the thing that bothers me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will look on the back page of the Senate Calendar, he will find the dates when the bills were passed and approved by the House and Senate. Sometimes the requests will come up after the House has passed a bill. In the case of HEW, they sent up something like seven requests after the House had passed the bill, for additional amounts; one was to the tune of $1.2 billion more.

Mr. MILLER. Then these were for additional amounts——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER (continuing). During the hearings?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Surely.

Mr. MILLER. Did they also ask for some reductions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. They did not ask for any reduction here, except the education add-ons in the House.

(At this point, Mr. GRAVEL took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is referring to his own subcommittee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think they agreed to some reductions in the defense appropriations——

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON (continuing). After they had sent up the appropriation; and then after Mr. Laird had reviewed it he sent a note to the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that it would be all right if we took some cuts here and there, which we did. That is often done. But it is an informal way of doing it.

Mr. MILLER. The only purpose of this colloquy—and I shall not extend it further—is to put it clearly on record that the position of the Senator from Washington is that there were $135 billion in controllable budget requests—total budget requests—by the Nixon administration——

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I did not say they were all controllable.

Mr. MILLER. I thought the Senator in colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts brought that point out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. These are two different things. Some are controllable and some are not. Let us take an item such as impacted aid. That is not really controllable. That is the law. I have some objections to the formula on impacted areas personally. I did not vote for the increase offered here on the floor. But we have to change the law to do that. Probably 90 percent of the Veterans' Administration appropriation is not controllable. Then there are many items in the agricultural appropriation which are not controllable but they have to be sent up here to get the money. We would have to change the law, particularly on price supports, corn supports, for instance.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa understands that, but I thought the point made by the Senator from Massachusetts was that the difference between the $135 billion, which the Senator from Washington said were the total budget askings by the Nixon administration, and the $192.9 billion Federal expenditure ceiling, adopted by resolution of Congress, related to the uncontrollable items.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not wholly. Not wholly. Some of them are not controllable. I just mentioned one, the impacted areas.

Mr. MILLER. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the agriculture. I do not know how much is in the agriculture bill. The administration suggested there $7,237,000,000, and the Senate approved $7,600 million, which is one of the pluses in the $250 million. If the Senator will let me finish, I am talking about this appropriation bill in which many items are controllable and some are not.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator suggests that in the responses by the Senator from Washington he was not only talking about the HEW appropriation bill. He was also talking about the fact that the activities of Congress had reduced the Nixon requests by some $5 billion.

And when he talked about that, I thought it was proper to engage in this colloquy to try to get this point clarified. I am sorry to say that I do not think it is yet clear because the Senator from Washington says the difference between the $135 billion and the $192 billion does not represent uncontrollables.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could not possibly limit controllables. Every appropriation bill has controllable items in it.

Mr. MILLER. With respect to the Nixon budget requests and the actions by Congress, I think that we had better have an analysis made of the difference between the $135 billion and the $192 billion. Until we have that analysis made, I do not think that the Senator can validly say there has been a reduction by Congress in the Nixon budget requests. Perhaps there have been in some areas, but not overall.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not know how to explain it better, because Congress appropriates. There can be a much smaller item that is not controllable if Congress does not appropriate the full amount in the appropriation bill. That has happened. As a matter of fact, as a rough figure, when we take out Defense, which is controllable, we have about 40 percent of the other items that go to the veterans, to impacted areas, to agriculture, and things of that nature that are not controllable if we send the money down.

The Bureau of the Budget does not have to ask for this much. They ask for much less sometimes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator from Washington, he was attempting to talk in terms of a chart that he has referred to and made part of the record. That is a most detailed and most accurate representation of the amounts the administration requested of Congress and the amounts that were actually agreed upon by Congress.

The point that the Senator from Washington has made, which I think is extremely clear to everyone who has a chance to review these figures, is that Congress, as reflected by its conference reports, has appropriated some $5.6 billion less than has been requested of it.

As I understand it, the Senator is not trying to go into any of these other areas—the trust funds or unexpended funds or the ability of the President to withhold funds, which he does have an opportunity to do in terms of such legislation as the Highway Construction Act.

As I understand it, the Senator from Washington is merely saying that in those areas in which Congress has the most direct control and authority, it has reduced by some $5.6 billion the funds which were requested by the administration of Congress.

We can talk about these other peripheral issues which are desperately significant and important in talking about the state of the economy. But I think that what the Senator from Washington has done so well today—as has the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) on other occasions—is to remind the Senate and the American people that when the President talks about the Senate and the House of Representatives feeding the fires of inflation in terms of the $1 billion extra for the HEW, it is extremely important to point out that even with that increase, which will affect the health, education, and welfare of the people in the most significant ways, we are below the President's request on some figures.

I think that is extremely clear. And I think the Senator has performed a great service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have not actually appropriated more than was requested in the HEW bill. We have merely shifted the priorities and propose to use the $1.2 billion for advance funding for ESEA in fiscal 1971 and assign it to other priorities.

So, even though we agree with the

overall amount, we have shifted priorities. The argument seems to be because we have shifted priorities.

We may have different viewpoints on priorities. As I will point out, we have some unique qualifications with respect to the matter of priorities. And I think we have a responsibility to our constituency in the 50 States.

Most Members have served in Congress for many years and, I think, they have a feeling for the needs and the priorities of the Nation.

Many members of the Appropriations Committee have reviewed many budgets under some distressing circumstances. And they have dealt with budgets presented by a variety of Presidents and administrations.

Making judgments on budget programs and proposals and the fiscal needs of the country is not new work for many of us.

We are just as mindful of inflation as anyone, and as elected Members we are as responsive to our constituencies, if not more responsive, than any Bureau of the Budget or administrative appointees.

Both the Senate and the House of Representatives held extensive hearings on this particular bill. We took volumes of expert testimony. We examined every item in the bill carefully. We had a great deal of discussion about reordering the Nation's priorities, but, within the amount suggested. And I am hopeful that the President will allow Congress to be involved in this process of determining how and why we do certain things with the taxpayers' dollars.

The President has put the blame, in part, on formula grants as a reason to veto the measure now before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table outlining the HEW formula grant programs that received increases in the House or Senate.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE MANDATORY FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS RECEIVING INCREASES IN HOUSE OR SENATE

[In thousands]

Appropriation/activity	1970 budget	1970 House	1970 Senate	1970 final conference action	Increase over budget
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Educationally deprived children	$1,226,000	$1,396,975	$1,396,975	$1,396,975	+$170,975
Supplementary educational centers	116,393	164,876	164,876	164,876	+48,483
Library resources		50,000	50,000	50,000	+50,000
Guidance, counseling, and testing		17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Equipment and minor remodeling		78,740	78,740	78,740	+78,740
School assistance in federally affected areas: Maintenance and operation	187,000	585,000	645,000	585,000	+398,000
Education professions development: Grants to States	15,000	15,000	21,500	18,250	+3,250
Higher education:					
Undergraduate instructional equipment			14,500		
Direct loans	161,900	229,000	229,000	229,000	+67,100
Facilities grants	43,000	76,000	200,000	76,000	+33,000
Vocational education:					
Grants to States	230,336	357,836	352,836	352,836	+122,500
Work-study		10,000	10,000	10,000	+10,000
Programs for students with special needs		40,000	40,000	40,000	+40,000
Research (State portion only)		17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Consumer and homemaking education	15,000	15,000	20,000	20,000	+5,000
Libraries:					
Library services	23,209	40,709	40,709	40,709	+17,500
Construction of public libraries		9,185	9,185	9,185	+9,185
Education for the handicapped: Preschool and school programs	29,250	29,250	34,250	29,190	−60
Total, Office of Education	2,047,088	3,131,571	3,341,571	3,134,761	+1,087,673
Hill-Burton construction grants	150,000	254,400	254,400	254,400	+104,400
Community mental health center construction grants	29,200	30,500	36,200	35,500	+6,300
Health professions student loans	15,000	19,781	27,781	23,781	+8,781
Nursing student loan	9,610	15,110	17,610	16,360	+6,750
Grants to the States for public health services (314d)	90,000	90,000	100,000	100,000	+10,000
Total, health agencies	239,810	409,791	435,991	430,041	+136,231
Development of Programs for the Aging: Grants to States	13,000	(1)	20,000	13,000	
Total, HEW	2,353,898	3,541,562	3,797,562	3,577,802	+1,233,904

1 Consideration deferred due to lack of authorizing legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, under education, I might mention just a few programs that the President will veto because of increases that have been provided.

Elementary and secondary education, title I programs for educationally deprived children, was increased by $170,975,000.

Library resources, where the President's budget was zero, was increased by $50 million.

School assistance in federally affected areas, Public Law 874, the impacted aid measure, was increased by $398 million.

I might point out that that was done pursuant to an amendment offered by a distinguished Senator on the Republican side.

The impacted aid program is one that is understood by every Member of Congress. It is disliked by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President.

There are parts of the program that I am concerned about.

I do not know whether the formula is correct, but it is there. And there was no suggestion made that the law should be changed. Perhaps it should be. Possibly the President should press for a change in the basic law, instead of arguing about whether to impound or not to impound the funds provided.

He has argued that Public Law 874 helps wealthy school districts, and it does. It was not designed just to help poor school districts. Perhaps it should have been.

My point is just this, that until the basic law is changed, the Congress—and the President—must follow the law in regard to appropriations.

What the President would do would be to repeal by Budget Bureau orders.

To continue with some of the education programs, we increased direct loans to students in colleges, universities, and technical institutes by $67,100,000.

This money, we hope, will come back to the Federal Treasury, many times over—just as the GI bill of rights funds have—and this program follows the President's policy to expand loan programs and cut down on outright grants.

In vocational education we increased grants to States by $122,500,000 to improve this area of grave need. For students with special needs in vocational technical education there is $40,000,000 for this program authorized by the 1968 amendments to the vocational education act, which the Senate passed overwhelmingly.

In health, we added $104,400,000 for the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. We thought the Johnson and Nixon budgets were woefully low and we added $104,400,000. I do not have to stand here today and outline the need for hospital beds in this country.

In loans to health professions students, and nurses, the increase was $15,081,000.

In State grants under the partnership in health programs, the increase was $10,000,000.

The total increases over the budget estimates for so-called mandatory formula grant programs total $1,223,904,000, of which $398,000,000 is for impacted aid. This $1.2 billion includes both health

and education programs approved by the conference, and the conference report was signed by every member of the conference, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate.

The President has indicated that the increases in the health programs are keyed to lower priority purposes and are excessive, and also misdirected spending.

This was not the testimony that we received before our committee, nor the opinion of the majority who voted overwhelmingly for these programs in Congress.

In a recent article the Washington Post outlined the struggle the veterans' hospitals are having in meeting the medical care needs of patients who have fought for and served their country.

I would remind my colleagues and others that the health manpower money in this bill has a direct relation to the supply of medical professionals involved not only in caring for people in regular hospitals, but also in veterans' hospitals as well.

When we talk about not doing this, or not spending funds because it has some effect on the fiscal policies of the country, I remind Senators that we have one mandatory program which we discussed briefly for the Veterans' Administration, of which over $1.2 billion was for in-hospital care, because every other bed is for a mental case and a little money for research might do something in this regard. Choking off funds for this purpose is a mistake.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI MEDICAL CARE COMPLAINTS RISE UNDER BUDGET SQUEEZE

(By Stuart Auerbach)

A doctor who specializes in the care of paraplegics says the Veterans Administration treated patients paralyzed by spinal cord injuries better in 1946 than it does now.

In Miami, young doctors at the VA hospital charge that, veterans suffer a "tragic lack of care" there because the hospital is "grossly understaffed."

Psychiatric services at many VA hospitals, once considered very good, "have been falling steadily behind what is available elsewhere in the community," says Dr. Louis Jolyon West, chairman of the department of psychiatry at the University of California at Los Angeles and a VA consultant.

The statements reflect a growing concern in Congress, veterans' organizations and among doctors that the nation's 166 VA hospitals are so underfinanced that the quality of medical care will begin slipping very shortly—if the slide has not already started.

DOOM FORESEEN

"I don't think we could last over a year," as a top-quality hospital without more money for staff and innovative new medical programs, says Dr. Arthur J. Klippen, director of the VA Hospital in Minneapolis, one of the best in the country.

A long-time doctor at his hospital, Dr. Lesley Zieve, says "we'll be doomed" if the budget squeeze continues next year.

"There is real danger that the Administration and Congress are about to see veterans' hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 1920s and the 1930s, when tired physicians and political job holders provided the care for the defenders of our country," warns Dr. Stewart Wolf, a professor of medicine at the University of Oklahoma.

While admitting the VA hospitals could use more money, Donald E. Johnson, the Nixon appointee who heads the VA, insists that veterans still receive top quality care—"care second to none."

"They receive good care, compassionate care and good service. The doctors and nurses they have are top flight. We can handle the mission," says Johnson.

Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, disagrees. He accuses the Nixon Administration of reducing the medical care in VA hospitals "to a second class status." He asked for a meeting with President Nixon to discuss the VA hospitals.

Interviews and congressional testimony indicate that there is little wrong with the VA hospitals that more money wouldn't cure. The budget for VA hospitals is currently $1.9 billion.

Dr. Ernest H. J. Bors, who is about to retire as head of the spinal cord injury center at the VA Hospital in Long Beach, Calif., blames lack of people for the deterioration over the past 20 years in the care of paraplegics.

MATTER OF BUDGET

"We don't have the hands to do the job," he says. "It boils down to a matter of the budget."

He calls the 1940s—after World War II—"the honeymoon time" because there were enough trained people to give patients physical therapy two or three times a day if needed. There were enough nurses to spend hours at the bedside providing tender loving care—"a sweetheart or mother image at the bedside."

Now, he says, patients get physical therapy once a day and nurses are too swamped to spend much time talking to patients. He estimates his center needs twice as many therapists and nurses "to get back to the good old days."

Dr. Douglas J. Stewart, a second year resident at Miami's VA hospital, says staff shortages there mean that patients with bleeding ulcers wait hours to get needed blood transfusions.

"It's a risk," he says. "You are walking a thin line."

He also says that expensive sophisticated lifesaving equipment bought for the year-old, $22 million hospital is unused because there are not enough trained staff members available. Only 688 of the 1,020 beds in the hospital are currently open for use.

But Miami isn't in any worse shape than other VA hospitals scattered around the country. It has about 1.56 staff members for each patient—right about at the National average for VA hospitals.

This compares to the average of 2.72 employes for each patient in the Nation's community hospitals and three employes per patient in university and teaching hospitals.

Rep. Teague want to increase the staff-patient ratio to two-to-one. This means adding 28,000 more employes at an annual cost of $240 million.

"If we had a 2-to-1 ratio, I think we could compete in the quality of medical care with any hospital in the area, even though they have three or four employes for every patient," says Dr. R. H. Kaplan, chief of staff at the VA Hospital in Washington.

The VA hospitals have been hit by a triple financial crunch. The yearly increases in their budgets haven't kept up with either the Nation's inflationary trend or the rising cost of medical care—which leads the cost-of-living index.

COSTS SURGE

With 80 per cent of the budget going for salaries, the increases have barely matched four raises that Congress has voted for federal workers, says Oliver E. Meadows, the staff director of the House Veterans Affairs' Committee.

And, with the cost of medical care in the private sector rising so high, more and more veterans are forced to go to VA hospitals because they can't afford to get treatment on the outside.

Added to all that, the Nixon Administration trimmed the budget for hospitals by $70 million this year as part of its fight against inflation.

Congress, however, returned half of that to the VA and indications are that the Bureau of the Budget will allow that money to be spent. VA officials are counting on that money to open $20 million in unused facilities in hospitals across the country.

Surprisingly, the Vietnam war with its 132,000 hospitalized casualties has had little effect on the VA hospitals.

About 5 per cent of the VA's 800,000 patients last year were Vietnam veterans. The number is growing, though; this year the VA expects to treat more than 60,000 Vietnam veterans.

Many of the Vietnam wounded never get to V.A. hospitals. They are treated and discharged directly from military hospitals. When casualties are high, however, the military moves patients out to the V.A. in order to open beds for newly wounded servicemen.

The Vietnam veterans are causing a special problem for the VA. They are young, impatient and demand speedy treatment. Capt. Max Cleland, a Silver Star winner who lost his right arm and both legs in Vietnam, complained that it took him twice as long as it should have to get artificial limbs.

Dr. Bors notes that paraplegics from Vietnam are rehabilitated in about half the time of his other patients.

This is important because as Sen. Alan Cranston (D.-Calif.) points out Vietnam is the most crippling war America has fought.

Testimony before Cranston's Senate veterans affairs subcommittee shows that servicemen are being crippled in Vietnam at twice the rate of the Korean War and three times the rate of World War II.

Started after World War I to care for the war wounds of veterans, the VA hospitals' mission has gradually been increased until today only one-third of their patients suffer from service connected ailments.

MORE TRAINING URGED

Any veteran can be admitted to a VA hospital if he cannot afford medical care elsewhere—with the highest priority going to service connected cases.

The VA hospitals also play a large part in medical research and training. More than 90 of the hospitals are affiliated with medical schools and half the doctors in the country received some part of their training in VA hospitals.

Teague feels that the training element of the VA should be expanded—especially in the field of paramedical personnel who could help ease the nationwide shortage of doctors and nurses.

Drs. Philip Lee and Roger O. Egeberg, the past and present assistant secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare for health and scientific affairs agree. They both told Cranston's committee that the training potential of the VA should be increased.

All this, the experts say, requires money.

Johnson, the VA administrator says that it appears as if the veterans' hospitals will receive a hefty increase in the 1971 budget, currently in preparation.

"If the funds are low, the quality of medical care goes down," says Dr. Kaplan of Washington's VA Hospital. "That affects recruitment. It's a vicious cycle."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, finally, I wish to say a few additional words about the alleged inflationary impact this measure may or may not have on our economy.

It is difficult to understand how improving the availability of better medical facilities and patient care will inflate costs; or how inflationary it is to provide more doctors, dentists, osteopaths, pharmacists, nurses, and paramedical personnel. Just the reverse is true.

One of the reasons that medical costs are so high and rising so rapidly is the critical shortages in these areas, if we had more doctors, dentists, nurses, and health professionals, and the right type of hospital facilities, it would have the opposite effect.

In my considered opinion, nothing contributes more to the escalating costs of medical care than the shortages of health care personnel and the right types of hospital facilities. In our fight against inflation, perhaps we should think these things through a little further.

Sometimes it seems as though the administration's holddown in spending, in certain areas, is accentuating the livability gap and making a bad situation even worse.

This could apply to other areas, as decay in our urban centers rather than just housing, hunger, and malnutrition, pollution, health, and education. The Congress must have a hand in making these determinations.

It is also somewhat difficult to believe that there will be an absolute inflationary effect by increasing the capacity and the capability of our schools to turn out better educated students, and have better vocational-technical programs.

Education most certainly advances the earning capacity of every individual, and making them more responsible citizens, too.

An individual with an education and increased earning capacity is not a welfare recipient—he is a taxpayer.

There is something else about an educated people, which was said a long time ago, and which I believe: "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave."

To me, education must be ranked among the top priorities of our Nation, and our responsibility as legislators.

While I certainly respect any effort in the fight against inflation—and I share the hope of many that success is just around the corner—I am not impressed with the scorecard for the last 12 months, where inflationary costs have soared at a greater rate than any year since 1951, and interest rates are at the highest level in the last 100 years.

It is difficult to make the arithmetic match the intended goal. It makes one wonder if we are using false logic, if we still have some distorted priorities, and if we are neglecting fundamental human values.

These last 2 years have shown an increase in State and local expenditures for our schools, at the same time that total support from the Federal level has been dropping.

I suggest the Federal level of support averages about 7 percent of the total costs of schools. It has not even reached 10 percent, but it has been dropping.

However, local districts are having a tougher fight each time a local bond issue or taxing question is placed before the voters. Just to stay even in our efforts to educate 52 million students, the Federal contribution will have to be increased.

The best ways to fight inflation are not easily agreed upon. There is a difference of opinion among us, and between the Congress and the administration. There are differences of opinion within the administration.

However, in our pursuit of anti-inflation measures, we should continue to examine these policies to make certain they do not have the opposite effects, and feed the fires of inflation instead of slowing them down.

In the days that follow the adoption of this conference report, I know that the impact of what we do will be on the collective conscience of all of us. No matter what side of the aisle we sit on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the action taken on H.R. 13111 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Agency	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service	$227,064,000	$229,477,000	$277,177,000	$227,177,000	$250,968,000	$242,522,500
Health Services and Mental Health Administration	1,077,261,000	1,030,441,000	1,103,449,000	1,001,939,000	1,179,037,000	1,154,339,000
National Institutes of Health	1,394,549,500	1,448,610,000	1,449,651,000	1,448,445,000	1,629,384,000	1,546,244,500
Scientific activities overseas	15,000,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000
Subtotal	2,713,874,500	2,711,983,000	2,783,732,000	2,681,016,000	3,062,844,000	2,946,561,000
Office of Education	3,647,200,000	[1] 3,197,634,000	[1] 4,222,889,000	[1] 3,160,997,000	[1] 4,540,724,000	[1] 4,276,117,000
Social and Rehabilitation Service	7,338,302,000	8,451,856,000	[2] 8,410,754,000	8,449,856,000	8,397,257,000	8,400,920,500
Social Security Administration	1,690,772,000	2,014,864,000	2,014,564,000	2,014,564,000	2,014,864,000	2,014,564,000
Special Institutions	36,146,000	62,409,000	62,409,000	62,409,000	62,723,000	62,723,000
Departmental Management	30,898,000	35,160,000	34,734,000	34,954,000	34,734,000	34,734,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	15,457,192,500	16,473,906,000	17,529,082,000	16,403,796,000	18,113,146,000	17,735,619,500
Title I advance funding:						
1970 advance (in 1969 bill)	1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300
1971 advance (in 1970 bill)		1,226,000,000		1,226,000,000	1,117,580,000	
Total, HEW appropriation bill	16,468,006,800	16,689,091,700	16,518,267,700	16,618,981,700	18,219,911,700	16,724,805,200

[1] Includes $1,010,814,300 appropriated in the 1969 bill.

[2] Due to lack of authorizing legislation, the House did not consider $28,360,000 requested for "Development of programs for the aging."

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE						
Food and drug control:						
1. Medical evaluation	$18,774,000	$19,674,000	$19,674,000	$19,674,000	$19,674,000	$19,674,000
2. Scientific research and evaluation	16,378,000	16,583,000	16,583,000	16,583,000	16,583,000	16,583,000
3. Education and voluntary compliance	1,275,000	1,296,000	1,296,000	1,296,000	1,317,000	1,296,000
4. Regulatory compliance	29,205,000	29,647,000	29,647,000	29,647,000	30,304,000	29,992,500
5. Program management	4,812,000	4,807,000	4,807,000	4,807,000	4,820,000	4,807,000
Total	70,444,000	72,007,000	72,007,000	72,007,000	72,698,000	72,352,500
Air pollution control:						
1. Abatement and control	32,567,000	35,531,000	35,531,000	35,531,000	35,531,000	34,431,000
2. Research, development, and demonstration	47,614,000	52,328,000	50,328,000	50,328,000	73,438,000	66,428,000
3. Manpower training	5,279,000	5,405,000	5,405,000	5,405,000	5,405,000	5,405,000
4. Program management	2,500,000	2,536,000	2,536,000	2,536,000	2,536,000	2,536,000
Total	87,960,000	95,800,000	93,800,000	93,800,000	116,900,000	108,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE—Continued						
Environmental control:						
1. Solid waste management	$16,113,000	$14,872,000	$14,872,000	$14,872,000	$14,872,000	[1] $14,872,000
6. Occupational health	7,466,000	7,774,000	7,774,000	7,774,000	7,774,000	7,774,000
3. Radiological health	16,183,000	16,527,000	16,527,000	16,527,000	16,527,000	16,527,000
4. Community environmental management:						
(a) Aedes aegypti eradication	6,446,000	440,000	440,000	440,000	440,000	440,000
(b) Other community sanitation	11,359,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000
Subtotal environmental management	17,805,000	10,312,000	10,312,000	10,312,000	10,312,000	10,312,000
5. Water hygiene	2,184,000	2,593,000	2,593,000	2,593,000	2,593,000	2,593,000
6. Program management	3,080,000	3,130,000	3,130,000	3,130,000	3,130,000	3,130,000
Total	62,831,000	55,208,000	55,208,000	55,208,000	55,208,000	55,208,000
Buildings and facilities		300,000				
Salaries and expenses Office of the Administrator	5,829,000	6,162,000	6,162,000	6,162,000	6,162,000	6,162,000
Total CPEHS	227,064,000	229,477,000	227,177,000	227,177,000	250,968,000	242,566,500
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
Mental health:						
1. Support and conduct of research:						
(a) Grants:						
(1) Research	81,159,000	82,273,000	82,273,000	82,273,000	82,273,000	79,473,000
(2) Hospital improvement	10,610,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	7,500,000
(3) Early child care demonstrations		1,000,000			1,000,000	
Subtotal, grants	91,769,000	91,273,000	90,273,000	90,273,000	91,273,000	86,973,000
(b) Direct operations:						
(1) Intramural research	17,959,000	18,125,000	18,125,000	18,125,000	18,125,000	18,125,000
(2) Planning, development, and administration	5,070,000	7,006,000	5,104,000	6,404,000	7,006,000	6,404,000
Subtotal, direct operations	23,029,000	25,131,000	23,229,000	24,529,000	25,131,000	24,529,000
Subtotal, research	114,798,000	116,404,000	113,502,000	114,802,000	116,404,000	111,502,000
2. Manpower development:						
(a) Grants:						
(1) Training	109,046,000	107,500,000	107,500,000	107,500,000	112,500,000	107,500,000
(2) Fellowships	10,641,000	10,866,000	10,866,000	10,866,000	[2] 11,366,000	10,866,000
Subtotal, grants	119,687,000	118,366,000	118,366,000	118,366,000	123,866,000	118,366,000
(b) Direct operations	4,530,000	4,583,000	4,583,000	4,583,000	4,583,000	4,583,000
Subtotal, manpower	124,217,000	122,949,000	122,949,000	122,949,000	128,499,000	122,949,000
3. Support of institutions and resources:						
(a) Grants:						
(1) Construction of community mental health centers	15,000,000	29,200,000	30,500,000	29,200,000	36,200,000	35,500,000
(2) Staffing of community mental health centers	49,699,000	51,300,000	51,300,000	51,300,000	[2] 57,896,000	48,300,000
(3) Narcotic addiction and alcoholism community assistance	8,000,000	8,000,000	12,000,000	8,000,000	16,000,000	12,000,000
Subtotal, grants	72,699,000	88,500,000	93,800,000	88,500,000	110,096,000	95,800,000
(b) Direct operations	2,364,000	2,379,000	2,379,000	2,379,000	2,379,000	2,379,000
Subtotal, institutions and resources	75,063,000	90,879,000	96,179,000	90,879,000	112,475,000	98,179,000
4. Service activities:						
(a) Narcotic addiction and drug abuse treatment and research	14,288,000	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000
(b) Regional and field activities	2,346,000	2,346,000	2,346,000	2,346,000	2,346,000	2,346,000
(c) Scientific communication and public education	2,588,000	2,749,000	2,749,000	2,749,000	2,749,000	2,749,000
Subtotal, service activities	19,222,000	22,551,000	22,551,000	22,551,000	22,551,000	22,551,000
5. Program direction and management services	4,871,000	5,121,000	5,121,000	5,121,000	5,121,000	5,121,000
Total, mental health	338,171,000	357,904,000	360,302,000	356,302,000	385,000,000	360,302,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital	13,380,000	10,405,000	10,405,000	10,405,000	10,405,000	10,405,000
Health services research and development	41,907,000	44,975,000	44,975,000	44,975,000	44,975,000	44,975,000
Comprehensive health planning and services:						
1. Partnership for health grants:						
(a) Planning	18,500,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(b) Formula	66,032,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
(c) Project	86,600,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
Subtotal, grants	171,132,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
2. Migrant health	8,100,000	15,000,000	8,110,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
3. Standard setting and resource development	5,998,000	6,849,000	6,849,000	6,849,000	6,849,000	6,849,000
4. Program management	1,879,000	2,184,000	2,184,000	2,184,000	2,184,000	2,184,000
Total	187,109,000	214,033,000	207,143,000	214,033,000	224,033,000	224,033,000
(Trust fund transfer)	(4,320,000)	(4,320,000)	(4,320,000)	(4,320,000)	(4,320,000)	(4,320,000)
Regional medical programs:						
1. Operational and planning grants	56,200,000	73,500,000	49,500,000	53,500,000	73,500,000	73,500,000
(Obligations)	(72,365,000)	(93,500,000)	(69,500,000)	(73,500,000)	(93,500,000)	(93,500,000)
2. Chronic disease control programs	25,082,000	24,771,000	24,771,000	20,771,000	24,771,000	24,771,000
3. Program management	1,851,000	1,729,000	1,729,000	1,729,000	1,729,000	1,729,000
Total	83,133,000	100,000,000	76,000,000	76,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Communicable diseases	39,084,000	38,638,000	38,638,000	38,638,000	38,638,000	38,638,000
Hospital construction:						
1. Construction	254,487,000	150,000,000	254,400,000	150,000,000	254,400,000	254,400,000
2. Operations and technical services	3,802,000	3,923,000	3,923,000	3,923,000	3,923,000	3,923,000
Total	258,289,000	153,923,000	258,323,000	153,923,000	258,323,000	258,323,000
District of Columbia medical facilities	15,000,000	[3]			10,000,000	10,000,000
Patient care and special health services	71,437,000	72,224,000	72,224,000	72,224,000	72,224,000	72,224,000
National health statistics	8,109,000	9,641,000	8,841,000	8,841,000	8,841,000	8,841,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers	13,041,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
Buildings and facilities		2,100,000				
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator	8,601,000	9,898,000	9,898,000	9,898,000	9,898,000	9,898,000
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration	1,077,261,000	1,030,441,000	1,103,449,000	1,001,939,000	1,179,037,000	1,154,339,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH						
Research institutes (analysis by program):						
1. Research grants:						
(a) Regular program:						
(1) Noncompeting	$331,315,000	$331,200,000	$331,200,000	$331,200,000	$331,200,000	$331,200,000
(2) Competing	142,048,000	131,365,000	131,365,000	131,365,000	153,465,000	141,873,000
Subtotal	473,363,000	462,565,000	462,565,000	462,565,000	484,665,000	473,073,000
(b) General research support grants	52,945,000	52,945,000	52,945,000	52,945,000	57,945,000	52,945,000
(Total program including NIMH)	(60,700,000)	(60,700,000)	(60,700,000)	(60,700,000)	(65,700,000)	(60,700,000)
(c) Multidisciplinary centers	27,225,000	27,630,000	27,630,000	27,630,000	33,484,000	30,915,000
(d) Special programs	82,279,000	82,274,000	87,234,000	83,274,000	95,239,000	91,239,000
Subtotal, research grants	635,812,000	626,414,000	630,374,000	626,414,000	671,333,000	648,172,000
2. Manpower development programs	197,727,000	179,000,000	179,000,000	179,000,000	216,913,000	197,852,000
3. Intramural research	84,502,000	87,689,000	87,689,000	87,689,000	90,047,000	89,871,000
4. Collaborative research and development	125,851,000	120,916,000	118,162,000	120,916,000	144,994,000	132,677,000
5. Other institute direct operations	49,985,000	50,851,000	50,851,000	50,851,000	53,378,000	52,798,500
Total	1,093,877,000	1,064,870,000	1,066,076,000	1,064,870,000	1,176,665,000	1,121,370,500
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	(3,374,000)	(2,954,000)	(2,954,000)	(2,954,000)	(2,954,000)	(2,954,000)
Research Institutes (analysis by appropriation):						
Biologics standards	8,305,000	8,225,000	8,225,000	8,225,000	8,225,000	8,225,000
National Cancer Institute	183,485,500	180,725,000	180,725,000	180,725,000	200,000,000	190,362,500
National Heart Institute	166,008,500	160,513,000	160,513,000	160,513,000	182,000,000	171,256,500
National Institute of Dental Research	29,697,500	29,289,000	29,289,000	29,289,000	32,000,000	30,644,500
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	143,402,000	137,668,000	137,668,000	137,668,000	155,000,000	146,334,000
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	106,013,500	101,256,000	101,256,000	101,256,000	112,700,000	106,978,000
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	106,623,500	102,389,000	102,389,000	102,389,000	105,000,000	103,694,500
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	163,122,500	154,288,000	154,288,000	154,288,000	175,000,000	164,644,000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	72,590,500	75,852,000	73,098,000	75,852,000	80,800,000	76,949,000
National Eye Institute	22,240,000	23,685,000	23,685,000	23,685,000	25,000,000	24,342,500
Environmental health sciences	17,785,000	18,328,000	18,328,000	18,328,000	18,328,000	18,328,000
General research and services	71,229,500	69,698,000	73,658,000	69,698,000	79,658,000	76,658,000
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	3,374,000	2,954,000	2,954,000	2,954,000	2,954,000	2,954,000
Total	1,093,877,000	1,064,870,000	1,066,076,000	1,064,870,000	1,176,665,000	1,121,370,500
Health manpower:						
1. Institutional support:						
(a) Medical, dental, and related	66,000,000	101,400,000	101,400,000	101,400,000	108,598,000	105,000,000
(b) Nursing	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	10,000,000	8,400,000
(c) Public health	9,471,000	9,471,000	9,471,000	9,471,000	10,671,000	10,071,000
(d) Allied health professions	10,975,000	10,988,000	10,988,000	10,988,000	11,988,000	11,587,000
Subtotal	93,446,000	128,859,000	128,859,000	128,859,000	141,257,000	135,058,000
Health education loan fund:						
1. Loan activity						
(Obligations)	(21,187,000)	(6,817,000)	(6,817,000)	(6,817,000)	(6,817,000)	(6,817,000)
2. Sales insufficiencies and interest differential	200,000	957,000	957,000	957,000	957,000	957,000
Total	200,000	957,000	957,000	957,000	957,000	957,000
2. Student assistance:						
a. Traineeships	20,670,000	20,670,000	20,670,000	20,670,000	20,670,000	20,670,000
b. Direct loans:						
(1) Medical, dental, etc.	15,000,000	15,000,000	19,781,000	15,000,000	27,781,000	23,781,000
(Obligations)	(26,429,000)	(16,113,000)	(20,894,000)	(16,113,000)	(28,894,000)	(24,894,000)
(2) Nursing	9,610,000	9,610,000	15,110,000	9,610,000	17,610,000	16,360,000
(Obligations)	(16,910,000)	(12,281,000)	(17,781,000)	(12,281,000)	(20,281,000)	(19,031,000)
Subtotal, direct loans	24,610,000	24,610,000	34,891,000	24,610,000	45,391,000	40,141,000
Scholarships:						
(1) Medical, dental, etc	11,219,000	16,000,000	11,219,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	15,541,000
(2) Nursing	6,500,000	12,000,000	6,500,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	7,178,000
Subtotal, scholarships	17,719,000	28,000,000	17,719,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	22,719,000
Subtotal, student assistance	62,999,000	73,280,000	73,280,000	73,280,000	94,061,000	83,530,000
3. Manpower requirements, utilization and program management	15,641,000	15,882,000	15,882,000	15,882,000	15,882,000	15,882,000
Total, health manpower	172,086,000	218,021,000	218,021,000	218,021,000	251,200,000	234,470,000
Dental health:						
1. Grants	5,259,000	5,845,000	5,739,000	5,739,000	6,845,000	6,739,000
2. Direct operations	4,926,000	5,042,000	4,983,000	4,983,000	5,042,000	4,983,000
Total	10,185,000	10,887,000	10,722,000	10,722,000	11,887,000	11,722,000
Construction of health educational, research and library facilities:						
1. (a) Medical and related	60,000,000	94,480,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	114,500,000	106,500,000
Obligations	(104,157,000)	(112,800,000)	(112,800,000)	(112,800,000)	(126,800,000)	(118,800,000)
(b) Dental	15,000,000	23,620,000	23,600,000	23,600,000	23,600,000	26,600,000
Obligations	(26,039,000)	(28,200,000)	(28,200,000)	(28,200,000)	(28,200,000)	(28,200,000)
2. Nursing	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Obligations	(18,781,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
3. Allied health professions	1,800,000					
Obligations	(3,008,000)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Medical library construction					1,900,000	950,000
Obligations	(1,250,000)	( )	( )	( )	(1,900,000)	(950,000)
5. Health research facilities	8,400,000				10,000,000	5,000,000
Obligations	(20,640,000)	( )	( )	( )	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Total, construction	93,200,000	126,100,000	126,100,000	126,100,000	160,000,000	149,050,000
Obligations	(173,875,000)	(149,000,000)	(149,000,000)	(149,000,000)	(176,900,000)	(162,950,000)
National Library of Medicine:						
1. Grants	5,788,000	5,792,000	5,792,000	5,792,000	5,792,000	5,792,000
2. Direct operations	12,220,000	13,890,000	13,890,000	13,890,000	13,890,000	13,890,000
Total	18,008,500	19,682,000	19,682,000	19,682,000	19,682,000	19,682,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—Continued						
Buildings and facilities		$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,900,000	$1,900,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Director	$6,993,000	7,093,000	7,093,000	7,093,000	7,093,000	7,093,000
Total, National Institutes of Health	1,394,549,500	1,448,610,000	1,449,651,000	1,448,445,000	1,629,384,000	1,546,244,500
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	15,000,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000	3,455,000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
1. Educationally deprived children	1,123,127,000	1,226,000,000	[4] 1,396,975,000	[4] 1,226,000,000	[4] 1,396,975,000	[4] 1,396,975,000
2. Dropout prevention	5,000,000	24,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000	5,000,000
3. Bilingual education	7,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
4. Supplementary educational centers	164,876,000	116,393,000	164,876,000	116,393,000	164,876,000	164,876,000
5. Library resources	50,000,000		50,000,000		50,000,000	50,000,000
6. Guidance, counseling, and testing	17,000,000		17,000,000		17,000,000	17,000,000
7. Equipment and minor remodeling	78,740,000		78,740,000		[4] (78,740,000)	30,000,000
8. Strengthening State departments of education	29,750,000	29,750,000	29,750,000	29,750,000	29,750,000	29,750,000
9. Planning and evaluation		9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
Total	1,475,993,000	1,415,393,000	1,761,591,000	1,406,393,000	1,712,851,000	1,727,851,000
Instructional equipment	(93,240,000)		(78,740,000)		93,240,000	48,740,000
School assistance in federally affected areas:						
1. Maintenance and operation	505,900,000	187,000,000	585,000,000	187,000,000	645,000,000	585,000,000
2. Construction	15,153,000	15,167,000	15,167,000	15,167,000	15,167,000	15,167,000
(Obligations)	(74,051,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)
3. Evaluation	200,000					
Total	521,253,000	202,167,000	600,167,000	202,167,000	660,167,000	600,167,000
Education Professions Development:						
1. Preschool, elementary, and secondary:						
(a) Grants to States	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	21,500,000	18,250,000
(b) Training programs	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	98,000,000	88,750,000
2. Recruitment and information (504)					500,000	500,000
Total	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	120,000,000	107,500,000
Teacher Corps:						
1. Operations and training	20,900,000	31,100,000	21,737,000	24,737,000	31,100,000	21,737,000
Higher education:						
1. Program assistance:						
(a) Strengthening developing institutions	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
(b) Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	11,950,000	[4] 19,361,000	12,120,000	[4] 19,361,000	[5] 19,361,000	[5] 19,361,000
(c) Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources	14,500,000				[4] (14,500,000)	
Subtotal, program assistance	56,450,000	49,361,000	42,120,000	49,361,000	49,361,000	49,361,000
2. Construction:						
(a) Public community colleges and technical institutes	50,000,000	43,000,000	43,000,000	43,000,000	125,000,000	43,000,000
(Obligations)	(83,000,000)	(43,000,000)	(43,000,000)	(43,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(43,000,000)
(b) Other undergraduate facilities	33,000,000		33,000,000		75,000,000	33,000,000
(Obligations)	(133,463,924)		(33,000,000)		(75,000,000)	(33,000,000)
(c) Graduate facilities	8,000,000					
(Obligations)	(25,576,994)					
(d) Interest subsidization	3,920,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	11,750,000
Amount of subsidized loans	(145,000,000)	(290,000,000)	(290,000,000)	(290,000,000)	(290,000,000)	(290,000,000)
(e) State administration and planning	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(f) Technical services	4,833,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
Subtotal, construction	106,753,000	65,850,000	98,850,000	65,850,000	222,850,000	98,850,000
3. Student aid:						
(a) Educational opportunity grants	124,600,000	175,600,000	159,600,000	175,600,000	175,600,000	164,600,000
(b) Direct loans	193,400,000	161,900,000	229,000,000	161,900,000	229,000,000	229,000,000
(c) Insured loans:						
(1) Advances for reserve funds	12,500,000					
(Obligations)	(4,700,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)
(2) Interest payments	62,400,000	62,400,000	62,400,000	62,400,000	62,400,000	62,400,000
(Accrued costs)	(65,000,000)	(101,887,000)	(101,887,000)	(101,887,000)	(101,887,000)	(101,887,000)
(3) Computer services	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, insured loans	76,400,000	63,900,000	63,900,000	63,900,000	63,900,000	63,900,000
(d) Work-study programs	139,900,000	154,000,000	154,000,000	154,000,000	154,000,000	154,000,000
(Obligations)	(146,049,856)	(154,000,000)	(154,000,000)	(154,000,000)	(154,000,000)	(154,000,000)
(e) Cooperative education		[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]
(f) Special programs for disadvantaged students:						
(1) Talent search	4,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(2) Upward Bound	29,800,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
(3) Special services in college		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal special programs	33,800,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
Subtotal student aid	568,100,000	600,400,000	651,500,000	600,400,000	667,500,000	656,500,000
4. Personnel development:						
(a) College teacher fellowships	70,000,000	61,469,000	56,163,000	56,163,000	56,163,000	56,163,000
(b) Training programs	6,900,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, personnel development	76,900,000	71,469,000	66,163,000	66,163,000	66,163,000	66,163,000
5. Planning and evaluation		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total	808,203,000	788,080,000	859,633,000	782,774,000	1,006,874,000	817,874,000
Vocational education:						
1. Basic grants	234,216,000	234,216,000	359,716,000	234,216,000	354,716,000	354,716,000
2. Consumer and homemaking education	14,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
3. Cooperative education		14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
4. Innovation		13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
5. Curriculum development		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
6. Planning and evaluation		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
7. Work-study			10,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000
8. Programs for students with special needs			40,000,000		40,000,000	40,000,000
9. Research			34,000,000		34,000,000	34,000,000
Research	248,216,000	279,216,000	488,716,000	279,216,000	488,716,000	488,716,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued						
Libraries and community services:						
1. Library services	$40,709,000	$23,209,000	$40,709,000	$23,209,000	$40,709,000	$40,709,000
2. Construction of public libraries	9,185,000		9,185,000		9,185,000	9,185,000
(Obligations)	(24,098,743)		(9,185,000)		(9,185,000)	(9,185,000)
3. College library resources	25,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	25,000,000	20,834,000
4. Acquisition and cataloging by Library of Congress	5,500,000	4,500,000	5,500,000	4,500,000	7,356,000	6,737,000
5. Librarian training	8,250,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	8,250,000	6,833,000
6. University community services	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
7. Adult basic education	45,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
8. Educational broadcasting facilities	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	5,625,000	5,083,000
Total	147,144,000	107,709,000	135,394,000	107,709,000	155,625,000	148,881,000
Education for the handicapped:						
1. Preschool and school programs	29,250,000	29,250,000	[a] 29,190,000	29,250,000	34,190,000	[a] 29,190,000
2. Early childhood programs	945,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
3. Teacher education and recruitment:						
(a) Teacher education	29,700,000	29,700,000	35,000,000	29,700,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
(b) Recruitment and information	250,000	500,000	610,000	500,000	610,000	610,000
(c) Physical education and recreation	300,000	300,000	1,000,000	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, teachers	30,250,000	30,500,000	36,610,000	30,500,000	36,610,000	36,610,000
4. Research and innovation:						
(a) Research and demonstrations	12,800,000	14,050,000	16,000,000	14,050,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
(b) Regional resource centers	500,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(c) Innovative programs: (Deaf blind centers)	1,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(d) Physical education and recreation	300,000	300,000	700,000	300,000	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, research	14,600,000	18,350,000	23,700,000	18,350,000	23,700,000	23,700,000
5. Media services and captioned films	4,750,000	4,750,000	6,500,000	4,750,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
Total	79,795,000	85,850,000	100,000,000	85,850,000	105,000,000	100,000,000
Research and training:						
1. Research and development:						
(a) Educational laboratories	23,600,000	25,750,000	25,750,000	25,750,000	25,750,000	25,750,000
(b) Research and development centers	10,800,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,0000,00	10,000,000
(c) General education	26,951,000	26,950,000	26,950,000	26,950,000	26,950,000	26,950,000
(d) Vocational education	11,375,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(e) Evaluations	1,250,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(f) National achievement study	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, research and development	74,976,000	68,800,000	68,800,000	68,800,000	68,800,000	68,800,000
2. Major demonstrations	1,000,000	5,250,000	1,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
District of Columbia model school	(1,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(1,000,000)
3. Experimental schools		25,000,000		12,500,000	9,500,000	
4. Dissemination	4,226,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
5. Training	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000
6. Construction						
(Obligations)	(29,581,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)
7. Statistical surveys	500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total	87,452,000	115,000,000	85,750,000	102,250,000	98,250,000	85,750,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs:						
1. Centers, fellowships, and research	15,165,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	7,000,000	15,000,000
2. Fulbright-Hays training grants	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
3. International Education Act		2,000,000			2,000,000	
Total	18,165,000	20,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	12,000,000	18,000,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Salaries and expenses	40,804,000	43,375,000	42,157,000	42,157,000	42,157,000	42,157,000
Student Loan Insurance Fund		10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000	10,826,000
(Obligations)	(1,948,000)	(16,388,000)	(16,388,000)	(16,388,000)	(16,388,000)	(16,388,000)
Higher Education Facilities Loan Fund:						
1. Loans to higher education institutions	100,000,000					
(Obligations)	(5,000,000)			(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)
2. Participation sales insufficiencies	3,275,000	2,918,000	2,918,000	2,918,000	2,918,000	2,918,000
Total	103,275,000	2,918,000	2,928,000	2,918,000	2,918,000	2,918,000
Total, Office of Education	3,647,200,000	3,197,634,000	4,222,889,000	3,160,997,000	4,540,724,000	4,276,117,000
Title I advance funding:						
1970 advance (in 1969 bill)	1,010,814,300	−1,010,813,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300	−1,010,814,300
1971 advance (in 1970 bill)		1,226,000,000		1,226,000,000	1,117,580,000	
Total, Education portion of the HEW appropriation bill	4,658,014,300	3,412,819,700	3,212,074,700	3,376,182,700	4,647,489,700	3,265,302,700
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE						
Grants to States for Public Assistance:						
1. Maintenance payments	3,395,424,000	3,948,340,000	3,948,340,000	3,948,340,000	3,948,340,000	3,948,340,000
2. Medical assistance	2,396,322,000	2,677,969,000	2,677,969,000	2,677,969,000	2,677,969,000	2,677,969,000
3. Social services and administration	624,800,000	725,242,000	725,242,000	725,242,000	725,242,000	725,242,000
Total	6,416,546,000	7,351,551,000	7,351,551,000	7,351,551,000	7,351,551,000	7,351,551,000
Work incentives:						
1. Training and incentives:						
(a) On-the-job training	18,969,000	15,732,000	15,732,000	15,732,000	8,500,000	14,474,000
(b) Institutional and work experience training	67,631,000	48,408,000	48,408,000	48,408,000	40,400,000	45,539,000
(c) Work projects	3,000,000	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,360,000	100,000	210,000
(d) Program direction and evaluation	5,300,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Subtotal	94,900,000	73,500,000	73,500,000	73,500,000	57,000,000	68,223,000
2. Child care	22,600,000	56,140,000	56,140,000	56,140,000	43,000,000	51,777,000
Total	117,500,000	129,640,000	129,640,000	129,640,000	100,000,000	120,000,000
Assistance to repatriated U.S. nationals	645,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE—Continued						
Rehabilitation services and facilities:						
1. Vocational rehabilitation service:						
(a) Basic services	$345,900,000	$471,000,000	$471,000,000	$471,000,000	$436,000,000	$436,000,000
(b) Innovation	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(c) Expansion of services	8,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(d) Migratory agricultural workers		3,500,000		2,000,000	(9)	(10)
Subtotal, services	357,100,000	488,700,000	485,200,000	487,200,000	450,200,000	450,200,000
2. Rehabilitation facilities:						
(a) Planning and construction	1,340,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	3,500,000
(Obligations)	(2,762,785)	(1,340,000)	(4,840,000)	(1,340,000)	(4,840,000)	(4,840,000)
(b) Initial staffing	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(Obligations)	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)	(550,000)
(c) Facility improvement:						
(1) Training service projects	6,000,000	6,333,000	6,333,000	6,333,000	6,333,000	6,333,000
(2) Improvement grants	4,000,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Subtotal, facilities	11,890,000	11,083,000	14,583,000	11,083,000	14,583,000	14,583,000
Total	368,990,000	499,783,000	499,783,000	498,283,000	464,783,000	464,783,000
Mental Retardation:						
1. Research	126,000	126,000	126,000	126,000	126,000	126,000
2. Hospital improvement	8,972,000	8,972,000	8,972,000	8,972,000	8,972,000	8,972,000
3. Rehabilitation service projects		4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
4. Community service facilities:						
(a) Construction	6,000,000	8,031,000	12,031,000	8,031,000	12,031,000	12,031,000
(Obligations)	(18,013,000)	(13,531,000)	(17,531,000)	(13,531,000)	(17,531,000)	(17,531,000)
(b) Initial staffing	8,358,000	12,000,000	11,371,000	12,000,000	11,371,000	11,371,000
(Obligations)	(8,358,000)	(12,000,000)	(11,371,000)	(12,000,000)	(11,371,000)	(11,371,000)
5. Construction of university-affiliated facilities	9,100,000				2,000,000	
(Obligations)	(9,100,000)				(2,000,000)	
Total	32,556,000	33,629,000	37,000,000	33,629,000	39,000,000	37,000,000
Maternal and child health:						
1. Maternal and child health services	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
2. Crippled children's services	57,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
3. Maternity and infant care	48,000,000	61,850,000	61,750,000	61,750,000	61,750,000	61,750,000
4. Health of school and preschool children	39,000,000	40,950,000	40,850,000	40,850,000	40,850,000	40,850,000
5. Dental health of children			200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
6. Training	9,000,000	9,000,000	11,200,000	9,000,000	11,200,000	15,200,000
7. Research	6,200,000	8,700,000	6,200,000	8,400,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
Total	209,200,000	228,500,000	228,200,000	228,200,000	228,200,000	228,200,000
Child Welfare:						
1. Child welfare services	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
2. Training	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
3. Research and demonstration	4,400,000	4,600,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
4. White House Conference on Children and Youth		400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Total	56,200,000	56,800,000	56,600,000	56,600,000	56,600,000	56,600,000
Total, maternal and child health and welfare	265,400,000	285,300,000	284,800,000	284,800,000	284,800,000	284,800,000
Development of programs for the aging:						
1. Grants to States for community planning and services	16,000,000	13,000,000		13,000,000	20,000,000	13,000,000
2. Foster-grandparents program	9,250,000	9,250,000		9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
3. Research and demonstration	4,100,000	3,500,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
4. Training	2,900,000	2,610,000		2,610,000	3,500,000	2,610,000
Total	32,250,000	28,360,000	(11)	28,360,000	36,250,000	28,360,000
Juvenile delinquency prevention and control:						
1. Planning, prevention, and rehabilitation	2,650,000	11,000,000	2,650,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	7,300,000
2. Training	1,300,000	2,600,000	1,300,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	1,700,000
3. Model programs and technical assistance	1,050,000	1,400,000	1,050,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,000,000
Total	5,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000
Rehabilitation research and training:						
1. Research and demonstrations	21,325,000	21,325,000	21,325,000	21,325,000	21,325,000	21,325,000
2. Training	31,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000
3. Special center program	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000
4. International research (domestic support)	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
5. Center for deaf-blind youths and adults	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Total	64,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Cooperative research or demonstration projects:						
1. Research grants	1,680,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
2. Directed research	1,470,000	9,750,000	9,750,000	9,750,000	9,750,000	9,750,000
Total	3,150,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
Research and training (special foreign currency program)	5,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Salaries and expenses	27,665,000	12 34,393,000	28,780,000	12 34,393,000	31,673,000	30,266,500
Trust fund transfer	(348,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)	(360,000)
Total social and rehabilitation service	7,338,302,000	8,451,856,000	8,410,754,000	8,449,856,000	8,397,257,000	8,400,926,500
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						
Limitation on salaries and expenses	(807,492,000)	13 (921,200,000)	(901,500,000)	13 (921,200,000)	13 (921,200,000)	(911,350,000)
Limitation on construction						
Obligations	(24,220,221)	(10,237,661)	(10,237,661)	(10,237,000)	(10,237,000)	(10,237,000)
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged:						
1. Reimbursement for the uninsured	465,227,000	617,262,000	617,262,000	617,262,000	617,262,000	617,262,000
2. Supplementary medical insurance	895,000,000	928,151,000	928,151,000	928,151,000	928,151,000	928,151,000
Subtotal	1,360,227,000	1,545,413,000	1,545,413,000	1,545,413,000	1,545,413,000	1,545,413,000
Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
Payment for special benefits for the aged	225,545,000	364,151,000	364,151,000	364,151,000	364,151,000	364,151,000
Consumer credit training (BFCU)		300,000			300,000	
Total, Social Security Administration	1,690,772,000	2,014,864,000	2,014,564,000	2,014,564,000	2,014,864,000	2,014,564,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE 1970 HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—Continued

Appropriation/activity	1969 comparable	1970 revised budget	House action	Department appeal	Senate action	Conference agreement
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS						
American Printing House for the Blind	$1,340,000	$1,404,000	$1,404,000	$1,404,000	$1,404,000	$1,404,000
National Technical Institute for the Deaf: Salaries and expenses	800,000	2,851,000	2,851,000	2,851,000	2,851,000	2,851,000
Model Secondary School for the Deaf:						
1. Salaries and expenses	400,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000	415,000
2. Construction	445,000	351,000	351,000	351,000	351,000	351,000
Subtotal	845,000	766,000	766,000	766,000	766,000	766,000
Gallaudet College:						
1. Salaries and expenses	3,691,000	4,257,000	4,257,000	4,257,000	4,332,000	4,332,000
2. Construction		867,000	867,000	867,000	1,106,000	1,106,000
Subtotal	3,691,000	5,124,000	5,124,000	5,124,000	5,438,000	5,438,000
Howard University:						
1. Salaries and expenses	18,231,000	20,455,000	20,445,000	20,445,000	20,445,000	20,445,000
2. Construction	2,209,000	22,710,000	22,710,000	22,710,000	22,710,000	22,710,000
3. Freedmen's Hospital	9,030,000	9,109,000	9,109,000	9,109,000	9,109,000	9,109,000
Subtotal	29,470,000	52,264,000	52,264,000	52,264,000	52,264,000	52,264,000
Total special institutions	36,146,000	62,409,000	62,409,000	62,409,000	62,723,000	62,723,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						
Office of the Secretary	5,133,000	5,975,000	5,975,000	5,975,000	5,975,000	5,975,000
Trust fund transfers	(389,000)	(398,000)	(398,000)	(398,000)	(398,000)	(398,000)
Office of Community and Field Services	4,189,000	4,730,000	4,510,000	4,730,000	4,510,000	4,510,000
Trust fund transfers	(2,168,000)	(2,486,000)	(2,325,000)	(2,486,000)	(2,325,000)	(2,325,000)
Office for Civil Rights	4,004,000	5,259,000	5,259,000	5,259,000	5,259,000	5,269 000
Trust fund transfers	(804,000)	(856,000)	(856,000)	(856,000)	(856,000)	(856,000)
Office of the Comptroller	9,242,000	10,425,000	10,425,000	[12](2,060,000)	[12](2,065,000)	10,425,000
Trust fund transfers	(1,255,000)	[12](2,060,000)	(1,808,000)			(2,060,000)
Office of Administration	4,926,000	5,234,000	5,066,000	5,066,000	5,066,000	5,066,000
Trust fund transfers	(302,000)	(359,000)	(350,000	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)
Surplus property utilization	1,243,000	1,255,000	1,255,000	1,255,000	1,255,000	1,255,000
Office of the General Counsel	2,161,000	2,282,000	2,244,000	2,244,000	2,244,000	2,244,000
Trust fund transfers	(1,375,000)	(1,416,000	(1,396,000)	(1,396,000)	(1,396,000)	(1,396,000)
Total, departmental management	30,898,000	35,160,000	34,734,000	34,954,000	34,734,000	34,734,000
Trust fund transfers	(6,293,000)	(7,575,000)	(7,133,000)	(7,546,000)	(7,385,000)	(7,385,000)
Total with trust fund transfers	37,191,000	42,735,000	41,867,000	42,500,000	42,119,000	42,119,000

[1] A reprograming of an additional $1 million for "Solid waste management" is being developed in response to a recommendation in the Senate committee report.
[2] The committee report specifies an additional $7,096,000 to be divided between fellowships and mental health center staffing. Distribution is left to HEW.
[3] 1970 request was enacted as a 1969 supplemental.
[4] Includes $1,010,814,300 appropriated in the 1969 bill.
[5] Included in "Instructional equipment," a new appropriation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.
[6] Includes budget amendment of $7,241,000 for Federal City College; amendment was sent to the Senate after the House acted on the bill.
[7] Up to 1 percent of work-study funds can be used for cooperative education.
[8] Excludes $60,000 for Indian children not yet authorized.
[9] Bill language would allow funds to be spent for this program, but they would have to be provided by a reprograming.
[10] Language authorizing funds to be spent for migrant rehabilitation program was dropped in conference.
[11] Consideration deferred by House, due to lack of authorizing legislation.
[12] Includes budget amendment of $2,893,000; amendment was sent to the Senate after the House acted on the bill.
[13] Includes budget amendment of $19,700,000; amendment was sent to the Senate after the House acted on the bill.
[14] Includes budget amendment of $252,000; amendment was sent to the Senate after the House acted on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this table shows in greater detail the programs contained in this bill than the one I inserted on December 23, and should be helpful to Members in understanding the effects of various actions taken in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, what about the priorities of this Nation?

There are, in the national accounts, budget items which lead to no productive end. There are expenditures without any return, costs without tangible, or even intangible, benefits—unchecked wastes far in excess of the appropriation increases here that President Nixon threatens to veto.

The expenditures in this bill before you are investments in a vigorous society—investments in the education, health and welfare of our people—and they are not inflationary.

Perhaps the programs in this bill should be viewed not so much as an appropriation or an expenditure from the Federal Treasury, but as an investment that will return dividends for the balance of this century, and beyond.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, if there should be a reduction in these appropriations figures in the conference report, several thousand medical students will lose their opportunity for additional loans. I do not know whether the Senator had a visit from a number of medical students who came to visit me and talked about the plight they were facing with respect to continuing their medical education.

Of course, as the Senator from Washington knows, the opportunity for medical education is already extremely restricted because of the economics involved. Actually, only a very small percentage of students who attend medical schools in this country come from outside families who are in the top quarter of incomes received. Forty-five percent come from families in the top 10 percent income bracket. As a result, many students who are gifted and committed and concerned about the health needs of this country are dependent on student loans.

On the one hand, the President, as the Senator from Washington has reminded us, told us on other occasions that one of the best ways of providing opportunity for young students was not to provide grants, but loans. If we went back to the old figures, several thousand medical students would lose their opportunity to continue in medical schools, at a time when there is a great need for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the most conservative estimates are that there is a shortage of 50,000 doctors in this country. The shortage of dentists is even higher. As I said in December, if anyone does not believe that, I suggest that he try to get an appointment with a good dentist.

There is an even greater need of technicians and a need to deliver the manpower to treat people. The amount provided in the conference report is a split between the Senate and House versions. It would allow for less than 1,800 new medical students coming into such schools in all the United States. This is far short of our need. The figure may be less than 1,500. The experts were not sure. Someone from a middle income or low middle income family cannot afford to attend medical school. I think the costs are about $8,000 to $10,000 a year. We do not have other necessary facilities. Clinics are important. It is important to teach people to get involved with actual patients.

The rise in hospital costs is directly related to the shortage of personnel. In my opinion, that in itself is highly inflationary.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Federal Government has increased expenditures in the

whole field of medicine dramatically in the last 8 or 9 years. The amount has increased from some $4 billion to some $14 or $15 billion. That includes medicare, medicaid, NIH, and certain Veterans' Administration expenditures. Yet we have seen an extraordinary rise in the costs of medical services.

As one who has been interested in this problem as a member of the health subcommittee, I have heard medical economists say that one of the key ways to try to hold down inflation in the health field is by providing different kinds of medical personnel. The committee has done that to some extent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is not as much as we should do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is one of the other activities which will have to be reduced unless we have this kind of increase in appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not complaining about the budget or the revised budget. When there is a change of administration, it is typical that it cannot write a clean-cut revised budget until it has had an opportunity to make a thorough study. There was a budget amendment for approximately $28 million. It should have been $36 million. The Budget said it should be $28,360,000. I refer to the Older Americans Act, in which the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from New Hampshire have been so interested. This is one of our great human needs. But when the administration changed the budget, the recommendations for cuts were in the field of training, scholarships, and fellowships, in some cases 35 to 42 percent. We thought that, with respect to this field, the priorities were just reversed; that we should supply the necessary funds for manpower development.

The Senator from Massachusetts knows I have been concerned for many years with medical research. When I first came to Congress in 1937 I was privileged to introduce a bill to establish the Cancer Institute. Sometimes these efforts are disappointing.

I am not too disappointed in our medical research. We have many research programs in operation. But in delivering trained manpower to the people who need it, who need care, we are falling short.

Mr. KENNEDY. A host of different activities will have to be reduced if the increased appropriations are slashed and cut. One of the areas which I have noticed in my visits to a number of schools in my own State is libraries, in urban as well as rural areas. In conversations with schoolteachers, we have found that this program, which has been in effect for only about 3 or 4 years, has brought about new interest on the part of students in books and in learning to read. School districts have made available various rooms to provide books and library services. As I understand it, there was absolutely no provision in title II of the ESE Act for that, and if it were not for the committee——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House did not have a chance to act on it. The Senator is right that there would not have been anything for that purpose under the President's budget. I do not know what the figures in the hearings were, but the lack of any kind of library facilities in many secondary schools in this country, in outlying and rural districts, was amazing.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Could I mention one other thing that was woefully inadequate in the bill, which we added?

Mr. KENNEDY. Surely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the need for bilingual education. Many thousands of children of Spanish-American and other backgrounds need bilingual education. I was surprised at the number of children involved.

Mr. KENNEDY. And, if I might mention it at this point, not only are there thousands of Mexican-Americans and Spanish-speaking people to take advantage of it, but we have two small programs up in southeastern Massachusetts involving Portuguese-Americans who are able to use these programs to good advantage.

We find also that there is increasing interest on the part of many of the Indians to try to develop this kind of program as well. We find that one of the most critical problems in Indian education is the need for the kind of assistance and training that bilingual education gives—providing an opportunity for learning in reading during those first 2 or 3 years.

By increasing the resources in this area, it is hoped that we can achieve a significant decrease in the dropout rate—which is presently about 60 percent for the Indian people in this country. Most of the educators we have talked to have stressed the importance of bilingual programs. The committee has responded to that need in this bill, and that program would be slashed drastically by any kind of reduction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That increase of $15 million was added on the Senate floor.

But in all fairness, we have, in some of these areas, in relation to the so-called revised budget, kept some programs going. All we have said is that we should have something to say about national priorities, and certainly this health manpower situation was one of the most glaring deficiencies.

There are some two or three new programs here that we hoped to work out. The Teacher Corps was one. That has been the subject of a great deal of discussion in the Senate for some time. The conference committee did not agree to the entire amount on that, but they agreed to a fairly reasonable amount.

Libraries are a very important item, and we have a small amount also for the dropout prevention program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, would the Senator be kind enough to discuss for a moment the importance which he attaches to vocational education? We see more and more educators who believe that this is an area where we really ought to have a higher priority. In many instances, young people are being trained with general kinds of liberal education, which is valuable and worthwhile. But if we are to meet the demands of a changing technological society, we ought to be willing to support the necessary kinds of vocational education. Congress has expanded this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that the Senator has stated the problem well. In this area the administration made a definite request, the same as last year, for $234 million in basic grants. The House made it $359 million. Action was taken by the House of Representatives practically unanimously in this field, and we in conference made the figure $354 million, the same action as the Senate took. We approved a total of $488.7 million for vocational education.

I think there is nothing more important than vocational-technical education, particularly for disadvantaged people who have no other learning opportunities.

Mr. KENNEDY. One of the other important areas is title VI of ESEA. I understand there are some 6 million handicapped children in the country, of which only a third are receiving educational services. They are the physically handicapped, the retarded, some deaf and blind, and the emotionally disturbed, for which estimates are that, there is a need for some 325,000 specially trained teachers. Only 80,000 are now available. Here again, the Senate and the Congress responded to the need.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We need to provide for some teaching of the mentally retarded at community service centers. This is a small item compared to the total amounts in the bill.

HEW also has some responsibility in the area of air pollution, and we increased that small amount for research and demonstration programs.

All of these are matters that seemed to us to be essential at the moment, and were so agreed upon by both Houses.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, many centuries ago the Greeks recognized that a sound mind and a sound body are the fundamental needs for individual achievement in society. The point holds equally true today. And it underscores the importance of our action on the HEW appropriations bill now before us. The final outcome will have a profound effect for years to come.

The conference report provides for an increase in health and education programs of $861 million over last year's level, or $1.3 billion over the budget request. Members of this Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, have already voted their strong support. As we enter the decade of the 1970's, we have recognized the need to follow through on our earlier commitment to improvement and equal opportunity in education and health care. Moreover, the specific program increases in the bill will affect the quality of life for millions of Americans—persons for whom the $1.3 billion will translate into higher quality education and better health care in the immediate future.

Citizens in every State would be hurt by appropriation cutbacks to the figures sought by the administration. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables prepared by HEW of how such cutbacks would affect specific education programs in each State.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$34,986,823	$38,156,305	$44,064,322
State administrative expenses	349,908	381,563	440,643
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	840,259	----	826,105
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,893,354	2,040,343	2,904,233
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	531,860	531,860	531,860
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	1,888,098	----	
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	35,243	----	
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	315,250	----	311,027
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	41,840,795	41,110,071	49,078,190
Instructional equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States			1,860,191
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			34,770
Subtotal, instructional resources			1,894,961
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	9,241,181	2,362,000	11,075,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	372,344	328,000	328,000
Subtotal, SAFA	9,613,525	2,690,000	11,403,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	297,401	262,781	313,427
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	423,950	----	
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	721,351	262,781	313,427
Teacher Corps	285,388	----	
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,032,026	----	
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	224,435	227,680	227,680
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	240,351	----	
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	679,637	1,037,770	1,037,770
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,436,369	----	510,083
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	102,579	102,859	102,859
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,263,130	1,012,802	915,698
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,673,248	2,195,856	3,146,940
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	251,574	----	
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,540,009	3,771,234	3,771,234
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	48,471	----	
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	766,100	----	
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	310,000	----	
Subtotal, Higher Education	17,567,929	8,348,201	9,712,264
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,755,151	5,493,553	8,327,100
Innovation		248,333	248,333
Work-study			197,686
Cooperative education		267,787	267,787
Consumer and homemaking education		346,640	462,414
Programs for students with special needs			925,913
Research			793,786
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,755,151	6,356,313	11,223,019
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	633,492	319,145	633,492
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	397,777	----	168,825
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,892	42,892	42,892
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,251	25,251	25,251
College library resources (HEA II-A)	313,682	----	
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	54,758	----	
Libraries and Community Services—Con.			
University community service programs (HEA I)	$175,958	$175,958	$175,958
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,072,101	1,199,378	1,199,378
Special projects and teacher education	30,000	----	
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,785,430	1,802,133	2,285,305
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	571,028	571,028	571,028
Teacher education and recruitment	488,478	----	
Research and innovation	150,250	----	
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,209,756	571,028	571,028
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	29,598	17,866	17,866
Subtotal, Research and Training	29,598	17,866	17,866
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	143,330	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	561,688	----	
Total, Office of Education	80,563,941	61,208,393	86,549,060
Total, Office of Education comparable basis[3]	76,639,241	61,208,393	86,549,060
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$1,725,848	$1,731,032	$1,943,044
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	66,568	----	70,860
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	547,744	483,700	551,348
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	242,131	242,131	242,131
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	106,156	----	
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333	----	
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	49,999	----	50,000
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	2,901,779	2,606,863	3,007,383
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States			115,746
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			129,079
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	14,731,443	13,925,000	15,917,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	918,641	1,293,000	1,293,000
Subtotal, SAFA	15,650,084	15,218,000	17,210,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	112,896	112,896	118,307
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	423,950	----	
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	536,846	112,896	118,307
Teacher Corps	1,500	----	
Higher education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	70,000	----	
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	152,468	155,378	155,378
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	8,119	----	

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)		$50,000	$50,000
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	$190,628		50,000
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	28,901	35,400	35,400
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	61,078	30,508	30,246
Direct loans (NDEA II)	67,329	66,145	94,794
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	6,941		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	164,593	130,963	130,963
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	40,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	45,800		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)			
Subtotal, Higher Education	835,857	468,394	546,781
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	508,238	293,153	444,360
Innovation		203,530	203,530
Work-study			15,873
Cooperative education		204,951	204,951
Consumer and homemaking education		18,498	24,676
Programs for students with special needs			49,371
Research			28,312
Subtotal, Vocational Education	508,238	720,132	971,073
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	136,935	115,172	136,935
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	21,765		86,150
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,200	40,200	40,200
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	6,939	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	3,221	25,017	25,017
College library resources (HEA II–A)	41,398		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	105,733	105,733	105,733
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	131,891	136,550	136,550
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	488,082	462,181	570,094
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	73,390		
Research and innovation			
Media services and capitoned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	173,390	100,000	100,000
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education		15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training		15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	21,175,776	19,753,466	22,717,717
Total, Office of Education comparable basis [3]	20,534,678	19,753,466	22,717,717
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$9,384,173	$9,528,554	$9,732,769
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	422,604		425,551
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,514,678	1,143,854	1,526,861

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	$368,490	$368,490	$368,490
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	784,359		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	16,488		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	147,487		148,584
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	12,788,279	11,190,898	12,352,255
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			800,812
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			16,612
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			817,420
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	9,187,169	6,526,000	10,825,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	1,095,682	175,000	175,000
Subtotal, SAFA	10,282,851	6,701,000	11,000,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	181,870	181,870	209,943
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,363,104		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,544,974	181,870	209,943
Teacher Corps	268,764		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	177,936	180,964	180,964
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	163,854		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	807,119	415,830	415,830
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,228,671		323,980
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	58,386	72,487	72,487
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	1,350,664	804,143	639,937
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,169,754	1,743,464	2,498,605
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	245,961		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	1,384,360	1,417,892	1,417,892
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	138,751		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	171,200		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	59,733		
Subtotal, Higher Education	7,956,389	4,634,780	5,549,695
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	2,133,895	2,237,119	3,391,015
Innovation		220,501	220,501
Work-study			83,692
Cooperative education		228,752	228,752
Consumer and homemaking education		141,161	188,306
Programs for students with special needs			376,764
Research			315,526
Subtotal, Vocational Education	2,133,895	2,827,533	4,804,556
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	312,656	187,354	312,656
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	215,407		115,407
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,153	41,153	41,153
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,100	25,100	25,100
College library resources (HEA II–A)	202,552		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	134,680	134,680	134,680
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	346,188	379,898	379,898
Special projects and teacher education	200,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,517,245	807,694	1,048,403

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$224,757	$224,757	$224,757
Teacher education and recruitment	547,590	----	----
Research and innovation	47,119	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	819,466	224,757	224,757
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	58,332	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	58,332	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	51,789	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	133,600	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	37,605,584	26,633,532	36,072,031
Total Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	34,063,356	26,633,532	36,072,031
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$21,811,725	$23,499,049	$27,137,579
State administrative expenses	218,117	234,991	271,376
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	453,532	----	447,401
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,713,497	1,266,286	1,707,779
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	388,193	388,193	388,193
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	886,740	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	18,499	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	165,473	----	164,377
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	25,655,776	25,388,519	30,116,705
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----	----	978,829
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	18,376
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	997,205
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,842,356	958,000	3,079,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	1,245,726	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	4,088,082	958,000	3,079,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	187,861	187,861	215,588
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	665,111	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	852,972	187,861	215,588
Teacher Corps	268,545	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	648,560	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	189,394	192,476	192,476
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	648,560	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	189,394	192,476	192,476
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	136,490	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	----	557,980	557,980
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,248,903	----	283,138
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	----	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	74,074	77,911	77,911
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$1,656,935	$677,466	$519,808
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,830,266	1,468,814	2,104,996
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	64,487	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,505,616	2,265,627	2,265,627
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	42,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	171,200	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	59,733	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	9,627,658	5,240,274	6,001,936
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,319,461	2,963,572	4,492,168
Innovation	----	225,660	225,660
Work-study	----	----	105,337
Cooperative education	----	235,988	235,988
Consumer and homemaking education	----	187,000	249,456
Programs for Students with Special Needs	----	----	499,108
Research	----	----	422,857
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,319,461	3,612,220	6,230,574
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	391,716	219,830	391,716
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	346,970	----	128,570
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,581	41,581	41,581
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,138	25,138	25,138
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,374	----	----
Librarian training (HEA-II-B)	----	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,316	142,316	142,316
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	631,826	701,583	701,583
Special projects and teacher education	150,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	----	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,965,430	1,169,957	1,470,413
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA I)	297,836	297,836	297,836
Teacher education and recruitment	298,587	----	----
Research and innovation	----	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	596,423	297,836	297,836
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	20,067	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	41,607	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	61,674	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	85,107	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	----	----	----
Civil Rights Education	441,183	----	----
Total, Office of Education	47,012,311	36,919,667	48,474,257
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	43,849,974	36,919,667	48,474,257
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$80,232,375	$83,959,819	$96,959,920
State administrative expenses	802,900	839,598	969,599
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,786,011	----	4,801,557
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	14,180,196	9,681,939	14,208,380
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,908,448	1,908,448	1,908,448
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	5,335,635	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	174,462	----	----

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	$1,560,552		1,566,092
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	108,980,579	$96,389,804	$120,413,996
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			5,635,068
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			175,073
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			5,810,141
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	76,264,658	25,225,000	88,431,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	10,880,448	460,000	460,000
Subtotal, SAFA	87,145,106	25,685,000	88,891,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	977,178	1,027,178	1,340,500
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	6,201,146		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	7,178,324	1,027,178	1,340,500
Teacher Corps	2,546,153		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	322,300		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	519,125	523,740	523,740
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	1,577,046		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103	6,699,777	3,453,412	3,453,412
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	15,422,360		3,663,040
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	534,541	399,679	399,679
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	11,127,949	7,170,901	6,548,209
Direct loans (NDEA II)	17,825,858	15,547,238	22,281,155
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	2,567,470		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	13,636,446	12,567,739	12,567,739
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	406,087		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,262,900		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	834,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	80,435,859	39,662,709	49,436,974
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	17,471,789	18,153,766	27,517,384
Innovation		422,522	422,522
Work-study			919,170
Cooperative education		512,086	512,086
Consumer and homemaking education		1,145,491	1,528,071
Programs for students with special needs			3,057,356
Research			2,623,115
Subtotal, Vocational Education	17,471,789	20,233,865	36,579,704
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	2,666,778	1,154,367	2,666,778
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,313,062		507,365
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	53,915	53,915	53,915
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,210	26,210	26,210
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,161,076		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	703,007		
University community service programs (HEA I)	506,766	506,766	506,766
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,908,201	2,137,446	2,137,446
Special projects and teacher education	224,914		
Educational broadcasting facilities	168,766		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	9,772,204	3,918,213	5,937,990
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,397,629
Teacher education and recruitment	1,920,604		
Research and innovation	1,554,439		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	656,261		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	6,528,933	2,397,629	2,397,629
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	$4,171,896		
Research and development centers	3,242,638		
Vocational education	1,468,244	$59,037	$59,037
Subtotal, Research and Training	8,882,778	59,037	59,037
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	534,067	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	2,275,532		
Civil Rights Education	487,177		
Total, Office of Education	332,288,501	189,423,435	310,916,970
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	291,627,389	189,423,435	310,916,970
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$8,914,233	$9,135,370	$10,505,367
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	541,044		543,947
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,767,120	1,307,980	1,769,391
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	430,472	410,474	410,474
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	802,055		
Loans to non-profit schools	3,900		
State administration	19,340		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	259,627		175,980
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	12,887,791	11,003,824	13,555,159
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			837,012
Loans to non-profit schools			
State administration			19,673
Subtotal, instructional resources			856,685
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	12,924,352	3,109,000	15,399,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,655,971		
Subtotal, SAFA	15,580,323	3,109,000	15,399,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	231,798	204,815	240,531
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,597,409		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,829,207	204,815	240,531
Teacher Corps	63,615		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	150,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	188,629	191,707	191,707
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	212,102		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	940,502	483,869	483,869
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,917,682		414,543
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	173,128	83,988	83,988
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,061,131	1,042,836	880,449
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,814,663	2,260,975	3,240,262
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	363,089		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,823,059	1,697,619	1,697,619
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	71,586		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—(Continued):			
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	$1,523,000		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	35,200		
Subtotal, Higher Education	12,473,771	$5,760,994	$6,992,437
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	2,452,139	2,410,681	3,654,099
Innovation		224,710	224,710
Work-study			101,008
Cooperative education		234,655	234,655
Consumer and homemaking education		152,113	202,915
Programs for Students with Special Needs			405,995
Research			341,169
Subtotal, Vocational Education	2,452,139	3,022,159	5,164,551
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	386,437	217,661	386,437
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	232,842		127,691
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,553	41,553	41,553
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,135	25,135	25,135
College library resources (HEA II-A)	354,370		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	102,866		
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,295	142,295	142,295
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	255,893	275,835	275,835
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities	338,685		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,919,585	741,988	1,038,455
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	285,258	285,258	285,258
Teacher education and recruitment	696,367		
Research and innovation	498,738		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,480,363	285,258	285,258
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	346,000		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	76,218	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	422,218	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	66,744	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	175,765		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	49,401,521	24,193,038	43,597,076
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	42,672,729	24,193,038	43,597,076
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$8,699,833	$9,924,014	$11,425,229
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	717,392		718,570
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,331,546	1,687,122	2,343,122
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	449,925	449,925	449,925
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	724,973		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	26,250		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	234,802		235,929
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	13,334,721	12,211,061	15,322,775

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Instructional Equipment: [1]			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States			$734,201
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			26,375
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			760,576
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	$3,265,208	$1,503,000	3,974,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)			
Subtotal, SAFA	3,265,208	1,503,000	3,974,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	270,462	238,978	285,645
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	523,202		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	793,664	238,978	285,645
Teacher Corps	171,534		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	257,121	210,285	210,285
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	163,167		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	707,988	452,481	452,481
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,461,717		454,530
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	91,915	96,574	96,574
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,668,912	889,184	801,634
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,360,435	1,927,841	2,762,840
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	1,796,129		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,597,398	1,593,508	1,593,508
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	70,500		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,538,600		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	45,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	12,758,882	5,169,873	6,371,852
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	2,634,697	2,613,726	3,961,873
Innovation		232,448	232,448
Work-study			132,753
Cooperative education		245,509	245,509
Consumer and homemaking education		164,925	220,007
Programs for students with special needs			440,189
Research			371,168
Subtotal, Vocational Education	2,634,697	3,256,608	5,603,947
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	514,029	270,073	514,029
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	270,118		148,935
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,244	42,244	42,244
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,195	25,195	25,195
College library resources (HEA II-A)	418,350		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	162,263	162,263	162,263
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	457,836	503,143	503,143
Special projects and teacher education	225,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,154,544	1,042,427	1,435,318
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	369,463	369,463	369,463
Teacher education and recruitment	534,275		
Research and innovation	143,986		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	26,499		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,074,223	369,463	369,463

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	$95,930	$15,000	$15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	95,930	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	92,547	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	644,664		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	37,070,614	23,856,410	34,188,576
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	30,769,708	23,856,410	34,188,576
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$2,520,995	$2,571,260	$2,974,538
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	134,057		133,044
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	714,568	597,711	719,823
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	261,718	261,718	261,718
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	164,547		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000		50,000
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	4,009,218	3,580,689	4,289,123
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			180,310
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			193,643
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,000,165	1,388,000	2,205,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)		801,000	801,000
Subtotal, SAFA	2,000,165	2,189,000	3,006,000
Education professions development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	125,971	125,971	135,664
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)			
Subtotal, education professions development	125,971	125,971	135,664
Teacher Corps	6,744		
Higher education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,925		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	157,678	160,612	160,612
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	26,175		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	75,582	84,324	84,324
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFAI—Section 104)	403,675		85,158
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	53,749	49,416	49,416
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	234,852	135,912	140,312
Direct loans (NDEA II)	358,429	294,671	422,301
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	28,837		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	206,977	310,950	310,950
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	85,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	148,400		
Teacher programs (EPDA Part E)			
Subtotal, Higher Education	2,097,319	1,035,885	1,253,073
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	$623,244	$478,774	$725,723
Innovation		206,110	206,100
Work-study			25,011
Cooperative education		208,568	208,568
Consumer and homemaking education		30,210	40,301
Program for Students with Special Needs			80,633
Research			55,737
Subtotal, Vocational Education	623,244	923,662	1,342,083
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	172,884	129,939	172,884
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	133,812		92,135
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,395	40,395	40,395
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,059	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,034	25,034	25,034
College library resources (HEA II-A)	51,166		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	111,098	111,098	111,098
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	155,845	162,892	162,892
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	730,043	508,867	643,947
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	116,735		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	216,735	100,000	100,000
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	34,638	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	34,638	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	137,618		
Total, Office of Education	10,061,695	8,529,074	11,028,533
Total, Office of Education comparable basis [3]	9,142,795	8,529,074	11,028,533
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$32,030,278	$32,717,727	$32,717,727
Basic administrative expenses	320,928	327,177	327,177
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,358,173		1,385,908
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	4,389,257	3,182,146	4,603,634
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	709,479	709,479	709,479
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	2,268,779		
Loans to nonprofit private schools	1,200		
State administration	53,121		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	475,164		484,750
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	41,606,379	36,936,529	40,228,675
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			2,313,878
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			54,190
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			3,368,068

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operation (Public Law 81-874)	$17,547,731	$5,013,000	$19,941,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,694,363	17,000	17,000
Subtotal, SAFA	20,242,094	5,030,000	19,958,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	410,952	363,114	458,054
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	1,512,124		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,923,076	363,114	458,054
Teacher Corps	685,906		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	851,904		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	264,313	267,743	267,743
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	398,154		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)	2,312,667	1,193,372	1,193,372
Other undergraduate facilities (UEFA I-Section 104)	3,661,823		902,586
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I-Section 105)	168,491	132,528	132,528
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,249,260	1,692,052	1,664,938
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,509,571	3,668,541	5,257,482
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	180,238		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,993,543	4,139,255	4,139,255
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	50,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,882,300		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	233,113		
Subtotal, Higher Education	22,005,377	11,093,491	13,557,904
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	7,143,929	7,393,929	11,207,681
Innovation		266,390	266,390
Work-study			272,721
Cooperative education		293,111	293,111
Consumer and homemaking education		466,553	622,375
Program for Students with Special Needs			1,245,245
Research			1,068,380
Subtotal, Vocational Education	7,143,929	8,419,983	14,975,903
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	908,640	432,168	908,640
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	398,742		214,637
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,384	44,384	44,384
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,381	25,381	25,381
College library resources (HEA II-A)	553,565		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	110,327		
University community service programs (HEA I)	227,490	227,490	227,490
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,040,045	1,159,832	1,159,832
Special projects and teacher education	79,950		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	3,428,033	1,928,764	2,619,873
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	736,246	736,246	736,246
Teacher education and recruitment	839,519		
Research and innovation	287,657		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	36,696		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,900,118	736,246	726,246
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	83,400	24,046	24,046
Subtotal, Research and Training	83,400	24,046	24,046
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	187,558	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	235,182		
Civil Rights Education	$518,550		
Total, Office of Education	100,009,602	$64,582,173	$94,976,769
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	91,304,417	64,582,173	94,976,769
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$34,745,771	$37,758,167	$43,604,537
State administrative expenses	347,488	377,582	436,045
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,089,383		1,086,360
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,623,910	2,519,142	3,663,910
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	628,796	628,796	628,796
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	2,266,363		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	44,018		
Guidance counseling and testing (NDEA V)	393,735		393,215
Subtotal Elementary and Secondary Education	43,099,464	41,283,687	49,772,863
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			2,182,778
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			43,958
Subtotal Instructional Resources			2,226,736
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	16,133,291	5,749,000	18,902,000
Construction (P.L. 85-815)	2,309,974	1,598,000	1,598,000
Subtotal SAFA	18,443,265	7,347,000	20,500,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	311,043	311,043	380,665
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	750,849		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,061,892	311,043	380,665
Teacher Corps	397,473		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,550,985		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	240,444	243,763	243,763
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	274,568		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	2,044,455	1,063,460	1,063,460
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,587,633		615,620
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	77,383	120,015	120,015
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,670,339	1,205,195	1,040,494
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,242,368	2,612,985	3,744,737
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	538,465		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,700,025	4,209,230	4,209,230
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	40,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,453,800		
Training programs (EDPA Part E)	82,509		
Subtotal, Higher Education	18,702,974	9,454,648	11,037,319
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	7,105,908	6,961,237	10,551,808
Innovation		260,009	260,009
Work-study			247,709
Cooperative education		284,162	284,162
Consumer and homemaking education		439,251	585,953
Program for Students with Special Needs			1,172,372
Research			1,005,858
Subtotal, Vocational Education	7,105,980	7,944,659	14,107,871

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	$743,951	$364,518	$743,951
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	357,471		187,217
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,491	43,491	43,491
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,304	25,304	25,304
College library resources (HEA II–A)	427,931		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	218,930		
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,164	196,164	196,164
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,352,356	1,515,610	1,515,610
Special projects and teacher education	700,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	4,105,107	2,184,596	2,751,246
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	682,477	682,477	682,477
Teacher education and recruitment	729,543		
Research and innovation	9,549		
Media services and captions films for the deaf	124,561		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,546,130	682,477	682,477
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	670,000		
Research and development centers	789,680		
Vocational education	95,576	22,639	22,639
Subtotal, Research and Training	1,555,256	22,639	22,639
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	172,456	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	481,623		
Total, Office of Education	96,721,548	69,280,749	101,531,816
Total, Office of Education comparable basis [3]	86,281,082	69,280,749	101,531,816
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$2,215,107	$2,753,137	$3,061,221
State administrative expenses	150,000	550,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	193,833		192,394
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	556,489	716,722	895,686
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	281,390	281,390	281,390
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (MDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	299,306		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance counseling and testing (NDEA V)	66,059		68,974
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	3,775,557	3,901,249	4,649,665
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			325,337
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			338,670
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	9,520,455	5,741,000	10,650,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	1,728,671		
Subtotal SAFA	11,249,566	5,741,000	10,650,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	137,551	137,551	149,706
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	104,613		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	242,164	137,551	149,706

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Teacher Corps	$282,716		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	185,300		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	162,092	$165,047	$165,047
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	58,366		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	327,314	169,240	169,240
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	547,034		127,380
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000		
State administration and planning HEFA I—Section 105	30,490	53,635	53,635
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV—A	275,170	251,661	240,466
Direct loans (NDEA II)	319,050	545,627	781,953
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	82,795		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	563,188	509,439	509,439
Special programs for disadvantaged			
Talent search	66,286		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	342,200		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	111,539		
Subtotal, Higher Education	3,670,824	1,694,649	2,047,160
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,000,869	943,321	1,429,882
Innovation		210,047	210,047
Work-study			43,289
Cooperative education		214,090	214,090
Consumer and homemaking education		59,563	79,402
Program for Students with Special Needs			158,869
Research			124,373
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,000,869	1,426,981	2,259,952
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	603,338	142,449	203,338
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	71,358		97,206
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,049	25,049	25,049
College library resources (HEA II–A)	112,262		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	49,920		
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,728	115,728	115,728
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	235,281	251,540	251,540
Special projects and teacher education	520,986		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,013,991	614,835	772,930
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,023	113,023	113,023
Teacher education and recruitment			
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	131,534		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	244,557	113,023	113,023
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	25,334	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	25,334	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	31,661	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	167,132		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	21,753,891	13,694,288	21,046,106
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	19,338,242	13,694,288	21,046,106
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$2,947,216	$3,006,605	$3,338,547
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	$180,728		$180,068
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	857,190	$689,438	855,370
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	283,917	283,917	383,917
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	358,140		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	64,750		64,139
Subtotal Elementary and Secondary Education	4,855,274	4,129,960	4,872,041
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			356,734
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			370,067
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,707,913	1,044,000	3,225,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	80,850		
Subtotal, SAFA	2,788,763	1,044,000	3,225,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,799	135,012	146,521
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	488,709		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	651,508	135,012	146,521
Teacher Corps			
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	162,907	165,865	165,865
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	65,137		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	400,064	206,857	206,857
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	546,443		132,503
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	89,308	57,748	57,748
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	558,213	296,613	258,188
Direct loans (NDEA II)	806,240	643,087	921,626
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	74,845		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	639,633	581,865	581,865
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	40,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	154,800		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)			
Subtotal, Higher Education	4,387,590	1,952,035	2,324,652
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,202,766	1,032,903	1,565,670
Innovation		209,639	209,639
Work-study			38,960
Cooperative education		213,519	213,519
Consumer and homemaking education		65,176	86,943
Programs for students with special needs			173,955
Research			137,608
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,202,766	1,521,237	2,426,294
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	208,959	144,758	208,959
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	131,159		98,141
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,591	40,591	40,591
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,051	25,051	25,051
College library resources (HEA II-A)	73,906		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,079	115,079	115,079
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	$146,680	$153,041	$153,041
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities	334,605		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,115,539	518,029	680,371
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	116,982	116,982	116,982
Teacher education and recruitment	134,140		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	251,122	116,982	116,982
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	44,465	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	44,465	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	39,430	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	15,376,457	9,482,255	14,226,928
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	13,210,315	9,482,255	14,226,928
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$44,413,015	$46,736,723	$53,973,306
State administrative expenses	444,130	467,367	539,733
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,681,475		2,672,463
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	8,235,338	5,650,541	8,251,199
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,056,099	1,056,099	1,056,099
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	3,085,357		
Loans to non-profit private schools	2,460		
State administration	99,990		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	894,406		901,171
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	60,912,270	53,910,730	67,393,971
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			3,157,687
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			100,742
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			3,258,429
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	12,924,988	4,280,000	14,805,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	907,187		
Subtotal, SAFA	13,832,175	4,280,000	14,805,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	701,085	619,473	790,440
Training Programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	2,187,500		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	2,888,585	619,473	790,440
Teacher Corps	1,238,523		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	380,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	385,726	389,721	389,721
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	627,907		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HELATH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	$3,311,412	$1,706,263	1,706,263
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	7,145,802	----	1,688,339
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,150,000	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	268,425	227,574	227,574
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	6,957,766	3,518,305	3,016,661
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,003,578	7,628,040	10,931,945
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	1,224,052	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	6,674,449	6,690,989	6,624,079
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	146,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NEDA IV)	3,749,500	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	300,800	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	41,325,417	20,160,892	24,584,582
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	10,300,874	9,870,472	14,961,613
Innovation	----	324,227	324,227
Work-study	----	----	503,114
Cooperative education	----	374,227	374,227
Consumer and homemaking education	----	622,822	830,834
Programs for students with special needs	----	----	1,662,330
Research	----	----	1,426,227
Subtotal, Vocational Education	10,300,874	11,191,748	20,082,572
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,746,355	776,280	1,746,355
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,653,747	----	354,115
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,925	48,925	48,925
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,776	25,776	25,776
College library resources (HEA II–A)	1,001,350	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	503,663	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	333,347	333,347	333,347
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,460,494	1,633,780	1,633,780
Special projects and teacher education	500,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	----	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	7,313,166	2,857,617	4,181,807
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885
Teacher education and recruitment	1,499,900	----	----
Research and innovation	687,514	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	231,059	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	3,907,358	1,488,885	1,488,885
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	240,489	----	----
Research and development centers	1,707,213	----	----
Vocational education	397,728	32,100	32,100
Subtotal, Research and Training	2,345,430	32,100	32,100
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	360,319	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	1,311,609	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	145,785,726	94,591,445	136,667,786
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	127,478,647	94,591,445	136,667,786
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$15,015,004	$16,001,678	$18,479,336
State administrative expenses	150,191	160,017	184,793
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,286,642	----	1,282,958
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,974,139	2,766,361	3,989,229
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	630,850	664,602	664,602
Grants for special projects	----	----	----

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	$1,950,699	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	48,185	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,016	----	431,892
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	23,486,726	$19,592,658	$25,032,810
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----	----	1,941,848
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	48,281
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	1,990,129
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	4,159,363	982,000	4,974,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	157,850	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	4,317,231	982,000	4,974,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	349,257	349,257	431,457
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,077,531	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,426,788	349,257	431,457
Teacher Corps	303,628	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	286,887	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	257,471	260,870	260,870
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	360,578	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	2,044,962	1,050,631	1,050,631
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,483,714	----	844,564
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	----	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	170,805	129,751	129,751
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	3,980,453	1,981,089	1,585,291
Direct loans (NDEA II)	5,348,259	4,295,200	6,155,565
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	483,347	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	2,626,683	3,548,133	3,548,133
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	48,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,291,000	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	434,227	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	21,816,486	11,265,674	13,574,805
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	6,170,769	5,660,581	8,580,280
Innovation	----	261,231	261,231
Work-study	----	----	246,747
Cooperative education	----	285,876	285,876
Consumer and homemaking education	----	357,180	476,471
Programs for students with special needs	----	----	953,323
Research	----	----	817,921
Subtotal, Vocational Educational	6,170,769	6,564,868	11,621,849
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	861,433	412,777	861,443
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	206,881	----	206,777
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,128	44,128	44,128
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,359	25,359	25,359
College library resources (HEA II–A)	527,165	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	574,301	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,111	207,111	207,111
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	568,749	630,936	630,936
Special projects and teacher education	120,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	468,770	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	3,643,406	1,359,820	2,015,263

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$745,215	$745,215	$745,215
Teacher education and recruitment	615,356		
Research and innovation	824,671		
Media ervices and captioned films for the deaf	638		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	2,185,880	745,215	745,215
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Education laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	172,804	18,409	18,409
Subtotal, Research and Training	172,804	18,409	18,409
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	193,488	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	780,439		
Civil Rights Education	65,184		
Total, Office of Education	64,612,811	40,927,901	60,453,937
Total, Office of Education comparable basis [3]	55,637,876	40,927,901	60,453,937
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$14,591,865	$14,644,700	$16,505,967
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	165,060
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	722,942		720,857
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,292,488	1,648,450	2,281,698
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	461,077	461,077	461,077
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,119,359		
Loans to nonprofit schools			
State administration	26,323		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	235,455		234,317
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	19,599,509	16,904,227	20,368,976
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,062,143
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			26,194
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,088,337
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,653,905	310,000	3,033,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	670,028		
Subtotal, SAFA	3,323,933	310,000	3,033,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	180,053	240,053	286,236
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	535,761		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	715,814	240,053	286,236
Teacher Corps	369,241		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	795,105		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	212,383	215,572	215,572
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	244,835		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,383,909	712,803	712,803
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,136,021		515,496
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	675,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	99,713	109,775	109,775

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$3,185,784	$1,384,620	$1,073,409
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,611,023	3,001,996	4,302,240
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	286,147		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,146,018	2,567,000	2,567,000
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	40,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,240,600		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	72,475		
Subtotal, Higher Education	16,129,013	7,991,766	9,496,295
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	4,106,252	3,309,767	5,016,928
Innovation		234,892	234,892
Work-study			139,968
Cooperative education		248,936	248,936
Consumer and homemaking education		208,844	278,595
Programs for students with special needs			557,412
Research			474,006
Subtotal, Vocational Education	4,106,252	4,002,439	6,950,737
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	550,334	284,986	550,334
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	506,923		154,980
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,441	42,441	42,441
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,212	25,212	25,212
College library resources (HEA II-A)	422,878		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	40,024		
University community service programs (HEA I)	159,710	159,710	159,710
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	284,335	309,838	309,838
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities	316,617		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,387,983	861,696	1,282,024
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	432,885	432,885	432,885
Teacher education and recruitment	391,785		
Research and innovation	356,003		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,180,673	432,885	432,885
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	24,615	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	24,615	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	122,556	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	65,312		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	48,074,901	30,808,066	43,003,490
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	43,018,223	30,808,066	43,003,490
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$9,784,956	$9,864,608	$10,844,247
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	556,782		547,184
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,942,094	1,422,144	1,938,094
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	414,425	414,425	414,425
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	893,721		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	21,680		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	$291,036	----	$194,351
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	14,054,694	$11,851,177	14,088,301
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	----	----	906,782
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	21,727
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	928,509
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	8,664,572	3,302,000	9,985,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	573,750	63,000	63,000
Subtotal, SAFA	9,238,322	3,365,000	10,048,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	207,864	207,864	241,367
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	336,778	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	544,642	207,864	241,367
Teacher Corps	----	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	743,747	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	198,680	201,805	201,805
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	208,085	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,051,377	531,076	531,076
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,723,010	----	412,235
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	150,000	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	89,473	99,770	99,770
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,070,461	1,211,224	872,547
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,249,036	2,626,056	3,763,470
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	98,308	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,015,111	1,948,114	1,948,114
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	39,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,086,700	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	311,800	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	14,034,788	6,618,045	7,829,017
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,089,082	2,789,750	4,228,688
Innovation	----	228,104	228,104
Work-study	----	----	114,475
Cooperative education	----	239,415	239,415
Consumer and homemaking education	----	176,032	234,823
Program for Students with Special Needs	----	----	469,833
Research	----	----	397,175
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,089,082	3,433,301	5,912,513
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	455,789	246,149	455,789
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	201,413	----	139,238
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,929	41,929	41,929
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168
College library resources (HEA II-A)	414,277	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	146,541	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	149,218	149,218	149,218
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	260,619	282,224	282,224
Special projects and teacher education	----	----	----
Educational braoadcasting facilities	268,809	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,003,272	784,197	1,133,075

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$338,673	$338,673	$338,673
Teacher education and recruitment	780,110	----	----
Research and innovation	299,868	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,418,651	338,673	338,673
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	49,833	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	49,833	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	91,385	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	218,743	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	44,793,412	26,663,257	40,584,455
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis[3]	39,690,646	26,663,257	40,584,435
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$30,207,987	$33,739,322	$38,963,425
State administrative expenses	302,084	337,393	389,634
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	759,127	----	754,260
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,622,860	1,849,465	2,601,011
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	477,508	477,508	477,508
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	1,581,651	----	----
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	30,673	----	----
Guidance counseling and testing (NDEA V)	274,372	----	270,416
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	36,256,262	36,403,688	43,456,254
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	----	----	1,524,396
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	30,230
Subtotal Instructional Resources	----	----	1,554,626
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	8,407,184	5,604,000	9,801,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	230,278	127,000	127,000
Subtotal SAFA	8,637,462	5,731,000	9,928,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	247,063	247,063	294,866
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	452,063	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	699,126	247,063	294,866
Teacher Corps	671,384	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	864,600	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	219,025	222,244	222,244
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	233,537	----	----

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I–Section 103)	$1,338,963	$927,912	$927,912
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,034,025	----------	474,383
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	----------	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	84,070	103,380	103,380
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	2,828,376	1,110,483	870,849
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,014,967	2,407,639	3,450,451
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----------	----------	----------
Interest payments	148,217	----------	----------
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	3,124,716	3,312,872	3,312,872
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	117,000	----------	----------
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	610,600	----------	----------
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	58,000	----------	----------
Subtotal, Higher Education	15,676,096	8,084,530	9,362,091
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,459,534	4,894,998	7,419,813
Innovation	----------	242,902	242,902
Work-study	----------	----------	175,561
Cooperative education	----------	260,170	260,170
Consumer and homemaking education	----------	308,872	412,031
Programs for students with special needs	----------	----------	824,388
Research	----------	----------	707,299
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,459,534	5,706,942	10,042,164
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	596,161	303,810	596,161
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	158,205	----------	162,610
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	4,235	42,690	42,690
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,234	25,234	25,234
College library resources (HEA II–A)	309,262	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	183,946	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	168,818	159,710	159,710
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	910,457	1,019,688	1,019,688
Special projects and teacher education	477,989	----------	----------
Educational broadcasting facilities	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,873,816	1,590,641	2,045,602
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	509,972	509,972	509,972
Teacher education and recruitment	387,755	----------	----------
Research and innovation	343,102	----------	----------
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,240,829	509,972	509,972
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----------	----------	----------
Research and development centers	----------	----------	----------
Vocational education	43,070	15,919	15,919
Subtotal, Research and Training	43,070	15,919	15,919
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	----------	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	143,135	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	13,415	----------	----------
Civil Rights Education	5,912	----------	----------
Total, Office of Education	71,720,041	58,339,755	77,259,494
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	67,707,859	58,339,755	77,259,494
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$30,428,619	$32,483,644	$37,513,321
State administrative expenses	304,314	324,836	375,133
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	954,621	----------	957,137
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,074,668	2,150,754	3,079,542

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	$535,430	$535,430	$535,430
Grants for special projects	----------	----------	----------
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	1,806,533	----------	----------
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	37,949	----------	----------
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	339,449	----------	339,712
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	37,481,583	35,494,664	42,800,275
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	----------	----------	1,992,135
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	----------	----------	37,976
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----------	----------	2,030,111
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	3,447,717	770,000	3,930,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	351,676	666,000	666,000
Subtotal, SAFA	3,799,393	1,436,000	4,596,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	322,474	283,936	347,280
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	611,791	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	934,265	284,936	347,280
Teacher Corps	168,072	----------	----------
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,089,051	----------	----------
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	224,205	227,449	227,449
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	272,955	----------	----------
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	306,071	939,932	939,932
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	5,111,837	----------	564,669
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HSFA I—Section 105)	160,233	101,494	101,494
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	2,533,113	1,333,386	1,028,548
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,345,928	2,893,084	4,146,155
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----------	----------	----------
Interest payments	182,628	----------	----------
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	3,081,348	3,778,457	3,778,457
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	56,000	----------	----------
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,244,900	----------	----------
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	86,008	----------	----------
Subtotal, Higher Education	17,944,277	9,274,802	10,786,704
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,453,039	5,488,273	8,319,096
Innovation	----------	248,065	248,605
Work-study	----------	----------	198,167
Cooperative education	----------	268,167	268,167
Consumer and homemaking education	----------	346,307	461,969
Program for Students with Special Needs	----------	----------	924,305
Research	----------	----------	793,024
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,453,039	6,351,352	11,213,333
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	631,904	318,493	631,904
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	229,744	----------	168,561
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,883	42,883	42,883
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,251	25,251	25,251
College library resources (HEA II–A)	308,819	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	182,226	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,251	178,251	178,251
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,266,373	1,414,980	1,414,980
Special projects and teacher education	----------	----------	----------

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUSIIANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services—Continued			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	$2,904,960	$2,019,367	$2,501,339
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	570,824	570,824	570,824
Teacher education and recruitment	346,923		
Research and innovation	8,270		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	926,017	570,824	570,824
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	5,430	17,848	17,848
Subtotal, Research and Training	5,430	17,848	17,848
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	134,293	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	203,255		
Civil Rights Education	281,793		
Total, Office of Education	70,286,377	55,499,793	74,913,714
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	64,993,686	55,499,793	74,913,714
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$3,351,971	$3,663,453	$4,123,001
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	253,111		251,204
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	964,066	804,617	1,025,569
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	303,881	303,881	303,881
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	436,944		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NEDA V)	82,737		81,866
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	5,556,043	4,921,951	5,935,521
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			425,881
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			439,214
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-875)	2,594,464	2,213,000	3,564,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)		22,000	22,000
Subtotal, SAFA	2,594,464	2,235,000	3,586,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	149,034	149,034	164,900
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	60,991		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	210,025	149,034	164,900
Teacher Corps			
Higher Education:			
Program Assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	120,300		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	170,056	173,048	173,048
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	53,126		

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—section 103)	$548,214	$283,459	$283,459
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—section 104)	620,484		152,426
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—section 105)	85,786	65,833	65,833
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	666,632	287,069	248,553
Direct loans (NDEA II)	780,846	622,395	891,971
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	147,253		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	797,691	744,348	744,348
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search			
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	148,400		
Training programs (EPDA part E)	33,219		
Subtotal, higher education	4,172,007	2,176,152	2,559,638
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,490,962	1,387,705	2,103,477
Innovation		212,626	212,626
Work-study			50,985
Cooperative education		217,708	217,708
Consumer and homemaking education		87,564	116,808
Program for students with special needs			233,709
Research			190,029
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,490,962	1,905,603	3,125,342
Libraries and community services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	258,291	165,022	258,291
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	106,355		106,355
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,858	40,858	40,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,075	25,075	25,075
College library resources (HEA II-A)	143,115		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,158	121,158	121,158
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	192,097	204,502	204,502
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities	72,216		
Subtotal, libraries and community services	998,674	596,124	795,748
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	153,967	153,967	153,967
Teacher education and recruitment	155,543		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	309,510	153,967	153,967
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education		15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training		15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	48,182	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	15,429,867	12,202,831	16,825,330
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	14,495,704	12,202,831	16,825,330
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$14,445,834	$17,445,114	$20,146,268
State administrative expense	150,000	174,451	201,463

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Continued			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	$936,620		$947,722
Supplemental educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,887,002	$2,088,229	2,980,295
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	529,969	529,969	529,969
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,312,943		
Loans to non-profit private schools	12,890		
State administration	34,987		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	312,960		315,861
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	20,623,205	20,237,763	25,121,578
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,326,935
Loans to non-profit schools			
State administration			35,310
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,362,245
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	25,867,892	3,387,000	29,362,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	494,236	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, SAFA	26,362,128	3,410,000	29,385,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	318,527	281,448	344,847
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	622,171		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	940,698	281,448	344,847
Teacher Corps	156,293		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	706,694		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	220,505	223,731	223,731
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	213,395		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,346,890	693,653	693,653
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,241,212		565,382
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	69,208	107,349	107,349
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,670,392	1,054,785	941,773
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,346,063	2,286,880	3,277,378
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	234,680		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,547,538	2,293,450	2,293,450
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search			
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,544,300		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	80,027		
Subtotal, Higher Education	12,520,904	6,659,848	8,102,726
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,966,192	4,025,023	6,101,112
Innovation		244,939	244,939
Work-study			185,181
Cooperative education		263,026	263,026
Consumer and homemaking education		253,976	338,802
Programs for students with special needs			677,872
Research			579,683
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,966,192	4,786,964	8,390,615
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	606,374	308,005	606,374
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	393,560		164,310
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,745	42,745	42,754
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,239	25,239	25,239
College library resources (HEA II-A)	298,449		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	102,510		
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,121	178,121	178,121
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services—Continued			
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	$615,676	$682,321	$682,321
Special projects and teacher education	53,331		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,455,514	1,275,940	1,738,619
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	493,874	493,874	493,874
Teacher education and recruitment	376,451		
Research and innovation	323,800		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	102,895		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,297,020	493,874	493,874
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers	613,880		
Vocational education	128,787	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	742,667	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	118,672	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	13,131		
Civil Rights Education	225,529		
Total, Office of Education	69,471,953	37,210,837	75,004,504
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	64,111,111	37,210,837	75,004,504
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$16,794,736	$18,817,388	$21,731,022
State administrative expenses	167,965	188,174	217,301
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,296,227		1,297,768
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	4,108,964	2,867,743	4,139,035
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	626,114	626,114	626,114
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States	1,557,326		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	48,222		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,343		430,280
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	25,030,897	22,499,419	28,441,529
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,577,173
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			48,101
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,625,274
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	13,710,871	5,971,000	18,514,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	116,046	465,000	465,000
Subtotal, SAFA	13,826,917	6,436,000	18,979,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	301,000	351,113	435,283
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	2,099,039		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	2,400,039	351,113	435,283
Teacher Corps	829,390		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	268,977	272,428	272,428
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	507,779		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	$2,157,438	$1,114,870	$1,114,870
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	4,330,783	----------	1,038,447
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,800,000	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	208,175	173,339	173,339
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	5,488,242	2,629,074	2,222,744
Direct loans (NDEA II)	7,070,873	5,700,121	8,168,993
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----------	----------	----------
Interest payments	1,206,506	----------	----------
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	6,495,739	3,949,122	3,949,122
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	127,000	----------	----------
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	3,865,200	----------	----------
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	118,943	----------	----------
Subtotal, Higher Education	33,695,655	13,838,964	16,939,943
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,383,109	5,409,065	8,199,032
Innovation	----------	261,910	261,910
Work-study	----------	----------	251,557
Cooperative education	----------	286,828	286,828
Consumer and homemaking education	----------	341,308	455,301
Programs for students with special needs	----------	----------	910,964
Research	----------	----------	781,578
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,383,109	6,299,111	11,147,170
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	940,815	445,385	940,815
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	633,065	----------	219,994
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,558	44,558	44,558
State institutional library services LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,396	25,396	25,396
College library resources (HEA II–A)	919,725	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	293,465	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	216,889	216,889	216,889
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	750,102	835,242	835,242
Special projects and teacher education	278,000	----------	----------
Educational broadcasting facilities	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	4,141,524	1,606,979	2,322,403
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	750,780	750,780	750,789
Teacher education and recruitment	1,258,348	----------	----------
Research and innovation	675,184	----------	----------
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	138,741	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	2,823,053	750,780	750,780
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	959,655	----------	----------
Research and development centers	----------	----------	----------
Vocational education	437,153	17,591	17,591
Subtotal, Research and Training	1,396,808	17,591	17,591
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	179,461	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	898,381	----------	----------
Civil Rights Education	91,670	----------	----------
Total, Office of Education	90,746,904	51,849,957	80,708,973
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	74,679,878	51,849,957	80,708,973
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$32,395,258	$36,375,056	$42,007,267
State administrative expenses	324,175	363,751	420,073
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,326,201	----------	2,353,365
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	6,790,000	4,691,787	6,834,442

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	$990,466	$990,446	$990,466
Grants for special projects	----------	----------	----------
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	3,421,788	----------	----------
Loans to non-profit private schools	5,900	----------	----------
State administration	86,061	----------	----------
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	769,811	----------	772,571
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	47,109,660	42,421,060	53,378,184
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----------	----------	3,392,504
Loans to non-profit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	----------	----------	86,366
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----------	----------	3,478,870
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	4,550,314	2,852,000	5,211,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	194,618	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, SAFA	4,744,932	2,855,000	5,214,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	550,647	550,647	708,000
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	2,279,616	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	2,830,263	550,647	708,000
Teacher Corps	849,241	----------	----------
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	90,000	----------	----------
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones) [4]	332,282	336,028	336,028
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	612,301	----------	----------
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	3,315,772	1,701,935	1,701,935
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	6,385,324	----------	1,469,623
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	178,974	197,259	197,259
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	6,080,085	3,232,073	2,690,991
Direct loans (NDEA II)	8,650,342	7,007,462	10,042,578
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----------	----------	----------
Interest payments	435,727	----------	----------
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	5,006,293	5,922,710	5,922,710
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	85,000	----------	----------
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowhsips (NDEA IV)	2,323,500	----------	----------
Training programs (EPDA part E)	368,106	----------	----------
Subtotal, higher education	34,163,706	18,397,467	22,361,124
Vocational education:			
Basic grants	9,284,246	9,105,044	13,801,380
Innovation	----------	306,305	306,305
Work-study	----------	----------	427,599
Cooperative education	----------	349,093	349,093
Consumer and homemaking education	----------	574,525	766,406
Programs for students with special needs	----------	----------	1,533,420
Research	----------	----------	1,315,626
Subtotal, vocational education	9,284,246	10,334,967	18,499,829
Libraries and community services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,377,606	624,808	1,377,606
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	925,674	----------	292,719
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	46,926	46,926	46,926
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,602	25,602	25,602
College library resources (HEA II–A)	802,205	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	522,737	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	283,198	283,198	283,198
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	991,837	1,106,931	1,106,931
Special projects and teacher education	500,000	----------	----------
Educational broadcasting facilities	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, libraries and community services	5,515,294	2,126,974	3,172,491

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$1,268,699	$1,268,699	$1,268,699
Teacher education and recruitment	1,576,186		
Research and innovation	762,333		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	78,735		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	3,685,953	1,268,699	1,268,699
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	384,500		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	449,550	29,611	29,611
Subtotal, Research and Training	834,050	29,611	29,611
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	297,765	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	1,159,039		
Civil Rights Education	163,569		
Total, Office of Education	110,687,718	78,034,425	108,160,808
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	97,484,923	78,034,425	108,160,808
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$18,633,931	$19,279,742	$22,264,965
State administrative expenses	186,360	192,797	222,650
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	996,022		1,004,025
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,976,699	2,097,802	2,995,509
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	544,184	544,185	544,185
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,563,031		
Loans to non-profit private schools	11,500		
State administration	35,901		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	321,136		323,919
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	25,268,764	22,114,526	27,355,253
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,571,167
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			36,211
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,607,378
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	3,381,658	846,000	3,367,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)			
Subtotal, SAFA	3,381,658	846,000	3,367,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	331,551	292,956	359,393
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,166,053		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,497,604	292,956	359,393
Teacher Corps	443,834		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	292,135		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	227,918	231,178	231,178
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	318,722		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)	1,824,346	951,515	951,515
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	2,864,880		699,726
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,000,000		
State administration and planning HEFA I-Section 105)	180,132	122,169	122,169

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$4,093,988	$1,691,761	$1,340,828
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,516,471	3,667,909	5,256,576
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	416,615		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,074,487	3,107,129	3,107,129
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	99,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	962,200		
Training programs (EPDA part E)	31,900		
Subtotal, Higher Education	19,902,794	9,771,661	11,709,121
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	4,942,203	4,346,673	6,588,669
Innovation		245,075	245,075
Work-study			180,852
Cooperative education		263,217	263,217
Consumer and homemaking education		274,274	365,875
Programs for students with special needs			732,042
Research			627,025
Subtotal, Vocational Education	4,942,203	5,129,239	9,002,935
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	657,518	329,014	657,518
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	177,371		172,826
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,022	43,022	43,022
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,263	25,263	25,263
College library resources (HEA II-A)	469,205		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	280,541		
University community service programs (HEA I)	177,277	177,277	177,277
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	360,302	393,947	393,947
Special projects and teacher education	200,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,430,008	1,008,032	1,509,362
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	552,663	552,663	552,633
Teacher education and recruitment	702,609		
Research and innovation	634,739		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,889,981	552,633	552,633
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	800,000		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	472,021	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	1,272,021	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	141,929	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	260,387		
Civil Rights Education	78,967		
Total, Office of Education	61,560,150	39,780,047	55,528,075
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	53,695,378	39,780,047	55,528,075
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$32,395,258	$39,797,685	$45,959,848
State administrative expenses	366,015	397,977	459,598
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	589,397		578,180
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,101,942	1,502,449	2,056,766
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	437,838	437,838	437,838
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,312,466		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	24,641		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	$220,413	----	$217,880
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	37,447,970	$42,135,949	49,710,109
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,303,096
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			24,357
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,327,453
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,593,395	1,115,000	3,037,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	117,158	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	2,710,553	1,115,000	3,037,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	214,182	214,182	249,375
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	145,925	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	360,107	214,182	249,375
Teacher Corps	468,815	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,929,260	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	198,669	201,794	201,794
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	180,563	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,197,927	640,997	640,997
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,640,792	----	358,037
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	89,151	93,741	93,741
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,470,096	854,632	696,224
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,304,564	1,852,929	2,655,482
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	128,300	----	----
Interest payments			
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,159,065	3,188,960	3,188,960
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search			
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	370,800	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	200,926	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	13,870,113	6,833,053	7,835,235
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	4,298,675	3,755,696	5,692,865
Innovation		233,534	233,534
Work-study			137,563
Cooperative education		247,032	247,032
Consumer and homemaking education		236,982	316,130
Program for Students with Special Needs			632,514
Research			539,890
Subtotal, Vocational Education	4,298,675	4,473,244	7,799,528
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	455,712	246,118	455,712
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	139,226	----	139,226
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,938	41,928	41,928
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168
College library resources (HEA II-A)	298,915	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	339,973	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	150,559	150,559	150,559
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	831,474	936,895	936,895
Special projects and teacher education	320,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,642,464	1,440,177	1,788,997
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$399,693	$399,693	$399,693
Teacher education and recruitment	229,137	----	----
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	628,830	399,693	399,693
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	45,826	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	45,826	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	107,308	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	289,604	----	----
Total, Office of Education	62,920,265	56,676,298	72,212,390
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	58,018,047	56,676,298	72,212,390
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$22,898,224	$23,390,495	$27,012,216
State administrative expenses	228,982	233,905	270,122
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,670,831	----	1,170,511
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,556,732	2,481,771	3,568,682
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	596,859	596,859	596,859
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,655,991	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	41,641	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	372,479	----	372,587
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	31,021,739	26,703,030	32,990,997
Instructional equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,688,243
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			41,652
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,729,895
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	8,398,571	2,176,000	9,617,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,485,317	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	9,883,888	2,176,000	9,617,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	346,701	321,701	402,406
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	470,198	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	816,899	321,701	402,406
Teacher Corps	524,256	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions HEA III)	1,127,530	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	249,360	252,721	252,721
Under graduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	343,879	----	----

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	$1,972,556	$1,017,094	$1,017,094
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,987,407	----	728,823
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	700,000	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	143,722	134,033	134,033
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	3,586,582	1,823,047	1,414,063
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,823,178	3,952,550	5,664,502
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	130,362	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	3,295,787	3,733,029	3,733,029
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	123,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,013,200	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	383,000	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	21,879,563	10,912,474	12,944,265
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,909,451	5,453,944	8,267,062
Innovation	----	253,221	253,221
Work-study	----	----	216,445
Cooperative education	----	274,641	274,641
Consumer and homemaking education	----	344,142	459,078
Programs for students with special needs	----	----	918,523
Research	----	----	788,063
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,909,451	6,325,948	11,177,033
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	805,469	389,789	805,469
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	512,392	----	197,459
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,824	43,824	43,824
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,333	25,333	25,333
College library resources (HEA II–A)	522,912	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	61,748	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	198,738	198,738	198,738
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	742,562	824,641	824,641
Special projects and teacher education	127,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	340,000	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	3,419,487	1,521,834	2,134,973
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	641,800	641,800	641,800
Teacher education and recruitment	724,146	----	----
Research and innovation	9,600	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,375,546	641,800	641,800
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	2,683,838	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	20,573	17,737	17,737
Subtotal, Research and Training	2,704,411	17,737	17,737
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	173,605	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	239,679	----	----
Civil Rights Education	60,067	----	----
Total, Office of Education	78,058,591	48,670,524	71,706,086
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	68,601,706	48,670,524	71,706,086
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$3,460,422	$3,521,648	$3,560,421
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	185,736	----	182,895
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	888,162	686,277	850,697

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	$282,290	$282,290	$282,290
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [4]			
Grants to States	333,751	----	----
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	13,333	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	96,194	----	63,172
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	5,409,888	4,640,215	5,089,475
Instructional equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [4]			
Grants to States	----	----	333,279
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	346,612
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	4,204,578	3,960,000	5,410,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	844,364	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	5,048,942	3,960,000	5,410,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	135,982	135,982	147,252
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	270,762	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	406,744	135,982	147,252
Teacher Corps	----	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strenghtening developing institutions (HEA III)	21,300	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	163,086	166,045	166,045
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	59,639	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	234,428	189,170	189,170
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	662,620	----	129,444
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	----	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	68,765	57,831	57,831
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	729,768	321,421	260,776
Direct loans (NDEA II)	877,702	696,872	998,706
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	71,730	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	2,529,733	597,086	597,086
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	50,394	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	229,200	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	24,000	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	5,722,365	2,028,425	2,399,058
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,116,404	917,393	1,472,432
Innovation	----	209,368	209,368
Work-study	----	----	37,998
Cooperative education	----	213,138	213,138
Consumer and homemaking education	----	61,295	81,765
Program for Students with Special Needs	----	----	163,597
Research	----	----	128,520
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,116,404	1,455,194	2,306,818
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	210,196	145,266	210,196
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	88,347	----	98,347
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,597	40,597	40,597
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,052	25,052	25,052
College library resources (HEA II–A)	108,233	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	33,737	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,187	115,187	115,187

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HELATH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services—Con.			
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	$156,723	$164,109	$164,109
Special projects and teacher education	138,000	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	----	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	955,581	529,720	692,997
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	112,296	112,296	112,296
Teacher education and recruitment	143,729	----	----
Research and innovation	7,710	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	24,365	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	288,100	112,296	112,296
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	32,571	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	32,571	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	38,665	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	12,951	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	19,082,211	12,926,832	16,569,508
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	17,886,461	12,926,832	16,569,508
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$5,668,814	$7,066,340	$8,092,079
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	374,367	----	368,323
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,353,663	1,024,798	1,350,932
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	340,817	340,817	340,817
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	576,770	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	13,673	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	183,554	----	122,154
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	8,661,658	8,581,955	10,424,305
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----	----	564,126
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	13,656
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	577,782
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	4,624,472	2,286,000	5,262,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	457,928	----	----
Subtotal, SAFA	5,082,400	2,286,000	5,262,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	172,525	172,525	195,158
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	848,726	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,021,251	172,525	195,158
Teacher Corps	541,734	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	280,000	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	180,520	183,560	183,560
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	125,481	----	----
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	$726,890	$359,064	$359,064
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,136,397	----	273,714
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	75,908	74,549	74,549
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,362,622	686,791	575,136
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,786,869	1,489,033	2,133,972
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	64,019	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,232,909	1,309,717	1,309,717
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	60,000	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	398,900	----	----
Training programs (EDPA part E)	113,000	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	7,843,515	4,102,714	4,909,712
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	2,135,034	1,742,754	2,641,568
Innovation	----	217,650	217,650
Work-study	----	----	71,186
Cooperative education	----	224,754	224,754
Consumer and homemaking education	----	109,967	146,694
Program for students with special needs	----	----	293,505
Research	----	----	242,485
Subtotal, Vocational Education	2,135,304	2,295,125	3,837,932
Library and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	330,484	194,677	330,484
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	356,938	----	118,375
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,249	41,249	41,249
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,109	25,109	25,109
College library resources (HEA II-A)	204,610	----	----
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	----	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	131,132	131,132	131,132
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	207,912	221,891	221,891
Special projects and teacher education	----	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	----	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,263,943	653,567	907,749
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	217,458	217,458	217,458
Teacher education and recruitment	176,671	----	----
Research and innovation	13,048	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	261,337	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	668,514	217,458	217,458
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	82,022	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	82,022	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	64,271	(2)	(2)
Education of Foreign Languages and World Affairs	34,980	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	27,422,592	18,374,344	26,397,096
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	24,000,086	18,374,344	26,397,096
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$886,124	$893,858	$1,024,544
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	$113,689	----	$117,828
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	646,767	$551,066	650,895
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	257,521	259,550	259,550
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	113,732	----	
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333	----	
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	----	50,000
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	2,231,166	1,854,474	2,252,817
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			134,580
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			147,913
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	3,554,294	1,426,000	4,097,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	221,351	14,000	14,000
Subtotal, SAFA	3,775,645	1,440,000	4,111,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA-B-2)	3,661	122,025	130,441
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	46,706	----	
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	50,367	122,025	130,441
Teacher Corps			
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	153,867	156,784	156,784
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	14,561	----	
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)		61,219	61,219
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	334,962	----	60,539
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I-Section 105)	43,460	38,960	38,960
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	14,788	83,274	93,823
Direct loans (NDEA II)	22,484	180,546	258,746
Insured loans			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	31,014	----	
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	343,532	193,116	193,116
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	44,000	----	
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	91,600	----	
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	26,200	----	
Subtotal, Higher Education	1,447,468	713,899	863,187
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	566,052	390,324	591,652
Innovation		204,616	204,616
Work-study			19,240
Cooperative education		206,474	206,474
Consumer and homemaking education		24,630	32,855
Programs for Students with Special Needs			65,736
Research			42,669
Subtotal, Vocational Education	566,052	826,044	1,163,242
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	$146,589	$119,137	$146,589
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	62,523	----	87,757
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,253	40,253	40,253
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	20,753	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	5,299	25,022	25,022
College library resources (HEA II-A)	57,175	----	
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	109,324	109,324	109,324
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	121,076	123,829	123,829
Special projects and teacher education	160,000	----	
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	722,992	457,074	572,283
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	90,967	----	
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	190,967	100,000	100,000
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	140,627	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	140,627	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	([2])	([2])
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	62,931	----	
Total, Office of Education	9,268,215	5,578,516	9,405,883
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	8,643,061	5,578,516	9,405,883
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$1,431,723	$1,610,227	$1,728,148
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials services (ESEA II)	168,878	----	171,826
Supplementary educational centers and (ESEA III)	815,216	665,545	820,062
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	269,677	269,677	269,677
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	257,968	----	
Loans to non-profit private schools	2,970	----	
State administration	13,333	----	
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	55,921	----	56,404
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	3,165,686	2,695,449	3,196,117
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			259,521
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			272,854
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,065,756	904,000	2,454,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	−9,245	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, SAFA	2,056,511	910,000	2,460,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	$147,716	$132,716	$144,392
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	281,745	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	429,461	132,716	144,392
Teacher Corps	----	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	215,000	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	161,480	164,432	164,432
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	61,584	----	----
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I–Section 103)	----	168,618	168,618
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I–Section 104)	835,235	----	124,761
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	----	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I–Section 105)	44,491	61,000	61,000
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	656,280	297,415	259,748
Direct loans (NDEA II)	804,338	644,825	924,115
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	35,014	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	766,819	484,432	484,432
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	----	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	326,300	----	----
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	40,000	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	3,946,541	1,820,722	2,187,106
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	941,303	834,902	1,265,540
Innovation	----	208,146	208,146
Work-study	----	----	32,707
Cooperative education	----	211,425	211,425
Consumer and homemaking education	----	52,683	70,278
Programs for Students with Special Needs	----	----	140,610
Research	----	----	108,354
Subtotal, Vocational Education	941,303	1,307,156	2,037,060
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	199,116	140,714	199,116
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	152,108	----	96,503
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,537	40,537	40,437
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,047	25,047	25,047
College library resources (HEA II–A)	117,971	----	----
Library training (HEA II–B)	----	----	----
University community service programs (HEA I)	114,625	114,625	114,625
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	153,033	160,283	160,283
Special projects and teacher education	----	----	----
Educational broadcasting facilities	----	----	----
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	841,946	520,715	675,620
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	73,850	----	----
Research and innovation	----	----	----
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----	----	----
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	173,850	100,000	100,000
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----	----	----
Research and development centers	----	----	----
Vocational education	26,550	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	26,550	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	34,050	(2)	(2)
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	$50,731	----	----
Civil Rights Education	----	----	----
Total, Office of Education	11,716,629	$7,551,758	$11,138,149
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [2]	10,514,434	7,551,758	11,138,149
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$24,487,811	$27,524,859	$31,786,733
State administrative expenses	245,001	275,249	317,867
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,652,599	----	1,655,018
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	5,233,177	3,626,822	5,260,743
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	738,898	738,898	738,898
Grants for special projects	----	----	----
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,796,586	----	----
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	2,432	----	----
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	552,014	----	553,724
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	34,708,518	32,165,828	40,312,983
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----	----	1,886,094
Loans to non-profit private schools	----	----	----
State administration	----	----	61,901
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----	----	1,947,995
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	10,321,861	4,251,000	13,729,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	774,195	27,000	27,000
Subtotal, SAFA	11,096,056	4,278,000	13,756,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	420,452	420,152	257,580
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	705,047	----	----
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,215,499	420,152	527,580
Teacher Corps	264,859	----	----
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000	----	----
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	290,710	294,262	294,262
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	255,201	----	----
Construction:			
Pubic community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA–I—Section 103)	2,260,985	1,162,358	1,162,358
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,452,283	----	854,566
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,600,000	----	----
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	175,863	129,991	129,991
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	2,636,170	1,261,348	1,065,148
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,281,169	2,734,731	3,919,215
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----	----	----
Interest payments	2,023,322	----	----
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	2,751,188	3,272,107	3,272,107
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	139,875	----	----
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,756,800	----	----
Training programs (EPDA part E)	118,600	----	----
Subtotal, Higher Education	20,792,166	8,854,797	10,697,647

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	$6,246,915	$6,497,533	$9,848,926
Innovation		278,202	278,202
Work-study			320,820
Cooperative education		309,677	309,677
Consumer and homemaking education		409,991	546,921
Programs for students with special needs			1,094,278
Research			938,855
Subtotal, Vocational Education	6,246,915	7,495,403	13,337,679
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,090,767	506,982	1,090,767
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	545,193		244,961
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	45,371	45,371	45,371
State institutional library services (LSCA (IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,467	25,467	25,467
College library resources (HEA II-A)	487,854		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	248,366		
University community service programs (HEA I)	249,254	249,254	249,254
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,057,036	1,177,851	1,177,851
Special projects and teacher education	417,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	4,205,817	2,044,434	2,873,180
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	866,823	866,823	866,823
Teacher education and recruitment	503,629		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	9,336		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,379,788	866,823	866,823
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	338,844	21,131	21,131
Subtotal, Research and Training	338,844	21,131	21,131
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	201,903	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	423,131		
Civil Rights Education	92,322		
Total, Office of Education	80,925,818	56,196,568	84,391,018
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	71,830,476	56,196,568	84,391,018
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$9,794,395	$9,875,844	$9,875,844
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	288,109		283,617
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,112,240	860,486	1,108,128
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	319,982	319,982	319,982
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	525,835		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396		100,238
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	12,304,290	11,206,312	11,837,809
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			596,353
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			609,686

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	$10,219,522	$6,147,000	$11,209,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	229,219		
Subtotal, SAFA	10,448,741	6,147,000	11,209,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	142,814	155,814	173,273
Training programs (EPDA parts C and D)	183,920		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	326,734	155,814	173,273
Teacher Corps	456,756		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	159,660		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	169,625	172,614	172,614
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	73,684		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)		307,654	307,654
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,361,848		184,264
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	80,506	62,013	62,013
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	954,594	381,399	332,197
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,040,703	826,911	1,185,068
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	59,250		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,288,791	972,393	972,393
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	113,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	509,300		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	59,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	6,169,961	2,722,984	3,216,203
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,547,049	1,524,933	2,311,486
Innovation		214,256	214,256
Work-study			57,719
Cooperative education		219,993	219,993
Consumer and homemaking education		6,,223	128,358
Programs for Students with Special Needs			256,821
Research			210,303
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,547,049	2,055,405	3,398,936
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	255,312	163,798	255,312
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	132,985		105,859
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,842	40,842	40,842
State institutional library services LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,073	25,073	25,073
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,710		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	8,380		
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,677	121,677	121,677
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	289,178	314,106	314,106
Special projects and teacher education	933,162		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,042,828	705,005	902,378
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	175,883	175,883	175,883
Teacher education and recruitment	291,082		
Research and innovation	132,876		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	352,753		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	952,594	175,883	175,883
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	862,244		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	50,000	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	912,244	15,000	15,000

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	43,107	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Language and World Affairs	99,838		
Civil Rights Education	367,646		
Total, Office of Education	35,721,788	23,233,403	31,588,168
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	30,637,560	23,233,403	31,588,168
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$120,389,680	$150,579,865	$173,895,222
State administrative expenses	1,204,063	1,505,799	1,738,952
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,090,893		4,076,563
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	13,221,927	8,869,461	13,007,779
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,474,535	1,474,815	1,474,815
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	4,198,623		
Loans to non-profit private schools	151,200		
State administration	156,767		
Guidance counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,402,273		1,376,253
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	146,289,961	162,469,940	195,569,584
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			4,211,231
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			153,851
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			4,365,082
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	16,738,842	6,027,000	20,504,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	98,325	1,688,000	1,688,000
Subtotal, SAFA	16,837,167	7,715,000	22,192,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	892,515	892,515	1,153,195
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	4,332,101		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	5,224,616	892,515	1,153,195
Teacher Corps	1,174,556		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA-III)	135,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	544,335	549,067	549,067
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	1,170,283		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)	5,110,882	2,623,120	2,623,120
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	9,896,878		2,780,466
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I Section 105)	497,178	347,369	347,369
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	12,047,255	5,624,578	5,023,882
Direct loans (NDEA II)	14,717,179	12,194,653	17,476,477
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	9,779,625		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	9,537,189	10,320,156	10,320,156
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	312,236		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	7,677,000		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	331,950		
Subtotal, Higher Education	74,456,990	31,658,943	39,120,537
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	$16,447,902	$16,331,918	$24,755,838
Innovation		401,206	401,206
Work-study			819,125
Cooperative education		482,191	482,191
Consumer and homemaking education		1,030,532	1,374,719
Programs for students with special needs			2,750,531
Research			2,359,869
Subtotal, Vocational Education	16,447,902	18,245,847	32,943,479
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	2,840,719	1,225,816	2,840,719
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	2,521,607		536,326
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	54,858	54,858	54,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,292	26,292	26,292
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,018,364		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	656,562		
University community service programs (HEA I)	493,850	493,850	493,850
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	2,946,251	3,299,893	3,299,893
Special projects and teacher education	536,318		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	12,134,330	5,140,218	7,291,447
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,331,331
Teacher education and recruitment	2,533,652		
Research and innovation	1,604,051		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	934,881		
Subtotal Education for the Handicapped	7,403,875	2,331,335	2,331,331
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	3,644,494		
Research and development centers	495,973		
Vocational education	872,939	53,113	53,113
Subtotal Research and Training	5,013,406	53,513	53,113
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	575,316	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	2,357,698		
Civil Rights Education	213,880		
Total Office of Education	288,179,697	228,516,907	305,069,768
Total Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	245,706,513	228,516,097	305,069,768
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$49,388,344	$53,422,821	$61,694,660
State administrative expenses	493,970	534,228	616,947
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,186,993		1,168,551
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	4,019,265	2,787,844	4,020,973
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,110,464	669,081	669,081
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	2,543,076		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	48,734		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,402,472		435,115
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	60,193,119	57,413,974	68,605,327
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			2,469,235
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			48,642
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			2,517,877

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-784)	$11,886,349	$6,864,000	$12,621,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	1,391,665	60,000	60,000
Subtotal, SAFA	13,278,014	6,924,000	12,681,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	337,952	329,952	401,899
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	809,378		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,147,330	329,952	401,899
Teacher Corps	665,659		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,854,457		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	254,954	258,341	258,341
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	364,447		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	2,664,358	1,368,374	1,368,374
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,212,504		765,470
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	400,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	217,104	139,376	139,376
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,329,263	1,691,105	1,437,343
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,519,639	3,666,487	5,254,540
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	164,526		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	4,815,571	5,388,943	5,388,943
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	50,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,064,200		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	227,006		
Subtotal, Higher Education	26,138,029	12,512,626	14,612,387
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	8,749,892	7,956,680	12,060,695
Innovation		268,562	268,562
Work-study			283,302
Cooperative education		296,158	296,158
Consumer and homemaking education		502,062	669,743
Programs for students with special needs			1,340,020
Research			1,149,694
Subtotal, Vocational Education	8,749,892	9,023,462	16,068,174
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	844,066	405,643	844,066
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	388,584		203,886
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,033	44,033	44,033
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,351	25,351	25,351
College library resources (HEA II-A)	678,984		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	301,099		
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,608	207,608	207,608
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,495,891	1,677,851	1,677,851
Special projects and teacher education	415,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	4,440,125	2,399,995	3,042,304
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	805,195	805,195	805,195
Teacher education and recruitment	456,656		
Research and innovation	135,136		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	795		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,397,782	805,195	805,195
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	820,000		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	457,975	25,876	25,876
Subtotal, Research and Training	1,277,975	25,876	25,876
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	221,793	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	$127,573		
Civil Rights Education	731,116		
Total, Office of Education	118,418,407	$89,485,080	$118,810,039
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	110,006,832	89,485,080	118,810,039
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$4,033,993	$4,453,821	$5,044,875
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA I)	162,589		160,353
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA II)	815,806	653,528	802,305
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	273,216	273,216	273,216
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	329,954		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	88,341		57,048
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	5,867,232	5,530,565	6,487,797
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA II-):[1]			
Grants to States			318,932
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			1,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			332,265
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	2,664,431	2,664,000	2,863,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)		1,000	1,000
Subtotal SAFA	2,664,431	2,665,000	2,864,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	131,498	131,498	141,428
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)			
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	131,498	131,498	141,428
Teacher Corps	29,604		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	405,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	162,084	165,039	165,039
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	71,130		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	77,204	200,784	200,784
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	919,319		129,049
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	253,165		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	72,802	58,948	58,948
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	893,715	350,872	283,305
Direct loans (NDEA II)	946,751	760,727	1,090,218
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	175,900		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	753,069	700,121	700,121
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	48,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	269,200		
Training programs EPDA Part E)			
Subtotal, Higher Education	5,047,339	2,236,491	2,627,464
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,270,281	975,062	1,477,994
Innovation		208,689	208,689
Work-study			35,593

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Cooperative education		$212,186	$212,186
Consumer and homemaking education		61,526	82,074
Programs for Students with Special Needs			164,214
Research			129,062
Subtotal, Vocational Education	$1,270,281	1,457,463	2,309,812
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	203,285	142,427	203,285
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	256,991		97,197
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,049	25,049	25,049
College library resources (HEA II-A)	133,911		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	113,911	113,911	113,911
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	168,753	177,469	177,469
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	981,969	538,925	696,980
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	109,151	109,151	109,151
Teacher education and recruitment	177,879		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	287,030	109,151	109,151
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	45,834	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	45,834	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	42,740	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	16,417,958	12,734,093	15,633,897
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	14,854,169	12,734,093	15,633,897
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$33,370,827	$37,655,907	$43,486,444
State administrative expenses	333,804	376,559	434,864
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,661,889		2,628,457
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	8,124,232	5,570,394	8,132,773
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	669,081	1,110,464	1,110,464
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	4,089,849		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	101,489		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	905,668		907,940
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	50,256,839	44,713,324	56,700,942
Instructional equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			4,086,302
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			101,499
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			4,187,801
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	10,796,237	1,182,000	12,384,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	601,890		
Subtotal, SAFA	11,398,127	1,182,000	12,384,000
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool elementary and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	$615,679	$615,679	$779,071
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,529,997		
Subtotal Education Professions Development	2,145,676	615,679	779,071
Teacher Corps	729,250		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	928,455		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	376,856	380,809	380,809
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	681,179		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	5,062,019	2,208,535	2,208,535
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	7,474,954		1,642,921
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,200,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	130,405	216,768	216,768
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,825,477	3,464,719	2,875,956
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,263,289	7,511,862	10,765,447
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	353,134		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	4,369,310	6,842,259	6,842,259
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	139,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,734,500		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	80,200		
Subtotal, Higher Education	39,618,778	20,624,952	24,932,695
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	12,007,320	11,817,532	17,912,956
Innovation		328,571	328,571
Work-study			516,101
Cooperative education		380,320	380,320
Consumer and homemaking education		368,691	994,727
Programs for students with special needs			1,990,243
Research			1,707,566
Subtotal, Vocational Education	12,007,320	12,895,114	23,830,484
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,685,152	751,140	1,685,152
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,080,285		343,925
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,593	48,593	48,593
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,747	25,747	25,747
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,016,270		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	302,349		
University community service programs (HEA I)	324,216	324,216	324,216
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,208,203	1,351,381	1,351,381
Special projects and teacher education	100,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities	131,687		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	5,962,011	2,540,586	3,818,523
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,519,923
Teacher education and recruitment	902,441		
Research and innovation	110,492		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	2,532,856	1,519,923	1,519,923
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	2,239,722	38,432	38,432
Subtotal, Research and Training	2,239,722	38,432	38,432
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	369,365	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	228,989		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Civil Rights Education	$156,630		
Total, Office of Education	127,695,563	$84,180,010	$128,241,871
Total, Office of Education comparable basis [3]	118,618,064	84,180,010	128,241,871
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$16,791,317	$18,162,341	$20,974,549
State administrative expenses	167,913	181,623	209,746
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	596,823		596,784
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,108,726	1,496,021	2,047,264
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	441,825	441,825	441,825
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,034,408		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	22,411		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	200,465		201,120
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	21,363,888	20,281,810	24,471,288
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,019,010
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			22,483
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,041,493
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	12,601,770	3,695,000	13,952,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	194,246	11,000	11,000
Subtotal, SAFA	12,796,016	3,706,000	13,963,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,917	215,621	254,181
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	552,463		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	693,380	215,621	254,181
Teacher Corps	134,527		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	906,400		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	202,223	205,364	205,364
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	243,359		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,278,671	652,830	652,830
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,937,759		453,759
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	163,842	97,138	97,138
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,349,126	1,218,254	949,548
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,259,838	2,641,299	3,785,314
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	81,295		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,264,220	2,396,494	2,396,494
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	91,808		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	732,200		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	45,263		
Subtotal, Higher Education	13,556,004	7,211,379	8,540,447
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,699,294	3,531,214	5,352,598
Innovation		230,683	230,683
Work-study		0	126,019
Cooperative education		243,033	243,033
Consumer and homemaking education		222,817	297,236
Programs for students with special needs			594,706
Research			506,724
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,699,294	4,227,747	7,350,999

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	$480,232	$256,190	$480,232
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	485,060		143,308
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,061	42,061	42,061
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,179	25,179	25,179
College library resources (HEA II-A)	395,613		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	181,146		
University community service programs (HEA I)	153,588	153,588	153,588
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	482,882	531,447	531,447
Special projects and teacher education	145,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,430,270	1,047,974	1,415,324
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	366,917	366,917	366,917
Teacher education and recruitment	380,135		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	100,000		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	847,052	366,917	366,917
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	253,116	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	253,116	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	96,258	([2])	([2])
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	55,919,805	37,122,448	57,468,649
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	52,836,996	37,122,448	57,468,649
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$8,093,651	$8,243,687	$8,983,814
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	485,416		501,940
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,723,019	1,267,496	1,709,568
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	392,527	392,527	392,527
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	745,867		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	18,609		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	166,454		164,054
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	11,775,543	10,053,710	11,901,903
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			739,672
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			18,340
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			758,012
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	3,282,405	791,000	3,076,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)			
Subtotal, SAFA	3,282,405	791,000	3,076,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	203,938	636,109	229,678
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,309,266		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,513,204	636,109	229,678
Teacher Corps	386,867		

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	$106,950		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	188,978	$192,058	$192,058
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	198,461		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	978,887	502,615	502,615
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,651,456		403,333
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	86,876	89,263	89,263
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,901,186	941,640	834,098
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,539,560	2,041,571	2,925,829
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	348,206		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,422,079	1,536,246	1,536,247
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	68,620		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,225,500		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	96,422		
Subtotal, Higher Education	13,313,181	5,303,393	6,483,442
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	2,503,962	2,410,600	3,653,978
Innovation		224,845	224,845
Work-study			100,527
Cooperative education		234,845	234,845
Consumer and homemaking education		152,108	202,909
Programs for students with special needs			405,980
Research			341,157
Subtotal, Vocational Education	2,503,962	3,022,398	5,164,241
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	375,683	218,650	388,844
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	387,922		128,092
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,566	41,566	41,566
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,136	25,136	25,136
College library resources (HEA II-A)	323,389		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	228,958		
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,684	142,684	142,684
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	225,639	241,935	241,935
Special projects and teacher education	43,472		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,833,958	709,480	1,007,766
Education for for the handicapped;			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	279,058	279,058	279,058
Teacher education and recruitment	994,455		
Research and innovation	613,213		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,886,726	279,058	279,058
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	1,763,473		
Research and development centers	518,759		
Vocational education	253,116	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	2,535,348	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	73,613	(2)	
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	120,593		(2)
Civil Rights Education	207,597		
Total, Office of Education	39,482,997	20,860,148	28,965,100
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	30,535,746	20,860,148	28,965,100

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$46,085,501	$48,837,387	$56,399,232
State administrative expenses	460,885	488,374	563,992
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,767,349		2,751,699
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	8,692,138	5,928,233	8,661,553
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,071,500	1,071,500	1,071,500
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	3,992,360		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	104,487		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	934,630		927,923
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	64,108,850	56,325,494	70,375,899
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			3,923,184
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			103,732
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			4,026,916
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	9,290,582	856,000	10,184,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)			
Subtotal, SAFA	9,290,582	856,000	10,184,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	719,912	194,038	810,912
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	2,324,878		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	3,044,790	194,038	810,912
Teacher Corps	1,208,432		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	636,445		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	415,033	419,164	419,164
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	738,408		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	5,381,842	2,754,310	2,754,310
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	7,313,779		1,787,686
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,648,829		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	443,361	256,687	256,687
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,920,537	3,586,899	3,022,911
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,314,508	7,776,759	11,145,077
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	1,819,562		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	5,302,145	7,898,003	7,898,003
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	90,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	3,604,700		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	96,300		
Subtotal, Higher Education	43,725,449	22,691,822	27,283,838
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	13,607,721	13,347,672	20,232,333
Innovation		337,124	337,124
Work-study			552,175
Cooperative education		392,317	392,317
Consumer and homemaking education		842,231	1,123,522
Programs for students with special needs			2,247,941
Research			1,928,662
Subtotal, Vocational Education	13,607,721	14,919,344	26,814,074

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	$1,948,566	$859,344	$1,948,566
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,274,143	----------	387,784
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	50,021	50,021	50,021
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,872	25,872	25,872
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,322,250	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	245,608	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	350,978	350,978	350,978
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,758,365	1,967,553	1,967,553
Special projects and teacher education	445,000	----------	----------
Educational broadcasting facilities	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	7,460,312	3,293,277	4,770,283
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,672,090
Teacher education and recruitment	1,387,240	----------	----------
Research and innovation	520,065	----------	----------
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	72,690	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	3,652,085	1,672,090	1,672,090
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	2,700,000	----------	----------
Research and development centers	1,454,332	----------	----------
Vocational education	753,769	43,408	43,408
Subtotal, Research and Training	4,908,101	43,408	43,408
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	437,176	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	927,017	----------	----------
Civil Rights Education	30,538	----------	----------
Total, Office of Education	152,451,053	100,045,473	146,031,420
Total, Office of Education Comparable basis [3]	131,815,204	100,045,473	146,031,420
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$3,427,736	$3,798,750	$4,280,811
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	210,946	----------	211,557
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	950,666	751,529	947,120
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	280,536	280,536	280,536
Grants for special projects	----------	----------	----------
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	281,708	----------	----------
Loans to non-profit private schools	43,800	----------	----------
State administration	13,333	----------	----------
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	69,988	----------	69,618
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	5,428,713	4,980,815	5,939,642
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	----------	----------	273,607
Loans to non-profit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	----------	----------	13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----------	----------	286,940
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	3,453,728	1,585,000	4,052,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	125,400	----------	----------
Subtotal, SAFA	3,579,128	1,585,000	4,052,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,866	140,866	154,656
Training program (EPDA Parts C and D)	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	140,866	140,866	154,656
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Teacher Corps	----------	----------	----------
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	$37,000	----------	----------
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	167,458	$170,438	$170,438
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	75,611	----------	----------
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	366,701	189,606	189,606
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	643,900	----------	158,643
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	64,566	61,106	61,106
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	820,489	404,658	317,502
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,074,064	877,340	1,257,338
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	----------	----------	----------
Interest payments	351,741	----------	----------
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	548,835	669,589	669,589
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	42,000	----------	----------
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	898,700	----------	----------
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)	32,589	----------	----------
Subtotal, higher education	5,723,654	2,372,737	2,824,222
Vocational education:			
Basic grants	1,087,186	1,031,291	1,563,225
Innovation	----------	210,590	210,590
Work-study	----------	----------	43,770
Cooperative education	----------	214,852	214,852
Consumer and homemaking education	----------	65,074	86,807
Programs for students with special needs	----------	----------	173,685
Research	----------	----------	137,369
Subtotal, vocational education	1,087,186	1,521,807	2,430,298
Libraries and community services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	240,363	157,658	240,363
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	122,211	----------	103,370
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,761	40,761	40,761
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,066	25,066	25,066
College library resources (HEA II-A)	130,256	----------	----------
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	----------	----------	----------
University community service programs (HEA I)	119,427	119,427	119,427
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	228,181	244,389	244,389
Special projects and teacher education	----------	----------	----------
Educational broadcasting facilities	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, libraries and community services	945,774	626,810	812,885
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	127,696	127,696	127,696
Teacher education and recruitment	160,366	----------	----------
Research and innovation	----------	----------	----------
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	288,062	127,696	127,696
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	----------	----------	----------
Research and development centers	----------	----------	----------
Vocational education	124,574	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	124,574	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	37,901	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	46,837	----------	----------
Civil Rights Education	75,073	----------	----------
Total, Office of Education	17,527,768	11,420,731	16,693,339
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	15,077,595	11,420,731	16,693,339
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$29,997,874	$32,519,726	$37,554,991
State administrative expenses	300,015	325,197	375,550

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Continued			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	$647,442		$637,976
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,876,411	$1,634,142	2,258,962
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	462,194	462,194	462,194
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	1,435,659		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	26,798		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	239,707		240,441
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	35,986,100	34,941,259	41,530,114
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States			1,438,032
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			26,879
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,464,911
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	8,148,582	3,589,000	9,872,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	1,090,261	559,000	559,000
Subtotal, SAFA	9,238,843	4,148,000	10,431,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	225,427	225,427	264,823
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	204,116		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	429,543	225,427	264,823
Teacher Corps	389,168		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,322,163		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	203,508	206,656	206,656
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	145,939		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,352,252	758,609	758,609
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	1,552,012		346,685
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	89,260	88,808	88,808
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,318,847	676,045	556,431
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,755,247	1,465,734	2,100,582
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	58,412		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,318,936	2,923,329	2,923,329
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	29,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	484,600		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	51,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	9,681,176	6,119,181	6,981,100
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	4,590,788	4,356,478	6,603,527
Innovation		238,015	238,015
Work-study			158,245
Cooperative education		253,315	253,315
Consumer and homemaking education		274,891	366,701
Programs for students with special needs			733,693
Research			628,654
Subtotal, Vocational Education	4,590,788	5,122,699	8,982,150
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	489,102	259,833	489,102
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	191,554		144,785
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,109	42,109	42,109
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,183	25,183	25,183
College library resources (HEA II-A)	330,491		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	68,841		
University community service programs (HEA-I)	156,011	156,011	156,011
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	938,021	1,056,859	1,056,859
Special projects and teacher education	120,000		
Footnotes at end of table.			

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services—Con.			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	$2,400,821	$1,579,504	$1,953,558
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	448,822	448,822	448,822
Teacher education and recruitment	183,963		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	632,785	448,822	448,822
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	41,942	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	41,942	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	114,757	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	363,946		
Total, Office of Education	63,919,869	52,649,892	72,121,478
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	61,490,393	52,649,892	72,121,478
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$5,384,852	$5,932,095	$6,769,112
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	181,001		177,119
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	209,789	670,038	826,702
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	280,643	280,643	280,643
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	351,316		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	92,268		59,949
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	6,663,202	7,032,776	8,263,525
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States			331,117
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			344,450
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	3,425,076	2,697,000	4,239,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	192,626	24,000	24,000
Subtotal, SAFA	3,617,702	2,721,000	4,263,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,859	135,065	145,759
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	184,482		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	337,341	135,065	145,759
Teacher Corps	33,037		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	109,300		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	163,222	166,182	166,182
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	70,545		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)		219,374	219,374
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	978,247		133,587
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Construction—Con.			
State administration and planning (HEFA I–Section 105)	$81,037	$61,447	$61,447
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	931,287	342,968	279,677
Direct loans (NDEA II)	929,478	743,588	1,065,656
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	68,059		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	835,548	764,132	764,132
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	42,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	202,400		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	20,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	4,431,123	2,297,691	2,690,055
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,271,620	978,137	1,482,655
Innovation		208,961	208,961
Work-study			36,074
Cooperative education		212,567	212,567
Consumer and homemaking education		61,720	82,334
Programs for students with special needs			164,734
Research			129,516
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,271,620	1,461,385	2,316,841
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	211,135	145,651	211,135
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	264,000		98,504
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,602	40,602	40,602
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,052	25,052	25,052
College library resources (HEA II–A)	122,741		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	36,290		
University community service programs (HEA I)	114,690	114,690	114,690
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	157,733	165,279	165,279
Education projects and teacher education	50,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,061,752	530,783	694,771
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,577	113,577	113,577
Teacher education and recruitment	156,012		
Research and innovation	7,853		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	277,442	113,577	113,577
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	105,000	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	105,000	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	42,950	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	6,477		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	17,897,636	14,357,277	18,896,978
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	16,788,440	14,357,277	18,896,978
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$32,040,454	$34,783,877	$40,169,717
State administrative expenses	320,413	347,839	401,697
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	887,491		880,651
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,110,281	2,179,882	3,122,578
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	548,312	548,312	548,312
Grants for special projects			

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	$1,880,219		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	36,486		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	326,367		$326,497
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	39,150,023	$37,859,910	45,449,452
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,829,702
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			36,499
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,866,201
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	6,763,256	856,000	10,184,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	53,590		
Subtotal, SAFA	6,816,846	856,000	10,184,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	271,931	271,931	327,519
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D	808,592		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,080,523	271,931	327,519
Teacher Corps	892,463		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,690,064		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	231,544	234,822	234,822
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	293,417		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,972,230	991,560	991,560
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,385,730		580,969
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	139,223	116,041	116,041
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	3,802,933	1,459,224	1,127,246
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,915,617	3,163,746	4,534,047
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	203,720		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	3,740,853	3,977,080	3,977,080
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	95,774		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,434,700		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	350,087		
Subtotal, Higher Education	20,455,892	9,942,473	11,561,765
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	6,385,518	5,843,004	8,856,765
Innovation		250,098	250,098
Work-study			240,420
Cooperative education		270,262	270,262
Consumer and homemaking education		745,678	491,828
Programs for students with special needs			984,045
Research			628,654
Subtotal, Vocational Education	6,385,518	7,109,042	11,686,102
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	682,542	339,293	682,542
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	225,972		176,992
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,158	43,158	43,158
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,275	25,275	25,275
College library resources (HEA II–A)	408,431		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	280,418		
University community service programs (HEA I)	183,638	183,638	183,638
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,111,779	1,243,389	1,243,389
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	3,000,722	1,874,262	2,394,503

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$592,555	$592,555	$592,555
Teacher education and recruitment	755,063		
Research and innovation	294,094		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	83,259		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,724,961	592,555	592,555
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education		19,002	19,002
Subtotal, Research and Training		19,002	19,002
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	159,386	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	103,774		
Civil Rights Education	376,697		
Total, Office of Education	80,196,878	58,575,175	84,131,099
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	73,616,389	58,575,175	84,131,099
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$73,314,190	$74,534,785	$80,269,393
State administrative expenses	734,549	745,348	802,694
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,723,308		2,739,956
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	8,478,686	5,817,974	8,498,616
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	1,214,477	1,214,477	1,214,477
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	4,554,006		
Loans to non-profit private schools	4,800		
State administration	106,791		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	955,233		959,509
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	92,086,040	82,312,584	94,484,645
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			5,081,022
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			107,263
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			5,188,285
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	30,311,176	7,709,000	34,386,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	4,876,004	309,000	309,000
Subtotal, SAFA	35,187,180	8,018,000	34,695,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	627,577	627,577	807,877
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,632,485		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	2,260,062	627,577	807,877
Teacher Corps	1,121,647		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,850,462		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	373,876	377,795	377,795
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	818,531		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	4,437,818	2,284,545	2,284,545
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	7,246,734		1,752,795
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,800,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	252,014	229,549	229,549
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$7,466,566	$3,928,154	$3,254,435
Direct loans (NDEA II)	7,524,662	8,516,635	12,205,414
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	1,107,488		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	8,341,028	9,160,666	9,160,666
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	189,200		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	2,360,000		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	127,200		
Subtotal, Higher Education	44,895,579	24,497,344	29,265,199
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	14,936,466	15,170,533	22,995,449
Innovation		337,125	337,125
Work-study			563,239
Cooperative education		392,317	392,317
Consumer and homemaking education		957,253	1,276,963
Programs for Students with Special Needs			2,554,941
Research			2,192,058
Subtotal, Vocational Education	14,936,466	16,857,248	30,312,092
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	1,664,458	742,639	1,664,458
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	1,622,353		340,480
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,481	48,481	48,481
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,737	25,737	25,737
College library resources (HEA II-A)	971,864		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	374,104		
University community service programs (HEA I)	332,502	332,502	332,502
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	2,505,509	2,823,537	2,823,537
Special projects and teacher education	283,905		
Educational broadcasting facilities	200,000		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	8,068,422	4,012,405	5,274,704
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,598,917
Teacher education and recruitment	1,448,263		
Research and innovation	358,824		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	171,114		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	3,577,118	1,598,917	1,598,917
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	1,709,715		
Research and development centers	820,000		
Vocational education	425,455	49,336	49,336
Subtotal, Research and Training	2,955,170	49,336	49,336
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	359,602	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	425,414		
Civil Rights Education	809,808		
Total, Office of Education	206,732,508	138,023,411	201,726,055
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	187,152,484	138,023,411	201,726,055
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$3,013,832	$3,467,494	$3,894,438
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	296,752	0	294,968
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,088,519	866,965	1,117,701
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	329,967	329,967	329,967
Grants for special projects	0	0	0

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	$562,511	0	$581,548
Loans to non-profit private schools	0	0	0
State administration	13,333	0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396	0	100,882
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	5,555,310	$4,814,426	6,482,837
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	0	0	581,548
Loans to non-profit private schools	0	0	0
State administration	0	0	13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	0	0	594,881
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	7,069,317	1,055,000	8,067,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	1,235,518	773,000	773,000
Subtotal, SAFA	8,304,835	1,828,000	8,840,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	178,237	157,489	176,206
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	513,069	0	0
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	691,306	157,489	176,206
Teacher Corps	0	0	0
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,600	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	168,195	171,178	171,178
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	189,561	0	0
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	0	313,134	313,134
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	1,830,753	0	264,246
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	54,045	67,778	67,778
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,253,811	859,058	629,481
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,047,412	1,862,525	2,669,234
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds	0	0	0
Interest payments	178,722	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,102,791	1,081,711	1,081,711
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	50,000	0	0
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	958,800	0	0
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	27,975	0	0
Subtotal, Higher Education	6,976,665	4,355,384	5,196,762
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	1,439,960	1,445,921	2,191,721
Innovation	0	213,577	213,577
Work-study	0	0	54,833
Cooperative education	0	219,041	219,041
Consumer and homemaking education	0	91,238	121,709
Programs for students with special needs	0	0	243,513
Research	0	0	198,630
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,439,960	1,969,777	3,243,024
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	245,448	159,746	245,448
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	243,914	0	104,217
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,788	40,788	40,788
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,069	25,069	25,069
College library resources (HEA II-A)	227,431	0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	16,303	0	0
University community service programs HEA I)	121,786	121,786	121,786
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	146,169	152,742	152,742
Special projects and teacher education	0	0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities	59,310	0	0
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,165,727	539,640	729,559
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$165,654	$165,614	$165,614
Teacher education and recruitment	443,578	0	0
Research and innovation	3,537	0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	0	0	0
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	612,729	165,614	165,614
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	0	0	0
Research and development centers	0	0	0
Vocational education	0	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	0	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	38,478	([2])	([2])
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	94,501	0	0
Total, Office of Education	24,929,551	13,895,330	25,493,883
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	22,052,124	13,895,330	25,493,883
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	1,632,466	1,878,396	2,040,937
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	104,377	----------	111,049
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	637,800	534,728	640,052
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	251,499	251,499	251,499
Grants for special projects	----------	----------	----------
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NEDA III):[1]			
Grants to States	187,862	----------	----------
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	13,333	----------	----------
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	----------	50,000
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	3,027,337	2,823,623	3,243,537
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	----------	----------	179,379
Loans to nonprofit private schools	----------	----------	----------
State administration	----------	----------	13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources	----------	----------	192,712
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	136,062	4,000	138,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, SAFA	136,062	4,000	138,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	120,221	120,221	128,690
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	144,578	----------	----------
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	264,779	120,221	128,690
Teacher Corps	----------	----------	----------
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	----------	----------	----------
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	156,343	159,271	159,271
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	43,846	----------	----------
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I-Section 103)	208,229	112,256	112,256
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I-Section 104)	351,138	----------	89,927
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000	----------	----------
State administration and planning (HEFA I-Section 105)	58,174	56,723	56,723

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HELATH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	$572,834	$226,362	$190,591
Direct loans (NDEA II)	589,299	490,776	703,344
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	84,397		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	419,455	377,681	377,681
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	15,700		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	148,400		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)			
Subtotal, Higher Education	3,447,815	1,423,069	1,689,793
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	704,708	563,453	854,079
Innovation		205,159	205,159
Work-study			20,683
Cooperative education		207,235	207,235
Consumer and homemaking education		35,554	47,428
Programs for students with special needs			94,893
Research			68,248
Subtotal, Vocational Education	704,708	1,011,401	1,497,725
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	163,671	126,155	163,671
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	22,344		90,601
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,345	40,345	40,345
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV–B)	25,030	25,030	25,030
College library resources (HEA II–A)	112,087		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)	24,510		
University community service programs (HEA I)	108,892	108,892	108,892
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	131,267	135,709	135,709
Special projects and teacher education	30,680		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	698,335	475,640	603,757
Education for the handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	448,822	448,822
Teacher education and recruitment	72,260		
Research and innovation	43,867		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	216,127	448,822	448,822
Research and training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education		15,000	15,000
Subtotal, research and training		15,000	15,000
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	33,318	(2)	(2)
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	72,165		
Civil rights education			
Total, Office of Education	8,650,666	6,371,776	8,008,036
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	7,058,176	6,371,776	8,008,036
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$26,959,114	$29,583,055	$34,163,614
State administrative expenses	270,742	295,831	341,636
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,057,993		1,070,540
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,568,334	2,498,188	3,592,947
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	604,339	604,339	604,339
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States	1,960,992		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	42,701		

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	$381,959		$381,934
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	34,846,174	$32,981,413	40,155,010
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):[1]			
Grants to States			1,927,258
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			42,696
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,969,954
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81–874)	35,704,596	7,442,000	39,552,000
Construction (P.L. 81–815)	3,589,739	635,000	635,000
Subtotal, SAFA	39,294,335	8,077,000	40,187,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B–2)	319,962	304,962	376,578
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	581,689		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	901,651	304,962	376,578
Teacher Corps	341,530		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,006,475		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	241,008	244,330	244,330
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI–A)	267,588		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,908,903	987,014	987,014
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,551,185		626,507
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	104,159	115,965	115,965
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV–A)	2,335,930	1,159,806	1,042,262
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,951,774	2,514,577	3,603,706
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	459,026		
Work-study programs (HEA IV–C)	2,032,353	3,570,372	3,570,372
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	40,000		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,188,300		
Training programs (EDPA Part E)	191,400		
Subtotal, higher education	15,278,101	8,592,064	10,190,156
Vocational education:			
Basic grants	6,700,866	6,456,132	9,786,173
Innovation		258,244	258,244
Work-study			242,899
Cooperative education		281,687	281,687
Consumer and homemaking education		407,378	543,436
Programs for students with special needs			1,087,306
Research			932,874
Subtotal, vocational education	6,700,866	7,403,441	13,132,619
Libraries and community services:			
Grants for public library services LSCA I)	747,843	366,117	747,843
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	168,885		187,865
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,512	43,512	43,512
State institutional library services (LSCA IV–A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped IV–B)	25,305	25,305	25,305
College library resources (HEA II–A)	420,852		
Librarian training (HEA II–B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,597	196,597	196,597
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	1,132,973	1,272,206	1,272,206
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, libraries and community services	2,775,476	1,943,246	2,512,837
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	660,289	660,289	660,289
Teacher education and recruitment	689,322		

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Research and innovation	$9,683		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	17,634		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,376,928	$660,289	$660,289
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	23,272	20,996	20,996
Subtotal, Research and Training	23,272	20,996	20,996
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	173,136	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	96,045		
Civil Rights Education	542,682		
Total, Office of Education	102,400,196	60,033,411	109,255,439
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	97,554,445	60,033,411	109,255,439
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$11,517,854	$11,728,452	$13,440,808
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	819,428		825,273
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	2,503,083	1,854,696	2,609,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	513,297	513,297	513,297
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,105,278		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	29,065		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	259,983		271,705
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	16,897,988	14,246,445	17,810,406
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,137,535
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			30,374
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			1,167,909
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	12,296,924	4,852,000	14,977,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	530,390	425,000	425,000
Subtotal, SAFA	12,827,314	5,277,000	15,402,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	292,833	258,745	313,212
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,284,423		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,577,256	258,745	313,212
Teacher Corps	369,943		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	220,000		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	212,648	217,847	217,847
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	312,641		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	1,372,312	709,565	709,565
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,618,385		618,724
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	100,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	178,004	106,142	106,412

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$2,518,068	$1,486,035	$1,229,052
Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,908,034	3,221,874	4,617,352
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	250,413		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	2,745,963	2,375,723	2,375,723
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	53,156		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,293,600		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	224,013		
Subtotal, Higher Education	16,007,237	8,117,456	9,874,675
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,610,797	3,519,602	5,334,993
Innovation		239,372	239,372
Work-study			161,131
Cooperative education		255,219	255,219
Consumer and homemaking education		222,085	296,258
Program for Students with Special Needs			592,751
Research			505,008
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,610,797	4,236,278	7,384,732
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	565,959	291,404	565,959
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	323,350		157,581
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,526	42,526	42,526
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,220	25,220	25,220
College library resources (HEA II-A)	376,750		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	357,552		
University community service programs (HEA I)	165,768	165,768	165,768
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	305,985	333,131	333,131
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	2,202,619	897,558	1,329,694
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	451,985	451,985	451,985
Teacher education and recruitment	433,170		
Research and innovation	256,576		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	28,008		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,169,739	451,985	451,985
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	47,383	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	47,383	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	113,306	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	453,264		
Civil Rights Education	142,010		
Total, Office of Education	55,468,856	33,550,467	53,799,613
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	49,313,337	33,550,467	35,799,613
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$16,156,287	$18,798,318	$21,708,999
State administrative expenses	161,563	187,983	217,090
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	420,151		406,702
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,615,010	1,186,348	1,589,655
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	374,730	374,730	374,730
Grants for special projects			

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	$892,132		
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	17,219		
Guidance, couseling, and testing (NDEA V)	154,028		$149,551
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	19,791,120	$20,547,379	24,446,727
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			851,102
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			16,718
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			867,820
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P.L. 81-874)	520,634	18,000	486,000
Construction (P.L. 81-815)	−8,575		
Subtotal, SAFA	512,059	18,000	486,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	85,395	181,395	205,073
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	552,878		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	638,273	181,395	205,073
Teacher Corps	287,331		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	655,786		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	191,149	194,239	194,239
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	135,930		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)		608,986	608,986
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	2,373,604		288,927
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	78,080	79,459	79,459
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,434,297	677,010	570,018
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,783,385	1,467,827	2,103,582
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	119,460		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	1,854,608	1,938,617	1,938,617
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	33,850		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	171,200		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	10,000		
Subtotal, Higher Education	8,841,349	4,966,138	5,783,828
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	3,010,158	2,836,702	4,299,858
Innovation		225,796	225,796
Work-study			103,413
Cooperative education		236,178	236,178
Consumer and homemaking education		178,995	238,776
Programs for students with special needs			477,741
Research			404,112
Subtotal, Vocational Education	3,010,158	3,477,671	5,985,874
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	403,825	224,804	403,825
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	308,680		130,586
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,647	41,647	41,647
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,143	25,143	25,143
College library resources (HEA II-A)	199,360		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	139,136	139,316	139,316
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	497,755	550,582	550,582
Special projects and teacher education			
Educational broadcasting facilities	283,826		
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	1,938,881	1,021,001	1,330,608

Footnotes at end of table.

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$314,074	$314,074	$314,074
Teacher education and recruitment	235,097		
Research and innovation	58,498		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	607,669	314,074	314,074
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories	895,478		
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	57,903	15,000	15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	953,381	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	91,340	[2]	[2]
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education	65,429		
Total, Office of Education	36,786,990	30,590,658	39,485,004
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	33,082,867	30,590,658	39,485,004
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$14,388,760	$15,278,409	$17,644,076
State administrative expenses	150,000	152,784	176,441
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,153,770		1,155,828
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	3,403,351	2,364,521	3,395,425
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	565,995	565,995	565,995
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	1,720,045		
Loans to nonprofit private schools	111,630		
State administration	41,056		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	367,246		366,463
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary education	21,901,853	18,361,709	23,304,228
Instructional equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			1,707,176
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration			40,967
Subtotal, instructional resources			1,748,143
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	2,095,973	571,000	2,639,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	99,715		
Subtotal, SAFA	2,195,688	571,000	2,639,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	282,828	323,516	398,612
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	1,014,790		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	1,297,618	323,516	398,612
Teacher Corps	313,757		
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	113,300		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	240,649	243,969	243,969
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	353,677		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	2,005,041	1,032,197	1,032,197
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	3,404,584		793,453
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000		
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	189,230	134,944	134,944

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher Education—Continued			
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	$4,329,791	$1,787,985	$1,544,035
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,831,288	2,876,532	5,555,560
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	596,580		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,056,446	3,168,640	3,168,640
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search	73,884		
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,271,000		
Training programs (EPDA Part E)	86,300		
Subtotal, Higher Education	21,051,770	10,244,267	12,472,798
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	5,447,744	4,890,133	7,412,439
Innovation		251,591	251,591
Work-study			207,787
Cooperative education		272,356	272,356
Consumer and homemaking education		308,566	411,620
Program for students with special needs			823,569
Research			706,596
Subtotal, Vocational Education	5,447,743	5,722,646	10,085,958
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	745,365	365,099	745,365
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	732,551		187,452
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,498	43,498	43,498
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,304	25,304	25,304
College library resources (HEA II-A)	518,630		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	276,081		
University community service programs (HEA I)	190,150	190,150	190,150
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	543,151	600,765	600,765
Special projects and teacher education	260,000		
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	3,374,239	1,264,325	1,832,043
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	625,438	625,438	625,438
Teacher education and recruitment	767,180		
Research and innovation	370,651		
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	49,733		
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	1,813,002	625,438	625,438
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers	1,200,000		
Vocational education	128,533	15,903	15,903
Subtotal, Research and Training	1,328,533	15,903	15,903
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	162,247	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs	822,013		
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	59,758,463	37,178,804	53,172,123
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis [3]	51,170,887	37,178,804	53,172,123
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Basic grants	$1,364,174	$1,383,315	$1,447,595
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	87,394		86,211
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	580,075	501,223	577,243
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	249,634	249,634	249,634
Grants for specal projects			

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Elementary and Secondary Education—Con.			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States	$144,298		
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration	13,333		
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000		$50,000
Subtotal, Elementary and Secondary Education	2,638,908	$2,284,172	2,560,683
Instructional Equipment:			
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III): [1]			
Grants to States			145,029
Loans to non-profit private schools			
State administration			13,333
Subtotal, Instructional Resources			158,362
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas:			
Maintenance and operations (P. L. 81-874)	1,696,509	1,275,000	1,895,000
Construction (P. L. 81-815)			
Subtotal, SAFA	1,696,509	1,275,000	1,895,000
Education Professions Development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	116,931	116,931	122,273
Training programs (EPDA Parts C and D)	56,147		
Subtotal, Education Professions Development	173,078	116,931	122,273
Teacher Corps			
Higher Education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	118,900		
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	154,927	157,849	157,849
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	28,359		
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Section 103)	169,890	87,843	87,813
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Section 104)	247,470		62,265
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)			
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Section 105)	71,006	47,216	47,216
Student aid:			
Education opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	365,050	152,432	122,359
Direct loans (NDEA II)	411,098	330,488	473,632
Insured loans:			
Advances for reserve funds			
Interest payments	23,343		
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	516,201	273,002	273,002
Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
Talent search			
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	195,100		
Training programs (EPDA part E)	45,481		
Subtotal, Higher Education	2,346,825	1,048,830	1,224,166
Vocational Education:			
Basic grants	590,814	416,792	631,773
Innovation		204,345	204,245
Work-study			17,316
Cooperative education		206,093	206,093
Consumer and homemaking education		26,299	35,083
Program for students with special needs			70,193
Research			46,580
Subtotal, Vocational Education	590,814	853,529	1,211,383
Libraries and Community Services:			
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	153,093	122,142	153,903
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	105,309		88,975
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,292	40,292	40,292
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,025	25,025	25,025
College library resources (HEA II-A)	49,573		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
University community service programs (HEA I)	106,901	106,901	106,901
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	124,625	127,831	127,831
Special projects and teacher education			

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 budget requests	1970 conference agreement
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING—Continued			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Libraries and Community Services—Con.			
Educational broadcasting facilities			
Subtotal, Libraries and Community Services	$645,137	$461,700	$582,436
Education for the Handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Teacher education and recruitment	79,389		
Research and innovation			
Media services and captioned films for the deaf			
Subtotal, Education for the Handicapped	179,389	100,000	100,000
Research and Training:			
Research and development:			
Educational laboratories			
Research and development centers			
Vocational education	$87,014	$15,000	$15,000
Subtotal, Research and Training	87,014	15,000	15,000
Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes Act)	30,000	(2)	(2)
Education in Foreign Languages and World Affairs			
Civil Rights Education			
Total, Office of Education	8,437,674	6,205,162	7,919,303
Total, Office of Education Comparable Basis[3]	7,841,382	6,205,162	7,919,303

[1] This program is funded from both the Elementary and Secondary appropriation and the new Instructional Equipment appropriation in 1970.
[2] Included under Basic Grants—Vocational Education.
[3] The 1969 actual column shows obligations for project type programs where the State by State distribution cannot be predicted in advance, and therefore, is not shown in the 1970 column. For this reason the 1969 comprable figure excludes obligations for project type programs.

Mr. KENNEDY. The issue of whether or not to cut $1.3 billion from the bill comes down to a basic matter of priorities. Are we as a nation going to respond to our staggering needs in the delivery of health care, in the search to cure cancer and other dread diseases, in training more doctors and medical personnel? Will we meet the great demand for qualified schoolteachers, for improved facilities, for special help to disadvantaged and exceptional and handicapped students, for assistance to give every deserving youth an opportunity to pursue a higher education? I say the Federal Government should not abdicate responsibility. We can and must meet the challenge.

To strike down the higher expenditures for health and education would be disastrous:

Several thousand potential medical students will lose the opportunity for loans;

Many thousand patients will die unnecessarily for lack of trained workers or adequate facilities;

Some 115,000 college students will be denied loans;

Over 50,000 schoolchildren will struggle and fall behind because they receive no bilingual assistance;

Close to 10,000 persons will be turned away from teacher training under the Education Professions Development Act;

Over 200,000 children will be cut off from vocational education programs;

Three million fewer books will be available in community libraries.

The list goes on. Without the expected Federal aid, many communities will again be forced to raise local property taxes in order to finance their school budget. Some schools may have to close several weeks early. Children will suffer today; society will suffer tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have discussed my views on specific programs in testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on December 4. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Schools need the money now, and they can use it constructively. I have a letter, for example, from one school superintendent in Massachusetts who says:

> Almost without exception, local school districts across this nation started school in September in full expectation of program support from the federal government.

He goes on to say that it is "utter nonsense" to contend that the money cannot be usefully spent at this point in the school year. Other educators in my State, and throughout the country, confirm this view.

Even at a level of $4.27 billion for education, we will be spending at only 46 percent of authorization—a far lower percentage than in almost all other appropriation areas. And this comes at a time when the administration's own task force on urban education is calling for "massive" increases in appropriations—up to $14.5 billion more a year by 1975. The task force concludes:

> Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities. The current need for funds is as desperate as it is massive.

Mr. President, this Nation and this Federal Government should put greater emphasis on ABC's, not ABM's. Investment in medical research, vocational education, mental retardation programs, air pollution control, libraries, compensatory education, and training nurses, doctors and teachers—all of this is far more important than running up billions of dollars in cost overruns on military projects. Our children at home should not be the victims of a dubious war abroad. An increase of less than 6 percent over administration requests for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is modest, responsible, and urgently needed.

There has been much talk about possible inflationary effects of this appropriations bill. I share the general concern about inflation. But HEW expenditures cannot and should not be singled out for blame. The situation goes far beyond spending $1.3 billion more than the administration wants for urgent health and education needs.

Congress has already acted with great responsibility and care on the administration's budget. We have made cuts elsewhere which more than offset the increase in health and education, and thereby help in the fight against inflation. Even with the HEW increase, the net effect of congressional action on all appropriation bills is an actual reduction of $5.6 billion.

It is incongruous indeed for the administration to insist on spending at its own request levels for HEW. For consistent application of that policy would have resulted in total spending of $5.6 billion more. And it is inappropriate to single out and attack the HEW appropriation bill, which happens to come last. I might add that I certainly hope we have not reached the point where Congress is expected to simply "rubber stamp" administration requests. We are elected representatives with an obligation—and a constitutional mandate—to evaluate programs and express priorities through the appropriations process.

The Labor-HEW-OEO budget is still less than one-third of the Defense budget. And the sum of $1.3 billion is small indeed in the context of a gross national product of almost $1 trillion.

One of the President's own economic advisers has stressed that inflation cannot be blamed on budget shifts of a few billion dollars, or on whether or not we have a budget surplus. I quote from a speech by Herbert Stein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, delivered last November:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses a line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a $25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968 and a $3 billion surplus in fiscal 1969. Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the Government.

Mr. Stein also called it "astonishing" that a "prospective shift in the budget position should be assigned as much

weight as it commonly is in appraising the outlook for inflation."

Many items in the HEW bill are actually anti-inflationary. Student assistance programs for doctors and nurses will help meet the shortage of health personnel which has driven medical costs so high. Learning more about disease, discovering inexpensive treatments, improving the delivery of health and medical services—these also will meet the overwhelming demand and drive down prices. A more educated, better trained population increases productivity and our ability to supply goods and services. The ultimate result is lower prices.

As a supplement to the $5.6 billion budget cut by Congress, there are other avenues open to the President for combating inflation—avenues which to date he has not followed. For example, he has failed to bring any real pressure on big business to keep prices down—an anti-inflationary measure followed by his predecessors. He could also briefly defer highway expenditures, as was done twice by President Johnson. A cutback of 50,000 in military personnel would save half a million dollars annually.

And so, Mr. President, health and education expenditures should not be made the scapegoat for the failure to control inflation. They are solid investments in our Nation's future. They are a conscientious response to the immediate health and education needs of millions and millions of citizens.

If we fail to meet our obligation today, the damage in human terms will be irreparable, and the harm to society compounded many times over.

I support the conference report, and urge the Congress to continue to stand by our commitment to health and education.

EXHIBIT 1

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, ON HEALTH AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS, DECEMBER 4, 1969

This Subcommittee is working on one of the most important bills in Congress this year. Substantial appropriations for health, education, welfare, labor and the anti-poverty effort are essential for the strength and well-being of our nation.

It was Aristotle, more than 2,000 years ago, who said: "The neglect of education ruins the constitution of the country." The point is equally true today.

I come from a state which has a proud record for quality in education. We have the oldest private university in the nation. We have a state university which has tripled in enrollment and achieved national stature in the last decade. We have school systems in Newton and other areas which are models throughout the United States.

In the last few weeks, I have visited several schools and talked with dozens of educators in Massachusetts. I have met with our fine Commissioner of Education, Neil Sullivan, and several of the top state leaders. I have called together groups of superintendents to discuss their problems and needs. I have talked with principals and teachers and students.

These visits and meetings have been extremely helpful and productive. I have seen the great contributions of many of our federal programs. I have been exposed again to the enthusiasm and dedication of so many educators in my state.

But my visits to Massachusetts have also confirmed what this committee so well knows: our schools today face an unprecedented financial crisis—a crisis which threatens to undo the progress of the '60's and deny equal opportunity in the '70's.

Commissioner Sullivan informs me that school costs in Massachusetts will exceed one billion dollars for the first time this year. Burdensome property taxes have already soared so high that local residents in Massachusetts pay 70 percent of school costs, compared to 52 percent nationally. Per pupil expenditure varies from a few hundred dollars in some districts to over $1,000 in others.

We have 1.4 million students in our elementary and secondary schools. But we do not have the financial resources to provide all of them with a first-rate education. The problems in Massachusetts reflect the situation in every state of the nation. And they underscore the tremendous importance of the appropriations bill before this committee. Only with greater funding of federal programs can we achieve the goals which Congress set forth with the landmark education bills of the 1960's.

Nine billion dollars is authorized for federal education programs. But the budget request was only $3.2 billion—or a mere 36 percent of authorizations. And Congress itself has generally funded education at a far lower percentage level than most other programs. Military appropriations, for example, were 93 percent of authorizations last year.

The time has come to rearrange priorities. We must recognize that billions of dollars more must be spent each year if we are going to achieve quality of result and equality of opportunity in education. We must not shy away from the prospect. We must start to meet the demands.

As John Adams of Massachusetts wrote many years ago: "The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and must be willing to bear the expense of it."

I applaud the House action in adding over one billion dollars to education appropriations. But we in the Senate have our own responsibility—to revise upward where necessary, and downward where necessary. In the end, I think that the educational needs of this nation certainly justify a final appropriation figure of greater than 50 percent of authorizations.

I would like to mention briefly some areas of particular importance.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

ESEA title I

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has brought great advances in compensatory education. I have seen remedial reading programs in Massachusetts schools, where there were no such programs five years ago. Across the nation, educators have placed a new priority on helping the educationally disadvantaged. Nine million young children, primarily from low-income families, have been helped each year.

There are two fundamental problems with Title I. First, annual appropriations of just over one billion dollars have been inadequate—with funds spread too thin to really concentrate on needy children. I urge the committee to appropriate full funds which can still be used this year to serve children from families earning less than $3,000 a year.

Second, as documented in the recent report by the Washington Research Project and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, many states and school districts have grossly misused Title I money. I hope that the committee will consider language, in the bill or in the report, directing the Commissioner to sue promptly for restitution or take other legal action on such abuses. I also hope that the committee will recommend in its report that the Office of Education devote more personnel and effort to monitoring Title I programs.

ESEA title II

In recent visits to schools in Sommerville, Arlington and Lexington, I saw attractive and well-stocked libraries—where before there had been dull and outdated collections. On the average, each student was checking out four and five times as many books as before Title II. Throughout the nation, the whole atmosphere in school libraries—and the whole attitude of students towards books—has changed.

I am disturbed that the Administration requested no funds at all for Title II. I recommend at least $75 million.

ESEA title III

Again, Massachusetts has developed over 70 innovative projects under Title III. In Arlington's exciting "Operation Male" program, young men from graduate schools in the area serve as teaching aides for first, second and third grade pupils. Studies have shown that male teachers have a favorable impact on learning attitudes of young boys in their formative years. Other Title III projects have helped to develop new approaches.

I recommend a $10 million increase over last year's level of $164.8 million.

ESEA title VI

Of the six million handicapped children in the nation, only one third are receiving educational services. These are the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, deaf, blind, emotionally disturbed and speech impaired. We need over 325,000 specially trained teachers, but only 83,000 are now available.

Of $224 million authorized, I hope that the committee recommends an appropriation of at least $50 million—a 40 percent increase over the House. I would also like to call special attention to Title V of P.L. 88-164. This law provides for training physical educators and recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

As the sponsor of this program, I am pleased at the positive effects of "Special Olympics" and other sport and recreation activities on mentally retarded and handicapped youngsters. Of the $4.5 million authorized, I hope that the Subcommittee will recommend funding of at least $3 million.

ESEA title VII

The House appropriated $10 million for bilingual education, out of $30 million authorized. I suggest that the House figure be doubled—to serve more American Indians and Mexican Americans, as well as children in deprived areas.

ESEA title VIII

Every school dropout is a potential tragedy—for the individual, and for the society which failed him. As the dropout rate goes up, so should our federal effort to meet the problem. I am distressed that the House cut $19 million from the Administration's request of $24 million. I urge this committee to restore those funds.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Vocational schools can provide a balanced education and career opportunities for many of our nation's young people. Just recently, for example, I met with citizens from Haverhill, Massachusetts, who hope to build an exciting new regional school—with broad vocational and other services to develop the full potential of every individual.

For too long, we have ignored this aspect of education. But last year, we authorized landmark programs to improve the concept and the quality of vocational schools. This year, I recommend $500 million to fund those

programs. And I urge the Administration to utilize whatever amount Congress finally appropriates.

HIGHER EDUCATION: TEACHER CORPS

As an original sponsor of the Teacher Corps, I am delighted at its success—both in attracting young college graduates to teach in poverty schools, and in improving the educational opportunities for children in those schools.

At the present funding level of slightly over $20 million, only 1500 of the 9000 applicants each year can be accepted. We cannot waste this resource. We cannot pass up the opportunity to develop dedicated and skilled teachers in poverty schools. I strongly recommend full funding of $56 million.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

We are a long way indeed from achieving equal opportunity in higher education. Seventy-six percent of our college students come from families in the top half of the income bracket. Only seven percent come from families in the lowest income quartile.

In the highest socioeconomic quartile, only 1 out of 20 top-ranking students—measured as the highest 20 percent in ability—fails to go to college. A staggering 10 times as many top-ranking students in the lowest quartile are denied a college education.

When Congress passed the guaranteed student loan bill earlier this year, I sponsored an amendment to increase authorizations for Educational Opportunity Grants, National Defense Student Loans and the College Work-Study Program. The new levels, which were approved in that bill, were based on actual requests by colleges and universities to the Office of Education.

According to latest statistics from the Office, over half a million needy students will be denied assistance if we fail to appropriate full funds.

I do not think that the Senate can or will tolerate that inequity. I do not think that any individual should be denied a higher education simply because he is poor. I strongly urge this committee to fund these programs in accordance with requests, as reflected in the new authorization figures.

The Office of Education initially asked for *more* than the authorized $56.6 million for the highly successful Talent Search and Upward Bound programs, and the program for special services in college. The full amount should be appropriated.

GENERAL EVALUATION

Comprehensive planning and evaluation should be a top priority at all levels of education—local, state and federal. Administrators should more carefully analyze the conduct and benefits of federal programs. But State agencies and local schools should also take a more general and comprehensive approach—evaluating the overall program mix, rather than just specific projects.

The Education Subcommittee recently accepted my amendment to authorize such long-range, overall planning and evaluation. I am hopeful that it will be adopted by Congress.

Meanwhile, there is limited authority under Section 402 of P.L. 90–247, although it is restricted to short-term evaluations of federal programs only. In a bill appropriating over $4 billion for education, I recommend an increase to $15 million for planning and evaluation. I also hope that you might indicate in the committee report the importance of cooperative efforts between and among local educational agencies, state educational agencies, and the Federal Government.

FORWARD FUNDING

Forward funding is essential if we are to end the confusion, hardship and inefficiency which beleaguered superintendents and principals suffer under the present system. This is the major complaint of educators in Massachusetts and elsewhere. I urge the committee to take the lead and act for forward funding. Perhaps if this bill simply appropriated for fiscal 1971 the same amounts as for fiscal 1970, this would serve as a base and would give administrators and teachers at least a minimum expectation and guarantee on which to plan. Revised appropriations could be added next year.

CAMPUS DISORDERS

I oppose section 407 of the House-passed bill. The existing law is already harsh—requiring a cutoff of federal funds to students convicted of participating in serious campus disruptions. They should not be further penalized, without a trial. And colleges should not completely lose their federal funds just because one student manages to get around the present law.

DESEGREGATION

Sections 408 and 409 of the House-passed bill would compel the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to approve so-called "freedom of choice" plans, even if they are ineffective in ending discrimination. The Senate has rejected such provisions in the past, for they run directly counter to our position against segregation and in favor of high quality education for all. I urge the committee to strike the section.

This Nation has over 59 million students—6 million in college, and 53 million in elementary and secondary schools. Over 30 percent of our population are teachers or students. Enrollments continue to rise. Increasingly, a solid education is necessary for a good job and other benefits in society.

Two weeks ago, we spent $375 million for a single space shot to put two men on the moon. Surely we can spend the funds necessary to put every child in a decent educational program. It will be a tragedy—for the children and for the Nation—if we fail in this commitment.

HEALTH APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I turn now to the area of health appropriations. In general, I support the position, advocated by a number of the leading medical and other health authorities in the nation, that the health programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be funded to full authorization and that the open-end authorizations should be funded at a level at least 10 percent above last year. Within the general increases, special priority should be given to health manpower. For it is becoming increasingly obvious to many of us concerned with the quality of health care in America that manpower is the key to improved services and more reasonable costs. We who favor increased opportunities for all our people to have good health recognize that our health manpower pool is already strained because of the increased purchasing power of our citizens under Medicare and Medicaid. We must act now to assure an adequate supply of health manpower.

Where do we stand today? When the Health Manpower Act of 1968 was passed, the committee reports indicated that we need 52,000 doctors now, but that we are producing only 9,000 a year. We need 141,000 more nurses right now. We still need 18,000 more dentists by 1973. And, of course, given the advent of new medical technology, the need for allied health personnel is almost overwhelming.

Our medical schools are in deep financial trouble. Our schools of nursing urged by Congress to become more efficient and produce more nurses, have begun to do so, only to see Federal funds cut, rather than increased to meet the need. Aid for allied health professions is almost non-existent.

Unfortunately, the Administration's budget requests for 1970 are simply insufficient to meet our needs in health manpower. Congress authorized $55 million for student loans, but the budget requests only $34 million. We authorized $192 million for operating funds for medical schools, but the budget request is only $128 million. Of $35 million authorized for improvement of nursing schools, only $7 million is requested. $40 million is authorized for allied health personnel, but only $12 million is requested. These are only a few examples of how underfunded our health manpower programs are.

Unless we provide more student assistance, the medical profession in this country will be reserved for the rich. For tuitions are rising. The average number of years of study has gone up. Availability of aid has gone down.

Already, a staggering 45 percent of medical students today come from families in the upper 10 percent income bracket. Opportunities for black Americans and other disadvantaged students are rare. Tufts University School of Medicine estimates that $3,500 in financial aid is needed each year for a disadvantaged student. The figures are similar in other schools. As a result, of the 200 black physicians graduated last year, more than three-quarters came from two medical schools—Howard in Washington and Meharry in Nashville.

The regular Guaranteed Loan Program is of little help. By the time students get to medical school, many have already taken out guaranteed loans and are in debt. Moreover, the maximums under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program are $1500 per year and $6000 totally. The Health Professions Student Loan provides for $2,500 per year and $10,000 totally.

$41 million would be necessary to fund all requests for Health Professions Student Loans—primarily for medical and dental students. The authorized maximum of $35 million is not sufficient. But it certainly is necessary.

The Regional Medical Program was established in 1965 to achieve through research, continuing education and training a marked improvement in the care of patient with heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases. Fifty-five Regional Medical Programs covering the entire nation have been established. An unprecedented number of participating physicians, medical schools, medical centers, hospitals, state and city agencies and voluntary health organizations have become involved. Yet, just at the time when the program is getting well underway, it is having serious funding difficulties.

In my own area, the Tri-State Regional Medical Program of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island may well be "devastated," according to Dr. Robert P. Lawton, the Deputy Director:

"What will be the effect of the low House appropriation on regions? Suffice to say that if this number is all that it is appropriated, the effect on Tri-State will be devastating.

"It is my personal judgement, if RMP were to have no more appropriation for 1970 than the House approved for grants, that it would be necessary to shut down some regions in order to keep the others alive. This is my national view. New England is potentially too important as an example of interstate cooperation, including effective coordination of RMP and CHP, not to warrant every possible regionalization dollar."

I strongly urge that we appropriate full funds for the Regional Medical Program.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a detailed statement with a number of attachments indicating the need for full funding of health manpower and other programs. I would like to submit these for the record.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a disastrous misallocation of resources for this Congress to vote tens of billions of dollars for military spending and then turn around and restrict our support for education and health. If we cannot or will not marshall the resources to move forward quickly and fully on these fronts, we certainly must fail as a Nation.

I strongly urge the committee to approve the substantial appropriation increases which are necessary to meet our responsibility in the fields of education and health.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I regret that circumstances do not permit me to rise in the Senate today and declare my support for the President of the United States in his intent to veto the appropriations bill for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has been badly advised. He should be cutting more deeply into military budgets before he vetoes a bill containing $1.3 billion more for education and health programs for the American people.

In a society where the scientific establishment has actually reached the moon and is probing outer space, less than one-half the adults in our country who are over 25 years of age have completed a high school education.

In a society where there are persistent unfilled demands for highly skilled employees, about 4 million unemployed individuals are unable to match their work skills to meaningful employment.

In a society that is or shortly will be reaching an annual productivity of $1 trillion, over one-third of its people live in or on the margin of poverty.

In a society where there are persistent unfilled demands for highly skilled employees—and leaders of industry are telling us that post high school training is now mandatory for the increasingly complex technological economy—about one-half the student population does not enroll in post high school education. Less than 18 percent of its students are currently being enrolled in secondary programs of vocational education of a gainful employment type.

This must change. And the Vocational Education Act, which was raised $200 million by this Congress to $488 million, will be an excellent instrument for bringing about these needed changes, if the administration will but spend the money.

The administration in its budget request, asked for only $279 million for this vital program for 1970—about the same cost as the rehabilitative Job Corps. This is also about the same as the cost overruns for the initial stages of the ABM—anti-ballistic-missile system.

In a society where education is increasing the basic link between youth and the world of work, some 20 percent of its young people become high school dropouts, and emotional dropouts begin in the elementary grades, but the physical dropouts begin in junior high school.

In a society where preparation for work is required for virtually all people in all jobs, the prevailing educational structure is primarily designed to serve the 20 percent who will eventually complete a 4-year college degree.

Figures vary on the number each year of dropouts, but it is close to 1 million each year. And the stark fact that the high schools, even in the face of this fact, are still gearing their educational programs to the elite 20 percent who will obtain college degrees, rather than to the 80 percent who will not, indicates what is seriously wrong with American education and what the new focus should be and where additional funds should be spent.

This is precisely what the Vocational Education Act was written to do—regear vocational education for the space age. I am happy to say that Oregon is in the forefront of the movement to develop comprehensive high schools and to provide "cluster" occupational studies for its students so that they will have an opportunity to learn a skill before high school graduation—in job-related programs. We are, however, underfunded.

The local property taxpayers have taxed themselves to the limit. They bear 73 percent of the burden of the costs of education, the State pays 20 percent, and the Federal Government pays 7 percent—too small a share, in my thinking.

We spend entirely too much money in this country for rehabilitative programs—manpower training, custodial care, welfare—which are vastly more costly in dollars, to say nothing of the waste in human life, lost time, and opportunity.

We find ourselves in the position of pulling up the flower by the roots and saying it is not growing very well; let us study the flower more—to paraphrase the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—rather than nourishing the plant with money enough to guarantee success.

For example, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in my principal city of Portland is funded at a level which reaches only a small fraction of the children in need—because of decisions to concentrate the money on a fraction of a percent of the needy children. Meanwhile, the other children suffer.

We are also going to have to double our vocational education teaching force over the next 5 years, and this is why I supported raising the appropriations in the Education Professions Development Act from $95 million to $107 million. We are assured that the EPDA would spend this for vocational teacher training.

It seems to me that there is not the degree of urgency at the executive level which I believe is necessary to save the inner city schools. I contend that a budget request for $5.75 million for the training and retraining of vocational education personnel is inadequate, in light of the demands being placed by the revamped Vocational Education Act to upgrade vocational education to meet space age needs, not only in the high schools and vocational schools but the community colleges as well.

Let me read an excerpt from the first annual report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education:

The violence that wracks our cities has its roots in unemployment and unequal opportunity. Those who have no jobs in an affluent community lash out in anger and frustration. Young men and women who cannot qualify for decent jobs distrust the society which reared them. Dissidents speak with the voice of rebellion; campus and inner-city revolt reaches into our schools. Our Nation seethes.

Racial unrest, violence and the unemployment of youth have their roots in inadequate education. Each year the ranks of the school drop-outs increase by three-quarters of a million young men and women. They enter the job market without the skills and attitudes employers require. They and the millions of others who are underemployed—among these the students who are graduates of our high schools but who are inadequately prepared for anything—are tragic evidence of the present inadequacy of our educational system.

The costs, the blighted lives, the discontent, the violence, and the threat of revolution, are needless. Schools can prepare young people to realize their potential. Each city in the country succeeds every year with some of its students, in even the most depressed parts of the city. Why is success not universal? Why is the failure rate so high.?

The reasons are attitude, program and money.

At the very heart of our problem is a national attitude that says vocational education is designed for somebody else's children. This attitude is shared by businessmen, labor leaders, administrators, teachers, parents, students. We are all guilty. We have promoted the idea that the only good education is an education capped by four years of college. This idea, transmitted by our values, our aspirations and our silent support, is snobbish, undemocratic, and a revelation of why schools fail so many students.

This attitude infects the Federal government, which invests $14 in the Nation's universities for every $1 it invests in the Nation's vocational education programs. It infects State governments which invest far more in universities and colleges than they do for support of skill training for those whose initial preparation for the world of work precedes high school graduation.

It infects school districts, which concentrate on college preparatory and general programs in reckless disregard of the fact that for 60 percent of our young people, high school is still the only transition to the world of work. It infects students, who make inappropriate choices because they are victims of the national yearning for educational prestige.

This attitude must change. The number of jobs which the unskilled can fill is declining rapidly. The number requiring a liberal arts college education, while growing, is increasing far less rapidly than the number demanding a technical skill.

In the 1980s it will still be true that fewer than 20% of our job opportunities will require a four-year college degree. In America every child must be educated to his highest potential, and the height of the potential is not measured by the color of the collar. Plumbers, carpenters and electricians make more than many school superintendents and college presidents. Only the arrogant will allow themselves to feel that one is more worthy than the other.

We recommend (says the Advisory Commission) that the Federal Government immediately exercise its leadership and allocate more of its funds to cure our country of our national sin of intellectual snobbery.

Mr. President, I might inject here that I hope it never comes to pass in this country that we have riots in the streets by college graduates because they cannot find jobs—such as happens in India because they turn out too many degree holders for the number of jobs.

I noted with interest that two conventions of job seeking college teachers this year were having difficulty in placement—because, for example, the colleges

are turning out too many candidates trained to teach English. For the first time, jobs were short.

I agree with the Advisory Commission when it says:

We recommend that substantial federal funds be allocated to support curriculum development, teacher training and pilot programs in vocational education. No federal investment will bring a higher return . . . We believe that the reform of American schools the Nation so desperately needs will not come about if the Federal government continues to invest nearly $4 in remedial manpower training programs for each $1 it invests in vocational programs. If the federal government will substantially support the additional initial cost of educating youth for employment, we believe that the financial, personal and social costs of unemployment can be dramatically reduced.

Mr. President, the States have requested funds in excess of $34 million for teacher training programs, for 23,000 participants.

The $5.75 million requested in the President's budget would permit funding for one-sixth of the projects submitted.

If the President's veto prevails and the amounts are reduced to the President's budget request, vocational education will be funded at only $279 million, $200 million less than Congress voted. My State's share is only $2 million, and at least $10 million is needed for vocational education programs this year to go forward with needed reform.

The real problem is money and personnel, and the Federal Government is not meeting its responsibility in either area.

Over a 3-year period my State needs at least $30 million from the Federal Government to carry out its plans for skills centers, for revamping vocational education in the high schools, and for postsecondary education in its community colleges.

Mr. President, I want to close my remarks as I began, with the wish that I could support the President on this matter. However, I cannot. I do not believe this to be inflationary—not when we have cut the foreign aid bill—in the House—by $1 billion, not when we have cut the budget by upwards of $5 billion. The C5–A has cost $5 billion, and has been grounded; that is inflationary. The F–111 is grounded, countless inflationary millions have been spent—more inflationary than costs for education, which is investment in the real security of this country—its young men and women, and in an educated, responsible citizenry.

Spending $80 billion on the military, even cutting it down to $70 billion, as we may do this year, is too great a price to pay for national defense.

If I may paraphrase T. S. Eliot, who wrote in "The Rock" about our civilization's values, "And the wind shall say, these were a decent people. Their only monument the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls" to read: And the wind shall say, these were a decent people. Their only monument the asphalt road and a thousand rusting tanks and airplanes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In listening to the Senator, he has emphasized the cuts recommended by the President deal primarily with education, wherein he is mandatorily directed to provide funds approved by the Congress. Is that right?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to place a table in the RECORD.

Mr. HATFIELD. Would the Senator kindly restate his question? I do not believe that I heard it all.

Mr. ELLENDER. The thrust of the Senator's statement was that, in most cases, the objections of the President to the bill deal with education—vocational educational training, and a variety of education grants to the States.

Mr. HATFIELD. The point I was making, Senator, was that if the veto is applied to this appropriation bill, I was raising the point of vocational education which would suffer as a result of the reduced figure from what the President had requested and from what we had voted.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I was trying to make was that the cuts recommended by the President deal primarily with the grants that he would be bound to make under the law. These deal with education.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have had prepared a table indicating that.

Mr. HATFIELD. Great.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount over and above the President's request for education and health is $1,223,904,000. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD, as I believe it is applicable to this discussion.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

MANDATORY FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS RECEIVING INCREASES IN HOUSE OR SENATE

[In thousands]

Appropriation/activity	1970 budget	1970 House	1970 Senate	1970 final conference action	Increase over budget
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Educationally deprived children	$1,226,000	$1,396,975	$1 396 975	$1,396,975	+$170,975
Supplementary educational centers	116,393	164,876	164,876	164,876	+48,483
Library resources		50,000	50,000	50,000	+50,000
Guidance, counseling, and testing		17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Equipment and minor remodeling		78,740	78,740	78,740	+78,740
School assistance in federally affected areas: Maintenance and operation	187,000	585,000	645,000	585,000	+398,000
Education professions development: Grants to States	15,000	15,000	21,500	18,250	+3,250
Higher education:					
Undergraduate instructional equipment			14,500		
Direct loans	161,900	229,000	229,000	229,000	+67,100
Facilities grants	43,000	76,000	200,000	76,000	+33,000
Vocational education:					
Grants to States	230,336	357,836	352,836	352,836	+122,500
Work-study		10,000	10,000	10,000	+10,000
Programs for students with special needs		40,000	40,000	40,000	+40,000
Research (State portion only)		17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Consumer and homemaking education	15,000	15,000	20,000	20,000	+5,000
Libraries:					
Library services	23,209	40,709	40,709	40,709	+17,500
Construction of public libraries		9,185	9,185	9,185	+9,185
Education for the handicapped: Preschool and school programs	29,250	29,250	34,250	29,190	−60
Total, Office of Education	2,047,088	3,131,571	3,341,571	3,134,761	+1,087,673
HEALTH AGENCIES					
Hill-Burton construction grants	150,000	254,400	254,400	254,400	+104,400
Community Mental Health Center construction grants	29,200	30,500	36,200	35,500	+6,300
Health professions student loans	15,000	19,781	27,781	23,781	+8,781
Nursing student loan	9,610	15,110	17,610	16,360	+6,750
Grants to the States for public health services (314(d))	90,000	90,000	100,000	100,000	+10,000
Total, health agencies	239,810	409,791	435,991	430,041	+136,231
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE					
Development of programs for the aging: Grants to States	13,000	(1)	20,000	13,000	
Total, HEW	2,353,898	3,541,562	3,797,562	3,577,802	+1,223,904

[1] Consideration deferred due to lack of authorizing legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The thrust of this conflict between the Congress and President Nixon, as I should like to point out once again, is that the President does not have sole responsibility for governing this Nation under the Constitution. The Congress also has a responsibility, and coequal authority. As a matter of fact, when it comes to the raising and disbursement of Federal revenues, the views of the Congress should be given greater weight over the ideas of the "faceless bureaucrats" whose task it is supposedly to advise the President as to what should be done. The Congress is the institution closest to the people, and the one most in tune with the people's needs.

It seems to me that if we were to fail to insist that this appropriations bill be enacted into law to fulfill the priorities established after lengthy investigation, the Congress would be derelict in its duty to the people. A "government by bureaucrat" would replace a government of "elected representation."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. ARENDS as members of the committee, on the part of the House, to join a committee, on the part of the Senate, to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 477) providing for a joint session of Congress on Thursday, January 22, 1970, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

(At this point Mr. CRANSTON took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

LABOR-HEW CONFERENCE REPORT, DESPITE GLARING WEAKNESS, SHOULD BE APPPROVED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I cast my vote today in support of the conference report on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for fiscal 1970. As my colleagues will recall I introduced an amendment when this legislation was first considered on the floor of the Senate to strike funds added to the bill above and beyond the amount the President included in his budget for impacted area aid. My amendment failed. Consequently the bill we are considering today contains almost $400 million more than President Nixon requested for aid to school districts teaching children of federally employed parents.

This means that Fairfax County, Va., to take an example, will receive Federal funds because my press assistant has children in the Fairfax County school system. Arlington County will get some extra Federal support because my administrative assistant has children attending public schools there. These are funds that could be spent on educating the underprivileged, both urban and rural. Or, in the alternative, the money could simply not be appropriated at all—thus reducing the amount by which the Labor-HEW bill exceeds the President's budget requests and increasing the chances for presidential acceptance of the bill.

I might say that the principle the Nixon administration is applying on the impacted area fund is precisely the same principle applied by the previous Johnson administration. Thus, it is not a partisan position they are taking here. The position, as I understand it, is that we should not provide impacted area funds unless the families of the children involved both work and live on the Federal installation.

There are, however, persuasive reasons to support this legislation. For legislative decisions are seldom made because of complete agreement or disagreement. Usually the pros and cons have to be carefully weighed and a judicious decision reached. Nowhere is this more the case than in the consideration of a complex appropriations bill which contains literally dozens of funding items.

Let me mention just a few of the pluses in this legislative package.

First, it should be recognized that, although the funding for the Office of Education included in this bill exceeds the President's budget request in a number of particulars, this is an investment that in many instances can produce an immense return. For instance, the Congress has added $209.5 million to the budget for vocational education. Both Houses agreed on this figure, which was not disputed in conference. And how better could we spend our tax dollars? By giving our young men and women marketable skills we are making them producers in an economy that needs not only the fruits of their production to fill excess demand, but also needs the tax dollars that these wage earners pay into the federal system. Inadequate support for vocational education may be pennywise. It most certainly is pound foolish. And consider Mr. President, what this Presidential-congressional fight over this appropriation bill is all about? Why does President Nixon threaten to veto the bill?

Why? Because he says it is inflationary. But Mr. President, vocational education is deflationary. Vocational education converts unskilled, untrained, often unemployed or unproductive workers into skilled producers. It increases our supply of skilled workers and nothing but nothing is more inflationary than our shortage of skilled workers and what that is doing to skyrocket wages and prices in the skilled trades. In this case more congressional spending on vocational education is deflationary because it will reduce the most inflationary element in our economy, the shortage of skilled workers. Or let us take the health manpower item. Although a part of our health budget, it could also be considered as an integral portion of our educational expenditures, for these funds prepare young men and women to provide health services as doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians. The modest $16.5 million included in the bill for this activity beyond the budgeted amount is nothing more nor less than an investment in the future health of our citizens—especially those citizens who live in urban ghettos and rural poverty pockets—areas that presently are confronted by a serious shortage of health personnel.

Mr. President, the most inflationary phase of the economy is in health services. Whereas we had an inflation of close to 6 percent overall last year, in the health services, inflation was between 12 and 15 percent.

Why?

Because we have a shortage of nurses, we have a shortage of doctors, and we have a shortage of technicians.

What this bill would do, and what Congress would like to do, is to provide more funds to train them. This is the only effective way that we, in the long run, can fight that kind of inflation.

When the Senate first considered this bill on the floor we added a substantial amount for research and development into new and improved methods for preventing and controlling air pollution resulting from fuel combustion. This amendment was introduced by our distinguished colleague from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD). The conferees approved most of the additional amount, and with good reason. Concern over the pollution of our environment runs deep.

I am sure that my colleague, Mr. NELSON, will make what I believe will be a historic speech this afternoon concerning this problem, and how Congress must commit itself to solving the problem if we are to have a country in which its people can literally survive.

Few would gainsay a mere $13 million addition to the President's budget for air pollution control research. Yet this is another drop in the budget overrun bucket that so concerns the President.

I hope these examples illustrate why we cannot simply look at a budget for a particular department, say that it exceeds the President's request, and vote it down. We must look at the quality of the spending. We must set our own priorities here in the Congress if we are to contribute to responsible decisionmaking by the Federal Government. This is why I have worked just as hard as I can to cut wasteful defense and space spending below the budgeted amount, while at the same time advocating a higher priority or education and social services. That is why I feel that it is unfair, if not irresponsible, for the President to

criticize the Congress for increasing this budget without recognizing that we cut five times as much from the Nixon defense budget without damaging in any way the Nation's defenses. In fact, we have been better budget cutters here in the Congress than the President.

Frankly, I would like to see this bill recommitted to conference so that the impacted areas assistance I so oppose could be deleted. However, I know that my chances of gaining support for a recommital motion with instructions to delete impacted areas increases are nonexistent. Thus, I will support this package in the belief that the good outweighs the bad.

Mr. President, the debate over the HEW appropriation bill must be placed in perspective. The propaganda from the White House, from the Budget Bureau, and from the minority party in the House and Senate—and it has been propaganda that has dominated the television and newspapers—would have the public believe that Congress has acted like a bunch of drunken sailors out on a spending spree. But the facts are very much different than that notion which has been widely publicized.

Far from increasing the President's budget, we cut it drastically.

Congress cut $5.6 billion from President Nixon's revised budget requests. The figures are slightly different, depending on the fiscal year one is talking about.

Let me repeat, Congress made an overall cut of $5.6 billion from President Nixon's revised budget request.

If we had been a rubberstamp Congress and had given him every penny he asked for, we would have voted $5.6 billion more than we did.

In achieving this net result, Congress cut 10 of the 14 fiscal year 1970 appropriation bills.

Congress cut a total of $7.6 billion from the 10 appropriation bills where cuts were made. This cut included $6 billion from the Department of Defense and the military construction bill. Congress added $2 billion to four appropriation bills.

For the sake of the record, let us be specific about the cuts and increases.

Congress cut $38.5 million below the President's request from the Treasury-Post Office and executive office appropriation.

It cut $226 million below the President's request from independent offices and HUD.

It cut $10 million below President Nixon's request from Interior and related agencies.

It cut $111 million below the President's request from State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.

It cut $28 million from the executive branch budget.

It cut $356.8 million below the President's request for military construction, or over one-third billion dollars.

It cut $60 million below the President's request from the District of Columbia appropriations.

Congress cut $5.6 billion below the President's request for the Defense Department.

Congress cut $1.1 billion from the President's request for foreign aid.

Congress cut $36 million from the President's request for supplemental appropriations.

That is a whooping cut of $7.6 billion.

On four bills, Congress increased the President's request. This included $251 million for Agriculture, $1.1 billion for Labor-HEW, $552 million for public works, and $89 million for transportation, or a total of just over $2 billion.

But the net result is a $5.6 billion overall cut for fiscal year 1970. That net result includes the additional funds in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

What we did here in Congress was to begin to reorder this Nation's priorities. We cut the military budget and many other areas. But we took a part of this overall savings and raised the amounts for health and education. But, at the same time, we reduced the overall fiscal 1970 appropriations by $5.6 billion.

If there is a big spender, it is the administration and the White House. Contrary to the vast propaganda, compared with the administration, Congress cannot rightly be charged with profligacy.

What effect does this action have on spending itself? According to the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures, these appropriation bill cuts will reduce actual "outlays" by almost $3 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that a table from page 4 of the committee's staff report No. 14, giving the results of the action of Congress on both budget authority and outlays, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING TABLES

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS AND INACTIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) DURING THE 91ST CONG., 1ST SESS. (AS OF DEC. 23, 1969)

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the revised budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the revised budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1970: Actions on individual bills affecting budget authority and outlays:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised budget):						
Treasury, post office, and Executive Office (H.R. 11582, Public Law 91-74)	−42,382	−34,519	−38,482	−37,000	−30,600	−34,000
Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 11612, P.L. 91-127)	−160,907	+405,236	+251,341	+53,000	+294,000	+166,000
Second supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400, P.L. 91-47)				−92,700	−64,700	−75,000
Section 401 outlay ceiling					(−1,900,000)	(−1,000,000)
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban development (H.R. 12307, P.L. 91-126)	−471,325	−177,521	−226,099	−61,000	−25,900	−40,000
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 12781, P.L. 91-98)	−15,810	−8,090	−10,481	−15,300	−11,800	−7,800
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 12964, P.L. 91-153)	−130,070	−83,350	−111,272	−71,000	−40,600	−60,000
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 13111)	+1,078,365	+1,637,686	+1,139,028	+521,000	+653,000	+565,000
Legislative Branch (H.R. 13763, P.L. 91-145)	−26,850	−29,842	−27,826	−7,900	−8,800	−8,700
Public Works (H.R. 14159, P.L. 91-144)	+301,469	+789,451	+552,030	+10,500	+67,400	+50,000
Military Construction (H.R. 14751, P.L. 91-170)	−466,741	−313,854	−356,844	−37,000	−26,500	−29,000
Transportation (H.R. 14794, P.L. 91-168)	+34,546	+106,679	+89,265	−172,000	−43,200	−133,000
District of Columbia (H.R. 14916, P.L. 91-155)	−40,151	−55,295	−60,332	−14,000	−13,800	−12,500
Department of Defense (H.R. 15090, P.L. 91-171)	−5,318,152	−5,955,544	−5,637,632	−3,000,000	−3,250,000	−3,200,000
Foreign Aid (H.R. 15149)	−1,071,544	−960,779	−1,120,654	−167,000	−146,000	−120,000
Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 15209, P.L. 91-166)	−63,490	−17,721	−36,317	−5,670	+30,000	+19,000
Subtotal, appropriation bills	−6,393,042	−4,697,463	−5,594,275	−3,096,070	−2,617,500	−2,920,000

Source: Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, "1970 Budget Scorekeeping Report" (staff report No. 14), Dec. 23, 1969, p. 4.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me make one further point. The President of the United States has control over outlays which the Congress does not have. He can slow down or speed up expenditures. He can determine their timing in a way in which Congress cannot. As a matter of fact, he can refuse to spend the money at all. And past Presidents have done so. Thus, the President can improve on the almost $3 billion cut in outlays Congress provided under the President's request. We cut outlays almost $3 billion below President Nixon's request. He can cut them even further, if he is willing to act.

Let me make some further points. It is my personal view that the President should have taken a much stronger stand against wasteful spending.

Congress was the one who cut military spending. The President and the Secretary of Defense were adamant against it. Finally, when Congress cut the defense budget, they tried to claim it was their idea all along. But if we had had real help from the White House and the Pentagon, we could have cut wasteful and unneeded military spending even more.

Some of us remember the charges that the critics of military spending were merely "new isolationists," and the words of the Secretary of Defense that the cuts would harm our security. It is amazing how, after the fact, they are now trying to claim credit for what Congress did. And some of the newspapers and some of the best reporters in the country have accepted that impression. Apparently they believe that the President is fighting to hold down spending, when it is the Congress that is doing it.

The President should have moved against excessive space spending for fiscal 1970. But that was not done by the White House.

He could have opposed the SST, as virtually every one of his advisers and departments proposed. But that billion dollar plane for the convenience of the jet set was approved.

And what about slowing down highways and other public works under the control of the Budget Bureau and the White House? That was done by President Johnson, and it was very successful in combating inflation in fiscal year 1966–67. That has not been done by the present President.

Those are the low priorities. They should be cut.

Instead we face a veto over funds for health and education and jobs. And we face such a veto even though this Congress had cut the President's own budget requests by a net amount of $5.6 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we talk about reordering the priorities. That is exactly what the two committees did, and exactly what was done on the floor.

It is hard for me to realize that we did reestablish the priorities. We took almost exactly the same amount from foreign aid that we put in the HEW bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a pretty sensible way for the American people to reorder priorities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we did exactly that. And in addition, we cut $5.6 billion overall below the amount the President asked for.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When we talk about reestablishing priorities, it is hard for me to understand that we have done it. The administration did not like it. However, the $1 billion, almost to the dollar, is what has been included in this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator makes an excellent point. I have made this argument before, and I have yet to hear a single Republican Senator refute the figures.

We did cut obligational authority by $5.6 billion, and we did cut outlays by almost $3 billion.

There is not disagreement except in the minds of the general public. No newspaper reporters have refuted this statement, but some have published stories that seemed to be aimed at this objective.

The Republicans agree on the floor that the figures are correct.

Somehow, we must get to the American people the fact that it is the Congress that has reduced spending and not the President.

I commend the Senator from Washington. I think he has done a superlative job.

I intend to support the bill. And I think we have every right to reorder our priorities and invest the small amount that we have saved overall in health.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin deals with fiscal problems every day in the joint committee. I am not an economist, but we are talking about $1.2 billion in this instance. The gross national product will be $1 trillion. I do not think it is going to shake any fiscal foundations in the country when the testimony was unanimous with respect to need.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is about one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded..

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period now for the transaction of routine morning business, and that remarks therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SECTION 401 OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969 (H. DOC. NO. 91–208)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Director of the Budget on the operation of section 401 of the act limiting fiscal year 1970 budget outlays through November, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION TO ALL YOUNG AMERICANS WHO QUALIFY AND SEEK IT

A communication from the President of the United States relating to postsecondary education to all young Americans who qualify and seek it; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Agency setting forth certain information on grants (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF AGREEMENTS SIGNED FOR FOREIGN CURRENCIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

A letter from the General Sales Manager, Export Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of agreements signed for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 for November and December 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STATUS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES FUNDS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Director of Science and Education, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of research facilities funds as of June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting on disbursements of appropriations under "Contingencies Defense" for the first quarter of fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED FLAG OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE IN THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OF THE' NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED FACILITIES PROJECTS, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing) reporting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED FACILITIES PROJECT, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), reporting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED FACILITIES PROJECTS, ARMY RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), reporting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICER ARMY AVIATORS ENTITLED TO FLIGHT PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on officer Army aviators entitled to flight pay for the period July 1 throught December 31,

1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE RYUKYUAN LEGISLATURE DURING 1969

A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional legislation enacted by the Ryukyuan Legislature during 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, reporting, pursuant to law, on the fees and charges which the Department of Housing and Urban Development proposes to collect to guarantee the land acquisition and development costs for new communities under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Department of Justice in the environment of title I of the Consumer Protection Act of 1968, for the calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM ON TRUTH IN LENDING

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Board on truth in lending, for the year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–September 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing information on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 83d annual report of the Commission, for fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ALL ELECTRIC HOMES IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a publication entitled "All Electric Homes in the United States," January 1, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of liabilities and other financial commitments of the U.S. Government as of June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND BALANCES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO COMPLEMENT THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on Hawk missile systems provided to Far East countries (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on improvements needed in selecting military personnel for formal school training by U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to improve performance standards for more efficient use of civilian production personnel in the Department of Defense, dated December 29, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that management of civilian hiring limitations and recruiting by the Department of Defense is costly, dated December 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for better coordination among, and guidance of, management evaluation groups in the Department of Defense, dated January 2, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improved procedures needed for obtaining facilities for U.S. naval support activity, Naples, Italy, by lease-construction method, Department of the Navy, dated January 6, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the readiness of selected units of the Reserve components of the Army, dated January 7, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on prices negotiated for rock-crushing plants for use in the Republic of Vietnam, Department of the Army, dated January 9, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., fiscal year 1969, Department of Justice, dated January 12, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of financial statements of the Veterans' Canteen Service for fiscal year 1969, Veterans' Administration, dated January 13, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a change proposed in interest rate criteria for determining financing costs of Federal power program, Department of the Interior, dated January 13, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvements needed in the management of aircraft modifications, Department of the Army, dated January 14, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing financial management of Bureau of the Mint operations needs improvement, Department of the Treasury, dated January 16, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on economies obtainable by increasing days at sea of oceanographic research and survey ships, Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce, dated January 16, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administration, for 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON STATUS OF THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 13th annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE HELIUM ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on matters contained in the Helium Act, dated December 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DONATIONS RECEIVED AND EXPENDITURES MADE FROM THE FUNDS CONTRIBUTED FOR ADVANCEMENT OF INDIAN RACE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law on donations received and expenditures made from the fund "14X8563 Funds Contributed for Advancement of Indian Race, Bureau of Indian Affairs" during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK, WYO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract for Yellowstone National Park, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to proceedings instituted before the Subversive Activities Control Board during the period January 1, 1969, through December 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on identical bidding in advertised public procurement, during the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report setting forth all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 19th annual report of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the year ended December 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE GOLDEN SPIKE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

A letter from the President, Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, reporting that it will complete its assignment and cease its function on December 31, 1969, and that a final report will be filed with the Congress thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of American for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SEASONAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor, Joint Labor-Commerce Study of Construction Seasonality, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on seasonal unemployment in the construction industry (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administration with respect to certain civilian position established during the calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of scientific and professional positions established in the Department under the authority contained in section 3104(a)(4), title 5, United States Code (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS, U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the scientific or professional positions authorized for establishment in the Agency for the calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES: GS–18, GS–17, AND GS–16, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering a Commission position in grade GS–18 which has been established (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, 17, 18, COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 which are under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, 17, 18, RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT CONCERNING SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, U.S. Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in the Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON GS–17 POSITIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, reporting, pursuant to law, on the four GS–17 positions allocated to this agency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RENTAL AGREEMENTS FOR QUARTERS AT FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES

A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter into rental agreements with postmasters for quarters at fourth-class offices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, informing the Senate that the report of the Economic Development Administration would not be completed until the end of January; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the activities of the TVA for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Federal Cochairman, New England Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the New England Regional Commission during fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON TERRITORIAL HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

entitled "Territorial Highway Study—Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"STATE OF MICHIGAN, MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 275

("Offered by Representatives Hampton, Loren D. Anderson, James F. Smith and Brennan)

"A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to use the Marine Hospital in Detroit for the treatment of youthful drug offenders

"Whereas, Marine Hospital, now called the Public Service Hospital, in Detroit was built in 1930 for $600,000.00 with a 130-bed capacity and was expanded three years later for improved outpatient services at a cost of $235,000.00; and

"Whereas, The hospital fronts on the Detroit River, has high fences on three sides and includes a two-wing hospital, nurses quarters and has a 146-bed capacity; and

"Whereas, The federal government closed the hospital as of June 30 of this year and deliberations are presently being held to determine the disposition of the Marine Hospital; and

"Whereas, There is a dire need for adequate treatment facilities for youthful drug offenders in Michigan, a problem of great magnitude; and the facilities of the Marine Hospital are particularly well suited for use as a rehabilitation and treatment center for youthful drug offenders; now therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the United States Congress are urged to take the necessary action to transfer the Marine Hospital in Detroit to the State of Michigan to be used as facility for the rehabilitation and treatment of youthful drug offenders; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the United States Congress.

"Adopted by the House December 11, 1969.

"Adopted by the Senate December 16, 1969.

"BERYL I. KENYON,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"T. THOS. THATCHER,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Pinellas County, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate sufficient sums for cancer research; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by Lions International, Chicago, Ill., supporting the President and Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Church Women United, at Beaumont, Tex., demonstrating against exploitation of women by the theater, motion pictures, newspapers, books, magazines, and advertising; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Educational Facility Planners, Columbus, Ohio, praying for the adoption of a Federal bond interest study program which will guarantee the saleability of bonds for educational facilities construction; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Audubon Society of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo., praying for the appointment of a commission to study the resources of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Plymouth, State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the taxation by the United States of interest on the obligations of a state or any political subdivision or public instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the St. Stans Holy Name Society, Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1077, relating to obscenity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition from the Neighborhood Legal Assistance Program, Inc., Charleston, S.C., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 3305. A bill to alleviate the trend toward concentration in the newspaper and broadcast media in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. MCINTYRE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 3306. A bill for the relief of Fermin Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3307. A bill to prevent further increases in the monthly premium payable for supplementary medical insurance under part B of the medicare program established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. PELL):

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States declaring that every person has an inalienable right to a decent environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 3305 AND AMENDMENT NO. 442—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AND AMENDMENT RELATING TO NEWSPAPER AND BROADCAST MEDIA IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference an amendment to S. 1520, the Newspaper Preservation Act, and also a separate bill entitled the "Independent Media Preservation Act."

I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a press release I have issued on the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD together with the amendment and bill.

There being no objection, the statement, press release, bill, and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM MCINTYRE

"A small group of men, numbering perhaps no more than a dozen anchor men, commentators, and executive producers, settle upon the film and commentary that is to reach the public. They decide what 40 to 50 million Americans will learn of the day's events in the nation and the world."

With these words, delivered to the Mid-Western Regional Republican Conference in Des Moines, Iowa, and in a subsequent attack on the multiple interests of such representatives of the print media as the Washington Post and the New York Times, Vice President Agnew drew our attention recently to one of the gravest dangers faced by a democracy—the prospect that a small and irresponsible elite might one day be able to gather in its hands complete control of the mass communications media.

Like many who heard and read the Vice President's words, I was troubled, for it would indeed be tragic if the media ever came to speak with a single monolithic voice.

The communications media do, after all, set the agenda of public issues and, indeed, provide the forum necessary to elect men to public office. What people think most important at a given time is often what the media have told them is important.

But what particularly troubled me about the Vice President's words was his seeming ignorance of the *real* dangers such media concentration could present.

Mr. Agnew seemed far less anxious to preserve a multiplicity of media voices than he was to shape the content of the single voice through which he fears the media now speaks.

In short, he appeared to advocate a "majoritarian" approach to news analysis. In his suggestion that the networks be "more responsive to the people they serve," he seemed to call for consensus reporting, for newscasters to reflect a collective point of view generally shared by the American public instead of a viewpoint at least in theory developed perceptive and professional journalistic techniques.

Under other circumstances, I would have been tempted to dismiss Mr. Agnew's remarks as just another political blast at some irritating press criticism. I can sympathize with such irritation. I think all men in public life must frequently feel as Dr. Johnson did when he said "the liberty of the press is a blessing when we are inclined to write against others and a calamity when we find ourselves overborne by the multitude of our assailants.

And in so dismissing the matter, I would have been tempted to twit Mr. Agnew about his obsession with the so-called "liberal Eastern establishment press," since any casual student of the subject knows that with the solitary exception of 1964 the Presidential ticket of Mr. Agnew's party has had the endorsement of the overwhelming majority of American newspapers for many, many decades.

What made it impossible for me to so dismiss the Vice President's remarks, however, was the office from which he spoke and the clear threat of intimidation implicit in his remarks.

Mr. Agnew said, of course, that he was "not asking for Government censorship or any other kind of censorship." But the thrust

of this disclaimer was diminished by his only slightly veiled reference to the Government's power to license television stations and by his suggestion that the networks be "made"—not "make themselves"—more responsive to popular views.

Under these circumstances, I was deeply troubled by the philosophy of news analysis implicit in Mr. Agnew's remarks. For the purpose of news analysis is not to convey an "official" line, nor to capture the popular mood of the moment. It is to provide information, stimulate thought, and enable individuals to make their own judgments intelligently.

As the late Edward R. Murrow once put it:

"It is a truism that democracy is a means of dealing with the human imperfections of society. It recognizes that no form of government is perfect, no administration can be faultless, no legal system beyond improvement, no economic order as good as it might be.

"Where there is imperfection there must be change. And to produce change, unless it is imposed by tyranny, there must be difference of opinion: there must be opposition . . . there must be freedom to criticize; there must be the unremitting conflict and testing of ideas. This undoubtedly involves a great deal of confusion. But the liveliness of a democracy can be measured by the activity of the minds of its citizens. Security and serenity in a democracy are not at all the same things. They may even be opposites."

Thomas Jefferson summed it up more simply when he said that a democracy can tolerate error of opinion only so long as truth may freely combat it.

Mr. Agnew's failure to deal responsibly with the issue of media concentration was the more distressing to me because I feel that we may now be heading in just that direction. If we examine the facts, the trends seem clear. Slowly, almost imperceptibly, our mass communications media are falling into fewer hands.

Consider the startling growth of newspaper chains. In 1960, 560 of the daily newspapers in the country were under chain control. As of 1967, the number of chain dailies was 871, an increase of 56% in only 7 years.

These 871 chain dailies represented 49.3 per cent of all the dailies in the country. They had amassed 61.8% of all dailies' circulation, and 19 of the 25 largest dailies were included in their number.

During the 1960's an average of 40 single newspaper ownerships have been bought out by chains each and every year. At the present rate of expansion, all of the daily newspapers in the country will be owned by chains in less than 20 years.

It was at the San Diego-based Copley chain, now with 26 newspapers and growing quickly, that the Administration found its Director of Communications Herb Klein and several other top officials.

This growth of large newspaper combines has been accompanied by a trend toward monopoly situations within individual cities. As of 1967, only 64 of the 1,547 cities in which daily newspapers were published had two competing papers. In all others a single owner controlled either the only newspaper in town or a morning-afternoon combination.

In 1910, 57.1% of our daily newspaper towns were served by more than one newspaper ownership. In 1930, the figure was still 21.5%. Now only 4.13% enjoy competing dailies.

The problem of press concentration, however, extends well beyond the newspaper field. Many newspaper publishers have found it profitable to acquire broadcast facilities. Already fully 25% of the television stations in the country are newspaper owned. In the 25 largest television markets, it is 35%. And the figures are even higher for VHF stations alone.

Let's look for a moment at just a few of our multi-media baronies. Mr. Agnew, in his speech at Montgomery, Alabama, himself referred to the multiple interests of The Washington Post and The New York Times, two occasionally rather waspish critics of Administration policy.

But he could have referred instead to The Chicago Tribune Company, an unyielding bulwark of American conservatism. In Chicago itself the Company controls two newspapers as well as television and radio interests. In New York its ownership of additional broadcast interests is accompanied by ownership of The New York Daily News, the largest circulation newspaper in the Country. Broadcast interests in Minnesota, Colorado, and Connecticut, CATV systems in Michigan and California, and newspapers in Florida constitute the Company's outer barricades.

Time, Inc., Cowles Communications, Gannett, Newhouse, Hearst, and Scripps-Howard —these are but a few of our other media baronies, and each has interests comparable in scope to those of The Tribune Company.

Such multi-media companies are having a distinct impact on many local communities. While few communities as yet have absolute monopolies, there are today 76 communities in the country where the one newspaper and one radio station are under common control. And 23 more communities put up with joint ownership of their only television station and only newspaper.

It is developments like these which lead me to believe that we well may be embarked on a trek toward monopoly in the most precious commodity known to man.

It would be ironic if this were to occur at a time when government itself were moving in the direction of more public participation. Yet such may prove the case. While our legislative bodies have been redistricted and we are on the verge of abolishing the electoral college, the fourth estate continues closing in upon itself.

Before assuming this is due to any inevitable trend toward bigness in the business world, we would do well to examine one more set of statistics. It is simply not true that only a giant metropolis can afford the benefits of competing daily newspapers. Of the 64 presently competitive cities, slightly less than half (29) are under 100,000 in population and almost a third (20) have less than 50,000 people.

Present trends within the media are due, no doubt, to a number of different causes. One of the most important, however, has been the attraction presented to businessmen by a local monopoly's profits.

The advantages of local monopolies can at times be startling. William Randolph Hearst, Jr. has been quoted as saying that two competing dailies making $100,000, each can increase their profits to $500,000 by agreeing to a merger.

One need not look far to see why this is so. Mergers produce savings on many staff, printing, and circulation expenditures. Equally important, they end all competition for advertising and circulation. It has been reported that a Brookings Institution study now in preparation will show newspaper advertising rates in monopoly towns to be 15% higher than in those where competition exists.

Some monopolies have come about through mergers, when permitted by the antitrust laws. Others have been achieved by driving competitors out of business. Selling advertising or subscriptions below cost and refusing to accept advertising from those who patronize competing papers are but two of the tactics which have been used upon occasion.

Newspaper chains and multi-media baronies have had distinct advantages over single unit competitors when engaging in such practices. They have been able to subsidize any losses thus incurred with profits earned from other operations.

They have also had open to them some tactics not available to single unit predators, such as the selling of advertising for two entities in combination at rates much lower than for each separately, or the refusal to accept advertising except in combination packages. These tactics have proved successful in drawing the funds of advertisers with limited resources and a need to reach certain essential parts of a local market away from smaller competitors.

It is not really clear how many publishers have engaged in predatory practices, either legal or illegal. A great many, however, have evinced a clear preference for the profits of monopoly over the rigors of competition.

One such group of publishers is now lobbying Congress for passage of a bill. It is known as "The Newspaper Preservation Act," and the exemption it would establish from our antitrust laws could significantly accelerate the growth of newspaper monopolies.

Under the bill's terms competing newspaper in a community would be allowed to enter into "joint operating agreements" with one another. They would be authorized to act jointly in setting advertising and circulation rates and also to engage in profit splitting, whereby their profits could be pooled and then divided between them according to an agreed ratio.

Support for the bill comes from 44 newspapers in 22 cities currently party to joint operating agreements such as would be legitimized if the bill were passed. Many of these agreements may be challenged in the courts by virtue of a recent Supreme Court decision.

The premise underlying the bill is that the newspaper industry is in serious financial straits and that joint operating agreements are essential if the independent editorial voices of many papers are to be saved. The only alternative, supporters of the bill argue, is the death of many papers or their complete merger with competitors.

This argument does not withstand analysis.

To begin with, the newspaper industry is now experiencing unprecedented prosperity. This may not be true in a handful of large cities, where the middle class readers sought by advertisers have deserted to the suburbs and where unions have been successful in resisting modernization. But by and large, it is true elsewhere.

As Forbes magazine concluded after a recent check on the industry's condition: "The fact is that, on the whole, the newspaper industry has never been healthier, not even in the heyday of Joseph Pulitzer and William Randolph Hearst."

It is also questionable whether the anticompetitive effects of joint operating agreements involving price fixing and profit splitting are really any less than those of an outright merger.

Both end all advertising competition in equally effective ways. According to the Brookings Institution study to which I referred earlier, the ad rates of newspapers with joint operating agreements are not significantly different from the rates of papers in monopoly towns.

It seems unlikely also that joint operating agreements will actually preserve independent editorial voices. Few publishers are likely to act jointly in all economic matters without occasionally conferring on editorial matters as well.

In fact, in at least one respect joint operating agreements might have a worse effect than would an outright merger. A new com-

petitor is more likely to enter a one newspaper market than he would a market with separate and ostensibly independent papers.

But these considerations are just the beginning.

It should be noted also that more limited forms of joint operation, such as the use of joint printing and distribution facilities, are already permitted under the antitrust laws. These activities already make possible considerable cost savings without adverse effects on competition.

Moreover, enactment of the bill would result in the establishment of a dangerous precedent. It would, without doubt, invite pleas for similar special treatment from others, such as book and magazine publishers, the broadcast industry, and motion picture producers. If newspapers are entitled to antitrust exemptions because engaged in the expression and dissemination of ideas essential to the national welfare, then why not these others who are similarly situated?

Yet the truth of the matter is that newspapers' role as disseminators of information in our society is the most important reason why they should not be granted an exemption in the first place. Other industries granted antitrust immunity, such as the transportation and insurance industries, have subsequently been subjected to detailed government regulation. Such regulation of newspapers, however, might well interfere with values protected by the First Amendment.

That such values are not of major importance to supporters of the bill is clear from two of its more technical provisions. Joint operating agreements would be permitted regardless of a newspaper's ownership of affiliation. The only prerequisite would be a determination that one of the two papers "appears unlikely to remain or become a financially sound publication." If it were really the purpose of the bill's supporters to act only when necessary to save dying editorial voices, surely tighter standards could easily be found.

This is not a newspaper preservation act; it is a publishers enrichment act.

That it should be seriously considered by Congress is a sad commentary of our failure to perceive what is happening to our media.

Its backing by the Administration is further proof of its own myopic vision. I call upon Mr. Agnew, if he truly fears a concentration of the media, to join with me now in opposition to this bill.

Unless we face up soon to the dangers such concentration entails, we may soon lose the diverse and antagonistic voices on which the welfare of our nation depends.

I call upon Mr. Agnew to join with me also in steps to preserve a multitude of such voices.

While I am unalterably opposed to the enactment of a publishers' enrichment act, I will, when the Congress returns, introduce an amendment to it. Its introduction will ensure that the issue of media concentration is debated by the Senate when the bill is brought to the floor.

My amendment will provide that the bill's exemption shall not be available to any paper owned by a newspaper chain or in any way affiliated with broadcast entities.

Chain newspapers and multi-media baronies are themselves responsible for the present concentration within the media. They are almost invariably highly profitable enterprises. I have discussed earlier the competitive advantages they enjoy in a community over their single unit competitors. If the bill's exemption were made available to them, they would have an incentive to use these advantages to so injure their competitors as to induce them into entering joint operating agreements. Once such agreements had been entered into, they would normally be the dominant party. And their competitive advantages over any remaining competitors would be even further enhanced.

To grant to such companies an exemption unlikely in any situation to preserve independent editorial voices would be an open invitation to greater media concentration.

I will also introduce when the Congress returns another bill separate from the Newspaper Preservation Act. It will be titled the Independent Media Preservation Act, and it will be designed to deal more broadly with media concentration and the role played in causing it by newspaper chains and multimedia companies.

The bill will have two main provisions:

1. It will prohibit any owner of five or more daily newspapers from henceforth acquiring any additional such papers. If enacted into law, this prohibition would bring to a halt the startling growth of large newspaper chains throughout the country. As I remarked earlier, this growth of large chains must be halted or all of the daily newspapers in the country will be chain owned in less than 20 years.

This proposal is not by any means a totally new departure. The FCC has already established analogous requirements in the field of broadcasting. Its existing Multiple Ownership rules already limit to five the number of VHF television licenses which any single party may hold. The FCC has also imposed similar limits on the number of UHF, AM, and FM licenses which may be gathered into a single corporate hand.

Newspaper publishing is a communications media in many respects analogous to broadvasting and in clear competition with it. Indeed, as more and more of our communities become monopoly newspaper towns, the remaining paper becomes for editorial purposes just one additional broadcaster. These considerations may well require that maximum limitations on ownership be established in the newspaper field.

2. My bill will complement its restrictions on the size of national communications empires with a provision dealing directly with local concentration. It will provide that no daily newspaper owner may henceforth own or control any radio or television station situated in the same standard metropolitan statistical area in which any such paper is published.

This proposal is also but an extension of existing rules. The FCC presently has under active consideration an amendment to its Multiple Ownership Rules which would prohibit the common ownership of any two broadcast interests within a given market. My proposal is nothing more than a logical extension of this prohibition across the media spectrum.

Some such extension has been called for by the Justice Department in its comments on the proposed amendment to the FCC's rules. As the Justice Department recognized, the same considerations which militate against the common ownership of two broadcasting media in a single market militate also against any newspaper-broadcast combinations in such a market.

The Justice Department also favored in its comments some kind of divestiture requirements such as are required by this second of my proposals. Under its terms, any existing newspaper-broadcast combination in a given market will be given three years in which to sell off one of its properties. This is the period for which broadcast licenses have long been granted, and it should give existing combinations ample time to bring themselves into compliance with the law.

Any sales of broadcast interests necessitated by the enactment of my amendment would be permitted to take place under Section 310 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934. I sincerely doubt that any such sales would work financial hardship on the sellers involved. I would, however, welcome comments directed to this point, and am willing to consider proposals designed to alleviate such hardships.

These are the two main provisions of my bill. Any violations of them will constitute violations of the antitrust laws and will be subject to prosecution as such.

Perhaps there are better ways to deal with the problem of media concentration. My bill will no doubt be referred for hearings to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, whose distinguished Chairman, Senator Philip Hart of Michigan, has demonstrated by his hearings on the Newspaper Preservation Act his firm grasp of media concentration issues. Modifications of my proposals might be made during the course of these hearings and alternative approaches developed. I am sure that any bill reported out by Senator Hart's Subcommittee will be subject first to a painstaking thorough analysis.

In conclusion, I would like to make two final points.

First, I want to make very clear the high regard I have for the performance in recent years of the great majority of our professional journalists in both the print and broadcast fields. Outstanding achievements have been recorded by entities large and small. It was the Dispatch News Agency, a new independent service, which first broke the story of the My Lai massacre to the world. Yet a great many Pulitizer prizes and other major awards have ben won by representatives of chains and multi-media companies.

Without the perception *and the persuasion* of the media I wonder how long it would have taken before all of us woke up to the widespread disenchantment over Vietnam, the tragically widening rift between black and white, the irony of want amidst affluence, the consequences of the generation gap, and the convictions and aspirations not only of the young American, but of the middle-aged Middle American as well.

I fully recognize the commitment to the public interest shared by many powerful media executives. If we could rest assured that men of their caliber would always occupy their positions of great power, I would be far less concerned with the dangers of concentration. But this cannot be assured and our long term hopes must therefore rest on a multitude of competing voices.

Second, I would like to anticipate one of the arguments sure to be raised in opposition to my proposals. They are, it will be said by some, in contravention of the First Amendment. But the intended beneficiaries of press freedom are the news consumers, not purveyors. As the Supreme Court has declared:

"It would be strange indeed . . . if the grave concern for freedom of the press which promoted adoption of the first amendment should be read as a command that the Government was without power to protect that freedom. The first amendment, far from providing an argument against the application of (antitrust concepts), provides powerful reasons to the contrary. That amendment rests on the assumption that the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the public and that a free press is a condition of a free society. Surely a command that the Government itself shall not impede the free flow of ideas does not afford nongovermental combinations a refuge if they impose restraints upon that constitutionally guaranteed freedom."

Let us determine, then, the extent of cur-

rent restraints and what it would be best for us to do about them.

PRESS RELEASE OF U.S. SENATOR THOMAS J. MCINTYRE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D-N.H.) today called upon Vice President Spiro T. Agnew to prove the sincerity of his alleged concern over media concentration by joining McIntyre in support of an anti-concentration bill the New Hampsire Democrat intends to introduce and in opposition to the Newspaper Preservation Act now pending before Congress with Nixon Administration support. (Full text of statement attached).

Mr. Agnew's recent forays against the media, McIntyre charged, have been conducted "in seeming ignorance the real dangers such concentration could present. He has seemed far less anxious to preseve a multiplicity of media voices than to shape the content of the one voice through which he fears the media now speaks."

Yet media concentration, McIntyre said, is a very real threat at the present time. Citing the growth of large newspaper chains and equally imposing newspaper-broadcast combinations, he declared that "slowly, almost imperceptibly, our mass communication media are falling into fewer hands."

McIntyre's bill contains two provisions designed to arrest this trend toward concentration. It would:

1. Prohibit any owner of five or more daily newspapers from henceforth acquiring any addditional such papers; and

2. Prohibit any owner of a daily newspaper from henceforth owning or controlling any radio or television station situated in the same standard metropolitan statistical area in which his paper is published.

Under the terms of McIntyre's proposals, existing newspaper chains would not be required to divest themselves of any newspaper properties and further growth would still be possible except by acquisitions.

Existing newspaper-broadcast combinations in specific markets would be given three years in which to sell off one of their properties. Sales of broadcast interests would be permitted to take place under Section 310(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 which permits license transfers without comparative hearings before the Federal Communications Commission.

Violations of the Senator's bill would constitute violations of the antitrust laws and would be subject to prosecution as such.

McIntyre took pains to emphasize the tentative nature of his specific proposals, noting that his bill would be referred for hearings to Senator Philip Hart's (D-Mich.) Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. "Modifications of my proposals might be made during the course of these hearings," he said, "and alternative approaches developed."

He also stressed his belief in the constitutionality of his proposals as presently framed. "The intended beneficiaries of press freedom," he declared, "are the news consumers, not news purveyors.

"As the Supreme Court has declared on more than one occasion: The first amendment, far from providing an argument against the application of (antitrust concepts), provides powerful reasons to the contrary. . . . Surely a command that the Government itself shall not impede the free flow of ideas does not afford nongovernmental combinations a refuge if they impose restraints upon that constitutionally guaranteed freedom."

Such restraints now exist, McIntyre said, as the result of two developments during recent decades.

As of 1967, he noted, daily newspaper chains "had amassed 61.8% of all dailies' circulation, and 19 of the 25 largest dailies were included in their number. At the present rate of expansion, all of the daily newspapers in the country will be owned by chains in less than 20 years."

He also pointed out that many newspaper publishers have found it profitable to acquire broadcast facilities. "Already fully 25% of the television stations in the country are newspaper owned, and in the 25 largest television markets it is 35%."

McIntyre indicated that while these developments have not greatly affected media competition on the national level, they have had real impact on many local communities. As of 1967, he stressed, only 64 of the 1,547 cities with daily newspapers had two competing papers, and in many communities the great bulk of the communications media were concentrated in a single hand.

However great the number of national media voices, he declared, they cannot offset the effects of this concentration where local issues are concerned.

The present trend toward media concentration would be accelerated, McIntyre said, if the Newspaper Preservation Act now pending before Congress were passed. He noted that the bill contains an exemption from the antitrust laws which would permit two ostensibly competing newspapers in a community to enter into price fixing and profit splitting agreements with one another.

McIntyre took issue with the suggestion that such an exemption was either needed or would in fact operate to save independent editorial voices.

"This is not a newspaper preservation act," he declared. "It is a publisher's enrichment act. That it should be seriously considered by Congress is a sad commentary on our failure to perceive what is happening to our media.

"Its backing by the Nixon Administration is further proof of its own myopic vision. I call upon Mr. Agnew, if he truly fears a concentration of the media, to join with me now in opposition to this bill."

While he expressed the hope that the bill would be defeated outright, McIntyre said he would introduce an amendment to it to ensure that the issue of media concentration is debated when the bill comes to the Senate floor. Under the terms of McIntyre's amendment, the bill's exemption would not be available to any paper owned by a newspaper chain or in any way affiliated with broadcast entities.

"I fully recognize," McIntyre declared, "the commitment to the public interest shared by many powerful media executives. If we could rest assured that men of their caliber would always occupy their positions of great power, I would be far less concerned with the dangers of concentration. But this cannot be assured and our long term hopes must therefore rest on a multitude of competing voices."

A bill to alleviate the trend toward concentration in the newspaper and broadcast media in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Independent Media Preservation Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In the public interest of maintaining the widest possible dissemination of news and editorial opinion from diverse and antagonistic sources, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to prevent the growth of private combinations which threaten to impede the free flow of information.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "newspaper chain owner" means any person who exercises or participates in control over the business or editorial policies of five or more daily newspaper publications through either or both of the following means:

(A) the ownership or control of one or more such newspaper publications directly or indirectly through separate or subsidiary corporations; or

(B) participation in any joint venture the parties to which own or control directly, or indirectly through one or more separate or subsidiary corporations, one or more such newspaper publications.

(2) The term "person" means any individual, and any partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity existing under or authorized by the law of the United States, any State or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any foreign country.

(3) The term "daily newspaper publication" means a publication produced on newsprint paper which is published in three or more issues weekly, and in which a substantial portion of the content is devoted to the dissemination of news and editorial opinion.

CONTROL OF COMPETING INFORMATION MEDIA

SEC. 4. (a) No person who owns or controls directly, or indirectly through separate or subsidiary corporations, any daily newspaper publication published or distributed within any geographical area which constitutes a standard metropolitan statistical area or standard consolidated area (as defined by the Bureau of the Budget) may hereafter own or control directly, or indirectly through separate or subsidiary corporations, any radio station or television station situated within the same geographical area which holds a commercial station license granted by the Federal Communications Commission.

(b) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that in the case of any radio or television station which on that date is engaged in radio communication pursuant to a station license duly issued theretofore by the Federal Communications Commission to any person, this section shall take effect three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any person with respect to any radio or television station if, prior to the effective date of this Act, such person transfers or has transferred in compliance with the provisions of section 310 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 310 (b)) the license under which that station is or has been operated to any person who is not prohibited by subsection (a) of this section from owning or controlling that station.

CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL OF NEWSPAPERS

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any newspaper chain owner hereafter to acquire directly, or indirectly by any means control over or any financial interest in—

(1) any business enterprise which is engaged in the publication or distribution of any daily newspaper publication; or

(2) any property or facilities which, within one year before the date of acquisition by such newspaper chain owner, have been used in whole or in part for the publication or distribution of any such newspaper publication.

ENFORCEMENT AND REMEDIES

SEC. 6. The provisions of law which provide for the enforcement of the prohibitions contained in the Act of July 2, 1890 (26 Stat.

209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1), commonly known as the Sherman Act, and which provide remedies for violations thereof and for injuries sustained by reason of such violations, shall apply with respect to this Act in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act were contained in that Act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 7. If any provision of this Act is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and the applicability of such provision to any other person or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT NO. 442

On page 2, beginning with line 24, strike all up to and including page 3, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The term "newspaper owner" means a person who owns or controls a single newspaper publication, but who—

(A) does not own or control directly, or indirectly through separate or subsidiary corporations, any other newspaper publication or any radio or television station engaged in radio communication within the meaning of section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153), and

(B) is not a party to or a participant in any joint venture with any other person who owns or controls directly, or indirectly through one or more separate or subsidiary corporations, any other newspaper publication or any such radio or television station.

On page 3, line 9, strike "regardless of its ownership or affiliations,".

On page 4, line 2, strike the word "person" and insert in lieu thereof the words "newspaper owner."

On page 4, line 9, strike the word "person" and insert in lieu thereof the words "newspaper owner."

On page 4, line 18, strike the word "person" and insert in lieu thereof the words "newspaper owner."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) for dramatizing the real illness threatening our Nation's press.

Obviously this approach is far more likely to guarantee a free and fair press than passing the Newspaper Preservation Act—or continuing threats from the Vice President.

My feeling about the Newspaper Preservation Act has been no secret. I opposed it in the past—I oppose it today—and I plan on voting against it when the roll is called in the Senate.

It is a bad bill—despite its attractive name—because it would allow an increasingly fewer number to decide what news the public would be told and would limit the diverse interpretations offered.

In short, it would encourage exactly what the Vice President claims is happening today—"the filtering of news through only a few hands."

Without endorsing each and every paragraph of Senator MCINTYRE's bill, I would suggest that if the administration shares the Vice President's concern it would be better advised to put its efforts behind the McIntyre approach to limit the concentration of media ownership rather than to support the Newspaper Preservation Act.

In my book, Mr. Nixon's Justice Department was right in opposing the bill.

Unfortunately, the President has chosen to let the Commerce Department speak for his administration. Not too surprisingly, that Department echoes the views of publishers who favor the bill.

The McIntyre proposal, on the other hand, encourages the multitude of voices the drafters had in mind when they made the guarantee of a free press the first amendment in the Bill of Rights.

All Members of Congress have felt the sting when the press decides—often rightly—to take a slap at us. It is not a pleasant experience, whether earned or unearned.

But I would rather take my chances on more criticism from more directions than be a part of any attempt to restrict freedom of the press—be it managed by big publishers or big government.

Either puts the Nation in real danger.

The antitrust and monopoly hearing record on the Newspaper Preservation Act—about 4,000 pages in all—spells out just how real that danger is. Senator MCINTYRE is to be applauded for recognizing that the time for talking is finished, and the time to act is upon us.

I applaud him and hope that his proposal will start Senators thinking of how to increase the number of voices represented in our free press.

S. 3307—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO MEDICARE PREMIUMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, inflation is one of the greatest burdens borne by our senior citizens. Not only are their fixed incomes hurt the most by rising prices, but they pay a disproportionate share of some of the fastest rising costs in our economy.

Nowhere is this problem more severe than in the squeeze between meager and declining incomes of senior citizens, and the escalating costs of their medical care.

And in no way has this problem been more dramatically revealed than in the recent announcement by the administration of a 33-percent increase in premium costs to participants in medicare's supplementary medical insurance program. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has directed that costs, originally $3 per month and now $4, be raised to $5.30 a month, for a new annual increase of $15.30 per participant.

For the great majority of the 20 million medicare beneficiaries, such an increase would be intolerable. For most of the remaining participants, it would be a substantial burden. Most of our older citizens are now receiving shockingly inadequate incomes and almost all of them are bearing extremely heavy medical expenses.

Persons over age 65 constitute only about 10 percent of our population. But 20 percent of the poor people in the United States are over 65. Older persons pay 20 percent of all prescription drug costs in America. Approximately 3.3 million elderly persons spend more than $100 a year on prescription drugs alone, and if they must go to the hospital, they have to pay a $52 deductible and substantial additional sums if their stay is an extended one. They also must pay a significant portion of their physicians' fees.

Since medicare went into effect in 1966, there have been very substantial increases in the deductible portions of hospital and extended care charges which participants must pay. For example, the hospital deductible was initially set at $40, the payment per day after the 60th day at $10, the individual's share of the lifetime reserve days was $20, and the payment per day for extended care facility charges after the 20th day was $5. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just increased these charges, effective January 1, to $52, $13, $26, and $6.50, respectively.

In short, the administration is seeking to lay the full burden of inflationary medical costs upon those who have the greatest need for medical care and the least capacity to meet these added burdens.

For, while the administration now plans to increase costs by 33 percent in part B premiums and has already increased costs by 18 percent in deductible and per diem payments, they sought to hold increases in social security payments to a grossly inadequate 10 percent. Congress did manage to enact a 15-percent increase, but it is clear that social security payments have barely managed to keep up with overall inflation, and cannot begin to keep up with inflation in the medical sector.

Perhaps, if social security beneficiaries had a good deal of additional outside income, as some fortunately do, these increased burdens under the medicare program would be tolerable. However, only about 17 percent of social security recipients have any outside resources. Millions of social security beneficiaries are paid only the minimum monthly payment which was just raised from $55 to $64.

Including the social security increases just enacted, the minimum benefit for a man and his wife is $1,152 a year. This is less than one-half the $2,671 per year estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics as necessary to permit existence at the poverty line for a retired couple.

The significant increase in deductibles and per-day payments will constitute a nearly crushing burden on many of those beneficiaries who receive benefits at or near the minimum, if they must be hospitalized. For those who have attempted to protect themselves against this risk by private health insurance to supplement the hospital and medical coverage under medicare, the picture is no better. For example, premiums for the medicare supplementary insurance offered by Blue Shield in Minneapolis have recently been increased from $7.95 a month only a year ago to $14.90 a month today. Thus, these costs have increased by 87 percent in the past year.

Seven million people age 65 and over

are living in poverty or near poverty, many of them receiving no income except social security benefits. We have recently succeeded in amending our tax laws so that those living in poverty can be freed of Federal income taxes. It makes no sense to levy an increase of $15.60 a year on a person living in poverty just because it is calculated as some kind of "share" of the medical insurance program. This has the effect of saddling those already in poverty with the cruel costs of inflation. We must find a better way.

Indeed, the average social security benefit meets only about one-third of the needs spelled out in the Bureau of Labor Statistics "retired couples budget." So it is not just a question of protecting a small minority of aged persons from a heavy increase in medicare premiums. What we have to do is protect literally millions of aged social security annuitants from having an already inadequate standard of living further impaired in order to finance this program.

I think there is a better way. When this program was established, it was decided that half of the cost would be borne out of general revenues of the Federal Government. The other half was to be borne by the participants. Had the cost of living remained reasonably stable, this would have been tolerable. But, in the face of recent and continuing inflationary developments, we cannot ask these poor, aged beneficiaries to pay even one-half of the increased physicians' charges that have been experienced since medicare went into effect.

Furthermore, the administrative costs under this program appear to be inordinately high. I do not think it is fair to ask the elderly to pay these administrative costs of the Government.

I am introducing legislation which will freeze the present $4 per month premium through June 1971. The additional cost to the Government to prevent the $1.30 per month increase which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has announced, will be approximately $301 million. Effective July 1, 1971, my bill will return the monthly premium for part B to $3 a month, as it was in 1966 when the program was initiated. This additional cost of about $230 million will also be paid out of the general fund.

As I have indicated, the medicare part B premiums are only one aspect of the increasing burden of medical care costs for the poor and the elderly. But we can deal with this problem immediately and directly.

The Government cannot deal so readily with the rapidly increasing medical care costs which are reflected in the increasing premiums for private insurance programs which supplement medicare. However, it can reduce these costs indirectly by avoiding increases in the deductible and per day costs to be borne by the participants.

I will be developing further legislation to roll back the increased deductibles and to make other badly needed improvements in the medicare program. I believe the program should be expanded to cover those on disability retirement under the social security program, even though they are under age 65.

I think it is vital that we eliminate the requirement that medicare participants provide, at their own expense, the first three pints of blood which they may require. Similarly, I think it is essential that we provide for coverage of a substantial portion of out-of-hospital prescription drugs for those under medicare. Finally, I think we should consider alternative methods of financing the entire participants' share of medicare part B. We should strive to eliminate the monthly premiums charged to the participants entirely. Through general fund financing, or increased payroll taxes, or some combination, it should be possible to eliminate these significant deductions from the monthly social security benefits checks.

Mr. President, I feel that the fight against inflation is our paramount task today. We must seek economy in Government. We must act to resist unjustified price increases. We must seek fiscal restraint, while protecting against unemployment or unfair burdens on particular sectors of the economy.

But we canont simply shift the problem of inflation over to that sector of our population least able to stand the burden.

The announced increases are "responsible neither to our economy nor to our people."

They are, rather, discriminatory and unfair.

I hope that this measure will be acted on promptly by the committee. I do not think we can afford to wait for comprehensive social security amendments. Action is required before the July 1 effective date for the new premium rates. I will welcome the cosponsorship of my colleagues of this important measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3307) to prevent further increases in the monthly premium payable for supplementary medical insurance under part B of the medicare program established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3307

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of section 1839 of the Social Security Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The monthly premium of each individual enrolled under this part shall be $4, in the case of any month after June 1970 and prior to July 1971, and shall be $3, in the case of any month after June 1971.

"(b) The Secretary shall, during December 1970 and of each year thereafter, estimate the dollar amount necessary to defray the total costs (including administrative costs) of providing benefits payable under this part for the 12-month period commencing July 1 of the succeeding year and the aggregate amount of the premium payments which will be paid into the Medical Insurance Trust Fund during or with respect to such period. In estimating such total costs for any period, the Secretary shall include an appropriate amount for a contingency margin. Whenever the Secretary, pursuant to the preceding sentence, makes an estimate of such costs for any 12-month period he shall make a public statement setting forth the amount of the costs so estimated by him, together with the actuarial assumptions and bases employed by him in arriving at such estimate."

(b) Subsection (a) (1) of section 1844 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) a Government contribution equal to the amount by which the total costs (including administrative costs) of providing benefits payable under this part for any period exceeds the aggregate amount of the premium payments which will be paid into the Medical Insurance Trust Fund during or with respect to such period, and".

(c) The amendments made by the preceding subsections of this section shall take effect July 1, 1970.

Sec. 2. In addition to sums authorized under other provisions of law to be appropriated to the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, such sums as may be necessary to place such Trust Fund, at the end of such year, in the same position in which it would have been at the end of such year if the first section of this Act had not been enacted.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A BILL

S. 3181

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3181, the Regional Water Quality Act of 1970.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 304—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED AND AGREED TO INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES THAT A QUORUM OF EACH HOUSE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 304) informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he submitted the resolution appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 305—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED AND AGREED TO INFORMING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A QUORUM OF THE SENATE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. SCOTT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 305) informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he submitted the resolution appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 306—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED AND AGREED TO FIXING THE HOUR OF DAILY MEETING OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 306) fixing the hour of daily meeting of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he submitted the resolution appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 307—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED RELATING TO FUNDS FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an original resolution requesting an appropriation of funds for the use of the subcommittee on privileges and elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The appropriation, in the total sum of $150,000, is for the fiscal year beginning February 1, 1970, and ending on January 31, 1971.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 307), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 307

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) corrupt practices;
(3) contested elections;
(4) credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1970, to January 31, 1971, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,700 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and the personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXEMPTION FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS CERTAIN COMBINATIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS NECESSARY FOR THE SURVIVAL OF FAILING NEWSPAPERS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 442

Mr. McINTYRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1520) to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers, which were ordered to lie in the table and to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. McINTYRE when he submitted the amendments appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE HARROLD CARSWELL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination:

George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Abe Fortas, resigned.

Any persons desiring to offer testimony in regard to this nomination shall, not later than 24 hours prior to such hearing, file in writing with the committee a request to be heard and a statement of their proposed testimony.

SGT. KENT LAWTON SUGGESTS BETTER SOLUTIONS FOR WOUNDED VETERANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Friday morning, January 16, 1970, I had the moving experience of visiting one of my constituents from West Allis, Wis., Sgt. E5 Kent Lawton, a patient at Walter Reed Hospital. Sergeant Lawton has been hospitalized since May of 1968, when he was in a tank in Vietnam which was hit by a Vietcong rocket. He was very seriously wounded, and much of his face was destroyed. It was almost miraculous that he survived, in view of his wounds, but he is at Walter Reed now and he has been there for 18 months. He has another 12 months and perhaps 2 years before he can be released completely. He has a remarkable attitude. He is not bitter. He is deeply concerned with what he can do to make life better for other veterans. He gave me a statement, which is most interesting, moving, and thoughtful, about the attitude of the public toward veterans and how he thought it could be improved.

He gave me suggestions, which we worked out later, on how those veterans who are hospitalized for a long time could be motivated to take advantage of educational opportunities. They receive one promotion and that is all they can get after being hospitalized. It seemed to Sergeant Lawton and me that if a veteran took advantage of educational opportunities, if he met certain standards, and passed certain tests, he could be promoted again and become a more productive citizen. This proposal would be confined strictly to veterans wounded in action. It seemed to us they would be motivated as to make better use of the time they have available. The wounded veteran in this position has the opportunity to work and make progress and he must feel that there is real hope for him when he gets out, and a tangible solid available reward like a promotion.

On the basis of my visit I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Army suggesting that he give consideration to legislation or regulations along this line.

I ask unanimous concent that there may be printed in the RECORD the statement by this young 23-year-old man who has given so much for this country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I, Kent Lawton, entered the army January 10, 1967 as a draftee for two years. In April 1968 I volunteered to go to Vietnam to fight for something I believed in. I was injured in May of 1968 and have been hospitalized ever since. It is my intention to record some of my feelings and experiences in those 20 months.

I find the general public has several misconceptions about hospitalization. Many people say "well at least you are getting good free medical care. I don't think that is a good way to look at the situation.

My feelings are that this is the very least that can be done. I am the one who must go through all the reconstructive surgery. For my efforts I get my basic army pay. Now right away this doesn't sound too bad because all I have to do is lay in bed and collect it. But when you consider the problem is with me (and others) 24 hours a day. It can't be left at 5 p.m. It is also such a slow process.

Then there is the fact that soldier status can not be changed while hospitalized. Promotions are slow due to specific rules. As far as compensation for a combat wound you receive 3 months "combat pay" while hospitalized. This $65 times 3 sounds good but doesn't amount to much compensation when hospitalized over a long period.

Many badly injured soldiers *who have worked under Social Security* receive disability compensation. This is entirely unrelated to the Army compensation. Some men do not receive Social Security because they do not meet the requirements.

All these disabled soldiers are operated on and then sent home to recover and heal. Often even if they are ready for the next step they must wait in line for an opening on the schedule. This naturally lengthens the time they are on hospital status. As a matter of fact the schedule is so busy that many little things are passed over by doctors, who, though very dedicated, are just too busy to worry about them.

What else besides 3 months pay does the Army do? Through the education office they consult patients ready to leave regarding

educational matters. These patients are different than the average soldiers leaving the Army. The handicapped amputees are given therapy. People who ask for psychological help get it. The others are released.

When released if they are judged to have a disability they will receive compensation. However, as long as you have all your features in the approximate place and *no scars* the disability is not compensatable. You do not have to look like you did before; only have all the appropriate features.

I would like very much to see the army do more for rehabilitating the disabled soldier in every way possible. This means mentally as well as physically. They must be made back into a productive member of society. I know of several bitter disabled GI's who feel the world owes them a living and sit back and collect disability. What has the army done to make them this way? They have a good program as far as education. But is that enough, to get a soldier who has been out of touch for 2 and 3 years back into circulation. Now the world is moving so fast. I feel the army owes it to these boys to help them adjust in any way it can.

The guys I knew care little about education and so forth. I agree with the idea that if a guy is going to study he is going to study; nothing will stop him. Yet even so the Army hospital atmosphere doesn't lend itself very well to study. 90% of the men just want to get out and get home. They care about nothing else. They are somewhat grateful for mistakes but actually nothing really affects that desire to get out.

If only this drive could be channeled to use the facilities available to their advantage. Maybe if more people came around to keep the men interested. Many need to be pressed to stay and finish their operations. The disabled soldier is in such a hurry to get out due to pressures from back home for him to get on with life and start earning a living again.

I think the people that go back to school will get back into the swing of things fast because this is the melting pot of all classes. They learn fast here what has been happening while they were gone. But what about the many guys that the Army does not encourage to go back to school? They have a lot of hangups, they think many strange things about their disability They get little help. Many are self-conscious. Others hide what happened. They don't want pity and are also sick of nosy people. Many want to be left alone and avoid people.

I also think the Army owes it to society to prepare the public for the hundreds of injured they release. The public needs to better understand these soldiers.

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, one of the most significant bills passed by the Congress last year was the National Environmental Policy Act sponsored by the junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

This act sets forth for the first time a congressional policy toward the environment and establishes a Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President. The President emphasized its importance when he signed the bill into law on New Year's Day in his first official act of the new decade.

Mr. President, in the past several weeks there have appeared a number of articles and editorials discussing the National Environmental Policy Act and the problems involved in protecting our environment. I ask unanimous consent that a selection of these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 4, 1970]

TURN POLLUTION AROUND

In his first official act of 1970, President Nixon signed the national environmental policy act, creating a three-man council of environmental advisers to the President parallel to the council of economic advisers. This council and, for that matter, the whole act are probably less significant than Nixon's assertion that "the 1970s absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters, and our living environment. It is literally now or never." A determination by the President of the United States to exert the powers of his office to resist the progressive deterioration of our physical environment is more important than any single statute.

Similarly, the fact that Congress—in this instance led primarily by Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington—took the initiative of passing the national environmental policy act is more hopeful than the act itself. Acts and councils seldom have much impact unless there is a sincere and persistent implementation of their intent in later executive and legislative decisions.

The idea of arresting the continual degradation of the human habitat is an idea whose time has come. The air and water in so many congested areas has become so fouled that the man in the street can confirm what until recently were largely disregarded warnings from a few scientists. Both the general public and powerful officials have got the message: "It is literally now or never."

Effective action against polluters requires national—indeed, international—action. But it is not the kind of action that governments have been in the habit of taking. Until very recently it was generally assumed that nature could absorb any amount of punishment. On the premise that what they did on their own property was their business, polluters large and small have been allowed to dump noxious stuff into air and water. Indeed, the polluters have included many an agency of government.

As is inevitable in undertaking new tasks, government's first efforts at coping with pollution have been inefficient. President Nixon alluded to some of the difficulties when he said, "To compound the levels of review and advice seldom brings earlier or better results."

Polluters accustomed to paying attention to nobody pounce on bewilderingly numerous directives as a good excuse for delaying remedial action. The assignment of fighting pollution needs to be accepted by and directed from the highest levels of the federal government, the President's office and Congress. The job is too big for cities, counties, or states to undertake alone, tho all have their essential roles. It is too essential to be consigned to federal burocrats, whether few or many. Turning pollution around so that it decreases instead of further increasing requires firm policy at the top, firmly implemented in day-to-day decisions.

President Nixon evidently has been impressed by what he learned in the "many hours" he has spent with his cabinet-level Environmental Quality council, appointed last May, considering "the pressing problems of pollution control, airport location, wilderness preservation, highway construction, and population trends." Meanwhile, Congress, wanting to express independently its recognition of a popular issue, brought to passage the new national environmental policy act. Both executive and legislative levels of the federal government are now as clearly on record against permitting further environmental deterioration as words can make them.

Let deeds follow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 5, 1970]

"NOW OR NEVER"

President Nixon couldn't have picked a better subject for a New Year's and new decade's resolution that the quality of the environment. As he signed the National Environmental Policy Act at his San Clemente retreat, he said: "The 1970's absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never."

It is now or never. With each year's delay the problems of pollution, overcrowding, urban blight, uglification of the landscape set their noxious roots deeper.

The President's science adviser Dr. Lee DuBridge said in Boston a week ago that the technology to arrest environmental decay is ready. Two things were still needed: organization and resolve.

The bill signed by the President on New Year's Day will help provide the rudiments of the organizational delivery system the nation will need to reverse pollution trends. It gives the President a Council on Environmental Quality, similar to the Council of Economic Advisers. The council will be backed up by a technical staff. Likewise, the timing and tone of the President's statement suggest the kind of resolve the nation needs to make real headway.

The sincerity of the President's resolve was quickly questioned by Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington, who wrote the new bill, and by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine. Sen. Jackson wondered whether Mr. Nixon would spend enough. Sen. Muskie objected to the President's remarks about keeping his environment protection staff "compact," an allusion to the more ambitious executive staff the Maine Senator has been proposing.

Both Senators agreed, however, that for the nation to make the needed turnaround, the President had to lead the way. Mr. Nixon will not find the going easy. One of the biggest obstacles is the general feeling that the problem is too complex to be masterminded by the government, that slovenliness and the hunger for material things are too entrenched.

But the restoration of a companionable life between man and his environment must be possible. One thinks of the Marshall Plan, and the tremendous restorative effect it had on Western Europe. Environmental decay is a subtler but no more pernicious ravager than war. If a new Europe could rise out of an enemy-caused rubble, so can a modern society save itself from its self-toxicated land, air, and water.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1970]

FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

President Nixon's characterization of the battle against the pollution of the environment as a "now-or-never" fight offers new hope that this survival issue will be given top priority, not in discussion panels but in action.

With poisons pouring into the air at a rate of 130 million tons a year and great bodies of water turning into cesspools, the question is no longer one of comfort or esthetics but of life and death. The President's warning that huge areas may become unlivable by 1980 must be underscored with the observation that many urban regions already fit this description.

Creation of the Council on Environmental Qualities and the President's emphatic endorsement of the Democratic-sponsored National Environmental Policy Act should be the first step in a bipartisan partnership to avert the disastrous prospects so dramatically set forth by Mr. Nixon.

The question still to be answered—and gravely posed anew by Senators Jackson and Muskie at the very moment of the Administration's appeal—is whether the country and its leaders truly comprehend both the nature and the price of the task. This is not a clean-up job or a beautification project. It is not a patch-up effort to muzzle a few smokestacks and incinerators or to improve the existing sewage system. It is not a series of skirmishes against easily identifiable despoilers of air, water, land or forests.

Nothing short of a new understanding of the total pattern of man's use of the environment and its resources can keep the nation from drowning in the wastes of its own affluence. It would be fatal self-deception to welcome the new concern with the environment, in all branches of society and at all age levels, as a painless diversion from radical pressures for basic social reform. In many ways, the strategies required to check the destruction of the environment involve a more fundamental assault on all our normal modes of conducting industry, moving about for business or pleasure and establishing a balance between public and private interests than any involved in race relations or other phases of the urban crisis.

Private gain and public expenditures, deeply involved in polluting the environment, cannot remain untouched by realistic policies to stop that pollution. Nor can there be a coherent plan to deal with man's future environment without concern for the population pattern itself.

Sacrifice will be required and so will large-scale expenditure of governmental funds. Inflation and the drain of the Vietnam war will provide handy excuses for inaction. But the price of evasion will be self-annihilation, a stake bigger than any war.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1970]

WASHINGTON: "IT IS LITERALLY NOW OR NEVER"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 3.—A great deal is being made by the Democrats in Washington these days about the difference between President Nixon's soaring rhetoric on pollution control and his comparatively low budget requests to deal with the problem.

On the face of it, the opposition party can argue that he is talking big and spending very little. He requested $214 million to help clean up the nation's waters in the current budget; the Congress finally appropriated $800 million; and it is not yet clear that the Administration will spend the extra money.

Nevertheless, Mr. Nixon declared the other day that "the nineteen-seventies absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never."

THE NEW CONVERT

Despite this difference between language and cash, however, it would probably be a mistake to put the contrast down to political hypocrisy. It is only in the last year that Mr. Nixon, like many other Americans, has come to realize that a population increasing by over two million a year and an indifferent industry expanding even faster are poisoning the atmosphere of the nation and raising vast new political as well as social problems.

Accordingly, he is said to be devoting a major part of his forthcoming State of the Union message to the pollution problem and to the reorganization of local, state and Federal Governments to deal effectively with the larger appropriations he intends to request in the next budget.

Mr. Nixon is not a fisherman like Herbert Hoover, or a hunter or conservationist like Teddy Roosevelt, but he is from California, where pollution has been a lively political controversy for years, and Ed Muskie, who could be his opponent for the Presidency in 1972, is one of the real experts in the Senate on this vast and complicated subject.

THE WHITE HOUSE COUNCIL

In signing the bill to create an Environmental Council to advise the President in this field—as the Council of Economic Advisers assists him in the economic field—Mr. Nixon has at least assured that experts will be watching all executive and legislative actions for their potential influence on the environment.

Lord Ritchie-Calder, writing in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, defines pollution as "a crime compounded of ignorance and avarice," and he notes that the ignorance often exists at the very top of civilized governments simply because all the implications of government decisions are not clear to the men at the top.

For example, Prime Minister Clement Attlee, who concurred in President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, wrote in "Twilight of Empires" sixteen years later:

THE FORGOTTEN FACTOR

"We knew nothing whatever at that time about the genetic effects of an atomic explosion. I knew nothing about fallout and all the rest of what emerged after Hiroshima. As far as I know, President Truman and Winston Churchill knew nothing of these things either. . . . Whether the scientists directly concerned knew or guessed, I do not know. But if they did, then so far as I am aware, they said nothing of it to those who had to make the decision."

This may, as Lord Ritchie-Calder observes, sound absurd, since H. J. Muller had won the Nobel Price in 1927 for his evidence of the genetic effects of radiation, but it is merely one dramatic illustration of a fact well known to anybody who has been around Washington or Westminster in the last thirty years, namely that governments are constantly making decisions without any serious study of the side effects of their actions.

Now, at least, there will be an early-warning post in the White House, and some expert advice on how money can be spent effectively in attacking the total problem rather than, as has happened often in the past, wasting it on piecemeal projects.

Besides, the new Environmental Council will serve, as the Economic Council does, as an educational agency, not only for the Administration, but for the Congress and the public as a whole.

THE BASIC CONFLICT

The real conflict will come between a conservative Administration's natural instinct to conserve and the opposition to expensive decontamination projects among the Republican party's supporters in American industry.

If Mr. Nixon sticks to his now-or-never battle against pollution, however, he will find a very large and powerful constituency in the public and the press at his side. This is one of those projects which, if well organized and financed, can be a major goal for the bicentennial celebrations of 1976, but it will have to be coordinated and pushed hard in the next few months, and the indications here are that the President intends to do just that.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 8, 1970]

EVERYONE'S GETTING INTO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ACT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

President Nixon went out of his way a few days ago, in signing the National Environmental Policy Act, to plump hard for conservation. It is "now or never," he said, for Americans to take steps toward clearing up the mess they have made of their country. From across the land, in one editorial voice, came the sound of a great Amen.

Forgive me if I maintain, for a while, a discreet and skeptical silence. The act just signed by Mr. Nixon may indeed be landmark legislation. It surely is a monument to one of the Senate most able men, Henry M. Jackson of Washington. It is entirely possible that the new three-member Council of Environmental Quality Advisers will add fresh clout to the anti-pollution cause.

But an uneasy feeling is beginning to grow that what is needed is not fresh clout, but better coordination. Everyone's getting into the act. Preservation of a livable environment has become the hottest cause on Capitol Hill since civil rights and Appalachia. It is hotter than hunger, poverty, food stamps and housing. There was a time, and not so long ago, when half the House would have been stumped by talk of "ecology." Now there's an ecologist in every cloakroom, and the end is not in sight.

In many ways, of course, this intense interest is wonderfully welcome. Those of us who were born after 1900, or even after 1920, inherited a land that was generally pleasant, livable, and lovely to look at. To be sure, there were slums and tenements and soft coal soot, and quite a lot of mud mixed with the horse manure, but the quality of life, as measured in clean air, clean water, and verdant hills, was something to remember with wonder—and with dismay.

For the generations of this century have squandered that inheritance. Never was so great a trust so grossly violated. We turned our valleys into dust bowls and our rivers into sewers, killed the lakes, fouled the air, choked the cities. With the brute efficiency of systematic vandals, we combined stupidity and greed. Now we measure the quality of our life by the tons of litter we leave behind. The hallmark of our society is stamped on 10 million roadside bottles: No deposit, no return.

All this has been said repeatedly. Teddy Roosevelt said it at the top of his lusty lungs. Editors of a thousand newspapers appealed for conservation of vanishing resources. Garden clubs, sportsmen's organizations, such governors as Pinchot of Pennsylvania, pleaded and warned and remonstrated. Nothing slowed the rapacious tide. Red-eyed, coughing, half-deafened, we staggered into the '60s.

And behold: If there is one good thing that can be said for the decade just ended, it is that perhaps—perhaps—it marked the beginning of a new awareness, and a new determination, in terms of a livable world. Now congressmen are leaping to the cause like so many spawning salmon.

As a result, we may wind up with too much of a muchness. The old-line agencies—the National Park Service, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service—suddenly have acquired a flock of young friends. In a torrent of reorganization and creation, recent years have brought a Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, a National Air Pollution Control Administration, an Environmental Science Services Administration, a Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Serv-

ice, and Environmental Control Administration, an assistant secretary for Model Cities, a Water Resources Council, and a small army of state and regional commissions.

The Jackson Act will create a Council of Environmental Quality Advisers. The council soon will be joined by an entirely new Office of Environmental Quality, to be created under a bill sponsored by Sen. Muskie of Maine. The Congress has got religion, all right; it could now use a firm ecumenical movement.

Nixon can provide the coordinating leadership, if Congress will let him. But my skeptical eyes inform me that private interests, jealous committees, and full-time bureaucrats will not yield their fiefdoms without a struggle. The best advise is to hang on to your eye drops and cough syrup, for another 10 years at least.

[From the New York Times, January 4, 1970]

THE NATION: IT'S "NOW OR NEVER" SAYS NIXON ABOUT POLLUTION

WASHINGTON.—The halting of environmental degradation was not one of Richard M. Nixon's campaign priorities in 1968. In fact, he rarely mentioned it. In mid-October, two weeks before the election, however, he did issue a statement on pollution.

"We have developed legal procedures to prevent people from dumping garbage in the streets," he said. "We must now develop procedures—appropriate to the last third of the 20th century—which prevent people from using more sophisticated ways of garbage disposal to poison our air and foul our waters."

In the closing days of the last session, after extensive hearings and floor debate in both Houses, Congress sent to the President a bill empowering him to do just that—and a great deal more. It was called "The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

The act declares that it is the policy of the United States Government "to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony." It requires all Federal agencies to take into account the environmental impact of all actions they propose.

Finally, it creates in the office of the President a permanent Council on Environmental Quality of three members, modeled on the Council of Economic Advisers, and authorizes an annual appropriation of $1-million to pay the salaries of the members and a small professional staff. The principal function of the council is to recommend environmental policies to the President.

DECADE'S FIRST ACT

On New Year's Day in San Clemente, Mr. Nixon signed the bill, saying it was a "particularly fitting" first act of the new decade. Over the past year, he said, he had become convinced "that the nineteen-seventies absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never."

Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat of Washington and chairman of the Interior Committee, who was the principal author of the bill, and Representative John D. Dingell, Democrat of Michigan, its chief sponsor in the House, welcomed this statement, as did such other leading Congressional environmentalists as Senators Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat of Maine, Gaylord Nelson, Democrat of Wisconsin, and Allen J. Ellender, Democrat of Louisiana.

Yet there was apparent among them, a suspension of complete belief until the President manifested in action how far he was prepared to go to carry out the purposes of Congress. Was he, they wanted to know, prepared to reorder national priorities? Would he, in his budget requests, put his money where his rhetoric was?

There was some history behind this Missouri attitude.

First, although the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 authorized an appropriation of $1-billion in this fiscal year for grants to states for waste treatment works, Mr. Nixon's budget request merely reiterated President Johnson's for $214-million. The House appropriated only $600-million, but the Senate granted Mr. Ellender's plea for the whole $1-billion. The two Houses finally settled on $800-million. There is considerable doubt on Capital Hill that Mr. Nixon intends to spend the $586-million above his request.

A second doubt derived from the Administration's original opposition last spring to the creation of a White House Council on Environment. The reasons given were the diffusion of responsibility and the fact that the President had already named a Cabinet level Environmental Quality Council with Dr. Lee DuBridge, Presidential science adviser as executive director.

However, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Muskie and Mr. Dingell regarded this Cabinet committee as window dressing, designed to forestall the Jackson-Dingell bill. They were convinced Dr. DuBridge's office already had too much on its plate to give much attention to environmental problems.

WATER QUALITY

Finally, there was the back of the hand which the President gave last Thursday to a provision in the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, which is still in conference committee of both Houses. This provision, sponsored by Mr. Muskie, would create, also in the White House, an Office of Environmental Quality, to provide daily operating staff for the policy-making council.

Mr. Nixon said such a staff organization would be "a mistake" and merely "compound the levels of review." Mr. Muskie sharply retorted that the council and the staff office represented "an integrated approach to environmental problems."

Mr. Nixon, it is agreed, could dissipate these Congressional reservations by moving quickly to appoint men of outstanding qualifications to the new council, by giving the council its own professional advisory staff as large as the 29-member staff of the Council of Economic Advisers (which also has a $1-million annual budget), and by withdrawing his opposition to the larger support staff proposed by Mr. Muskie.

Furthermore, it is agreed, he could win large credit on the Hill by announcing his intention to spend the whole $800-million for waste treatment works that local communities are unable to finance alone. Mr. Ellender agrees it is "literally now or never."

SMOTHER IN WASTE

"Unless we take positive action now," he said in urging Senate approval of the full $1-billion authorized "our great country will smother in its own waste matter. Even dumb animals have enough sense to avoid that ignominious end."

Some observers here believe Mr. Nixon may do much more than he ever intended to a year ago. He is well aware that, as Senator Jackson remarked last week, there is a very large constituency forming behind environmental quality, particularly among the young.

In his recent Reith Lectures on BBC in England, Frank Fraser Darling, head of the Conservation Foundation, said: "Government and local authorities have the legislation enabling them to tackle dereliction [of the environment], but in fact most are log-rolling, acting fragmentarily with a maximum of show, rather like funeral horses trained to trot magnificently at a pace slower than a walk."

Mr. Nixon now has the legislation, and Congress will be watching whether his progress is that of a funeral horse or a pacemaker.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Dec. 21, 1969]

SENATOR JACKSON SCORES ON ENVIRONMENT BILL

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The year's most significant development here in the mounting struggle to protect, preserve and enhance America's natural environment may turn out to be a rather modest appearing bill just passed by Congress.

It could be a "milestone," as its proud author, Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., claims, but only if President Nixon makes good use of it. And that prospect appears favorable, for White House aides report that Nixon plans to emphasize environmental protection in his first state of the Union report in January.

Entitled the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the bill is a compromise worked out after weeks of backstage meetings among key members of the Senate and House.

It would create a Council on Environmental Quality within the executive office of the president.

STATURE SOUGHT

Jackson hopes this three-man agency will gain the stature and influence of the president's Council on Economic Advisers, the three appointees who assist the president in determining policy on inflation, interest rates and national economic growth. Because the federal government plays such a critical role in national fiscal affairs, the views of these three economists are eagerly sought by the business community.

The Council on Environmental Quality will gain whatever prestige and power the president chooses to give it. If it does become comparable to the Council of Economic Advisers, it could pack a wallop. On the other hand, if it is a passing fancy, such as the president's Council on Physical Fitness, created back when we thought our worst problem was domestic flabbiness, the environment will get scant attention.

Nixon created an interdepartmental council on the environment last spring, made up of various cabinet officers with relevant concerns. Reportedly it has met only twice. This lack of attention to a grave national problem bears out the impression of Sen. Robert Packwood, R-Ore., who several months ago, during a dinner-cruise on the presidential yacht, tried to arouse Nixon's interest in a major effort to cope with pollution and other environmental threats. It just didn't grab him, Packwood found.

Then there was Interior Secretary Walter Hickel, marking time for many months with his scheme for undertaking a monumental anti-pollution campaign. It got moved to the back burner; other problems were more pressing.

CHANGE INDICATED

The word now is that all this has changed at the White House, that Nixon will embrace Hickel's anti-pollution program and urge Congress to enact it, that the administration will place environmental protection right on the front burner.

Assuming Nixon appoints three outstanding persons to the new council and gives them the latitude intended by Jackson's bill, they would systematically examine all new federal programs and projects—dams, highways, mining and logging operations on federal lands—to determine their impact on the natural environment. The council would not have any veto over such programs or projects, but its influence could be felt through the White House when their sponsoring agencies sought presidential clearance.

In a word, the council would try to make all federal agencies more sensitive to the common responsibility for environmental protection. And it would be available to help any state or local agency, or even private business, with information that might serve to enhance the environment. Annually the council would issue a report on the status of various aspects of the environment—air, marine, fresh water and the land, including forests, ranges, wetlands and the urban, suburban and rural areas in which people live.

The new act also directs all federal agencies to provide a detailed report on the environmental impact of each new proposed action. One of the compromises required to get the bill enacted exempts the AEC from passing on the environmental impact of private nuclear power plants that it licenses.

RESPONSIBILITY SPLIT

The AEC will continue to consider possible radiation hazards and to clear each power plant from a safety standpoint. But a question of environmental concern, such as thermal pollution caused by hot water discharged into rivers or bays, would be left up to the states to regulate. If a state rules that a nuclear power plant will not jeopardize the minimum water quality standards established by the state, the AEC would accept this.

Jackson lost one of his primary objectives in the final version. His original bill stated: "Congress recognizes that each person has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment."

The Senate passed this language, but House members objected on grounds it would give every citizen the legal authority to bring suit against the government if his "inalienable right to a healthful environment" has been violated.

JACKSON AGREES

Jackson couldn't deny their contention, for he agreed. In the House-Senate conference that drafted the compromise, the majority turned thumbs down on allowing anyone to seek judicial redress of grievances against pollution. That was much too radical an idea.

The compromise language, stripped of citizen power but clothed in the verbal garments of hope, says, "Congress recognizes that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment."

The senator, however, hasn't given up on his original idea. Losing this round, he put his staff to work drafting an environmental "bill of rights" designed to assure that one's right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is not rendered meaningless by another's practice of polluting the air, and water and the land around us.

[From Science, Jan. 2, 1970]

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT: CONGRESS PASSES A LANDMARK MEASURE—MAYBE

Congress completed action just before Christmas on the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, described by Senator Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, as "the most important and far-reaching conservation measure ever enacted." In part, the act amounts to no more than a statement of good intentions and whether it actually lives up to Senator Jackson's words will depend on how seriously it is taken by the Administration and the Congress itself. Its usefulness will depend also on the efforts of conservationists and others to make the issue of environmental quality weigh heavily enough politically to influence the day-to-day decisions of government administrators and practical politicians.

The act, which had strong backing in both the House and Senate and no significant opposition (final passage in each body was by voice vote), has two major features. The first consists of a declaration of policy that is made more meaningful by an "action-forcing" provision prescribing specific procedures to be followed by federal agencies as they develop policies and plans which would affect the environment. The second requires the President to submit to Congress an annual environmental quality report and to establish, as part of the Executive Office of the President, a high-level Council on Environmental Quality. Congress would hold hearings on the President's report, which the new council would have the task of preparing.

The Environmental Policy Act is loosely analogous to the Employment Act of 1946. That act prescribed full employment as a national goal and established the three-member Council of Economic Advisers, which, although virtually ignored during some periods, has been highly influential in the shaping of government economic policy during the 1960's.

The Environmental Policy Act calls on the government to seek environmental enhancement by "all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy. The policy goals include having an environment supporting diversity and individual choice; attaining, to the maximum extent possible, the recycling of depletable resources; and—achieving a "balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities."

According to the act, each person "should enjoy a healthful environment" and has a "responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment." As the Environmental Policy Act was first passed by the Senate, this provision had the ring of an environmental bill of rights—saying that "each person has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment." However, this language was deleted in conference at the insistence of the House conferees.

The act's action-forcing provision contains several specific directives to federal agencies. Among them are requirements that these agencies shall (i) "utilize a systematic interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment"; (ii) develop methods whereby "presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision-making along with economic and technical considerations"; (iii) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation or administrative actions affecting the environment, a detailed statement setting forth such considerations as the environmental effects expected and the available alternatives to the proposed course of action; and (iv) shall make the aforementioned statement public, together with the comments of other agencies.

These directives are not meant to override any provisions of existing law. But, if any agency not already operating under more specific or demanding requirements for environmental protection finds that it cannot legally follow the above procedures, it must propose to Congress, by 1 July 1971, such changes in its governing statutes as may be necessary to allow it to conform to the Environmental Policy Act.

Conservationists have reason to be elated at the act's insistence on rigorous analysis of the environmental consequences of government decisions regarding such things as the construction of dams and highways and the regulation of power companies, pipeline firms, and other utilities. In cases where significant environmental values are put in jeopardy by a project and feasible alternatives have not been pursued or identified, the act should make it easier for citizens groups, members of Congress, and strategically placed administration officials (such as those in the Bureau of the Budget and on the new environmental council itself) to stop the project before harm is done.

Members of the Council on Environmental Quality shall be selected by the President (subject to Senate confirmation) from among persons qualified by training and experience to interpret and analyze environmental trends, but not necessarily from among ecologists or other persons trained in a scientific discipline. They will serve full time, and Senator Jackson and other sponsors of the Environmental Policy Act are hopeful that the council members will soon attain the visibility and prominence in government circles now enjoyed by members of the Council of Economic Advisers. The council is authorized to spend eventually up to $1 million a year on staff and other expenses. However, its staff support may be provided by a new Office of Environmental Quality which Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine has proposed be set up in the Executive Office of the President. The Muskie proposal, which Jackson has endorsed, has been approved by the Senate as part of a water quality bill which is now in House-Senate conference.

The Nixon Administration, while never flatly opposing the environmental policy bill, has taken the position that no new council was needed in view of the fact that the President has established a cabinet-level council on the environment. However, in the view of the bill's sponsors, the President's group could serve best in resolving interagency conflicts, while the new council functioned more broadly as a trend-spotting and policy review body.

The analogy drawn between the Environmental Policy Act and the Employment Act of 1946 is an imperfect one. For one thing, while the Employment Act created Congress's Joint Committee on Economics (which has played a valuable educational role within the Congress), the Environmental Policy Act does nothing to coordinate Congress's handling of environmental issues. At the moment, there is no assurance that these issues will not continue to be dealt with by numerous individual legislative committees, which are often jealous of their jurisdiction.

Yet, even here, there is a possibility of improvement. Senator Jackson, in obtaining Senator Muskie's support for the environmental policy bill, has promised to back Muskie's proposal to establish a joint congressional committee on the environment. This body would not handle legislation, but it would allow influential members of the legislative committees that are concerned with environmental issues to meet regularly and consider their responsibilities jointly in a broad, long-term perspective.

[From the Economist, Jan. 10, 1970]

THE WORLD: POLLUTION—THE NEW ENEMY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Only yesterday it was safe for busy practical men to treat conservationists with the same blend of indulgence and irritation which they extend to vegetarians, esperantists and other estimable eccentrics. "Those butterfly chasers" is the phrase of an officer of the United States Corps of Engineers, the mighty builder of dams, digger of canals, drainer of marshes, filler of land and tamer of rivers. There is a

change. Not only has conservation of the human environment come to be taken seriously as an idea: it has actually acquired political weight. President Nixon was performing an act of political prudence last week when, in his first formal statement of the year, he declared the purity of the air, the waters and "our living environment" a prime subject of governmental concern in the 1970s.

To be fair, as a presidential candidate Mr. Nixon did devote a lengthy broadcast to the subject of natural resources, but his main emphasis on that occasion was on the open spaces as a source of refreshment for urban man and he paid a marked deference to the needs of industrial development and the demands of the extractive industries. The initiative in focusing the attention of government on the whole range of environmental problems came mainly from Congress. The Nixon Administration did not react favourably last spring when a number of Senators and Congressmen, reviving an idea some years old, pressed for the creation of a Council of Environmental Advisers. The President announced the formation of a cabinet committee, together with a citizens' advisory committee, on environmental quality and questioners were told be satisfied with that.

President Nixon, like President Johnson before him, also took a narrower view of the amount of federal money that could usefully be spent on curing water pollution than did Congress. The Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1967 provided for grants from the federal government to be matched by local authorities, for new or improved sewage works. But a good deal of the money authorized for the five-year period has not been asked for in the annual appropriation bills; last year Mr. Nixon asked for $214 million and Congress insisted on granting $800 million. The General Accounting Office got a rather sceptical reception in November when, on the basis of a sampling of various rivers across the country, it reported adversely on the effectiveness of the clean water programme. Town governments were already angry at being done out of the federal assistance that they believed that they had been promised and, when the accountants started to pronounce judgment on water treatment, they concluded that the Nixon Administration did not like the existing scheme and wanted to get rid of it.

Senator Henry Jackson of the State of Washington, Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine and their allies in both houses refused to be satisfied with Mr. Nixon's cabinet committee. They suspected it to be merely a sop and argued that the White House science adviser had too many things to think about to be able to devote enough attention to ecology. So far they have scored one major point with the passage of Senator Jackson's National Environmental Policy Act, which President Nixon signed on New Year's Day. This Act prescribes for environmental policy much the same treatment as was laid down for economic policy by the Employment Act of 1946, which gave the President his Council of Economic Advisers and required him to send Congress an economic report once a year. Now he will have a similar council of three full-time advisers, with a staff, on the environment and he is required to report annually on environmental quality.

At least this should ensure that the subject gets regular public attention. What more it will do must depend on the amount of earnestness that the Administration and Congress can sustain and this, no doubt, will depend on the efforts of the conservationists to give their subject a political weight that will make it unsafe for the politicians to disregard it. Like full employment, a "balance between population and resource use" has now been adopted as a national goal: but neither the one nor the other comes of itself. The Act places some procedural requirements on the executive departments which, when they are reporting on a proposed Bill or preparing an administrative decision, will now be obliged to explain the consequences for the environment if there are thought to be any. But the critics in Congress are not satisfied. Not far behind Senator Jackson's Bill in the parliamentary process is Senator Muskie's water quality improvement Bill, which the President, in signing the Jackson Bill, plainly indicated that he did not like. The chances that he will veto it when it is finally passed are fairly high.

The Muskie Bill would extend in a far-reaching way the water standards now imposed on the federal government: for example, any undertaking coming forward with a project—say, a power plant—that required a federal license would have to show that its project complied with the water standards (which, as is perfectly obvious, many now do not). It would come down hard on oil companies by imposing on them absolute liability for pollution of sea or fresh water caused by their tankers, offshore drilling rigs, or land installations. Mr. Nixon did not criticise the Muskie Bill on these grounds, but on the ground that the new office which it would set up would mean too much staff and too much organisation.

On the contrary, says Mr. Muskie, without his office the President's new environmental advisers will not be able to do their job properly. He wants the White House to command the staff which will enable it to overrule the executive departments when environmental policy requires it. He also wants Congress to organise itself for a period of acute ecological danger by setting up a new joint committee on the lines of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, which has indeed proved itself most useful. Finally, in a speech last week he went beyond his own Bill to propose a new agency with executive powers which would concentrate under one roof the various functions affecting the environment that various departments now exercise without much relation to each other.

People are more aware than they were of the threats to their comfort and safety that are piling up, they are more prepared to listen to warnings and are becoming more explicit themselves. Like the politicians, the press and television are echoing this awareness more than they are creating it, but the frequency and persistence of the echoes have become striking. *Life* magazine describes the preparations now going on to mine molybdenum on the unspoilt publicly-owned lands of the White Mountains in Idaho, the strong position enjoyed by the extractive industries under the mining laws and the forlorn outlook for the conservationists seeking to oppose them. The *New Yorker* prints a report from eastern Kentucky of the devastation done by strip-mining for coal there, the effect on the lives of the impoverished mountaineers and their powerlessness to defend themselves.

Dr. Fraser Darling's Reith lectures in London, with their warning of the dangers to man of his "exclusion from the hierarchy of nature," get a column and a half in the *Washington Post*. *Science Weekly* prints two articles on developments in conservation law, explaining that, while the law in America tends historically to put the interest of commercial exploitation before the comfort and even the health or livelihood of private persons, some recent judgments give ground for hoping that a change may be creeping into the philosophy of the courts. "Lawyers and school professors," it reports, "are becoming aware of conservation law as a potentially important field."

A degree of response to the change of feeling has begun to appear in some of the institutions which hold power in various ways to act upon the environment. An example is the reform policy on pesticides—which first found expression in the decision to restrict the use of DDT. Probably no institution has ever been able to spend so much money on interfering, for good or ill, with the hydrology of the earth's surface as the Army Corps of Engineers, which has enjoyed this privilege since 1824. So long beloved of politicians for the money that it could spend in their districts, the corps has been disconcerted to find its popularity ebbing away as more and more voices have been raised against the reshaping of landscapes and rivers which it has wrought so diligently. The policy has always been to mould the earth to the uses of man; but it begins to appear that something more sophisticated is required. More and more the corps finds itself involved in lawsuits brought by people who resist having their neighborhoods changed. In self-defense it has lately begun to recruit biologists, ecologists and other specialists in environmental science whom, previously, it had ignored.

For the moment, something like an alliance appears to exist between the old-fashioned nature lovers, the new style environmental and behavioral scientists, the political radicals who like to make private enterprise skip and the young who need cause. One has to wonder how durable the alliance is. The young people's movements which have fastened on pollution as the enemy were preoccupied a very short time ago with the war in Vietnam and not long before that with white racism in the South. Other causes espoused by the radicals require more money for welfare, more money for education, reconstructed towns and better medical service for all: in short, they depend on rapid economic growth, which so far, in America at least, has always gone hand in hand with spoliation of the land and pollution of the air and the waters. When a choice has been made it is not certain that the environment will come off best: if it does, it will be for the first time.

PROMISE TO SPEAK DAILY FOR SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at the beginning of the 90th Congress 3 years ago, I pledged to speak out daily in support of Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Political Rights for Women, on Genocide, and on the Abolition of Forced Labor. For more than 535 legislative days, I have spoken out on this subject. On this the first day of the second session of the 91st Congress, I pledge to continue this effort.

The importance of these three Human Rights Conventions cannot be overestimated. A brief review of the three conventions will substantiate this statement.

First, the Convention on Genocide confirms that genocide is a crime under international law, whether committed in time of peace or war. Of greater importance, the convention states that all persons committing genocide shall be punished, be they constitutionally responsible officials, or private individuals.

Though genocidal crimes are not to be confused with political crimes, those guilty will be subject to the rulings of their competent national court, or, if possible, an international penal tribunal.

This is the proposal which President

Truman made at the United Nations more than 20 years ago. It has been pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations for 20 years, and we have failed to act on it. It is entirely up to the Senate. All Presidents since then have asked us to proceed in this regard, and they have all favored it without exception.

It is a measure which, of course, involves no action by the House of Representatives. It is entirely up to the U.S. Senate.

Second, the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor prohibits any forced or compulsory labor for the purpose of, first, political coercion or punishment; second, mobilizing labor for economic development; third, labor discipline; fourth, punishing participation in strikes, or fifth, racial, social, national, or religious discrimination.

Here is another convention which was sent to us by President Kennedy in 1963. It is entirely within the province of the Senate to act. It is long overdue. It should have acted.

Third, the Convention on Political Rights for Women provides that women shall be entitled to vote in all elections on equal terms with men. It also provides that women shall be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies, to hold public office, and to exercise public functions established by national law, all on equal terms with men.

Once again, this was sent to us by President Kennedy 7 years ago, and we have yet to act on it.

The validity and justification for these conventions is acknowledged by a majority of nations throughout the world. We are one of the very few nations that has acted on none of these treaties. This Nation, however, which affirms these rights through its laws and traditions for its own people has not seen fit to affirm these rights for peoples throughout the world. The gap between national and international commitment must be bridged. And, the bridge in this case should be ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Genocide, Political Rights for Women, and Abolition of Forced Labor.

It is my hope that when this Congress completes its business some time late this year one of its finest accomplishments will be the Senate ratification of the human rights conventions. Through daily speeches that will further inform and educate my colleagues in the need for ratification, I pledge my efforts to seeing that the goal of Senate ratification will become reality.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 169—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL AGENDA FOR THE 1970'S

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in the nearly 40 years since Franklin D. Roosevelt said in his first inaugural address that "this great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper," our economy has soared to levels that no one in the 1930's could have imagined. In these past four decades we have become the wealthiest nation on earth by almost any measure of production and consumption.

As the economic boom and the postwar population explosion continued to break all records, a national legend developed: With science and technology as its tools, the private enterprise system could accomplish anything.

We assumed that, if private enterprise could turn out more automobiles, airplanes, and TV sets than all the rest of the world combined, somehow it could create a transportation system that would work. If we were the greatest builders in the world, we need not worry about our poor and about the planning and building of our cities. Private enterprise with enough technology and enough profit would manage that just fine.

In short, we assumed that, if private enterprise could be such a spectacular success in the production of goods and services, it could do our social planning for us, too, set our national priorities, shape our social system, and even establish our individual aspirations.

In fact, I am sure most can recall the famous words of Charles Wilson back in the mid-1950's, when he said, "What's good for the country is good for General Motors, and vice versa."

In the 1960's the era of fantastic achievement marched on to levels unprecedented in the history of man. It was the decade when man walked on the moon—when medical magic transplanted the human heart—when the computer's mechanical wizardry became a part of daily life—and when, instead of "a chicken in every pot," the national aim seemed to be two cars in every garage, a summer home, a color television set, and a vacation in Europe.

From the small farmers and small merchants of the last century, we had become the "consumer society," with science and technology as the New Testament and the gross national product as the Holy Grail.

One might have thought we would have emerged triumphantly from the 1960's with a shout: "Bring on the next decade."

We have not. For, in addition to the other traumatic national and international events, the 1960's have produced another kind of "top of the decade" list. It has been a decade when the darkening cloud of pollution seriously began degrading the thin envelope of air surrounding the globe; when pesticides and unrestricted waste disposal threatened the productivity of all the oceans of the world; when virtually every lake, river, and watershed in America began to show the distressing symptoms of being overloaded with polluting materials.

These pivotal events have begun to warn the Nation of a disturbing new paradox: The mindless pursuit of quantity is destroying—not enhancing—the opportunity to achieve quality in our lives. In the words of the American balladeer, Pete Seeger, we have found ourselves "standing knee deep in garbage, throwing rockets at the moon."

Cumulatively, "progress—American style" adds up each year to 200 million tons of smoke and fumes, 7 million junked cars, 20 million tons of paper, 48 billion cans, and 28 billion bottles.

It also means bulldozers gnawing away at the landscape to make room for more unplanned expansion, more leisure time but less open space in which to spend it, and so much reckless progress that we face even now a hostile environment.

As one measure of the rate of consumption that demands our resources and creates our vast wastes, it has been estimated that all the American children born in just one year will use up 200 million pounds of steel, 9.1 billion gallons of gasoline, and 25 billion pounds of beef during their lifetimes.

To provide the electricity for our air conditioners, a Kentucky hillside is strip-mined. To provide the gasoline for our automobiles, the ocean floor is drilled for oil. To provide the sites for our second homes, the shore of a pristine lake is subdivided.

The unforeseen—or ignored—consequences of an urbanizing, affluent, mobile, more populous society have poisoned, scarred, and polluted what once was a beautiful land "from sea to shining sea."

It is the laboring man, living in the shadows of the spewing smokestacks of industry, who feels the bite of the "disposable society." Or the commuter inching in spurts along an expressway. Or the housewife paying to much for products that begin to fall apart too soon. Or the student watching the university building program destroy a community. Or the black man living alongside the noisy, polluted truck routes through the central city ghetto.

There is not merely irritation now with the environmental problems of daily life—there is a growing fear that what the scientists have been saying is all too true, that man is on the way to defining the terms of his own extinction.

Today it can be said that there is no clear air left in the United States. The last vestige of pure air was near Flagstaff, Ariz., but it disappeared 6 years ago.

Today it can also be said that there is no river or lake in the country that has not been affected by the pervasive wastes of our society. On Lake Superior, the last clean Great Lake, a mining company is dumping 60,000 tons of iron ore process wastes a day directly into the lake.

Tomorrow? Responsible scientists have predicted that accelerating rates of air pollution could become so serious by the 1980's that many people may be forced on the worst days to wear breathing helmets to survive outdoors.

It has also been predicted that in 20 years man will live in domed cities.

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, believes that in 25 years somewhere between 75 and 80 percent of all the species of living animals will be extinct.

Dr. Paul Ehrlich, eminent California ecologist, and many other scientists predict the end of the oceans as a productive resource within the next 50 years unless pollution is stopped. The United States provides an estimated one-third to one-half of the industrial pollution of the sea. It is especially ironic that, even as we pollute the sea, there is hope that its resources can be used to feed tens of millions of hungry people.

As in the great depression, America is again faced with a crisis that has to do with material things—but it is an entirely different sort of dilemma. In effect, America has bought environmental disaster on a national installment plan: Buy affluence now and let future generations pay the price. Trading away the future is a high price to pay for an electric swizzle stick—or a car with greater horsepower. But then, the environmental consequences have never been included on the label.

It is a situation we have gotten into, not by design, but by default. Somehow, the environmental problems have mushroomed upon us from the blind side—although, again, the scientists knew decades ago that they were coming.

What has been missing is the unity of purpose, forged out of a threat to our national health or security or prestige, that we so often seem to have found only during world war.

But there is now, I think, a great awakening underway. We have begun to recognize that our security is again threatened—not from the outside, but from the inside—not by our enemies, but by ourselves. As Pago quaintly put it, "We have met the enemy and they is us."

A Gallup poll taken for the National Wildlife Federation last year revealed that 51 percent of all persons interviewed were deeply disturbed about the grim tide of pollution.

Growing student environmental concern is a striking new development. A freshman college student attitude poll, conducted last fall by the American Council on Education, found that 89.9 percent of all male freshmen believed the Federal Government should be more involved in the control of pollution. And a Gallup poll published in late December found that the control of air and water pollution is fast becoming a new student cause, with students placing this issue sixth on a list of areas where they felt changes must be made.

Other national and local polls, the rising citizen attendance at public hearings on polluters, the letters that are pouring into congressional offices—all indicate a vast new concern.

As a dramatic indication of the degree the new citizen concern has reached Congress, a daily average of 150 constituent requests on environmental questions is coming into the Legislative Reference Service, the research arm of Congress, from Members of Congress. This is a request rate second only to that for crime.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the amount of environmental material inserted in the first 6 months of last year by Senators and Congressmen was exceeded only by material on the issue of Vietnam.

Congress last year took the major initiative of appropriating $800 million in Federal water pollution control funds—nearly four times the request of the present and previous administrations.

And environmentalists across the country have been heartened by the reports that the President will devote major attention to the environmental crisis in his state of the Union message later this week. All conservationists applaud the President's interest and commitment.

In short, I believe that today we are at a watershed in the history of the struggle in this country to save the quality of our environment.

With the massive new coalition of interests that is now forming, which is including the urbanite and the student, it is possible to wage war on our environmental problems and win. In any such effort the continued commitment of millions of people is the most essential resource of all.

But, lest anyone be misled or caught unaware, this war will be lost before it is begun if we do not bring other massive resources to it as well. A victory will take decades and tens of billions of dollars. Just to control pollution, it will take $275 billion by the year 2000. Although that sounds like a lot of money, it will be spent over the next 30 years and is equivalent to the Defense expenditure for the next 4 years.

More than money, restoring our environment and establishing quality on a par with quantity as a goal of American life will require a reshaping of our values, sweeping changes in the performance and goals of our institutions, national standards of quality for the goods we produce, a humanizing and redirection of our technology, and greatly increased attention to the problem of our expanding population.

Perhaps, most of all, it will require on the part of the people a new assertion of environmental rights and the evolution of an ecological ethic of understanding and respect for the bonds that unite the species man with the natural systems of the planet.

The ecological ethic must be debated and evolved by individuals and institutions on the terms of man's interdependence with nature. Institutions such as our churches and universities could be of important assistance in providing increased understanding of these ethical considerations.

Such an ethic, in recognizing the common heritage and concern of men of all nations, is the surest road to removing the mistrust and mutual suspicions that have always seemed to stand in the way of world peace.

American acceptance of the ecological ethic will involve nothing less than achieving a transition from the consumer society to a society of "new citizenship"—a society that concerns itself as much with the well-being of present and future generations as it does with bigness and abundance. It is an ethic whose yardstick for progress should be: Is it good for people?

American college students—thousands of whom are now actively planning a teach-in on the crisis of the environment April 22 on hundreds of campuses—are in the forefront in expressing the terms on which we will need to meet this critical challenge.

Students, scientists, and many others are saying that we must reject any notion that progress means destroying Everglades National Park with massive airport development—or that it is progress to use the American public as an experimental laboratory for artificial sweeteners, food additives, or other products without understanding the "technological backlash" that may come from their unmeasured dangers—or that it is progress to fill hundreds of square miles of our bays and coastal wetlands, destroying natural habitat for thousands of species of fish and wildlife, polluting our waters, and in many other ways wreaking havoc with this fragile ecological system in the name of providing new space for industry, commerce, and subdivisions.

There is a great need, and growing support, for the introduction of new values in our society—where bigger is not necessarily better—where slower can be faster—and where less can be more.

This attitude must be at the heart of a nationwide effort—an agenda for the 1970's—whereby this country puts gross national quality above gross national product.

AN ENVIRONMENTAL AGENDA FOR THE 1970'S

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The first item I suggest for this agenda will be the introduction of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which will recognize and protect the inalienable right of every person to a decent environment.

In its degradation of the quality of American life—in its danger to the future of man himself—I believe the environmental crisis is the greatest single threat to our pursuit of those inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—which we have recognized as a society.

The amendment will be brief. It will state:

Every person has the inalienable right to a decent environment. The United States and every State shall guarantee this right.

Now, the tragedy is that the citizen has little clear, legal, or explicit constitutional avenue to protect the sensitivities and well-being of himself, his family, or his community from environmental assault.

Far too frequently, the citizen finds himself left with no remedy, in the face of the pollution of a lake which belongs to the public, or the poisoning of the air which he must breathe, or the shattering din which is imposed upon him with no choice.

This is because, in the development of our Anglo-Saxon common law, our protections have traditionally focused on economic or personal injury, with the subordination of other damages that we are finding are just as much a threat to the quality of life.

Although I believe we must explicitly establish environmental right and protection as a fundamental doctrine of our society, it is clear that any such right, and the terms of its protection, must be enumerated in statutes at the Federal and State level and further defined in the courts.

I will introduce this constitutional amendment today.

As the second item for an agenda, I propose immediate action to rid America in the 1970's of the massive pollution from five of the most heavily used products of our affluent age. For each of these products, I am convinced that it can be done—with firm Federal action to assure it.

The five areas are: Internal combustion engine, hard pesticides, detergent pollution, aircraft pollution, and nonreturnable containers.

INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINE

Phase out the internal combustion automobile engine by January 1, 1978, unless it can meet national emission standards by that time.

I have already introduced this legislation—the Low Emission Vehicle Act. It is imperative that a near pollution-free automobile be developed and put into use as quickly as possible. Present exhausts are causing up to 90 percent of the air pollution problem in some areas of the Nation.

This proposal would also initiate a Federal research and subsidy program to find an alternative to the internal combustion engine or improve the performance of existing alternatives.

ELIMINATE HARD PESTICIDES

Eliminate persistent, toxic pesticides—the "chlorinated hydrocarbons"—by 1972.

Because of the grave, worldwide environmental dangers from these long-lasting, poisonous compounds, this step was proposed as a national goal 7 years ago by the President's Science Advisory Committee. There is growing agreement that the persistent pesticides are expendable, because of less persistent substitutes and the development of other means of pest control.

A recent decision by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to eliminate all nonessential uses of DDT by the end of this year was a step forward. Yet the pesticide industry's continued unwillingness to initiate or accept reform, coupled with the Agriculture Department's historic hesitancy to improve pesticide regulation, makes it mandatory that Congress set a deadline on banning the persistent pesticides.

REDUCE DETERGENT POLLUTION

Set strict antipollution standards on detergents, including a ban on their phosphorous "builders" that have contributed so much to the pollution of our lakes all across the Nation.

Detergents are one of the major pollution problems in the country today. Six years ago I sponsored legislation which prompted an industry changeover to a new ingredient which cut the massive mountains of foam detergents were causing on our waters. Now, another important step is needed: elimination of the detergent's polyphosphate "builders" that pass through sewage treatment systems into our lakes and rivers, stimulating the growth of algae.

Most recently at House committee hearings, scientists testified that nonpolluting substitutes for these detergents are now within reach. Industry, however, continues to resist such a move. Congress must act to require the substitution and, in addition, to set national standards on the water eutrophication ability, biodegradability, toxicity, and health effects of detergents.

JET AIRCRAFT POLLUTION

To dramatically reduce pollution from jet aircraft, establish a deadline of December 1972 for the installation of smokeless combustors on their engines.

Industry has produced a combustor that makes jet engines smokeless and significantly cuts their other pollution. At the rate the airlines have agreed to install these devices, it would take until the middle of the decade to make the changeover. It will soon be possible to install the combustors at the rate of 200 a month, which would accomplish the changeover in 2 years, but the industry is refusing to do so.

With jets in the country pouring 78 million pounds of pollutants into the atmosphere each year, there is every reason for the combustors to be installed as quickly as possible. Congress should act to require this and to provide Federal assistance for research to make the combustors even more effective and easier to install.

Aircraft noise is another area which is in need of urgent action. As just one example, the supersonic transport plane, when flying at a height of 65,000 feet, will lay down a path of sonic booms 40 to 50 miles wide. This is a massive intrusion into human life which we cannot tolerate.

ELIMINATE NONRETURNABLE CONTAINERS

Eliminate bottles, jars, and cans from the American landscape through a combination of effluent charges, development of reusable or degradable containers, and packaging standards.

In the comprehensive solid waste management legislation that has already been introduced in this Congress, provision should be made for standards which will require reusable or degradable consumer product containers, as soon as it is proven technically feasible. In addition, our solid waste control program should be financed in part by effluent charges paid by industry or packaging that will not degrade or cannot be reused.

It is my conviction that the long run answer to our solid waste problem must be a massive effort to turn our wastes into valuable new products that can be recycled into the economy.

With these five actions, we would be taking great strides toward establishing the principle that industry's responsibilities for the human and environmental effects of its products do not stop at the end of the production line. The only way to assure this is through national laws that establish performance standards, so that products will be tested and environmental and health protections built in before, not after, they reach the marketplace.

FAMILY PLANNING

The third item on an agenda for quality of American life should be establishing and protecting the right of every citizen to plan his family. The funds and coordination must be made available for conducting necessary research into population problems and providing family planning services.

The statistics are deeply disturbing. It took until 1850 for the world population to reach 1 billion. By 1930, 80 years later, that figure had doubled, and by the year 2000, the world population is expected to reach 6 to 8 billion. Some ecologists see that population level as the "crash point." beyond which the natural environment will not be able to cleanse and restore itself from the massive pressure of exploitation and pollution.

At the December meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in Boston, there was general agreement that the world's optimum population limit has already been passed. Measured in terms of our past performance in protecting our environment, the United States is already overpopulated. If we cannot manage the wastes produced by 200 million people, it will be a catastrophe when we reach 300 million, as predicted within the next 30 years.

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATE AGENCY

The fourth item on an agenda for the 1970's must be involving the citizen in environmental decisionmaking through new mechanisms, including establishment of new channels and forums for public participation, creation of a citizen environmental advocate agency, and creation of an environmental overview committee in Congress.

As a start, industry must consult with the community on the pollution controls needed to protect and enhance the environment. It must make a full disclosure of facts before, not after, the decisions are made that affect the consumer and his environment.

Although it is ironic that it needs to be said, public participation in environ-

mental decisionmaking must also be extended to our Government. The sorry history is that, through rhetoric, inaction, and compromise with special interests, our public institutions have been accomplices in frittering away the quality of American life.

The infusion of a spirit of advocacy and environmental ombudsmanship is urgently needed at every level of government, and I will propose a citizen environmental advocate agency at the Federal level. This independent office would represent the public interest in matters before every Federal department and in the courts.

With strong support, the National Environmental Policy Act recently signed into law and a complementary proposal now pending in Senate-House conference that would provide staff support should be major steps forward in achieving in the White House an independent overview of Federal activities as they affect the American environment. Hopefully, one of the most frequently used provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act will be the one which makes available to the public the agency reports required where a Federal program or project would significantly affect the environment.

Finally, Congress itself could profit greatly by the establishment of a nonlegislative environmental committee that would provide all committees with a continuing assessment of the state of the environment and of Federal environmental activities.

MORATORIUM ON UNDERSEA OIL PRODUCTION

A fifth item on an environmental agenda for the 1970's should be the launching of a broad-scale effort to halt the pollution of our sea. Municipalities and industries must be required to halt their wholesale dumping of wastes into the ocean environment. And we should declare a moratorium on new leases or permits for oil production and other activities on the undersea Outer Continental Shelf until criteria are established for its protection.

The oceans, man's greatest asset, are being degraded at an alarming rate, hurling us toward worldwide catastrophe. In addition to dramatic oil pollution incidents, there are the less visible forms of pollution—from pesticides that are accumulating in the sea and from raw industrial wastes and sewage. In the United States, some 27 million tons of wastes were dumped at sea from barges and ships in 1968 alone.

These activities have their most immediate effect on our very limited continental shelves, the most productive area of the sea. If this sensitive environment is destroyed, sea life will rapidly diminish and a major source of food protein will be lost in a world that is searching for resources to feed its exploding population.

In a glimpse into the future, the recent report of the President's Panel on Oil Spills predicts we can expect a Santa Barbara-scale pollution incident once a year by 1980, if offshore oil development continues at the present rate.

To meet this problem, Congress should declare a moratorium on further Outer Continental Shelf development until the ground rules are established. Recreation, esthetics, fishery resources, and natural ecology must not be sacrificed in the interest of mineral and other development.

A high-level commission should be established and given the 2-year task of conducting an inventory of our offshore resources and recommending criteria by which we can achieve a harmonious relationship with the ocean environment. Upon the establishment of such criteria, the moratorium would be lifted.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

The sixth item on the agenda should be the establishment of an environmental education program which will make the environment and man's relationship to it a major interdisciplinary subject at every level of public education.

No country can maintain its vigilance in protecting its environment without a broad education for understanding of man's relationship to his land, air, water, and to other living creatures.

To help achieve this, I introduced the Environmental Quality Education Act in November. A companion bill was introduced in the House. The legislation would provide support for the development of new environmental education curriculums from preschool through college, adult education, and community programs.

TRANSPORTATION FOR PEOPLE

As a seventh item for an environmental agenda, we must utilize the billions of dollars a year that could be made available on completion of the Interstate Highway System to provide new transportation alternatives, including mass transit, in our polluted, congested, highway-choked urban areas.

This year, about $3.3 billion of the $4.4 billion administered by the highway trust fund will be spent on the Federal Interstate System, which is scheduled for completion in the mid-1970's. Instead of being used to lay new blankets of asphalt and concrete from coast to coast in another round of massive highway building, as has already been suggested, the Interstate Highway portion of the fund that could be made available in 1975 must be put to work alleviating the gargantuan transportation problems of our American cities. A major emphasis of those funds should be the provision of adequate mass transit systems, as well as developing and refining other tranportation alternatives.

NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY

As an eighth item, a national policy on land use must be delineated and implemented that will halt the chaotic, unplanned combination of urban sprawl, industrial expansion, and air, water, land, and visual pollution that is seriously threatening the quality of life of major regions of the Nation.

The nationwide land use policy must comprise and effectively use all the tools available to Federal, State, and local governments to establish rational planning, management, and controls.

Such a policy must deal with the massive strip mining operations that are ravaging and polluting vast acreages; the reckless draining and filling of wetlands that are destroying wildlife habitat and polluting vital coastal and inland areas; the helter-skelter development of our coastal and inland lakes shoreline that is eliminating a vital national asset from any future public use; the widespread land erosion in urbanizing areas that is silting and polluting our rivers and lakes; and the disruption of communities and destruction of marshlands and other scenic and naturally valuable areas that are brought about by our gigantic highway program where building in the fastest, cheapest "point to point" fashion has invariably been the rule, despite the consequences.

I should add that an integral part of our land resource and environmental heritage is the national park, lakeshore, and seashore system that we have established over the past decades. In this area, we have fallen tragically short of carrying out the congressional intention of providing $200 million a year for the land and water conservation fund through 1973. Land purchase for our national parks and other Federal wildlife and recreation areas is critically dependent on this fund. Yet for last year, only $124 million was sought and appropriated. Meanwhile, Outer Continental Shelf oil revenues intended to bring the fund to a $200 million a year level have been accumulating in trust year after underfunded year, unappropriated and unspent.

It is urgent that this year we provide not only the annually authorized $200 million, but the additional $164.5 million in Outer Continental Shelf funds now sitting in trust.

A NATIONAL MINERALS AND RESOURCES POLICY

A ninth item must be the establishment of a national minerals and resources policy.

Vital resources are already being exhausted because of our fantastic rate of consumption and our indiscriminate national waste. In addition, the extraction of our natural resources for our raw material has more often than not been done in such a way as to wreak violent and lasting environmental destruction.

A part of this national policy must be replacing the U.S. mining law of 1872 with a modern system of mineral leasing. As it is now, the 1872 law is a major obstacle to wise and effective land management in a world where the best kind of multiple use management is imperative. The present policy, based on that antiquated law, gives blind priority to mineral resources and makes any consideration of wildlife, recreation, esthetic or urban land values impossible. I have introduced legislation to establish a modern mineral leasing system, and a companion bill has been introduced in the House.

NATIONAL AIR AND WATER QUALITY POLICY

As a 10th and highly important item, America must establish a national air and water quality policy and commit-

ment which will restore and enhance the quality of these critical natural resources. Our dirtied rivers and poisoned air are dramatic evidence of the desperate need to take action on a national unprecedented scale.

The fuel funding of present pollution control programs—closing the environmental money gap—is a fundamental and urgent requirement of a national policy. Despite the congressional initiative last year in Federal water pollution control aid, our national water quality program still faces the danger of total collapse. While the Federal aid has been trickling to the critical municipal sewage treatment program in the millions of dollars, applications for aid from cities and towns across the country are in the billions.

In this perilous situation, it is essential that we appropriate the full authorization of $1.2 billion in the Federal water pollution control grant program for sewage treatment plants for fiscal 1971. Other means of long-range financing are being considered, but we cannot afford a delay in already authorized water quality funding while the alternatives are being debated.

A national air and water quality policy must also dramatically expand our present program of research and development of ways to neutralize, dispose of, and recycle all wastes, and require all governmental units and all industries and municipalities to comply with the highest state of the art in treating their wastes. We must also require that, as new, more effective pollution control equipment is developed, it be installed as a matter of course.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICAL ACTION

The 11th item on an agenda for the 1970's must be the creation of a nonpartisan national environmental political action organization, with State and local organizations providing the foundation.

The organization will give the public the day to day involvement that is essential to achieving environmental solutions.

CONCLUSION

Our efforts to meet a broad-gaged agenda such as I have outlined above will require a vast increase in spending for environmental programs. At least $20 to $25 billion per year over present expenditures is essential. A major portion of this could come from existing sources of revenues by reordering national priorities and diverting funds to environmental programs. New resources must also be tapped.

A radical reduction in the level of our Vietnam involvement and an elimination of unnecessary defense expeditures will result in substantial savings which could be tapped for environmental programs, among other dramatic needs. Normal economic growth will also produce more revenue which can be earmarked for improving our surroundings.

A casual look at the deterioration that has come about over the past 30 years is a frightening prolog to a disaster of inestimable dimensions if the accelerating rate of the environmental crisis continues.

It is not, however, a trend that cannot be reversed. If we have the will, the environmental challenge can be met. But in doing so, it will take significant modifications in our way of life. It will mark the beginning of a period when all of the institutions of our society—social, political, and economic—must readjust their philosophical attitudes toward man's relationship to his environment and all other living creatures.

Our environmental problems are man made. The solutions must be man made as well.

Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a constitutional amendment to guarantee every person the right to a decent environment and ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 169) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States declaring that every person has an inalienable right to a decent environment, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 169

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE ——

"Every person has the inalienable right to a decent environment. The United States and every State shall guarantee this right."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator on what I think—and I mean every word of this—is a rare and historic Senate speech. In the 12 years I have been in the Senate, I have not heard or read a more important speech.

I say this because the Senator is dealing with a problem that until recently was neglected. It is a problem with which the Senator was well aware when he was Governor of Wisconsin, where he contributed greatly to a beginning, in our State, in a big way. He has made very significant contributions in this area in the 7 years he has been in the Senate. But today he has done something which I think the Members of the Senate should be well aware of. He has proposed a constitutional amendment which would write into our Constitution a recognition and protection of the inalienable right of every person to a decent environment.

As I understand it, if we had this provision in the Constitution, it would mean that citizens would have a solid constitutional base for protection against the destruction of the air they breathe, the water they drink, the sound pollution—all the things which are absent now. Am I correct?

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct.

I think the great tragedy has been that historically the environment, which belongs to all people—air, water, soil, oceans, lakes, rivers, and streams—the assets which belong to all of us, has been progressively degraded by other individuals or industries or municipalities. The individual, who has a right to use that water, since the water is public property, who has a right to see it protected from degradation by the actions of some other individual, really has not had remedy in the past to do anything about it. When he relied upon the Federal Government, the State government, or the local government, they failed him.

If we have a right that is more important than any other right, it is the right to live in a clean and decent environment, and that people and industries not be permitted to so foul the air that it affects the very health as well as the quality of living for individuals in the area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot think of any more important action that Congress can take in the next 8 or 9 months—however long we are in session—than to approve the amendment that has been proposed by the Senator.

I think this is something that is being called for by people all over America. The overwhelming majority of Americans are now awake to this problem. This is an instance in which Congress is behind the people.

The Senator from Wisconsin is proposing a whole series of very helpful recommendations. They are comprehensive and cover many areas. I thank him and commend him for it.

Mr. NELSON. I thank my senior colleague for his gracious remarks.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate what the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) has said, and also to commend the junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) for his point No. 4—namely, that, no matter how you look at the problem of the befouling of our environment, there is no way it can be viewed apart from the failure of the United States to establish a national population policy. There is no way our failure to preserve the environment can be viewed apart from the failure of the United States to consider the consequences of overpopulation, our failure to provide enough money for biomedical and contraceptive research, and our failure to offer the same opportunity for the poor mother to plan a family that we provide for the affluent.

As the Senator well knows, the statistics overwhemingly confirm the conclusion in his statement. His explanation of the inherent link between overpopulation and the destruction of our environment constitutes a tremendously impor-

tant message to the American people. I am delighted that he is delivering that message today, and I hope he delivers many more like it.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland. As many of us know, he is a leading spokesman with respect to the very serious problem of overpopulation and has introduced an excellent bill which would move a long way in the direction of averting the disaster that is sure to come from overpopulation unless we do something about it in the next handful of years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is apropos of what the Senator is talking about. What little we are doing with respect to family planning is in the pending bill, which is threatened with a veto. What little we are doing is in this bill, particularly for the disadvantaged.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator for making that point.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for his very eloquent and striking speech on the question of environment and the control of our environment. It is long overdue. I congratulate the Senator for his continued leadership in this area. This is an area in which we have had continued leadership from the Senator from Wisconsin.

The most impelling of arguments are now marshaled here as to why we must take the steps that the Senator is advocating.

I would ask the Senator if he is aware of the bill now pending before the Senate to create a Department of National Resources and Environment, on which hearings were held in the last session of Congress but none have been held in this session of Congress.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. I am aware of the bill and I am aware of the Senator's continuing interest as author of the bill and as one who has advocated for several years now that we bring some units into this whole business of our dealings with the executive and legislative branches on the environmental question. The problem is being divided and apportioned among so many agencies that in fact one agency frequently is not aware of what the other agency is doing. Many times their actions are in conflict. This is a very thoughtful measure and the Senator should be commended for his persistence in pursuing a piece of legislation which I think, over the long pull, will give us unity.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin. It seemed to me that what the Senator here calls for, as to a nonlegislative environmental committee, would be a useful organization to have in Congress. I think of even greater impact would be the organization of a Department of Natural Resources and Environment because this would be the action agency of the Federal Government, as the Senator describes it. Oftentimes, our action efforts in Government are so fragmented and unrelated that they overlap and sometimes conflict, whereas if they were brought together in one charge, one goal, we could expect governmental policies at least to be consistent.

We have the practice, and I guess it is inevitable, of creating a new department or a new agency, when we have a particularly critical problem, and then it sits there and later on we have a problem that is perhaps somewhat related but we create something else and that is how we get them fragmented. We should stop and step back every once in awhile and look at where we are going to check on the goal of the Department and its functions, to see that they are related and are going in the same direction. Then we will get the kind of information we need.

As the Senator so eloquently pointed out in his speech, we have been so headlong in developing our resources industry and providing programs and all the other things, that for too long we have neglected even thinking about the environment. We had to balance the wastes developed and the burdens that came with all the good efforts we made in other areas, and now we find ourselves on the brink of disaster, unless we can find some way to eliminate the great wastes that are flowing down into our environment and take positive steps to preserve, improve, and restore the environment that gives us life on this globe.

The photographs that the astronauts have sent us back from the moon show this earth of ours all in one picture, so that we get the idea of how small and confined is the environment in which we live. When we destroy it or degrade it to the point where it no longer is compatible with life, then we have taken the first step toward the final elimination of the human race.

We must recognize that and turn back while there is still time.

Let me again express my appreciation to and admiration for the Senator in the great cause that he is advocating here, and to assure him that I will be as helpful as I can in this endeavor.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Utah. I agree with him about his observations on fragmentation of these issues and the need for the legislative proposals which he has been advocating for many years.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin on a truly grand speech. It is really a Magna Carta on the environmental rights to which our fellow citizens feel themselves entitled.

The thought runs through our minds that we are not really a rational and organized people, but are really a disorganized and an emotional people.

I wonder if we will be able to bestir ourselves and follow along the lines of action suggested by the Senator, or whether we will have to wait until a real disaster strikes one of our megalopolitan centers some day and find that some thousands of people have died. I wonder if it will be only then that action will be taken.

I hope that this will not be the case, but that we will follow the suggestions of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I express my full support and gratitude to the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) for his work in pressing the HEW appropriations. I hope that the pending measure is voted on soon; and that if it is vetoed, I hope we will have an opportunity to override the veto. I cannot for the life of me understand why the public press harps on the fact that we want to spend an additional $1 billion on that sector of Government spending from which the cost-benefit gives us the greatest advantage.

They lose sight of the fact that this Congress has also cut the President's budget by more than $7 billion. There is a blanketing of the airwaves and of the public media that mystifies those who look at the figures.

It is up to the public media to translate these facts accurately until the public realizes that we have cut the President's budget by more than five times the amount that the Senator from Washington is defending as an addition.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

As the Senator was speaking, I was reminiscing a little. I am not proud of this. In fact, I was somewhat embarrassed.

When I was a Member of the House of Representatives, we were talking about stream pollution. We had a public works bill up for consideration. I thought, "Why don't I send up a little amendment that would make everyone using the navigable waters, which is pretty nearly everyone, deposit all solid waste upstream." I did not get anywhere.

Think what that would have done if we had done that 30 years ago. I am embarrassed about that. I am sure that it would have passed.

As the Senator points out, we let these things pass, and a war has intervened, and it will now take billions of dollars to do what has to be done.

I could not help but reminisce about that. It would have been a simple amendment and it would have taken care of most of this matter.

(At this point Mr. CANNON assumed the chair.)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I would like to say that it was a great and special privilege to preside over the Senate during the remarkable address by the Senator from Wisconsin. I believe that his speech will be looked back upon as the keynote address for the 1970's. It spelled out what must be the agenda for mankind in the matter of the survival of the human race.

I congratulate the Senator on the thought and effort that went into that leadership address.

I would ask to be included as a cosponsor of the constitutional amendment when it is offered.

Mr. NELSON. It has been offered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be added as a cosponsor of the constitutional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator.

With regard to the aspect of his ad-

dress dealing with the environmental agency, I concur wholeheartedly in the need for a greater opportunity for the public to be represented, and for the Government to provide that opportunity, so that pollution and the poisonous aspects of proposed business and industrial activities are fully considered before and not after the fact.

We had an experience in my State in Santa Barbara where the Federal Government proceeded to lease for underwater oil drilling portions of the Outer Continental Shelf. The Department of the Interior has a responsibility to hold public hearings, but a memorandum in the Department of the Interior stated, in effect, "We do not want public hearings because it might stir up the natives," meaning they did not want the people of Santa Barbara to be aware of what was occurring until after it occurred. It turned out to be one of the worst disasters we have had there. The seepage still has not been halted. In a new development, the Army Corps of Engineers has abandoned its responsibility for holding public hearings on the erection of oil drilling towers without seeing to it that some other agency moved in to fill the vacuum.

We must see to it that the vacuum is filled. We must see to it that the public is informed on something that is about to happen in its area before it happens.

There are many other aspects of the Senator's fine address which are of great significance. I wish to add one footnote. I believe industry and business, responding to the obvious desires of the American public, and led, where necessary, by Government action, can and will do great things in controlling pollution and poison in the decade of the 1970's if we lead them in that direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin. I wish to join Senators who have applauded the Senator from Wisconsin for his more than significant speech this afternoon on life itself, this planet, and the problems we face with all the pollution that is taking over life on this planet. The Senator's address has been described as the "Magna Carta." It could be said that that phrase expresses the gratitude of Senators to the leadership the Senator from Wisconsin has taken in this long-term vital matter before us.

We have read that the state of the Union address on Thursday of this week will deal with the environment. I believe the leadership the Senator has taken and the work he has done over the months prior to this are registering from the White House throughout the Nation; and as I understand, it will be the focus of discussion of young people in the month of April. I do not know if that was discussed in the speech.

Gratitude is the word with which I would like to end—gratitude to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. I do this because as one who has followed the oceans with particular care, I realize the time is arriving when the degree of pollution in the oceans can pass a point of no return and turn them into a polluted area.

Mr. HART. Mr. President. The Senator from Wisconsin is to be highly commended for his resourceful program for environmental control and his dedication to the task at hand. His agenda for the 1970's includes many items which I endorse wholeheartedly. On several occasions the Senator from Wisconsin and I have worked together on environmental questions.

During the recess, I was delighted to hear that one effort in which we and others joined apparently produced favorable results. Last Thursday the administration announced an agreement with State and local authorities in Florida forbidding the construction of a major international jetport near the Everglades National Park. Under the agreement, it was announced, State and local authorities may use the already constructed single runway jet training facility for flight training, but only under strict Federal supervision. According to the announcement, the agreement further specifies that the training runway will be closed as soon as a new site for the jetport is found.

Assuming the controls on the operation of the training facility are sufficiently strict, the agreement appears to be a great victory for the forces of conservation in this country. It is a goal which several of us in the Congress have pursued for some time.

The administration is to be congratulated for averting what many had feared was an impending disaster to one of the Nation's most wondrous resources.

Mr. President, I would like to further commend Senator NELSON for signaling out several threats to our environment which require immediate action, including the environmental impact of hard pesticides, the internal combustion engine, and the jet aircraft. These problems, among others are being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, and more particularly by the Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment Subcommittee. We on the Commerce Committee recognize our responsibility for moving forward in these areas with all dispatch and look forward to working with Senator NELSON and others.

AN ENLIGHTENED BUSINESSMAN'S APPROACH TO POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the president of International Harvester, Mr. Brooks McCormick, presented a most interesting and informative address before the First Government-Industry Water Pollution Conference last fall. His words should be of significant interest to all of us as an example of what enlightened businessmen can do to safeguard our environment.

Many talk about environmental protection, but too often that is all we do. That has not been the case, fortunately, with International Harvester, as Mr. McCormick's words point out. While others slept, International Harvester recognized years ago the need to conserve our natural resources and make them work for man. Today, men like Brooks McCormick continue to lead the way by recognizing that we must possess a total concern for our environment and must recognize the social and moral justifications in such an endeavor as well as the economic benefits.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McCormick's statement be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE COMPANY'S ATTACK ON WATER POLLUTION

I welcome the undersecretary's invitation to participate in this first government-industry water pollution conference. Indeed, I am honored, along with my employer, International Harvester Company, for the privilege of kick-off position in this two-day symposium on water pollution abatement. It may well be true this nation and the world face no graver problems than those of environment. Almost everywhere we look we see signs of environmental deterioration.

The history of man has been the history of his efforts to take command of his environment, to control those elements around him upon which he depends for his very life. His method throughout most of that period has been extremely primitive and shortsighted. He has been concerned only with the immediate effects of his actions, with solutions for imminent problems and answers to current questions.

He has been so impressed that his environment, out of control, could destroy *him* that he has been oblivious of the possibility that he might destroy *it*—and himself in the process. And he has become aware of that possibility only in the most recent history. It may be one of the most important lessons mankind can ever learn.

This year, we have been privileged and thrilled to witness the first landing of human beings on the moon. Many people have attempted to assess the significance of that feat, and it will probably be years before we will appreciate its full meaning. But if it does no more than offer us the experience of a completely hostile environment, it can be worth its enormous cost. If it helps only to awaken our appreciation of this life-supporting planet and quicken our resolve to preserve it, the money this nation has spent and will spend on lunar exploration will prove to have been a bargain.

So while water is the subject of our deliberations today, I believe we need to be aware that it is concern for *total* environment that has brought us together. There can be no question that we must end the pollution of water. But neither should we doubt for a moment that the measures we take for abatement must be made in context with improving the quality of our total environment. We will be treating one element of something that, in essence, is indivisible. This, it seems to me, must be the underlying qualification of everything we say today.

I will, of course, be speaking for International Harvester Company and, therefore, in a sense, I will be representing the farm equipment industry as some of the advance literature for the conference has suggested.

At the same time, I must point out that my Company is also a maker of trucks and construction equipment as well as internal combustion and gas turbine engines, aerospace components, and steel.

In short, I do not represent my assigned category in the same exclusive way some of my colleagues on this program represent theirs. A more pertinent category for us would be "automotive metalworking" because the majority of International Harvester products move on wheels or tracks and are self-propelled and because the bulk of our manufacturing operations are classified as metalworking.

Still, the attitude of my Company toward water pollution in particular, and human environment in general, gets its essential character from our origin as a farm equipment company and our long alliance with agriculture.

It takes little imagination to associate farm equipment companies with a consuming interest in the conservation of water and soil resources. You can go back as far as you like in the history of the industry and find documented evidence of efforts and accomplishments in promoting and teaching conservation.

And incidentally, this was not "conservation for conservation's sake" which, Time magazine says, has been "freely scorned" by Secretary Hickel. It was conservation to enhance the life support elements for growing plants—conservation to maintain and improve the quality of the agricultural environment.

Now I'm not going to tell you it was sheer altruism that originally motivated farm equipment companies. Nor was it any clairvoyant vision of the day man would begin to realize he was seriously in danger of destroying his environment. It was just plain, good business. Water and soil conservation for the farmer was also market conservation for the Company.

But precisely for that reason, a highly favorable attitude toward the conservation of environmental resources became ingrained very early in the structure of our Company—and, I am sure, in that of other farm equipment firms. A natural feeling of responsibility for our corporate economic well-being became interchangeable with a feeling of responsibility for the quality of the agricultural environment. The relationship between them was as compelling as it was obvious.

Another strong influence on the present attitude of my Company toward environmental problems was the change that occurred nearly thirty years ago in our basic concept of the business. Like many other firms, ours had grown up with the belief that the affairs of our enterprise were largely private, that our major obligation to the public was to be law-abiding, ethical and constructive in our decisions and actions.

Then a former president of our Company introduced the concept that when a corporation reaches a certain size, it ceases to be a purely private business organization and becomes, in a sense, a social institution. He felt this was true because such size made the Company a tremendous influence, for good or bad, on the lives of thousands and thousands of people.

From this change of thinking evolved the concept of an enterprise operated not only in the interests of its owners but equally in those of its customers, its employes and the communities in which its people live and conduct business.

The implications of this point of view are many and varied. But essentially it stands as a formalized statement of social responsibility, a statement made at least a quarter of a century before it became fashionable to charge business and industry with an utter lack of social consciousness.

The significance of this statement in the context of today's conference is readily apparent. For when we talk about water pollution specifically or about environment generally, we're actually talking about society—about people and the effects of environment upon them.

Then there is a third reason for International Harvester's sincere concern about environmental problems. It grows out of the first two, and it is shared by the entire farm equipment industry.

We are justifiably proud of the contribution our Company and this industry have made in lifting the burden of drudgery from the farmer and thereby helping to unlock the door to the highest standard of living in this nation that the world has ever known.

Had it not been for agricultural mechanization, 70 or 80 percent of our population would still be farming—and farming laboriously. The industries represented here today would be vastly different if they existed at all. The professions would have few practitioners. And the Department of the Interior's jurisdiction might still be limited to the general land office, the patent office, the bureau of Indian affairs and the pension office—as it was in 1849. This would still be an agrarian nation.

But we might also not have a water pollution problem or an air pollution problem, or a traffic safety problem, or an urban problem.

As a developing nation, ours needed food and fiber more than it needed almost anything else. We were not unlike many of the struggling new nations of the world today. The farm equipment industry provided the tools to meet the needs of development. As a result, farming eventually ceased to be the inevitable vocation of our people, and for first time, they were free to choose among a myriad vocations essential to the country's continuing development.

They were also free to choose where they would live, to concentrate themselves in cities where the increasing sophisticated problems of their advancing civilization could be solved more easily. And essentially it has been this concentration of lives and living that has revealed the problem of environment to which we address ourselves today.

Our industry, as a result of its heritage, is in a unique position to understand its responsibility and that of industry generally, to take the lead in ending pollution where we are directly responsible for it. And I believe the positive, cooperative action of industry and government can set an example that will motivate the kind of total action our very grave situation now demands.

The stated policy of International Harvester in the matter of industrial pollution has evolved from this kind of background. It very simply says in twenty-one words: Within the limits of technical and economic feasibility our Company intends to prevent pollution of water and air by its facilities.

I want to make it clear this is fully as much a description of past practices as a declaration of intentions. For example, we have—I almost said always, but at least for a very long time—collected our spent materials—such as soluble oils and cutting oils and disposed of them through scavenger services. And as long as 16 years ago, before the present level of concern about water pollution was even imagined, we installed a waste treatment plant at our largest truck manufacturing operation to remove oils from storm sewers. At that time, we even had to establish our own standards for water quality. I think it is significant that we still believe that system is capable of performing within standards that will eventually be set by pollution control authorities.

As of the end of our 1968 fiscal year, we had spent more than $14 million for installation of water and air pollution controls in the present decade.

A few moments ago, I used the generic terms "metalworking" and "automotive" to define the essential nature of our manufacturing activities. Compared with many of those represented here today and with some others not represented, these activities do not involve a very large use of water. Therefore, I would be the first to admit that the water pollution problem we face in most of our plants is considerably smaller than that of some of our other speakers.

We do operate a small steel mill in Chicago, however, which does consume water in significant quantities. There was a time when this plant—which has a capacity of about one million tons of steel a year—probably used as much process water as all our metalworking operations combined.

I say "there was a time" this was true. It is not true today, because we have been making dramatic reductions in our requirement for input water in steel making. Perhaps a word about our accomplishment at this plant—IH Wisconsin Steel Works—is in order. For it does represent a type of industrial operation in which water pollution control is particularly difficult.

By the way, this mill is located some ten miles south of the Loop, and the origin of its name is now growing somewhat obscure.

We began earnestly to combat water pollution at Wisconsin Steel 25 years ago when we installed our first thickener for separating blast furnace flue dust from water. At that time we were drawing perhaps 120 million gallons of water per day from the Calumet River and were discharging virtually all of it directly into the river through thirteen outfalls.

Today, through the processes of cooling, cleaning, and recirculation, we have cut our demand for input water by one-half and have completely eliminated all but three outfalls.

This has cost our Company, along with air pollution control devices, $11.5 million at this one installation. Our remaining plans call for expenditures of several millions more. When this program is completed it is contemplated that we will be drawing only five million gallons of water from the river and that there will be no outfalls to it.

Of course, in the process of accomplishing this, we have spent considerably larger sums literally to replace our traditional production method with an entirely new one. We switched from open hearth to basic oxygen steel making, built a new rolling mill, installed continuous casting, vacuum degassing and a new battery of coke ovens, to list just the major changes.

It is clear, I am sure, that the first cost of solving our pollution problem at Wisconsin Steel would have been considerably larger had we attempted it without making these alterations in our facilities. The economic advantage we achieved in modernizing the steelmaking process helped to partially offset the cost of pollution control and certainly hasten our accomplishment of it.

No longer can there be any question that such measures as water pollution abatement must occupy the highest levels of priority in industry and government. But it is equally clear that only a profitable enterprise can afford the cost of what must be done. Just as government can spend nothing it does not first collect in taxes, industry can spend nothing it does not first earn in profit.

Any management today that does not understand its responsibility to society for the preservation of a living environment is derelict in its duty. But an even greater dereliction would be its failure to perceive and adopt a strategy of action that will provide income for maintaining the profitability of the enterprise as well as for meeting its pressing social obligations. Bankrupt businesses don't pollute streams. But they don't meet payrolls either. Neither do they

pay taxes, manufacture products, patronize suppliers or contribute to education.

The principal industries my Company represents have not been high profit industries. Essentially, we make machine tools for the most cost-conscious professionals you'll find anywhere—the farmer, the truck operator and the construction contractor. In the present decade, our net income has averaged about 3.6 percent on the dollar of sales. We'd like it to be higher and we're doing everything we can think of to make it higher. Still we are not likely, in the near term, to achieve the income levels enjoyed by some other types of U.S. business firms.

On the other side of the picture, first costs of abatement equipment are high—particularly if it must be installed in operating plants not otherwise involved in sales- or income-producing physical changes. In addition, there is the cost (which some people tend to forget) of operating, maintaining and updating abatement systems. The finest equipment available is only as good as the care it receives in use.

Our particular plan of attack on both water and air pollution takes two forms. One is *correction*, the other, *avoidance*. Corrective action involves the installation of physical facilities and normally is most practical when an operation is undergoing some extensive physical change or when we are undertaking new construction. Today in my Company, pollution abatement is a primary consideration in every plan for facility rearrangement and a part of every new construction contract.

For example, at our Louisville, Kentucky tractor factory we have just announced a $3.5 million program to install wet scrubbers and two electric furnaces for air pollution abatement in our foundry there. While the wet scrubbers will clean the air, they in effect merely solve an air pollution problem by creating a water pollution problem. So our plans for Louisville also include a complete water filtration and recirculation system. In the case of the new electric furnaces, which will replace a pair of the old cupolas, they will virtually avoid pollution at the very outset.

This then leads to that other arm of our plan of attack—avoidance—which is equally important but somewhat less dramatic. It is required in our Company today that, before a new process or new material may be employed by any operation, prior approval must be secured from our Manufacturing Research department. The physical welfare of our employes and avoidance of pollution are principal considerations of this procedure. If water pollution proves to be the potential result of adopting a new process or material, our people seek alternatives that will avoid it. The success of this program has been impressive in many instances, and we have been able not only to avoid pollution but also the cost of abatement.

These two approaches to water pollution abatement, in my opinion, make it possible for business management to meet its responsibilities to society as well as to the enterprise, its owners, employes and customers. Management has no alternative but to meet *both* obligations to the best of its ability.

Such considerations as these simply have to be factors in setting the timetables of abatement. They have to be taken into account along with such other practical matters as adequate time for planning and engineering, the ability of suppliers to deliver necessary hardware, contractor's schedules, and the adoption of definitive codes by control authorities.

In my view, there is no substitute for the dedicated desire of industry and government to understand the gravity of the total environmental problem and their earnest resolve to respond to it. There also is no substitute for a thorough understanding of the economic needs of business if we are to succeed in solving these problems of natural environment. Nothing could motivate industry to positive action like real improvement in the quality of our economic environment. The two are directly related, and it is not likely we will have one without the other.

What we have to do can be stated simply enough—as Professor Odum of the University of Georgia has expressed it: "We have got to stop thinking of ourselves as being in the growth stage of civilization and realize that we are in the mature stage. Up to now, we have been a consumptive, destructive civilization. We must learn to re-cycle and reuse."

Thank you indeed for your courteous attention. I look forward with keen interest to the views and remarks of others on what appears to be a most interesting panel.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is truly amazing to see the growing evidence that the American public has become aware of the problems facing our very existence in the area of environmental quality. This public awareness is especially gratifying to those of us in this body who have for many years been trying to get the message across.

On January 6, 1970, the Los Angeles Times carried an excellent editorial entitled "Deadline for Man's Survival." That is exactly what is facing us if we do not solve this problem and solve it soon.

I ask that the editorial be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 6, 1970]

DEADLINE FOR MAN'S SURVIVAL

As he signed the legislation setting up the three-member Council on Environmental Quality the other day, President Nixon remarked that the 1970s will be now-or-never years for reclaiming our living environment. The imperative deadline was no exaggeration.

We have already passed the point where our technology, greed and stupidity have resulted in fundamental alterations of the planet's life-support systems. We are now able to see that if this reckless tinkering is not halted and then reversed, the continuation of life on earth will become problematical.

Everyone is against pollution of the environment but few grasp how far the corruption of our air, water and land have progressed. The visible and esthetically disturbing signs—the air made filthy and noxious by photo-chemical smog, the streams and rivers discolored by wastes—hardly begin to tell the story.

Similarly, most of the solutions this far prospered have been shaped by political expediency and special-interest lobbying. They can scarcely begin to match the problem.

Our basic resources are being assaulted and strained beyond nature's ability to cope. The six billion tons of fossil fuels we burn each year are slowly raising the temperature at the earth's surface. North polar ice is thinning, life in the seas is being affected, the oxygen balance is changing.

Our lakes, rivers and now even the oceans have been polluted with pesticides. Wildlife not only is endangered by pesticides but in some cases—the American bald eagle is one example—faces extinction. The finality of that word must be stressed. We are beginning to see the end for all time of species that millions of years of evolution created.

Man himself may suffocate in his own garbage. In California alone in the next 35 years, according to one estimate, 2.3 billion tons of solid wastes will be produced, enough to cover a 1,500-square-mile area to a depth of 10 feet.

Wastes which find their way into our lakes are speeding up the aging cycle and so overwhelming the natural processes that the lakes are literally dying. We level forests and hills and sand dunes with little thought for the complex interrelationship of living things and natural forces. Agricultural acreage with its irreplaceable topsoil is given over to commercial or residential use. Where will the food of the future be grown?

Population growth and consumption demands are a basic part of the environmental crisis. Right now 80% of Americans live on 3% of the land. Almost daily, scientists voice new warnings about the effects on our health of this squeeze. The threat comes not only from the dirty water we drink and the foul air we breathe. Evidence mounts that overcrowding, noise and all the other by-products of too many people in too little space are responsible for physiological as well as psychological damage to humans.

The decade ahead is indeed—perhaps literally—the do or die era for reclaiming our environment, for saving ourselves. We know what must be done; the scientists and technologists must now show us the way, and political leadership must provide us the means, for doing it.

That requires first of all an unequivocal dedication at all levels of government to halting the pollution of the biosphere and the depredation of our resources. It means planning for our future, and implementing those plans in the development of new towns, in the control of population. It means a continuing outcry from the people, demanding that the job be done.

We have run out of time for wishy-washy compromises, for permissiveness toward special interest groups, for political doubletalk. The issue, in a word, is one of survival. That is not something we can compromise with.

DR. JOZEF LETTRICH

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a particularly fine, brave, decent, and excellent Eastern European leader, Dr. Jozef Lettrich recently died in New York.

I first came to know and admire Dr. Lettrich, when he served as head of the Slovak State of Czechoslovakia at the time I established our American Consulate General in Bratislava. I was always impressed by the fairness, intelligence, and objectivity of Dr. Lettrich, and all our relations were conducted in the most agreeable and correct manner.

During the Nazi occupation of his native land, Dr. Lettrich was an organizer of the resistance movement, persevering despite imprisonment and police surveillance. In 1944, he was a leader of an uprising of the Slovaks against the Nazis and had to live in hiding when the revolt was suppressed, and he was condemned to death. He resumed his political career at the end of the war, but was forced to flee his country when the Communists took over in 1948.

Since that time, he has lived in Washington, becoming chairman of the Central Committee of the Committee for a Free Czechoslovakia and chairman of the Czechoslovakia delegation to the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Last

year he was elected chairman of this assembly.

I was particularly sad not to be at Dr. Lettrich's funeral in New York, but because of duties here in the Senate, I could not be there. However, my wife who also shares my extremely high regard for Dr. Lettrich, attended in my place.

CLEAN AIR AND WATER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, President Nixon has already begun to make good on his New Year's resolution to "restore the cleanliness of the air and water." On Tuesday, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch and Transportation Secretary Volpe will meet with representatives of the 43 commercial airlines to draft a program for ending the pollution of the skies by 1972.

One does not have to be a scientist to know that jet airplanes are major air polluters. The heavy black exhaust trails seen daily on the approach paths to our major airports are ample proof of our airways pollution problem. Who is to blame for this problem? Probably, we must all share the blame.

The development of "clean" jet engines requires money and time. In the fifties and early sixties we were more concerned with cutting flight time than reducing the level of pollution. Federal regulatory agencies had no pollution control standards and no enforcement power. Since there was little governmental initiative and less public concern, major airlines and airplane manufacturers were unwilling to invest in more costly clean engine designs. Fortunately, governmental initiative and a widespread awareness of the need for better environmental quality have created a business climate which encourages increased clean engine investment. The cooperation of Government, private industry, and a concerned citizenry can point the way to better environmental quality. The fight for environmental quality is not a cops and robbers game. No one group or element in our country is solely responsible for our problems. We must all recognize that we share the blame and then join together in a spirit of cooperation to lick pollution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in today's Washington Post and the Air Transport Association's summary of progress.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to the printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1970]

END POLLUTION BY 1972, UNITED STATES TO WARN AIRLINES

The government will tell the nation's 43 commercial airlines Tuesday that they must end pollution of the skies with jet engine smoke by 1972 or face punitive legislation.

Airline executives are scheduled to get the blunt message at a meeting called by Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe.

The executives will be told of the Nixon administration's intention to push tough legislation already nearing passage unless they seize this final opportunity of doing the job themselves, HEW pollution fighters said.

Mainly at issue is the installation of a redesigned combuster—or burner can—on 3,000 existing commercial jet engines of one maker that reportedly account for 70 per cent of all smoke pollution from airlines.

The government estimates that all existing Boeing 727, Boeing 737 and Douglas DC9 jetliners with the Pratt and Whitney JT–8B engines can be converted to smoke-free operation by the end of 1972 at a cost of $13.5 million.

The airline industry has told the Federal Aviation Administration it can do the job by the end of 1974, but only at a cost of $30 million.

"Even using the industry's figures, that would add only 20 cents to a $100 airline fare," said one HEW official. "And it's peanuts in any event."

The smoke that pours from jet engines is caused by incomplete fuel burning in the standard combuster. The redesigned combuster eliminates the smoke almost completely, federal specialists say.

Jet smoke accounts for no more than one per cent of air pollution in metropolitan areas, government pollution officials concede. "But that one per cent in a very concentrated area can create one heck of a nuisance," said one.

The government is limited to persuasion about jet pollution at present because it lacks specific congressional authorization to attack the problem.

California already has laid down a Jan. 1, 1971 deadline for ending jet pollution in that state. Illinois and New Jersey have filed suits to force a quick cleanup in those states.

WHAT IS THE AVIATION INDUSTRY DOING?

(Statement of General Clifton F. von Kann, vice president, Operations and Engineering Air Transport Association)

FUTURE AIRCRAFT

As a result of study, testing, experimentation and evaluation to date, the future holds great promise for decided improvements in the next generation of aircraft such as the Boeing 747, the Lockheed 1011, and the DC–10. The newer engines which were designed and developed by engine manufacturers for these aircraft have combustion systems of more advanced design. The technical experience gained in the past as to the design feature which reduced smoke were incorporated in the engines. The elimination of exhaust smoke has become a routine development goal and is included in our technical specifications. As a result the airlines will be operating these new airplanes with engines which are essentially smokeless.

TODAY'S JET AIRCRAFT

Research by engine manufacturers is currently probing smoke reduction possibilities for several of the engines which now power the jet transports flying today.

Principal attention has been focused on the smoke plume emitted by the JT8D jet aircraft engine. This engine powers the Boeing 727, the Boeing 737, and the DC–9. The manufacturer of this engine, Pratt & Whitney, has been attacking the smoke problem for well over 4 years. Primary emphasis has been on eliminating the particulate emissions which cause the smoke from jet engines. The main offender is unburned tiny carbon particles caused by localized incomplete combustion in the burner cans.

The burner can is the heart of the jet engine. It is where fuel is mixed with compressed air and transformed by ignition into burned gas to form the propulsive thrust of the engine. Pinpointing the localized rich pockets in the burner cans was the first step toward smoke reduction. Once identified and adjusted, over 500 test rigs were run-in to confirm results. Then, more than 200 full-scale engines were run with different burner can configurations before a suitable design was selected for FAA certification.

FAA certification followed a 200 hour testing program by the manufacturer. A little over a year ago 37 engine sets of these newly fabricated and improved burner cans were delivered to 4 of the larger member airlines of the ATA for in-service operational evaluation on 727, 737, and DC–9 powered aircraft. The prime purpose was to determine how these new cans would operate during prolonged periods in the airline environments and to find the service life of these components under day-to-day airline operations.

A run out of at least 5,000 hours on all engines furnished the careers will take up to 2½ years. At present, ATA participating airlines have accumulated more than 3,000 hours on one engine set of cans being evaluated and as low as 200 hours on another. Most of this operation has been at the lower engine power rating. In short the airlines are more than half-way through the operational evaluation which should be completed in the fall of 1970.

It should be noted that this is not an excessively long period of evaluation. Unless the service life of these new cans is firmly determined when they are introduced into general airline service, engine life could be drastically reduced which would disrupt maintenance cycles and present the industry with virtually impossible problems in maintenance scheduling. Further, a short period of evaluation would fail to give the manufacturer the information he will require to eliminate the "bugs" from the new type burner cans.

With respect to the jet engines which power aircraft such as the DC–8, the 707, and Convair 880 (in other words, the JT3 and GE C805 engines), as soon as the manufacturers of these engines can provide the airlines FAA certified engine "fixes", operational evaluation of these items on airline aircraft will begin.

SUMMARY

The airlines' views can be summarized as follows:

1. New generations of airplanes such as B–747, DC–10 and Lockheed 1011 will be delivered with essentially smoke-free engines by the mid-1970's. They will amount to over 10 per cent of the U.S. airline fleet.

2. Regarding the JT8D engine, over a year ago the airlines voluntarily started an in-service evaluation of new burner cans provided by the manufacturer. Until at least 5,000 hours of service evaluation on each of the 37 engines is completed, the airlines determine their specific program of retrofitting this type of burner can in their fleets.

3. When the manufacturers of such engines at JT3 and the GE CJ805 have completed an appropriate smoke emission "fix" on their engines, the airlines will undoubtedly evaluate them operationally as well.

4. While it is impossible to make firm forecasts at this point in time, I believe it is safe to say that these actions will result in the majority of airline engines being smokeless by the mid-seventies.

WYOMING: ENVIRONMENT PATTERN FOR THE NATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the Senate has become much concerned about the problems of pollution of the environment which face most of the Nation. This concern will continue and I hope it will grow.

One of the several areas virtually unaffected by this problem is the State of Wyoming. A comprehensive article published in the Denver Post of January 11, 1970, provides some analysis of why

Wyoming has avoided pollution and considers Wyoming's fabulous potential for growth and development, profiting from the mistakes other areas have made in industry growth which resulted in a polluted environment.

The article, entitled "Is Wyoming a 'Lonesome Land?'" refers to the clear skies and clean, dry air, and to Wyoming's excellent overall climate. It recognizes the helpful cooperation among all its people and the pleasant fact that it takes less than 10 minutes for anyone in Wyoming to get from his home to his job.

The article notes, too, that Wyoming has more unmined, but accessible, coal than any other State, and is a leader in the petroleum industry, while extremely rich in uranium, gypsum, sodium carbonate, and iron ore. The State is growing economically in agriculture and is undergoing a fantastic recreational development.

According to the article, a recent survey of big city labor forces nationwide shows that the cream of skilled labor is ready to relocate their families to Wyoming should industry provide them jobs in that State.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS WYOMING A "LONESOME LAND"?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was researched, written and edited in an advanced reporting course at the University of Wyoming under the direction of Prof. John A. Lent. Written by William R. Eastman III, contributors were Ralph Berg, John Dunsworth, Kevin McKinney, Linda Howard, Monica Miller, Patrick Schmidt, and Sandra Snider.)

The grandeur is spectacular, the dimensions are tectonic and yet there is a strange desolation that spreads over the land to disguise the sparse outcropping of modern man.

This is Wyoming today; virtually unchanged physically by the movements of progress and industry that have engulfed the rest of the country.

The Wall Street Journal, on Oct. 3, published an article by Dennis Farney entitled, "The Lonesome Land." The state was compared to an underdeveloped nation; a "colonial region dominated economically and culturally by the outer world." Wyoming people are termed as solitary, rugged individualists.

"Wyoming people have been conditioned by heredity and their environment to be sort of individualistic," according to Dr. T. A. Larson, Wyoming historian and professor of American studies. Larson feels that the old frontier image of stoic individualism is not totally accurate.

"There has always been cooperation among the people in this state to help one another," he says. Today, whether or not Wyoming is a lonesome land, this cohesion principle still applies. "The people in this state will come together more than in other states because they are sensitive to outside criticism," said Larson.

Recently, 14 black athletes were suspended from the University of Wyoming football team. While a controversy over civil rights, academic freedom and athletic privilege spread nationwide, Wyoming people drew together to support the decision of Cowboy Football Coach Lloyd Eaton.

UNIFY STATE

Perhaps the most justifiable explanation for this unanimous support of the dismissal comes from a former university president, Dr. G. D. Humphrey.

"Wyoming's athletics have unified the state. People were fighting over junior colleges and what not, and football and other sports at the university served as a unification."

Statistics justify this claim. They show that Wyoming has the greatest out-of-state football following per capita in the nation. Over 10 per cent of Wyoming's 320,000 citizens become involved yearly in what Wyoming calls "Cowboy Football."

The University of Wyoming, located at Laramie, is this state's only four-year institution of higher learning.

Dr. James Hook, who was hired by the state to set up a special education system for retarded children, feels that this "one university system" has both advantages and disadvantages.

"One university in the state makes it possible to coordinate the whole higher education system," said Hook. With the small population of Wyoming, Hook feels that this is appropriate.

LACK COMPETITION

But there is also a lack of competition which, according to Hook, "may lead to stereotyping in the educational process." He observed that one university limited the student, as "he must either go to the University of Wyoming or else pay the higher tuition for an out-of-state education.

"Wyoming offers very little to the college graduate," said Hook. "I hate to see them leave the state, but we do very little to attract industry."

"Wyoming has never been thought of as a place to live and educate your kids," claims university sociologist, Dr. Marshall E. Jones. "It's considered better to go out-of-state for almost everything, including education. The services that make life worth living simply have not been developed here."

Another view was expressed by Dr. Ival R. Willey, dean of the College of Education. "It's hard to compare one university with another," he said. "As far as our goals and purposes, we are properly progressing in reaching them as are most institutions in the country." Willey said that the College of Education is comparable with any in the country. "Our graduate students have certainly made a name for themselves all over the country. In fact, about half of the states in the Union come here to recruit our teachers, and many of these people have told me that the teachers they get from Wyoming are among the best they find."

In education, transportation, and other intrastate endeavors, distance plays one of the unique and singular roles. Townships, hamlets and cities are not interconnected by suburbias as is common in other states. There is a lot of country between living areas in Wyoming.

"The average distance from one town to another in this state is not as unique as it may appear," reports Larson. "Whereas in big cities, a worker may spend as much as three or four hours getting to and from work, in Wyoming I'd say 90 per cent of the people are no more than 10 minutes away from their employment."

DISTANCE FACTOR

Even if distance doesn't inhibit working patterns, it does have an effect on Wyoming.

Hook is concerned over the distance factor in the primary and secondary education of the state. "It leads to problems of adjustment," explains Hook. Since Wyoming is a rural state, the student has very few opportunities to experience the problems of larger cities. "He doesn't get first-hand knowledge on housing, race, industry, etc., and when we consider that most of the students leave Wyoming for the cities and the jobs there, then we have the problem of the 'naive' rural man faced with the contemporary problems of the urban system."

"Thousands of our kids have never been to a town the size of Cheyenne (approximately 60,000 population)," points out Jones. "And there is a lack of contact with the outside world and the changes going on there."

"The Lonesome Land" referred to Wyoming people as having "a deepseated suspicion of 'outsiders' and a seemingly ingrained tendency to think small." Contrary to these remarks, Edwin G. Flittie, University of Wyoming sociologist, feels that people here are generally very open—"more so than people in most parts of the country. There is no doubt, however," he said, "that many people do think small. But this is largely because, except for natural resource development, there is virtually nothing in the state that would condition them to think big."

Willey disagrees.

"People of Wyoming have a deep concern for the problems of the world, especially for the nation, and I don't think that generally people of Wyoming feel they can isolate themselves from the problems of the world," he said.

"This is one of the hardest places in the country for new people to establish friendships," said Jones. "But again, it is the occupational structure of the state that has caused this problem. The geographic isolation here has made it necessary for some people to protect themselves. But," Jones continued, "the people here aren't different; they just live in a different environment."

AWED BY DESOLATION

The environment Jones speaks of is indeed different. Travelers emerge into southern Wyoming along Interstate 80, or in a compartment of a westbound train. As they converge onto the uncompromising vastness of the great American plains, they are awed by the odd desolation.

"How can people live there?" they sometimes ask.

Larson explains, "People don't live there; they can't, but they do live by a stream or in a productive region."

Today, Wyoming is losing population. The state's youth are leaving because of decreasing job opportunities and better pay in the nation's industrial centers. Older people are also leaving. The climate is harsh and they would rather live in warmer regions.

Many who do come to Wyoming to work at places such as the university are only using this state to improve their skills before attempting to find a better job in the urban centers of America, one native Wyomingite guessed.

Sometimes they stay.

"I came here in 1941 intending to make this a stepping stone to the West Coast," recalls Jones, "and I've never left. This university has the potential to become a first rate intellectual center—without all the problems of a metropolitan university."

"I certainly don't think the state is doomed," said Flittie. "I don't think we're facing extinction, nor do I think there will be any major population boom in Wyoming's immediate future. Except for developments resulting from the extraction and processing of uranium, oil, natural gas, trona and iron ore, it is doubtful that there is to be much industrial development that will result in substantial industrial payrolls."

INDUSTRY DESIRED

The development of new industries concerns most progressive people in Wyoming.

According to Larson, governors and other politicians who have tried to bring manufacturing into the state have failed because they have tried to please businessmen socially rather than as prospective clients to a growing Wyoming.

"What would you rather see if you were an industrialist,"asks Dr. James Pikl, head of

the Economics Department at the university, "glossy folders telling about the wonderful hunting and fishing, or definite facts about the size of the city, availability of labor, gas and utility rates, the tax structure, etc.?"

Pikl said that instead of wining and dining companies at "wild game dinners" and having hordes of files saying, "representative from such and such company sounds interested in making a move to Wyoming in the future and plans on being in Yellowstone Park for two weeks next summer. No definite plans as yet. Luncheon bill—$25," the company should be presented with pertinent facts about Wyoming.

"Under the circumstances," claims Pikl, "'The Lonesome Land' as the Journal titled it, is an asset. The wide open spaces, the untapped natural resources and all the raw products are all points in Wyoming's favor."

Ray Iiams, manager of the Wyoming State Employment Service in Rawlins, agrees. "We took a survey of labor forces in the large cities of the nation," recalls Iiams. "The skilled labor there would be ready to move in a moment to relocate their families away from the cities and the smog. Any large corporation could pick the cream of the crop from any of the major cities."

10 YEARS BEHIND

"We're about 10 years behind other states in development," observes Humphrey. "In the past, there were a lot of people who didn't really care if we developed and attracted people into the state or not. Most of those old-timers are dying off. I think we do want to develop now and Governor (Stan) Hathaway is really helping. Hathaway is a dynamic governor."

"We need to attract more industry," said Hook. "But we don't want big manufacturing developments; rather smaller industries based on intellectual challenges."

Most Wyomingites feel the same. They would like to see the inclusion of "capital intensive" industries such as electronics and aerospace, rather than smoke-producing factories with masses of low-wage employes.

"Losing population is not necessarily bad," said Pikl, "as long as the wages of those who remain increase."

Unfortunately, wages do not increase, and while good labor could be enticed into Wyoming from the nation's cities, a survey of 25 Illinois manufacturers showed that 24 were not willing to locate in Wyoming because of the climate.

"The trouble is," exclaims Larson, "we have a good climate, even better than others, but when we do have a blizzard or when we're the coldest spot in the nation, we get national publicity."

There are probably many reasons for Wyoming's cited "arctic conditions," but the most responsible is the states' mean elevation of 6,700.

"WAIT FIVE MINUTES"

"Wyoming weather may be cold," points out Larson, "but it isn't cold all the time. We have an extreme of temperatures. At night it may drop as low as —10 but it will warm to 40 or 50 degrees by noon the next day." Larson says, "If you don't like the weather right now, wait five minutes."

Wyoming is renowned for its clear skies and clean, dry air. There is a lack of large water bodies and, hence, a dominance of aridity. Many will swear that 20 degrees below zero in Wyoming is warmer than 20 above in more humid areas.

Dr. George C. Frison, head of the University Anthropology Department, has lived in both Wyoming and Michigan. "It's a harsh climate," he admits, "but I'd rather spend a winter in Laramie than Ann Arbor where I went to graduate school."

As for industry and the state's disinterest in pollution-bearing commerce, weather may play a limiting role but there have been industries that have adapted to the climate.

One such industry which has made this adaptation with great economic success is that of mineral extraction.

Last year there was a total mineral production of $576.2 million. Of that figure, 75 per cent was attributed to petroleum.

"Wyoming is enjoying a real spotlight in the country right now," said Dan Miller, head of the Wyoming Geological Survey. Miller feels that the oil activity in the state is very high and that Wyoming is presently leading the field, "even more so than Canada, Alaska and Texas (excluding offshore oil)."

WYOMING UNIQUE

"Wyoming is unique because it is one of the last states to try to develop natural resources," said Miller. "All the other states have previously been ransacked and exploited. Today we are more aware of the problems involved in exploitation than they were 20 years ago."

Miller explains that as well as petroleum, "we have more unmined coal than any other state." Miller said that because of its big hydrocarbon content, this resource has barely been developed. The coal was thought of little use in the past because it had no value for coking processes. But, today, with the rising importance of the petrochemical industry, for which this particular grade of coal is exceptionally useful, Wyoming coal is enjoying a rising demand.

Miller said that the uniqueness of Wyoming coal deposits made the resource even more valuable. "Coal deposits are located much nearer the surface than normal. This makes the extraction much easier and more economical."

But while Wyoming is rich in such minerals as coal, oil, uranium, gypsum, sodium carbonate and iron ore, it has a deficiency of the resource most necessary for growth—water.

Although the state is considered arid, its mountains and plains collect more than enough water to supply the animal consumption. Yet, the deficiency of this supply is one of the greatest limiting factors for Wyoming.

"Water is the secret of getting money into the state," asserts Humphrey. "Without water there is little you can do. We are beginning some projects now, and we are going to keep fighting for the state's right to use its own water rather than let it go to other states."

The siphoning of water to Utah, Nebraska, Colorado, Arizona and California is the cause of Wyoming's insufficient supply.

WATER VITAL

Hardest hit by this shortage of water are the farmers and ranchers. But with the assistance of reclamation laws, these groups have been able to meet the competitive markets of the nation.

"Irrigation practices in farming are making the difference in most of the state," reflects Dr. Delwin M. Stevens, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Wyoming. "Without irrigation, there would be no diversified production, because of insufficient rainfall."

In the past, sheep were raised in the southern region of the state while most of the cattle came from the central, eastern and northern areas. With the advent of railroads, the livestock industry was given an added boom as transportation to marketing centers became available.

Today, agriculture contributes roughly 15 per cent to Wyoming's basic income.

Economically, some consider Wyoming's agriculture to be lagging. Others, such as Dr. Conrad Kercher, animal nutritionist, feel that the state is in one of its most prosperous periods.

"The future of Wyoming agriculture isn't going to set the world on fire," cites Stevens, "but Wyoming is growing economically in agriculture. Cattle and sheep prices are higher this year than in the past."

"Efficiency in farming and ranching as well as improved management practices are making the difference in Wyoming agriculture today," said Kercher. "By grazing both cattle and sheep together many ranchers are finding their range is better utilized and more profitable." The retirement of horses for more efficient jeeps and airplanes has also added to time-saving and greater productivity.

MARKET CENTERS SCARCE

A major problem which affects agriculture is the lack of close market centers to process Wyoming food products. Wyoming has no distribution centers in the state and must look to Colorado, Montana and other surrounding states for processing.

Twenty per cent of Wyoming agriculture is made up of crops and food products, according to Stevens.

"Sugar beets and dry-land wheat take up the large percentage of this figure with dry beans and hay following close behind." Other agricultural products include potatoes, field corn, oats, barley and other small grain crops.

With the limitation of agriculture because of lack of water and climate conditions, with Wyoming's population declining and industry shying away, a third source of revenue and growth is necessary for a productive future.

Randy Wagner of the state recreation commission's planning division feels that Wyoming's potential in recreation may fill this demand.

"The state has a great wealth in sites and areas for recreational development," explains Wagner. "All it takes is just grabbing the bull by the horns."

According to Wagner, "nonresident visitors, vacationers and travelers spend somewhere in the neighborhood of $117 million a year." (Hunters and fishermen from other states spend about $65 million yearly.)

Wagner believes that Wyoming's tremendous potential for winter attractions is being recognized. "We have several fine ski areas, and more are being planned in western Wyoming and the Saratoga area."

He is ready to dispel the common belief that tourists visit only Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks (located in the northwest corner of the state). "Yellowstone, although still overflowing with tourists, dropped 2 per cent in its attendance while the rest of the state increased this past season. This means that people are heading for other attractions in the state."

"But the fact remains," continues Wagner, "that there just aren't any more campgrounds and places to accommodate tourists in Yellowstone. We have to develop surrounding areas to lighten the load at the parks.

"Here is where a good deal of the state's future in recreation lies. We must go outside the two national parks and develop new areas. Wyoming has many historic sites that either haven't been developed fully, or not at all. But the state must face up to the fact that it has to aid in the funding of these projects."

According to Frank Norris of the Wyoming Travel Commission, one of the the major objectives of the commission is to stretch the traveler's time in Wyoming as well as to bring more people to the state.

"If the 8 million visitors to Wyoming each year would stay but a half day longer," asserts Norris, "the travel tab to Wyoming would be $30 million more for the year."

But there are complaints.

DON'T NEED TOURISTS

"What Wyoming doesn't need is more tourists," says Pikl. "A problem we have is people coming in from other areas and using our recreational facilities and other resources without contributing much to the economy." Pikl said that he would rather add 7,000 permanent residents, each earning $10,000 a

year, than have 7 million tourists passing through and spending $10 each.

Others have criticized recreation and tourism because of the short two-month season.

The short season is falling by the wayside, according to Wagner. "The Grand Teton National Park, for example, is way ahead of its attendance marks for this time of the year (fall, 1969). It seems more people are traveling earlier and later in the season to get away from the crowds."

In recreation, agriculture, industry, and education, Wyoming may be behind, but its potential is here and it is being recognized. Wyoming people claim they are learning from the mistakes of other states. In the future, they feel that they can grow faster by avoiding these mistakes. Perhaps they will move ahead. If so, Farney's "Lonesome Land" may lose its wilderness to progress and prosperity.

THE 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN D. RHODES, FORMER OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES OF THE SENATE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, today, January 19, 1970, John D. Rhodes celebrates his 90th birthday anniversary.

Many Senators will remember Mr. Rhodes, who retired as chief official reporter of debates of the Senate on July 31, 1963. His retirement at that time marked the end of a long and distinguished career of service to the Senate. John Rhodes came to the Senate in 1919, 14 years before any of the present Members had reached the Senate. During the 44 years of his service to the Senate, he participated in the reporting of the major political discussions of those decades, beginning with the debate over the approval of the Treaty of Versailles, which involved the question of the U.S. participation in the League of Nations. He has also reported many sessions of the Senate of special, historical interest when heads of state of foreign governments were invited to address the Senate, including Winston Churchill, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Konrad Adenauer, and many other major foreign officials.

John Rhodes is remembered by his many friends here as a man of wide literary interests. He had a vivid recollections of a meeting once with Mark Twain at the Governor's mansion in Annapolis. Only since his retirement has Mr. Rhodes found the time to transcribe his personal notes covering Mark Twain's remarks to the group present on that occasion. He is a scholar in his pursuit of the accuracy of the recorded fact and correctness of grammar and style. Most of all, John Rhodes is remembered by all of us who know him as the witty but gentle and kindly friend.

I know that Senators will wish to join me in sending affectionate good wishes for a very happy birthday on the occasion of this major milestone in his life.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I want to add my own warm congratulations to John D. Rhodes on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary today. I am delighted to learn that he is enjoying good health and a good life.

John Rhodes established a most outstanding record of service to this body during the 44 years when he was an Official Reporter of Debates. This is one of the most difficult jobs I know of. It requires great professional responsibility because of the need for speed, accuracy, and oftentimes patience and understanding.

Mr. President, John Rhodes, in his duties to the Senate for all those years, not only witnessed but had a hand in the shaping of a lot of the history of the United States. In recording so much of the work of the Senate, I am sure he takes well-deserved pride in the many contributions he made to all of us during his remarkable career.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL SHALE DEPOSITS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, while the debate rages over the future of this country's petroleum policies, there is a tendency to pay slight attention to the vast reserves of oil contained in the shale deposits of Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado. But they are there, and thankfully, there are those paying great attention to their usefulness to America.

Primary among the people devoting their energies to the development of shale deposits are the scientists of the Petroleum Research Center of the U.S. Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.

Next month they will begin a series of experiments designed to stimulate burning of oil shale and recovery of oil from underground formations shattered by a nuclear explosive. Already, their work has demonstrated that oil can be extracted from underground shale and brought to the surface by wells. And there are encouraging results from their continuing experiments.

Reporter Dick Prouty, of the Denver Post, recently chronicled the work of the Laramie scientists—work of tremendous importance to all Americans. He quotes Research Director Gerald U. Dinnen as saying he does not doubt that commercial production will ensue. The question is, When? So far, the date is not known, but these men of the U.S. Bureau of Mines are doing much to advance the goal.

I ask unanimous consent that the Denver Post article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Jan. 11, 1970]

WYOMING TEST: OIL SHALE COOKER ERECTED

(By Dick Prouty)

LARAMIE, WYO.—On the wind-scoured prairie where settlers surged westward a century ago, nuclear age pioneers have erected a "trail marker."

The rusty-red marker looms 92 feet into the sky in stark contrast to its purpose of simulating the extraction of oil from shale deep in the earth.

The ugly steel monument has an aura of beauty about it because it offers prospects of using nuclear explosives to obtain oil from the vast deposits of shale in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah without blighting the environment.

Scientists from the Petroleum Research Center of the U.S. Bureau of Mines at Laramie recently completed a test run on the Denver-designed research tool and termed it a "real success."

SERIES OF EXPERIMENTS

Next month the first in a series of experiments designed to simulate burning of oil shale and recovering its oil from underground formations shattered by a nuclear explosive will begin, Gerald U. Dinneen, research director at the center, said.

The experiments are a bright part of a forecast of a 100,000-barrel-a-day production of oil from shale in Wyoming by 1980 made by Cameron Engineers of Denver for the Wyoming Natural Resource Board.

Half that forecast amount is to come from "in-situ," in place, retorting of shale from the underground formations. The other half is from an open pit mine and surface retorting operation.

The Bureau of Mines is core-drilling in southern Wyoming in search of the richest ore beds and Dinneen supervises laboratory retorting of the samples as well as the large-scale operation a mile north of town.

The "trail marker's" steel framework supports a 45-foot-high retort—a giant pot in which the shale is "cooked."

Pieces of oil shale ranging in size from a coffee mug to 8,000-pound chunks the size of a small car are brought from the agency's Anvil Points Mine near Rifle, Colo., and packed into the retort in a 10-day loading operation. The retort has an inside diameter of 11½ feet.

Harold Sohns, coordinator of oil shale-related projects at the center, and Arnold Harak, engineer in charge of the retort operation, said the retort is closed and the shale ignited by burning natural gas at the top of the column of shale for about 90 minutes.

On the test run to see if the retort worked, 175 tons of shale was loaded and after being ignited, burned at temperatures of up to 1,600 degrees for 24 days. Sohns explained that once ignited, the shale burns on its own as long as air is pumped into the retort.

Sensors inside the retort record the temperatures and pressures electronically on an instrument panel. This way, Sohns explained, the researchers know where the shale is burning, and at what temperatures and pressures.

The oil-containing kerogen in the shale melts and is collected in a self-weighing container. The experiment collected about 2,700 gallons, Harak said.

During the burning—retorting—gas released was recycled with the air to stimulate underground conditions. In future work different amounts of the gas will be blended with air to see which combinations are most efficient.

ASH COOLED

After the column of shale was burned, the ash was allowed to cool for 18 days—down to a temperature of 240 degrees—before the grate at the bottom was opened and the hot ash spilled out.

"Analysis of the ash showed there was very little oil left in it," Dinneen said.

Dinneen said the significant things learned in the test run were tremendously encouraging. They included:

The retort and its instrumentation worked.

The shale ash doesn't collapse and compact, preventing air from passing through the broken shale.

Oil can be extracted from big blocks of shale—crushing isn't necessary.

"This indicates" Dinneen said, "that the big blocks of shale we're told result from a detonation of a nuclear explosive can be retorted in a closed system such as the broken shale formation."

SOME PROBLEMS REMAIN

The scientist—a 1934 graduate of the University of Denver—said the experiments won't mean all the problems related to underground shale retorting are being solved.

"Still, we're most encouraged because by learning what happens here under known

conditions, we hope to tell later what's going on underground."

Experiments under Sohn's direction earlier near Rock Springs, Wyo., showed that oil can be extracted from shale underground by a different method and the oil brought to the surface via wells. Similar work is continuing there, Sohns said.

"This isn't a new process—it's similar to known ones," Dinneen said, "but it's the first time we've learned you can extract oil from large blocks of shale. It's the engineering we're interested in."

If that engineering will be used soon isn't known. The Atomic Energy Commission's (AEC) "Project Bronco" slated for the shale beds of Piceance Creek area of northwest Colorado has been shelved indefinitely.

The AEC helped start the Wyoming experiments in 1965 with a 10-ton retort on the University of Wyoming campus. The work is related to a peaceful use of the atom program by the AEC known as Plowshare.

RECOVERY 60 PERCENT

Assays of the oil from the retort showed 60 percent recovery from the 25 gallon-per-ton shales being used, Harak said. He hopes to boost that figure substantially when the actual experiments begin.

"What we found out was a lot more encouraging than what we wanted to know—if the pipes were hooked up right," he said.

Dinneen and Sohns are optimistic about oil shale's future. They don't doubt commercial production will ensue—but when, they don't know.

"Personally, we'll be highly disappointed if it doesn't become commercially feasible," Dinneen said. "We've spent more than 25 years each on making oil from shale cheaper and easier . . . that's a long time."

He first believed shale was set back by the huge discoveries of oil on Alaska's North Slope, and work on extracting oil from coal. But he feels shale soon will become competitive, particularly if the underground retorting is perfected. High North Slope development costs may make oil shale competitive economically, he feels.

"When you explode a nuclear device, such as in Project Rulison (a 40 kiloton explosion last September near Rifle) you get a very large amount of broken shale, I'm told," Dinneen said.

Retorting it underground avoids high mining costs from open pit or gallery mines, minimizes capital investment and the major problems of surface retorting—what to do with the contaminated water and great volumes of burned shale ash—that result from the extraction of the oil, he explained.

"We can keep a lot of garbage—ash, polluted water—underground where it doesn't contaminate the environment," Harak said.

"The water stinks to high heaven from phenols, ammonia sulfates and other components of the burned shale—40 per cent of the liquids extracted from shale are water—the rest is oil," he said.

At the sophisticated laboratories of the research center the character of the oil shale and of the undesirable water is being examined.

"We're trying to find out how good it (the oil) it, what its components are and what can be done with it," Dinneen said.

Work on the water is to determine if there are recoverable materials in it, he said.

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, every year about this time F. F. McNaughton, editor of the Pekin, Ill., Daily Times, and his wife, Ceil, send out a New Year's greeting to friends and subscribers. Those of us who are fortunate enough to receive this annual greeting always look forward to their warm friendliness and their thoughtful observations about the year just past.

Pekin was the home of Everett McKinley Dirksen. He always took a special pride in the fact that his roots were there, and he returned as often as he could. He delighted in talking about the many people he knew and admired in Pekin, and there were none for whom he had a greater affection and regard than Mac and Ceil McNaughton.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs of the McNaughton's New Year greetings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YEAR GREETINGS

JANUARY 1, 1970.

DEAR FRIENDS: It won't seem right for this New Year Greeting to go without one being sent to Everett McKinley Dirksen. The likes of him will never again brighten our day. For Pekin the loss of Senator Dirksen is beyond repair; and to many it has seemed that the loss to the nation was equally irreparable. Under consecutive Presidents (two Republicans and two Democrats) Dirksen had grown to be a sort of shadowy "prime minister"; if not the most powerful, surely the second most powerful man in the land. Since the sad September day of his death, we in Illinois have felt the government was floundering.

To youths here at home, Everett was living proof of what a poor boy (fatherless at five) could do in this America. He did it by hard work. He studied and mastered the art of telling a story, and he mastered the intricacies of a great nation's finances.

As age dimmed Everett's dreams of becoming President, he became the greater patriot. We were hoping that some October day the sage Senator would deliver a "Farewell Address" as part of the John and Sally McNaughton Memorial at DePauw University. Now our regret is deep.

CYRUS EATON CONTINUES HIS PATIENT SEARCH FOR PEACE FOR A WAR-PLAGUED WORLD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the supreme cause of all mankind is the achievement of just and lasting peace among the nations and peoples of the world. We have no higher calling. There would be no greater dream come true than the realization of this coveted goal. The concept of peace is the leaven which binds together the masses of the world. In these terms, there are not several races of men, but in reality only one race of man—for it is mankind as a whole who will solve this problem—or mankind as a whole who will suffer the fate of continued hostilities and conflicts and the terrifying prospect of nuclear holocaust. Men make war. Certainly, men can make peace. As we enter a new decade, it is our cherished hope that our heads and our hands and our hearts will be joined in a mighty crusade for peace.

During this time when persons envision renewed efforts to bring peace among nations, I call attention to a man who is dedicating his energies to this great cause. This man is Cyrus S. Eaton, chairman of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.—an outstanding industrialist and a persevering crusader for peace. Cyrus Eaton is 86 years old. He recently completed a trip to Paris, Moscow, and Hanoi as a part of his continuing quest for better understanding among peoples. There are those who disagree with Mr. Eaton's philosophy. There are others who agree. That is our privilege in a free society and each of us must justify his own convictions. But I hope such differences do not preclude the recognition of Mr. Eaton's unselfish and persistent efforts for peace.

Mr. President, on Sunday, December 21, 1969, the Akron Beacon Journal, in its "Editor's Notebook" contained comment by John S. Knight, owner of Knight Newspapers, on Cyrus Eaton's peace efforts. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EATON'S HANOI TRIP HELPS PEACE CAUSE

At this season of the year, as we pray for peace and the safety of loved ones in Vietnam, it seems appropriate to talk of a man who has dedicated his wintry years to ending a cruel and senseless war.

I speak of Cyrus S. Eaton, the 86-year-old Ohio industrialist, who in recent weeks has visited Paris, Moscow and Hanoi in the quest for a solution to the impasse between the United States and North Vietnam.

But first, as a noted editor is fond of saying, "Let me give you the background."

Cyrus Eaton is an atypical capitalist. Though he presides as chairman of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway and has served on dozens of corporate boards, his interests range from cattle breeding to membership in the Academy of Political and Social Sciences.

He is the founder of the famed Pugwash seminars where world leaders of government, science, education and philosophy gather each Summer in Nova Scotia to exchange views and explore common problems.

What distinguishes Eaton from his fellow tycoons of the business world is his long held conviction that Russia and the United States must reach accommodations on trade and other questions at issue if we hope to have a peaceful world.

He was largely responsible for arranging the visits to this country of Nikita Khrushchev, Alexei Kosygin and Anastas Mikoyan. It all began some 15 years ago when a group of Russian journalists wanted to see the home of an American industrialist. The State Department requested Cyrus Eaton to undertake this responsibility because of his contacts with the Russians during World War I.

Eaton's advocacy of the need for better relations with Russia has not contributed to his popularity. He has been called a Communist and worse by the business establishment. The general public has shown but little sympathy for his views.

To such criticism, Eaton replies: "I am a dedicated capitalist, both in theory and practice. The Soviet Union exists, so let's meet them halfway—let's know the top people and work with them. As long as we carry on warfare, we just make them fanatics—they go to extremes. So let's see if we cannot compromise with them."

In an interview with Merriman Smith of United Press International, Eaton added: "We need to export our food products in great quantities and extend credit. We also ought to supply backward countries with machinery and equipment. At a profit, of course. This is better than sending military missions to police them."

Eaton observes that "it used to be fashionable to be anti-Communist and denounce

anything of that kind. Now, half of the world is Communist—that's a hell of a lot."

He thinks, too, that the United States was wrong in placing an embargo on Cuba. "We thought an embargo would bring an end to the Castro regime, but the things Cuba needs of American origin can be obtained from our allies—Canada, Great Britain, France—and, of course, from the Communist countries."

As Merriman Smith has written, "Cyrus Eaton is not only a capitalist, he is a highly pragmatic capitalist."

There are overtones of Eaton's pragmatism in his just concluded eight day discussions with the leaders of North Vietnam in Hanoi. For he feels that to prolong the war is to invite serious economic consequences in our own country.

The main obstacle to peace, as Eaton sees it, is Hanoi's conviction that President Nixon's peace gestures are not sincere and that he really wants to continue the war.

In a Hong Kong talk to foreign correspondents, Eaton expressed the view that he thought he had made "some progress" in convincing North Vietnamese leaders to the contrary.

Another hang-up is the refusal of Premier Pham Van Dong and Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh to have any dealings with the present Saigon government. They are still demanding the complete withdrawal of American troops and formation of a provisional government to replace President Thieu and Vice President Ky.

Even so, Eaton said he has "discovered enough give and enough good will in Hanoi to indicate that compromises are possible to end the war." In this connection, he mentioned assurances from the North Vietnamese that American prisoners would henceforth receive better treatment including mail from home and dispatching of letters to the United States.

None of the above is intended to have you believe that Mr. Eaton will succeed where two Presidents have failed.

As the old saying goes, it is easier to get involved in wars than to get out of them.

Yet, Mr. Eaton has performed a useful mission. As he told me, "I wanted the Communist world to see an American capitalist who is opposed to the war. North Vietnam has the notion that our industrialists are interested only in profiting from the war."

This vigorous man of 86, the object of derision in the past, may have made an invaluable contribution to the cause of peace by providing a better understanding of the barriers of peace.

Cyrus Eaton will hear that he has been brainwashed, and be scorned as a Russian lover by those whose hatred of the Soviet Union paralyzes the ability to reason.

But never mind. Cyrus Eaton has in his way and with remarkable courage obeyed the Biblical injunction to live peaceably with all men.

THE 75TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, January 1 marked the 75th birthday anniversary of one of this country's truly dedicated public servants—Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I want to join the great host of Mr. Hoover's friends and admirers in wishing him continued good health and success. He has served the Nation long and well, and I hope he can continue to do so.

My good friend Mr. Louis C. Harris, executive editor of the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle and Augusta Herald, wrote an editorial published in the Chronicle of January 1, 1970, which, I think, expresses the feelings of many Americans about Mr. Hoover. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Jan. 1, 1970]

MISTER AMERICA

If there is one individual who, in the eyes of those who treasure America's heritage, can best typify the United States and all the values it stands for, we suggest that that man is J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Extremists who resent strict law enforcement, and feel they have a vested right to put themeslves and their causes above the Constitution and the statutes, have for years chisled away at the image of J. Edgar Hoover. Today, though, as he reaches his 75th birthday, his reputation stands secure and undiminished.

Mr. Hoover's accomplishments as the director and leading spirit of the FBI are well known. In view of the fact, however, that there are those who would like to have him regarded as a "controversial" figure, it is worth taking a look from the vantage point of this milestone to see just what he has done to arouse their ire. Let us quote the impartial Congressional Quarterly service, which serves as advocate for no one, and comment on its remarks:

He "spoke out often and bluntly on what he saw as dangers." But if all citizens had spoken out as determinedly would we now be bogged down in the permissiveness which has brought us to a low point in morality?

He "attacked complacency among the citizens." Doesn't a complacency which is willing to tolerate destruction of individual liberty deserve attack?

He criticizes "abuses in the parole system." But, while liberal elements who are soft on crime shut their eyes to that abuse, the rate of major offenses by repeaters goes up, and up, and up.

"Opponents have called Hoover's law enforcement stand 'hard line.'" The trouble with such critics is that they want two kinds of enforcement: hard line for their opponents, and permissive for transgressors they favor.

"Some have sought to ridicule his persistent reports of Communist or other subversion." What makes it particularly irksome to Leftists is that the reports are documented, with names, places and dates.

Some "have said the FBI was too independent and too far removed from political control." But Mr. Hoover's independence was the independence of dedication to law and principle, and any people who want law enforcement shaped by politics deserve what they get.

We believe that the people through their elected representatives, reject such scurrilous attacks. An example is a resolution in the House of Representatives adopted unanimously May 8, 1964, which said Mr. Hoover had "compiled one of the most remarkable records of service to God and country in our Nation's history."

We have no fear that the Federal Bureau of Investigation could grow into a Gestapo, as Mr. Hoover's enemies charge, as long as it adheres to the ideals which he has followed. Such a calamity could happen only if political control, urged by those who would warp law to their ideological advantage, laid its corrupt hand on Bureau operations.

Recurring rumors that Mr. Hoover would retire have again been dispelled by his recent assertion that he desires to continue in public service. Such an announcement should be welcome news, as his health is excellent, and his dedication undiminished.

On this day, he deserves thanks for keeping this a far better country than it might have been, as well as best wishes for many more birthdays.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, like most Senators, I have just returned from a fairly extensive home visit. In Wyoming, at present, a major concern is over the impending recommendations of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports. This concern is largely based on local economics. But it runs deeper, for there is genuine belief that a major change in the oil import program, as seems to be likely, would make the United States seriously dependent upon foreign petroleum sources in the future.

This concern over the future oil import policy of our Government, which I happen to share, is particularly acute in Casper, Wyo., a city known in the Rocky Mountain West as the oil capital. It is well expressed in a news article and an editorial from the Casper Star-Tribune, which I would share with the Senate. Unfortunately, it is impossible in the pages of the RECORD to share the cartoon which accompanied the Star-Tribune editorial of January 8. Suffice it to say that the cartoon portrayed Wyoming being ignored. Nor is Wyoming alone. Other States will share Wyoming's problems if, indeed, the oil import quota system is scrapped.

I ask unanimous consent that the news report and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Casper Tribune, Jan. 13, 1970]

FOREIGN PETROLEUM WOULD PUT DOMESTIC PRICES IN JEOPARDY

(By Phil McAuley)

"Believe me, it is serious," Casper oilman H. A. (Dave) True told Casper landmen at a luncheon Monday.

Speaking of the consequences if the recommendations of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Control are carried out, True said that it would result in higher, not lower, prices for petroleum products, that the United States national security would be in jeopardy, and the economy of many states would be irreparably damaged.

"If the oil import program is scrapped, the United States would be dangerously dependent upon foreign oil and the sheiks and sultans that control foreign oil will charge what the traffic will bear," True warned. "Domestic oil prices will remain down as long as we are not dependent upon foreign oil," he said.

True said the Cabinet Task Force is in error in its assumption that world oil prices will remain low, and actually it will result in monopolistic control by a few large companies and ultimately, nationalization of the American oil industry.

He told of the economic impact of the oil and gas industry in Wyoming, noting:

—There are 10 refineries in the state with 2,000 employed "and we're talking about seven going out of business."

—Thirty-seven per cent of the 1969 valuation was contributed by the oil and gas industry in 1969.

—Wyoming received $25 million in property taxes and $4 million in severance taxes last year.

—And 22 of Wyoming's 23 counties have oil or gas production.

True said that the United States must, between now and 1980, find more oil than has been located in all the past years and that a shortage of natural gas exists.

"Everyone recognizes that there is going to be a natural gas shortage," True said, "but there are not sufficient incentives for oilmen to do what is necessary."

True stated that there are many inadequacies and faulty assumptions in the Cabinet Task Force's report, which has been leaked to the press. Among these he listed the assumption that oil prices will decline if the present oil import quota system is done away with. It will result in vastly increased balance of payment deficit, he said. The natural gas shortage, he said, "was not even mentioned," in the report.

"The report completely ignores effects on payrolls, taxes, local and state economies, supply industries, and national security," True asserted, "not to speak of domestic oil exploration" and "It's apt," he said, "to halt development of Alaskan reserves."

He scored the study group resulting from the Cabinet Task Force, which he says is academically oriented.

"Secretary of Labor George Shultz picked a Harvard professor to head the study group," True said. "He in turn picked other professors and even students to work on the report. To the best of my knowledge not one of the members has any experience in the oil industry or even business experience," True said.

"We're in real trouble," he told the landmen. "It is late but maybe it isn't hopeless." (True was in Washington 14 times during the year as a spokesman for the oil industry).

He said the report of the group is completed but has not been released. It may, he said, be released shortly by the President but it could be studied by him for several months before release.

"The only way to apply the pressure and stop this screwball approach is contact with the President and legislators from both political parties."

He urged that personal contact and telephone calls be made and letters be written. The effective letter writers, he said, are anyone—individuals, businessmen, state and county officials, and particularly teachers.

[From the Star-Tribune, Jan. 8, 1970]

CONCERN ABOUT TASK FORCE PLAN

The cartoon which accompanies this column today was created by S. Stuart Johnson of Sheridan and contributed as his "letter to the editor." Mr. Johnson's work constitutes a very good "letter," and if a picture is worth a thousand words, the readers may be spared considerable redundancy.

Yet we do not pass it by with so slight a treatment, because it represents the thinking of many Wyoming residents—particularly the 10,000 employed directly in the oil sector—concerning the proposal to scrap the mandatory import quota system in favor of a tariff policy.

The opposition which this has aroused in Wyoming and other oil states should give President Nixon reason to exercise caution in considering the recommendation of the Cabinet Task Force Committee. The damage which such a change would do to Wyoming interests has been apparent in analyses such as that made recently by H. A. (Dave) True of Casper, who is nationally prominent on matters of oil policy. Dave True's logic needs no defense in Wyoming, because people here are not yet willing to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Nationally it needs endorsement, and this position has been supported by all members of Wyoming's delegation in Congress. Sens. Gale McGee, Cliff Hansen and Rep. John Wold have expressed their serious concern.

A majority of the Task Force Committee wants to make the change because the present policy seems to offend some counties which are not getting the quotas they desire. They ought not to be deluded, because the tariffs also would not be uniform. An article in the New York Times, which is not known for its conservatism, notes that the tariff would be "fixed at different levels for oil from Canada, from Latin America and from the Middle East."

There are so many phases of this issue that the discussion could be almost interminable. Wyoming's major interest is in the effect which scrapping of quotas would have on refinery operations, exploration and development and business.

Mr. Nixon may have to displease some people, such as those in New England, who also want protection for their industries. Senator Hansen mentioned that the other day. We might be willing to grant Senator Muskie his foreign trade zone so that a refinery could be built at Machiasport, Me., but if this is to open up a whole new policy we are not for it, for we are not ready to throw the baby out with the bath water.

DEATH OF LENOIR CHAMBERS

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, earlier this month Lenoir Chambers, distinguished former editor of the Virginian-Pilot, passed away. Mr. Chambers, in addition to a mastery of the craftsmanship and precision necessary in a great writer, possessed the courage, integrity, and vision necessary in a great editor.

Lenior Chambers received the Pulitzer Prize for editorials written during Virginia's turbulent period of massive resistance and school closings. At that time he wrote:

This is not a policy which Virginia can continue. It is so patently self-defeating that calmer judgment would find ways of getting rid of it even if it was not probable—as governmental leaders acknowledge—that the statutes for closing schools will be declared unconstitutional.

The punishment of innocent children is too severe.

Lenoir Chambers, a southerner who understood the problems of his native region, also wrote a splendid biography of Stonewall Jackson, now regarded as the definitive work on the life of Lee's most famous lieutenant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Lenoir Chambers," published in the Virginian-Pilot of January 12, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Virginian-Pilot, Jan. 12, 1970]

LENOIR CHAMBERS

Lenoir Chambers sustained the traditions of *The Virginian-Pilot* during the 12 years of his editorship. But that is not nearly enough to say of him and his career with this newspaper, which began as an associate editor in 1929. He contributed his own learning and convictions and style and personality, which ran deep and were strong. Today, eight years and twelve days after his retirement, his influence remains vigorous in the *Pilot*; it will live on now that he is dead.

In 1960 Mr. Chambers received the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished editorial writing in recognition of *The Virginian-Pilot's* lonely stand against the Massive-Resistance policy that resulted in 1958 in school closings in Norfolk, Charlottesville, and Warren County. The Pulitzer Prize being journalism's highest award, it seemed that the Chambers record had come spectacularly to a peak. That was an illusion. For Mr. Chambers in the school issue defended law and justice and enlightenment and dignity, and these were things he insisted upon year in and year out, consistently.

If Mr. Chambers in that period was out of sympathy with the Southern mood, or with those who by their positions undertook to define and project it, he was not in conflict with what has been excellent in this region and its leaders. Born a Southerner, he remained a Southerner by choice. When he chided the South it was out of an understanding of what it has been and how it should progress. And he drew constantly as an editorialist upon the virtues it has lent the national democracy and civilization and which its great men have practiced. Those were his own virtues. His mind was forever free and lively. But his standards, indeed his character, were of an old order. At the time he was protesting the South's reliance upon the extreme and politically mischievous, he also was cherishing its past; he was completing a Civil War history in his definitive *Stonewall Jackson*, a product of his Southerner's affection for home and kind and of his insights into the Southern experience (and, in a sense, his own experiences—he was an infantry officer in World War I) as well as his devotion to exactitudes.

He had the historian's knack and the scholar's discipline and the wise man's willingness to accept hard lessons. A second book of his authorship, *Salt Water & Printer's Ink*, is permanent evidence that he also had an abiding love for his City and his region and his neighbors and his newspaper; here he enlarged a review of *The Virginian-Pilot's* first century into a social history of Tidewater Virginia.

Those two books were, for all their worth, but an excursion in Lenoir Chambers' 50-year association with the printed word. He was first and last a newspaperman. The business of collecting and writing news and commenting on it absorbed and fascinated him. It challenged and inspired him.

His readers must have discerned a little of this. They could not, unfortunately, not all of them, have come to know him as his associates did—as a generous, tolerant, and warm friend, as an energetic companion of splendid humor and fine wit, as a cultivated aristocrat of infallible taste, as a highly conscientious editor who wouldn't scare.

But they must have recognized his absolute integrity and his soaring spirit and his commitment to the truth, to the rentless and enduring truth, in the writing that throughout the Chambers years distinguished this page and sustained its traditions.

DEATH OF DAVID O. McKAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I announce with deep sadness the passing of President David O. McKay in Salt Lake City yesterday, January 18, 1970, at 6 a.m. He was 96.

Since 1951, David O. McKay had served as president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. No man in my State of Utah was more beloved or respected, regardless of religious affiliation.

I ask unanimous consent that my comment to the press yesterday and the newspaper accounts published in the Washington Post and the New York Times of Monday, January 19, 1970, concerning this event be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MOSS

Word of the passing of President David O. McKay, comes as a saddening blow to me. I hasten to extend my deepest sympathy and offer my prayers for his wife and for his family, whom I have known so well since school days. The separation will be especially hard for Sister McKay after a lifetime of love and closeness unsurpassed in our time or perhaps ever. President McKay's deep and overwhelming love of his wife and his family was returned in kind by them all. Their loss and grief I share.

Our Church is now deprived of one of its most beloved and revered leaders. President McKay's lifetime of devoted service and leadership has left its mark on the Church, on our State, *indeed* on our Country, and even the whole world. Under his guidance, the LDS Church has grown and has spread its influence world-wide. President McKay will be sorely missed. In his place will come other leaders, but the devotion, admiration and reverence that we felt for him cannot be transferred immediately.

I treasure my personal relationship and deep friendship which we shared. President McKay and my father were classmates in college, which the President loved to recall nearly every time we met. So President McKay was to me like a respected and loved father—always interested, kind, wise and helpful. As his health declined, I saw him less and felt the loss.

This is a time for faith and a time for gratitude that we had so long a leader and friend such as President McKay.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1970]

MORMON PRESIDENT DAVID O. MCKAY DIES AT 96, LED CHURCH SINCE 1951

(By William L. Claiborne)

David O. McKay, president of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints and venerated by nearly 3 million Mormons as one of the greatest of the nine men who has headed the church since its founding in 1830, is dead at the age of 96.

Death came to Mr. McKay at 6 a.m. yesterday in his Salt Lake City apartment shortly after he lapsed into a coma from acute congestion of the heart. He had been in failing health for several months.

As president and "prophet, seer and revelator" of the church since 1951, Mr. McKay's leadership was synonymous with growth and progress of the sect that, since its founding by Joseph Smith in upstate New York 140 years ago, had risen above persecution and hatred to achieve a membership of 2.8 million persons.

During Mr. McKay's presidency, church membership more than doubled and during his lifetime it multiplied 20 times. To aid the growth, Mr. McKay traveled more than a million miles, leaving behind new chapels, seminaries and institute buildings.

He visited all the Latter Day Saints missions in Europe and was the first Mormon president to visit missions in a long list of African, South American and Asian countries.

His odyssey began in the small farm community of Huntsville in northern Utah.

As a 14-year-old one summer day in 1888, he dismounted from his horse, knelt beside a creek and asked God for a revelation that would guide his spiritual thoughts.

Ten years later, he related, while serving as a missionary in Scotland, a church official told him, "If you are faithful, you will yet stand in the leading councils of the church."

Fifty-three years later, he was president of the church and head of a vast business empire valued at more than $500 million. In discussing the church's holdings, Mr. McKay once emphasized, "In my mind, these material things come second. The greatest need in the world is spirituality."

In both senses, the church's growth during Mr. McKay's years of leadership was impressive.

Only six persons took part in the founding of the Mormon church seven years after Joseph Smith averred that he was visited by the Angel Moroni, who directed him to a hillside in rural Palmyra, N.Y., where he was to find engraved tablets of gold containing the history of the aboriginal peoples of the western continent.

Through divine inspiration, according to the history of the church, Joseph Smith translated the inscriptions and published "The Book of Mormon," becoming the first leader of the new church.

By the early 1830s, the church had shifted its center to Jackson County, Mo., and, following persecution under the cover of a charge that they were abolitionists, the Mormons founded the city of Nauvoo in Illinois, from where they were again driven away.

After Joseph Smith was jailed and then shot to death by a mob, the second president, Brigham Young, finally led the Mormons to the valley of the Great Salt Lake, which then was declared to be the land of promise to the Saints.

It was this unsettled background that characterized the Latter-Day Saints church when Mr. McKay, the son of a Mormon convert and missionary, became an active young member in Utah. The church at the time had a membership of 125,000.

He received his early education in Huntsville, and in 1894 entered the University of Utah, in Salt Lake City, from which he graduated as valedictorian of his class.

The church called him to serve as a missionary in Great Britain and two years later he returned to Utah to teach at Weber Academy. In 1902, he was named superintendent of that institution.

He was sustained as a member of the church's Council of the Twelve on April 8, 1906, and in 1918 became general superintendent of Sunday schools. The following year, he was appointed church commissioner of education.

On Sept. 8, 1934, he was chosen as second counselor to then-president Heber J. Grant and 11 years later was named to the same post under President George Albert Smith. He rose to the presidency five days after the death of Smith, by virtue of his senior position on the Council of the Twelve.

An imposing six-footer with piercing blue eyes, Mr. McKay was a tireless worker, arriving often at his desk at 6:30 a.m. His travels to establish new congregations and missions far exceeded those of his predecessors and he was generally regarded as a man who both supported the cause of individual freedom and kept pace with the changing world.

However, in the waning days of his life, he saw the church come under increasing attack for its doctrine barring Negroes from the priesthood—a rank most Mormon youths attain at the age of 12.

Despite the protests, the church hierarchy a month ago reaffirmed its doctrine on Negroes, holding that it was a matter of religion. Mr. McKay and his counselors at the same time reaffirmed their belief in the constitutionally guaranteed civil rights of all races.

In a statement from the White House, President Nixon said, "Today the Mormon church has been deprived of a distinguished and great leader. And America has lost a foremost citizen and human being. We grieve the death of David O. McKay in the comforting knowledge that his life will continue to bring strength and inspiration to his three million followers and to the nation he loved and served so well."

Former President Johnson stated, "Mrs. Johnson and I were saddened to learn of the death of that great religious leader and our friend. To the Mormon church and to the people, his life's work will be a sustaining force for long years beyond this day . . ."

"Christendom has lost one of its greatest spiritual leaders," he added.

Mr. McKay and his wife, the former Emma Ray Riggs, were married in 1901. She and five of their six surviving children were at his bedside when he died.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1970]

DAVID O. MCKAY, MORMON LEADER, IS DEAD AT 96

SALT LAKE CITY, January 18.—David O. McKay, president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, died today at the age of 96. Physicians said the Mormon leader died of acute congestion of the heart at 6 a.m. after having been in a coma for six hours.

All members of his family, except a daughter, Mrs. Lou Jean Blood, were present at his residence in the Hotel Utah, to which he had been increasingly confined during the last two years. Until stricken by severe heart and kidney failure in the last week, however, he had received official guests and conducted church affairs in his hotel apartment overlooking the park-like area in which Mormon structures are centered.

A funeral service will be held at noon Thursday in the Mormon Tabernacle, Buildings on the 10-acre Temple Square are being draped in black and church institutions will close for the occasion.

President Nixon issued today the following statement on the death of Mr. McKay.

"Today the Mormon Church has been deprived of a distinguished and great leader. And America has lost a foremost citizen and human being.

"We grieve the death of David O. McKay in the comforting knowledge that his life will continue to bring strength and inspiration to his 3 million followers and to the nation he loved and served so well."

Until a successor has been chosen, the Council of Twelve Apostles will be in charge of church affairs. It is expected that, following long-standing precedent, Joseph Fielding Smith, president of the Council of Twelve, who is 93, will then be chosen to succeed Mr. McKay as president of the church.

The death of its long-time President is not expected to bring any significant changes in the policies or activities of the Latter-day Saints.

"MISSIONARY PRESIDENT"

(By Alden Whitman)

As Prophet, Seer and Revelator of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, David Oman McKay was the supreme spiritual leader of almost three million Mormons around the world. He was the ninth head of a church organized by Joseph Smith and five other men at Fayette (now Waterloo), N.Y., on April 6, 1830.

During Mr. McKay's administration, which began April 9, 1951, when he was 77 years old, the Mormon church experienced its greatest growth both in membership and in influence. Much of this was attributable to the ceaseless exertions of Mr. McKay, the warmth and humanity of his personality and the breadth of his approach to religion. He captured the esteem and affection not only of his own people, but also of people of other faiths. In the opinion of many discerning Mormons he had more genuine charisma than any of their leaders but Joseph Smith.

A man of simple eloquence, quite in contrast to the thundering of Brigham Young or the dryness of his immediate predecessors, Mr. McKay personified missionary suasion. He appealed to the heart, offering hope

and salvation to those who sought the solace of his faith. Indeed, many Mormons, asked to characterize Mr. McKay's chief contribution to the church, called him "the missionary president."

Before he became president, Mr. McKay was active in the mission field; and from 1951 until he was nearly 95, he traveled the world in support of missions. The doubling of the church membership in this period reflected his zeal. Much of this astonishing growth was outside the United States—in Europe, Latin America, New Zealand and the South Seas. The expansion tended to universalize the Mormon church, changing it from a small, Utah-centered group to a large and respected global institution.

GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENT

In an interview for this article in the fall of 1968, Mr. McKay himself ranked as his greatest accomplishment "the making of the church a worldwide organization."

This had been brought about, he said, by, among other things, "visits to every foreign mission; meeting leaders of nations, ambassadors and other government officials; personally greeting all members of the church and investigators; holding meetings in every mission; and stimulating the work of local members and missionaries."

Mr. McKay met the church's growth by providing temples for its new members. Five were built in his presidency—in Britain, Switzerland, New Zealand, Los Angeles and Oakland—bringing the total to 13. Previously there had been eight temples—four in Utah, including the spired granite structure in Salt Lake City, and one each in Arizona, Idaho, Canada and Hawaii.

These temples, not to be confused with the thousands of houses of worship, are of central importance in the Mormon religion, for in them must be performed such sacred ordinances as endowment (a pledging of oneself to the church) and sealing in marriage. At the endowment rites, Mormons receive special toga-like undergarments, which they wear for life.

The temples built under Mr. McKay's direction served further to extrovert the church, since it was no longer necessary for Mormons to travel to the United States or Canada to participate in the highest rites of their faith. The church headquarters remained anchored in Salt Lake City, of course; but the outlook from Temple Square was no longer so completely parochial.

FRICTIONS DIMINISHED

In the process of universalizing and humanizing his church, Mr. McKay managed to mute many of its past frictions with the Roman Catholic and Protestant communities. His approach was personal rather than theological, broad rather than sectarian. Reflecting this was his reply to a question about the most important moment of his life. It was:

"The feeling of such peace and satisfaction and love for all God's children, which comes late in life after more than 80 years of work in the church and travels among people of all lands. My one great desire for them is that they may have peace and happiness in this world and the world to come."

Apart from having a personality that radiated confidence and goodwill, Mr. McKay was able to exercise his leadership through his unusual position in the church, at whose apex he stood. His authority derived, according to church doctrine, from a revelation to Joseph Smith in 1843, in which God pronounced that "there is never but one on earth at a time" on whom the full power of the Holy Spirit is conferred, and that one is the head of the Mormon church.

Faithful Mormons believed that Mr. McKay was a prophet of God, a man whose words and actions were divinely inspired and a man, moreover, capable of receiving revelations. At least one prophecy was credited to Mr. McKay. As related by Alvin R. Dyer, one of his Counselors, Mr. McKay said in 1960, "The time has come for many thousands of people in Europe to accept the teachings of the church."

"And," Mr. Dyer reported in an interview in 1968, "in two years 50,000 persons joined the church. This was in direct fulfillment of Mr. McKay's prophecy."

Although no written revelations such as those produced by Joseph Smith and Brigham Young were attributed to Mr. McKay, church leaders said that revelations took place every day. "The direction of God's people is dependent on revelation," Mr. Dyer asserted. He ascribed to revelation decisions to build temples, to revise the church welfare plan and to reinstitute a program to strengthen family bonds. Other revelations, said Joseph Fielding Smith, another Counselor, had to do with church assignments "according to the will of the Lord."

Mr. Dyer expressed the view that revelations through Mr. McKay, although not reduced to writing, were perfectly valid. Divine inspiration, he remarked, could take many forms. He recalled several temple meetings on church matters in which Mr. McKay had buttressed his presentations by adding, "Thus sayeth the Lord."

Mr. McKay's patriarchal authority, which was reinforced by tradition, extended from the spiritual into the temporal realm. In both areas he was accounted by many Mormons a liberal, at least in the first years of his administration. One instance of his liberalism was a positive attitude toward Negroes, according to Dr. Sterling G. McMurrin, a Mormon and head of the graduate school at the University of Utah.

Basing its position on an obscure passage in the Book of Abraham, written by Joseph Smith, the Mormon church, while accepting Negroes as communicants, bars them from the priesthood, to which all other Mormon men are eligible. This discrimination has disturbed many Mormons, especially in the intellectual community, who have sought to accommodate the church to the 20th century.

Dr. McMurrin was among those who discussed the problem with Mr. McKay in 1954. Recalling the conversation in 1968, the educator quoted the Mormon leader as declaring that "there is no doctrine that holds Negroes under a divine curse," but that rather it was a matter of practice, "which we expect to change."

NO CHANGE MADE

The change did not materialize. Dr. McMurrin explained this by saying that Mr. McKay, for all his humaneness, did not think in terms of laying out rules for the Mormon institution. "He was not sophisticated about social forces," Dr. McMurrin said. He added that as Mr. McKay aged he was more and more surrounded by conventional and conservative advisers.

Again, early last week, in the midst of the current dispute over this Mormon policy toward Negroes, Dr. McMurrin recalled the interview he had in the spring of 1954 with Mr. McKay.

In his robust years Mr. McKay was a firm, even stubborn, executive who sometimes ignored his Counselors, albeit after patiently listening to their advice. Six-feet, one-inch tall and weighing 200 well-proportioned pounds, he was an imposing figure. His eyes were hazel, and they seemed to many to be extraordinarily penetrating. "He could look right through you," it was said.

He gave off an air of command that called implicitly for obedience. "Never give an order that's not obeyed, or cannot be obeyed," he once told his children. "And if you give an order, be certain that it's followed through."

His general manner, however, was more genial than stern, his smile more ready than his frown. He was prepared to overlook some of the rigidities of church practice. New converts, for example, were not required absolutely to give up smoking; he tolerated coffee-drinking in Mormons who felt they needed the stimulant; he encouraged freedom of speech and opinion in church circles; and he was accessible to almost anyone who wanted to talk with him.

Mr. McKay put in a formidable working day. Rising usually at 4 A.M., he was in his sparsely furnished office on the first floor of the gray granite church headquarters building at 5.30. He sat in a plain leather swivel chair, and his desk was an oblong, glass-covered table, at which he received visitors With an interruption for lunch (his preference was a beefsteak, rare) and a short nap, he dispatched religious and temporal business until early evening. He dined with his wife and some church official or a member of his family and retired early.

WIDE RANGE OF BUSINESS

The range of business that passed through his hands was enormous—from the selection and assignment of church personnel to the location of a Federal office building in Salt Lake City; from decisions church investments to religious education; from the affairs of the church-owned Beneficial Life Insurance Company to those of the church-operated Hotel Utah; from bills before the Utah Legislature to a speech at a church conference.

Miss Clare Middlemiss, his secretary for more than 30 years, kept a daily diary that ultimately filled a large bookcase. One entry from Jan. 25, 1957, related Mr. McKay's concern lest Mormons not take polio vaccine. "I have learned," he wrote, "that some of our church officials are advising member not to take the polio vaccine and to rely wholly on faith. I made it clear that the Lord expects us to do everything we can to take advantage of all the improvements and discoveries (of medicine) and only when we have done all we can do we go to the Lord and rely upon His help."

Other diary entries recorded conversations with legislators over public policy and requests of Mr. McKay "to pass the word" on the church's stand on various proposals. In Utah, with 70 per cent of the population Mormon, the church position carried preponderant weight. Although Mr. McKay was not a heavy-handed theocrat, he did flex the church's muscle on such issues as opposition to liberal liquor statutes and support so-called right-to-work laws.

A plan to sell whisky by the drink was easily defeated in a Utah referendum after Mr. McKay had inveighed against it. Utah also banned the union shop. This was an extension of Morman belief in the doctrine of free agency, by which man is considered to have a choice whether to accept God's teachings. Applied in the temporal sphere, the belief militates against compulsory union membership, an ingredient of the union shop.

Critics of Morman policy in this area have said that the union shop ban reflects the church's close alliance with conservative business interests. Critics have also charged that the ban is responsible in part for low wages in the state. Utah, they point out, is 36th in the Union in per capita income. Its figure of $2,604 (in 1968) compares with $3,969 for Connecticut, which ranks first, and with $1,896 for Mississippi, which ranks 50th.

Mr. McKay's church was itself enormously wealthy. Its income was, however, a closely guarded secret, although some estimates put it at $1-million a day. Some of the money came from investments as diverse as a cattle ranch in Florida and an equity in The Los Angeles Times. Some came from its members, who gave 10 per cent of their gross income to the church. Not all Mormons tithed, but for most it was a sacred obligation, the fulfillment to which was essential for admission to a temple.

If church income was high, so was its outgo, for Mr. McKay and his colleagues spent

generously on missions, on education and on buildings, while taking nothing for themselves in salary. Mr. McKay received, for example, his expenses and that was all. The tradition of selfless sacrifice for the church was one into which Mr. McKay was born.

His ancestry was Scottish-Welsh, and his paternal grandparents, William and Ellen Oman McKay, were among the first in the British Isles to be converted to Mormonism by missionaries dispatched from Salt Lake City. In 1849, and for almost a century thereafter, the church sought to strengthen itself in the United States by encouraging converts to immigrate to Utah and its vicinity. Converts were obtained then by "tracting" (a more sophisticated system was instituted by Mr. McKay), which involved knocking on doors and proselytizing anybody who seemed willing.

William McKay and his wife and their four children came to the United States in 1856, selling all their possessions to pay for the trip. After reaching the Mormon settlement in Iowa, they walked a thousand miles across the plains and mountains to Ogden, Utah.

Also converts, David O. McKay's maternal grandparents, Thomas and Margaret Evans, came from South Wales and settled in Ogden. William's son David married Thomas's daughter Jeanette, and their first son was David Oman McKay, born on a farm in Huntsville, near Ogden, on Sept. 8, 1873. This was four years before the death of Brigham Young.

The farm, which Mr. McKay maintained until his death, shaped his early years, gave him a lasting interest in horsemanship (he was an excellent rider) and outdoor life, and was the place he retired to meditate from time to time. The rural values of enterprise and hard work and cooperation were those he prized.

"The individual is the most important element in our society," he said often, adding:

"There can be no progress without individual leadership. Too many say, 'Let the Government help us.' but that's not the way mankind has progressed.

"Rather we progress by having leaders who start on new courses that men follow. We must strike out and be individuals. Everyone must be a free agent—to be able to think and choose for himself."

David had his first introduction to responsibility and leadership as a boy of 8, when his father spent two years as a missionary in Britain and left the farm nominally in his eldest child's charge. (In Mormon households the father is the patriarch and in his absence the oldest male child carries the burden.) This habit of authority, learned young, persisted in Mr. McKay when it came to his own family.

FOND OF THE CLASSICS

While herding cattle and performing other farm chores, David found time to read the English classics, for which he developed a lifelong fondness and from which he could quote, even in old age, long swatches. Robert Burns was a favorite, as was Shakespeare.

The boy attended public schools in Huntsville and then Weber State Academy (later Weber College), of which his father was a founder. He began a career as a teacher at the age of 20 as principal of the Huntsville grade school. A year later, to qualify for a state teaching certificate, he enrolled for three years at the University of Utah, where he played on its first football team and was president of his class and its valedictorian when he graduated in 1897.

This period of Mr. McKay's life coincided with Federal persecution of the Mormon church, which was begun with the Edmunds Act in 1882. The persecution was aimed both at the Mormon practice of plural marriage and at the economic and political theocracy that the church had built in Utah. Under the Edmunds Act and the Edmunds-Taylor Act of 1887, Mormon leaders were jailed and church property was seized.

John Taylor, the immediate successor to Brigham Young, spent most of his 10-year administration in hiding. Wilford Woodruff, the next Prophet, acting in the face of virtual dispersal and breakup of the church, decided to submit to Federal power in 1890. Gradually, some church property was returned, but by the time Utah was admitted to the Union in 1896 the church was at an ebb (its membership was about 200,000) and it was searching out likely young men as missionaries and leaders.

At about the same time, Mr. McKay once recalled, he sought divine help for his own future by kneeling and asking God for a revelation that would guide his spiritual thoughts. His answer, he said, came while he was serving as a missionary in Scotland, a call he undertook upon graduation from the university. The answer was given by a Mormon official who assured him:

"If you are faithful, you will yet stand in the leading councils of the church."

The missionary call was an event he still remembered at 95, when he thought of it as an opportunity "to follow in my father's footsteps and go to Scotland to teach the beliefs and principles of the Gospel." Missionary work in those days was arduous and often perilous. Joseph Fielding Smith, who also served in the British Isles, recalled in a conversation in 1968, when he was 93, that he had been stoned at least once on his tour of duty. And finding likely converts was a matter of chance.

Mr. McKay returned exhilarated to Utah in 1899 after having been president of the Glasgow district of the British mission. He immediately began to teach English at Weber, becoming superintendent of the college in 1902. His experience as a teacher made him a stickler for grammatical exactitude in himself and others. It also helped him forge a bond with young people, in whose eductional welfare he was profoundly interested.

In April, 1906, while still head of Weber, he was called to membership in the Council of Twelve Apostles, the church's governing body. At 32 he was its youngest member. In Mormon practice, a call, or an appointment, is regarded as a divine summons, which has priority over any temporal business in which the Mormon may be engaged.

STEADY RISE IN CHURCH

Once an Apostle, Mr. McKay rose steadily in the church organization. A member of the Deseret Sunday School Board, he was appointed second assistant general superintendent of the churchwide Sunday School and then a member of the church's Board of Education. Increasing responsibilities obliged him to resign his job at Weber in 1908 to devote his energies to religious affairs. For 15 years his chief task was in the field of church education, but he also took part in the Ogden Betterment League and the Red Cross.

Mr. McKay's career took a dramatic turn in late 1920, when he set off on a 13-month tour of all the church's foreign missions, except that in South Africa. The 62,500-mile trip, the most extensive of any Mormon leader up to that time, opened his eyes to the world outside Utah and laid the groundwork for his global religious outlook.

Almost immediately on his return to Salt Lake City he was dispatched to Liverpool for two years to head the church's European missions. Once back in Salt Lake City, he was given general responsibility for the worldwide missions, a post in which he traveled extensively. Then, in 1934, he was named Second Counselor in the First Presidency, the highest executive body in the church. The church leader was then Heber J. Grant, and when he died in 1945 Mr. McKay was continued as a Counselor by George Albert Smith, Mr. Grant's successor.

At various times during his membership in the First Presidency Mr. McKay filled civic posts—he was chairman of the Utah State Centennial Commission and the Utah Council of Child Health and Protection; he served as regent of the University of Utah, trustee of the State Agricultural College and trustee of Brigham Young University, a church-operated institution.

The serenity of Mr. McKay's tenure as a Counselor was broken in 1945, when his favorite niece, Fawn McKay Brodie, published "No Man Knows My History," a biography of Joseph Smith. The Mormon leadership considered that the book, by the daughter of an Assistant Apostle, cast some reflections on the founder of their religion; and Mrs. Brodie was ordered to show cause why she should not be excommunicated. She ignored the request. Her relations with her uncle, already strained because she had married out of the faith, were virtually broken.

How much Mr. McKay was involved in Mrs. Brodie's disfellowship was never made clear. Observers noted, however, that in his administration no such penalty was imposed on Mrs. Juanita Brooks, a Mormon historian, who wrote a book that rattled some church skeletons. Moreover, when there was a move to excommunicate Dr. McMurrin a few years ago, Mr. McKay had it quashed.

Mr. McKay came to the church presidency on the death of George Albert Smith in April, 1951. As the eldest Apostle in point of service, he was "sustained," or accepted, as the Mormon Prophet by a church conference then in progress. In referring to him, even among themselves, Mormons customarily used his title and full name—President David O. McKay.

The first years of his administration were marked by a strong surge in missionary work. In a decade the number of missionaries was quadrupled to about 12,000, and the number of annual converts rose from 12,000 to 180,000. Apart from Europe, a traditional source, conversions were accelerated in Latin America and the South Seas. Wherever converts were made the church provided schools and recreation facilities. Mr. McKay's active guidance in these projects was apparent, for he traveled everywhere in an effort to stimulate church growth—a total of 300,000 miles, he calculated.

At the same time Mr. McKay impressed his personality on the church by a nondogmatic approach to religious and civic affairs. On occasion he overrode his more conservative Counselors in taking the church out of some political disputes. He seemed to want to play down the church as an obvious arbiter at the ballot box.

In the early nineteen-sixties the church leadership was troubled by the John Birch Society, whose ultraconservative views appealed to many Mormons, among them Erza Taft Benson, an Apostle and Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower Cabinet. When in 1963 Mr. Benson outspokenly endorsed the aims of the society, he was sent to Europe for two years to head the church missionary effort. "David O. McKay sent him out of the country," according to Wallace Turner in "The Mormon Establishment."

If Mr. Benson harbored any indignation over his "exile," he did not show it publicly. In fact, in an interview in 1968, he praised Mr. McKay as "a true man of God."

HEARTFELT LIBERALISM

Mr. McKay's liberalism, according to many observers, was a heartfelt feeling and it was against the grain of many of the aged church leaders, for whom authoritarianism was a righteous practice. In his later years, perhaps from 1965 onward, these observers said, Mr. McKay tended more toward tradition than he formerly had.

Until illness enfeebled him, Mr. McKay was a familiar figure in Salt Lake City. He greeted friends on the streets; he mingled with church members at conferences; he seemed never too busy for a brief chat. He was, according to one Mormon who did not always agree with him, "the loving father of his people."

In addition to his role in opening the church to the world and in liberalizing some of its practices, Mr. McKay played a strong part in a program to fortify family bonds. He sought to have families gather one night each week, with the father in charge, for a discussion of spiritual problems, for it was his conviction that the family was the basic unit of society and of the church.

His own family life was close. His wife was Emma Ray Riggs, whom he married in 1901 and who was living at his death. They had seven children, of whom six survive: David Lawrence McKay, Dr. Llewelynn R. McKay, Mrs. Lou Jean Blood, Mrs. Emma Rae Ashton, Dr. Edward R. McKay and Robert McKay.

DEATH OF DAVID O. McKAY, MORMON LEADER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Mormon Church and its people have suffered a sad loss this weekend. David O. McKay, president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, is dead, and Americans of all faiths are poorer as a result.

A man of simple eloquence, his warmth and humanity captured the esteem and affection not only of his own people, but also of people of other faiths.

He once ranked as his greatest accomplishment "the making of the church a worldwide organization." His success in expanding the church's membership and influence is in great part due to his vibrant personality that radiated confidence and goodwill.

He was a warm, personal man who knew the value of close family ties, and he lived his personal life with the conviction that the family was the basic unit of society and of the church.

David McKay had great influence on many families in my State of Nevada, and I think our State is the better for it.

His desire, that God's children may have peace and happiness in this world and the world to come, is the quest of good men in all ages. It is my hope that we can find a way to fulfill this quest. All those who honor him must certainly try.

Mrs. Cannon and our children join me in paying respects to the memory of this great leader and offering sympathy to his family.

David McKay's devotion to individualism and the rural values of enterprise, hard work and cooperation were instilled in him from his birth, in Utah. Of Scottish-Welsh ancestry, he was born on a farm near Ogden, Utah, on September 8, 1873, just 4 years before the death of Brigham Young.

As a young man of 20, he became the principal of the Huntsville grade school. His keen interest in the education of young people never left him. He attended the University of Utah to qualify for a State teaching certificate, and was president of his class and its valedictorian when he graduated in 1897.

The missionary call was an event he remembered as an opportunity to follow in his father's footsteps and go to Scotland to teach the beliefs and principles of the Gospel.

In April 1906, while superintendent at Weber College in Utah, he was called to membership in the council of 12 apostles, the church's governing body. At 32 he was its youngest member.

His worldwide tour of the church's foreign missions in 1920 laid the groundwork for his global religious outlook and upon ascending to the church presidency in 1951 the first years of his administration were marked by a strong surge in missionary work.

The doubling of the church membership since 1951 reflected his zeal. Aside from his dedication and selfless sacrifice for the church, David McKay will best be remembered in his role in opening the Mormon Church to the world.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TALMADGE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, strife and violence in the Middle East continue to threaten world peace and security. It is an explosive situation that can at any time erupt into open and widespread warfare.

No one wants this to happen. We all desire peace and stability for the Middle East, and a settlement of differences in the best interests of everyone concerned—Israeli and Arab alike.

In my judgment, there is going to have to be direct, face-to-face negotiations between the principal parties concerned. Neither we nor any other nation can impose a peace on the nations of the Middle East. That peace must come from these nations themselves.

I spoke in Augusta, Ga., on January 4, on the subject of the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER OF THE ADAS YESHURON SYNAGOGUE, AUGUSTA, JANUARY 4, 1970

I am honored indeed to share this important occasion with you.

I know all of you are very proud of this moment, as you have every right to be. I congratulate you on your outstanding record of service and on the splendid work you are doing in this community.

And I join you tonight in paying tribute to two of your most outstanding members—Abe Fogel and Hill Silver—who have distinguished themselves by a combined total of some 75 years of service and leadership.

Abe Fogel and Hill Silver have been in the forefront of all your endeavors. They have provided inspiration, hard work, and energy and have given of themselves above and beyond the call of duty. They have served not only this community, but the city of Augusta and the entire State of Georgia.

It is a pleasure tonight to offer them my heartfelt congratulations for a job well done.

Three years ago, at this time of year, Israel and Syria were about to begin a series of meetings to discuss intrusions into Israeli territory by Syrian-based commandos.

The meetings accomplished little, if anything. The Syrian delegation persisted in using the talks for verbal attacks against the Israelis.

The situation got worse. A few months after the meetings ended early in 1967, Syria increased its support of the commando aggressions against Israel and the Israelis were forced to defend themselves in major air battles in April of that year.

The events of April were an ominous prelude to what took place in the Middle East in May and June of 1967.

I need not recount the details of the war of June 1967. All of us, indeed the whole world lived through those trying days in anxiety and consternation. We all know the results. It was perhaps one of the shortest conflicts in the grim history of warfare. But it was probably one of history's most significant and dramatic wars.

When the last of the Arab armies capitulated and accepted the United Nations cease-fire, we received this news with joy and relief. We believed the crisis had passed. The war was over and a time of peace could began.

How wrong we were!

Instead of a time of peace and order, we saw the beginning of another stalemate of intransigence. There came more talking, more threats, and finally even more violence. Following the war in 1949, after the war of 1956 and again after the war of 1967, the instigators still were not satisfied to end hostilities. Instead, they preferred to continue the confrontation on other battlegrounds. They prosecuted a battle of words and a war of terror.

Arabs have rejected the peace conference in favor of verbal sabre rattling. They spurn negotiations in favor of terrorism and ambush.

So, the war of 1967 has not ended. The battle goes on in the daily exchanges and the incidents that have come to characterize the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has suggested that the war has entered a new phase—that of limited war. He has also said that the cease-fire along the Suez Canal has been so continually violated that it is no longer a cease-fire. . . . It is in fact a condition of hostility.

Virtually every day, there are incidents along the Jordan River, in the Jordan valley, and the Bait Shan Valley . . . that maim and kill, not just the soldiers who are trained and prepared for war, but innocent civilians as well.

On the Golan Heights, an area that was a Syrian shooting gallery for 20 years that is now under Israeli control, there are an increasing number of raids and incidents perpetrated against the Israelis by commandos and their tutors, the Syrian army. Moreover, the war has extended to the Lebanese-Israeli border . . . an area that had known relative peace for 20 years.

Within Israel, the people are plagued by the so-called Freedom Fighters, or the Resistance, or the Army of Liberation—whatever name they wish to call themselves. But the name that best seems to fit is the one used by Israel. They are Terrorists, and they are a threat to every citizen of Israel. You are all painfully familiar with incidents of the past three years.

A bomb in the Hebrew University cafeteria.

Several bombs in the main bus depot of Tel Aviv.

A car rigged like a mammoth time bomb in the market of Jerusalem.

Hand grenades thrown into the tomb of Abraham.

All these and more designed and executed with the simple but direct purpose of killing Israeli citizens.

These Terrorists have even taken their brand of warfare outside the Middle East and gone into international airports of the world . . . Athens, Zurich, Rome, and the hijackings of Damascus and Algiers.

Terrorists have attacked Israeli establish-

ments in Europe. They have attempted to intercept Israeli statesmen in South America. They have tried to intimidate Israelis and other people of the world in major cities all across the globe, including some in the United States.

These acts, and the open threats of future acts of the same nature are not warfare. They are savage and barbaric gangsterism of the lowest kind.

It is only natural that Israel has not remained silent or inactive through these attacks. If the nation and the people of Israel did nothing to answer aggressions against their homes and their lives, I would have serious doubts about their good sense and their fortitude. I have never had to entertain such doubts, for Israel strikes back. The retaliatory raids against the commando bases and against the training camps and staging areas of the Arab countries are the only form of preventive warfare open to Israel. Out of necessity, Israel has demonstrated to the Egyptians that they are as vulnerable as the Israelis to hit-and-run warfare.

A major factor in the continuing hostilities of the Middle East is the replacement of arms. The Soviet Union apparently has no qualms against furnishing arms to the Arab states and the Terrorists, and in providing an unlimited number of technicians and military advisers for training Arab armies and guerillas.

In my judgment, at some day in the future, the Soviets will call in those I.O.U.'s. The next obvious step is for the Soviet Union to furnish economic and political advisers as well . . . and the Arabs may wake up some morning to find they are no longer in control of their own national destiny.

United States interest in the Middle East . . . expressed both verbally and through the presence of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean . . . acts as a constant reminder to the Communists that the Free World is not willing to allow the Middle East to fall under the influence of the Soviet Bloc.

As for American involvement in the so-called arms race, our course should be extremely clear to everyone. We must continue to insure a balance in the arms situation. That means that the United States is obliged to furnish whatever weaponry is necessary for the defense of Israel, if such weaponry is not available through any other source.

Inasmuch as the French have apparently decided to cast their lot with the Arab nations, the United States should provide the jet aircraft needed by Israel for its defense.

But we are going to have to go further than just reaffirming United States interest in the Middle East through the availability of arms for Israel. The United States must make it clear in every possible way that this nation will not tolerate . . . . will not abide . . . will not condone . . . and will not allow the death of the State of Israel.

We cannot straddle the international fence on this issue. In the interest of democracy and decency, we have to be committed to the continued life and prosperity of Israel as a free and sovereign nation.

This brings us to what the United States is prepared to do and what it should do to find a peaceful settlement and to insure that it will not be violated and brushed aside at the whim of the Arab countries.

The first step is to insist upon a direct, face-to-face negotiation of a peace settlement. Neither we, nor any other nation, can impose a peace on the nations of the Middle East. That peace must come from the nations themselves.

All the talks and conferences between the various powers, and through the United Nations, cannot act as a substitute for an Arab-Israeli peace conference. All the many suggestions of guidelines and recommendations, formulas or international mediators cannot replace the absolute necessity of a peace treaty, signed by the Arabs on the one hand, and the Israelis on the other.

I also question the validity of beginning a search for compromises or territorial concessions even before the primary parties in the conflict . . . all the Arab governments . . . have agreed to negotiate. Such an effort is, in fact, counter-productive. As long as there are all these suggested "peace plans" floating around, the Arabs can use their rejection of one clause or another to delay the inevitable fact that sooner or later they are going to have to sit across the table from the Israelis and settle their own problems.

This is why I disagree with the recent statement by the Secretary of State that a line should be drawn in the Sinai region prior to any meeting between the State of Israel and Arab leaders.

It had the effect of serving notice to the Arab governments that the United States was committed to that line . . . and therefore undercut any negotiating that might have emerged at a peace conference.

If the Israelis offered anything less than the American line in the Sinai, the Arabs have only to point to the statement by Mr. Rogers and say, "We will start negotiating with that line." And that line only. In effect, we disarm Israel statesmen in any diplomatic exchange they may have attempted.

It has also become apparent who makes the policies for the Arab nations. Within days after the Secretary's speech in Washington in December, a delegation was on its way from Cairo to Moscow. This was supposed to be a hasty trip to discuss trade and more arms shipments. No doubt arms were discussed. But it seems to me that the Egyptian delegation was running to Moscow to ask what to do next in light of the change in American policy.

The idea that Israel would be able to find secure borders in the Sinai area is as uncertain as the wind that sweeps that barren desert.

A quick review of the history of 1948, 1956, and 1967 would demonstrate the insecurity of the boundary line in the Sinai which Mr. Rogers stated was the most appropriate border between the Egyptians and the Israelis.

I also find it difficult to accept the reasoning behind the several proposals that have been advanced on the unified city of Jerusalem. It is bewildering to me how the city can remain in its present status, that is under Israeli administration, and still be jointly controlled by Israel and another government. Either it will remain an Israeli city or it will not.

I do agree that free access for all religious pilgrims, no matter what their nationality or what their confession, is a necessity. But thus far, I am not convinced that such a condition does not already exist. Jews, Christians, and Muslims, regardless of their denominational differences or disagreements, are going to Jerusalem, to all the holy places, to pray and to worship as their consciences dictate. Until one faith or one sect cannot enjoy that freedom, I see no reason to change the status of the city of Jerusalem.

It is ironic indeed that the city of peace and the land of peace should not have peace. But we are involved in a time of the unreasonable and the illogical.

One day, Arab terrorist organizations say that their future aim for what they call Palestine is to create a federation of Arabs and Israelis, of Christians, Muslims and Jews. The next day, they say that their aim is to rid the land of all Jews. The Arabs meet at Cairo and other capitals to reaffirm that they will seek a political solution to the Middle East tangle. And then, leaders of the Arab states make speeches calling for total war and a military solution.

In one breath, the Arabs state that the real enemy is imperialism . . . a foreign power controlling their land and their lives. And the next moment, they run to the Communists for guidance . . . surrendering their independence to a political force which they claim is contradictory to their religion.

They see only what they want to see. And they cannot see the Soviet imperialism that threatens their nation and the freedom of every man, woman, and child on earth.

Arabs say that the Jew is his brother, and then they sneak into the home of their brother and plant a bomb that leaves him crippled or dead. It is a tragic situation. Israel faces two enemies . . . Arab soldiers and the vacuum of reason in the Arab mind.

On three occasions in the past two decades, the Israelis have proven that they are a match and more for the Arab soldier. Heavily armed and mobilized Arab armies have fallen before the brilliance and the determination of the Israeli defense forces.

During those same 20 years, the Israelis have remained steadfast in their quest for a reasonable peace . . . in spite of the worst kind of adversity, continuous harassment, and almost unbearable pressure from the outside.

It is incumbent upon all of us, as citizens of the United States and as citizens of the Free World, to give the Israeli people all the moral, intellectual, and material support they need in this quest.

Israel does not want war. She desires peace. She wants only to be left to live and grow in freedom.

I hope that we—as a nation which pursues the same course of freedom and democratic government—will continue to do everything possible to help her attain this goal.

SENATOR SYMINGTON CITES UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ARCHEOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recent accomplishments by an outstanding Missouri educator, Dr. Carl Chapman, once again demonstrate the leadership of the University of Missouri in public affairs. Dr. Chapman's accomplishments are not only indicative of the overall faculty excellence at the University, but serve as a reminder of the great contribution to society made by our land-grant institutions of higher learning.

Dr. Chapman, director of archeology research activities at the University of Missouri, and Dr. Charles R. McGimsey III, director of archeological survey, University of Arkansas Museum, came to Washington some months ago to talk to legislators on a matter of great concern to America's archeologists: the destruction of our historic and prehistoric heritage by Federal programs and activities that involve changes in the land surface.

In a recent archeological handbook Dr. Chapman tells of the growing difficulties of preservation:

The principal source of information about prehistoric and most early historic settlement in this century is the ground. Whenever there are no written sources, or when these sources are inadequate, we must rely on objects which remain in the ground, and knowledge of their exact location—their relationship to a house floor, to a storage pit, to a cemetery—to provide an adequate record. The objects themselves are important only because of what they can tell us of the activities of the people that made and used them. Almost any activity of man in the past that has disturbed the soil can be detected in the earth now by careful ob-

servation of the changes in color, by chemical analysis, by differences in density and compactness of the soil, and by special photography. If these past soil changes are disturbed before they have been investigated, this evidence is lost.

Plowing, leveling, construction, or other modification of the land has always been capable of destroying information about the past; but it was not until recently, when machinery increased in size and capacity to dig deeper and faster, that the rate of destruction of archaeological objects and information became of really serious concern. A mule-drawn plow, or a dirt road built for horse and buggy travel did not disturb the earth to any great extent or to any great depth. Since the end of World War II, however, the rate of destruction of (archaeological) sites has increased manyfold.

Determined to do something about this destruction, the two professors recommended that funds be included for archeological recovery of all data at any site affected by Federal programs. This proposal has been incorporated into a bill, S. 2893, introduced by the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) and 22 cosponsors. I would urge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which the bill has been referred, to consider the merits of this proposal during this session.

Mr. President, I applaud Dr. Chapman and the other members of the Mississippi alluvial valley archeological program for their energy and initiative in bringing this problem to light and their determination to see corrective legislation passed.

At a time when many citizens consider their Government unresponsive, Dr. Chapman's efforts illustrate that a private citizen can bring a problem to Congress and be heard.

THE FALL OF BIAFRA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Biafra has fallen and I think we can be sure that, whatever the true situation in that beleaguered part of Africa, it is not good. The world has been touched, even horrified, by the picture of starving men, women, and especially children caught in the snare of an essentially tribal war. Through the long months of Biafra's fight against the federal forces of Nigeria, our Government has remained neutral—not unconcerned, but neutral. The essential reason for such a policy was well stated by the Washington Sunday Star's lead editorial entitled "Biafra and Africa's Explosive Tribalism." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIAFRA AND AFRICA'S EXPLOSIVE TRIBALISM

Beleaguered Biafra, its rebel government virtually friendless, its leader in hiding abroad and its people starving, surrendered unconditionally on Thursday, ending its 2½-year secession from Nigeria.

But the concept for which an estimated two million Ibos died lives on ominously in the hearts of other millions of Africans. That notion is the belief that only within the context of the tribe can the African find an effective and just framework for his personal and political life.

Most Americans—white *and* black—tend to lump together all Africans. That is no more valid that the supposition that Pakistanis and Japanese think and act alike because both are Asian peoples. Or the hypothesis that Italians and Norwegians, being Europeans, have everything in common.

Even those prepared to admit that there just might be a significant difference between a Kenyan and a Nigerian find it just too complicated to face the fact that *within* these nations live millions of people who *think of themselves*—and that is the important point—not as Kenyans or Nigerians but as Efiks or Ibibios, Kipsigis or Nande.

The plain fact is that the political frontiers so neatly drawn on the map of Africa are mythical, bearing little or no relationship to anything but the administrative convenience and imperial ambitions of the former colonial powers, whose burdensome legacy to the continent these boundaries are. The real changes in dress, mood, custom and language which one associates with nationality come not when the traveler crosses Africa's international frontiers but when he leaves one tribal homeland and enters another.

The basic reason that only four (Gabon, Ivory Coast, Tanzania and Zambia) out of Africa's 40 nations extended diplomatic recognition to Biafra is that, had General Odumegwu Ojukwu succeeded in establishing an independent Ibo republic, the continent's leaders feared that literally dozens of other restive tribes might be tempted to follow his example. A series of secessions and civil wars could only result in generalized chaos. Hence the political leaders of Africa are right in their determination to preserve their present frontiers, no matter how illogical these borders may be, if only because they have no other rational choice.

But while these leaders are correct in recognizing tribalism's dangers, they are wrong in regarding the notion as somehow shameful. And most have failed miserably to channel the thrust of tribalism into creative forms.

There can be no precise definition of a tribe. Usually its members speak a distinctive language. Always they share a common heritage of beliefs which may manifest itself in terms of religion, traditions, customs and manner of dress. Without exception they regard themselves as distinct and different from—and usually superior to—their neighbors.

Tribalism is not confined to Africa, Asia, Latin America or the Indian reservations of this country. The nation-states of Europe stem directly from tribal beginnings. And tribal separatism—although it seldom is called that—continues to plague those nations. In Spain, Basque and Catalan nationalists intrigue for autonomy. Extremists among the Gaelic peoples of Britain—the Scots, Irish and Welsh—rail against their English overlords. Breton separatists fly their black and white flag in preference to the tricolor of France. In Belgium, Walloons and Flemings never cease from bickering. And if Yugoslavia should fly apart when Marshal Tito goes—as could happen—it will be because even Marxism cannot flatten the old rivalries which characterize that nation's Serbs, Slovenes, Croats, Montenegrins, Macedonians and Bosnians.

The reasons that tribalism remains a powerful and often pernicious force in Africa are as manifold as that continent's various peoples. Among these are the physical difficulties of travel and communication, the absence of an urban industrial society, and the policies of the former colonial powers.

Colonial administrators often were forced into a policy of divide-and-rule. Frequently a single white man found himself having to enforce the King's peace over an area the size of Scotland. His principal trumps in such a situation were his own force of character and tribal rivalries which could be played off against one another. For this very reason, the South African policy of apartheid is dedicated as much to emphasizing the difference between Xhosa and Zulu as it is to segregating black from white.

There are few African nations based fundamentally on a single tribe. One is Somalia. Others are Basutoland, Swaziland and Barotseland, which are historic outgrowths of South Africa. While life in such countries may be less complicated and more emotionally secure for their citizens, it also is less rich and varied.

Tribalism seems to be a less dangerous force in countries such as Gabon, where one tribe holds undisputed dominance, or in those such as Tanzania where none of more than 200 is strong enough to pretend to national leadership.

The danger of explosion is sharpest in countries where two or three tribes relatively equal in strength contend for power. This danger increases geometrically where religious and/or racial differences exacerbate tribal rivalries.

Two of these conditions existed in Nigeria, which has three principal tribes, the Moslem Hausas in the north, the Christian Ibos in the east, and the largely Islamized Yorubas in the west. Given such a situation, the abortive secession of Biafra had about it a tragic inevitability.

Just as the Nigerian civil war essentially was tribal conflict writ large, so, too, was the political rationale of the unsuccessful secession in the early 1960s of Katanga from the Congo founded at least partially on Balunda separatism. While the bloody failure of these rebellions may discourage other secessionists—and that is the one good thing which may emerge from the Ibo ordeal—Africa has a dozen potential Biafras, a score of incipient Katangas.

The most ill-starred of Africa's new nations may prove to be Kenya. In its seven years of independence, Kenya already has had to crush the secessionist hopes of its Somali minority. But a far more serious crises may arise when the more numerous Luo people of murdered Tom Mboya confront Kenya's two other large tribes, the Kikuyus and the Wakambas. The Luos were numerous enough to dream of national leadership, but too few to achieve it. Under President Jomo Kenyatta, a Kikuyu, a disproportionate share of the political, commercial and civil service plums has gone to his fellow tribesmen, to the anger of the thrusting, intelligent Luos. Kenya easily could come apart at the seams.

The tribal time bomb is one which the Africans—and only the Africans—can defuse. Thus, despite the horrors of the Nigerian and Congolese civil wars, the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon administrations probably were correct in their policy of neutralism, which in both cases meant support of the status quo. Where the White House may be faulted is in its failure to bring all the pressure at its disposal to bear on Kinshasa and Lagos to fight these civil wars with precision and humanity and to deal effectively with their aftermaths. Admittedly, however, Nigeria and the Congo lacked both the capacity and the will to respond to such pressure.

As for the American people, they can help both by supporting the African governments in their attempts to create national identities and by showing through their understanding of tribal realities that there is nothing shameful in the fact of tribalism.

Old concepts are a long time a-dying, and the notion of tribal exclusiveness is as ancient as man. In the passage of time, it will become more important to be a Nigerian or a Kenyan than an Ibo or a Luo. But that time has not yet come. And the price of its purchase is likely to be more corpses, more starving children, more Biafras.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, my basic position on American policy in the Middle East remains—and will continue to remain—as stated a year ago. At that time, in conjunction with Senators GOODELL, HART, JAVITS, MURPHY, and SCOTT, among others, I said I believed that the policy of the United States should be to establish a policy of permanent peace in the Middle East through implementation of the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967, in which each provision is related to the others so that Israel's withdrawal from occupied territories will not be in return only for paper promises from the Arab States. A key point in this U.N. resolution, I pointed out, is "respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force."

I also said that the United States should make every effort toward helping to maintain the strategic arms balance between the radical Arab States and Israel, lest these Arab States be tempted into renewing full-scale warfare. And I called for the most urgent consideration of the settlement of the Arab refugees, a problem which continues to be critical.

I continue to support the free and secure existence of Israel. In my view a just and lasting peace can only be brought about by negotiations between the Arabs and Israel. There can be no "imposed" settlement. In this connection, I note that Secretary Rogers has said that American policy has been made in the realization "that nations not directly involved could not make a durable peace for the peoples and governments involved." "Peace," he said, "rests with the parties to the conflict."

Secretary Rogers further said in his speech that U.S. policy was "to urge the Israelis to withdraw from occupied territory when their territorial integrity is assured as envisaged by the Security Council resolution." In response to my question specifically on this subject, the State Department has written me as follows:

> As President Nixon told the UN General Assembly on September 18, 1969, peace cannot be achieved on the basis of substantial alteration in the map of the Middle East. We continue, however, to stand firmly on the position that Israel should not be expected to withdraw its forces from any occupied territory except in the context of peace and security based on mutually binding commitments agreed upon between it and its neighbors.

In my view, these statements bind the administration to behavior that protects the free and secure existence of Israel. I shall do all that I can to insure that the administration abides by these pronouncements and that the actual implementation of enunciated policy in fact protects Israel's legitimate interests and security.

SUPER CHIEFS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Kansas City Chiefs are the champions of professional football—the undisputed champions. Their resounding defeat of the Minnesota Vikings was especially meaningful to the Chiefs, their organization, and fans; it was also a fitting end to the American Football League.

This year's championship game was a matter of pride and integrity for the Chiefs. They played in the first Super Bowl, and the memory of that afternoon has lingered. The last 3 years have been spent with one goal in mind: another opportunity to represent the AFL in the championship. This year was the last chance and the Chiefs earned their place the hard way by winning the playoff game over the Oakland Raiders.

As if the pressures of meeting the the Vikings as 13-point underdogs were not enough, the Chiefs and their courageous quarterback, Len Dawson, spent the week preceding the Super Bowl under the cloud of careless and unsubstantiated publicity. The victory under such circumstances was a testimony to the team's and Len Dawson's dedication to purpose and belief in their abilities, as well as Coach Hank Stram's confidence in his players and strategies.

Congratulations are also due to the Chiefs' organization, and especially Lamar Hunt, who more than anyone else was responsible for the birth and growth of the AFL. The entire membership of this fine organization can take justifiable pride in having been present at the beginning of the league and in being the best of both leagues at the end of the AFL.

Whether the Chief fans are a reflection of their team or the other way around is not clear, but one thing is certain they are the greatest. I had the unsurpassed pleasure of riding to and from New Orleans with them, and can certify to their spirit, their devotion, and their enthusiasm. They come from all over the Midwest, from Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and many other States. But their common devotion to and delight in the Chiefs is unsurpassed and unending.

It was a great day in New Orleans—for the Chiefs, the fans, and for football. We all look forward to another great year for the Chiefs in 1970 and to a great era for the new National Football League.

THE BIG THICKET: "WILDERNESS ON A DEATHBED"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the December issue of the Petal Paper contains a penetrating and timely article written by Prof. Pete Gunter, of North Texas State University, on the plight of one of America's last natural wilderness areas—the Big Thicket of southeast Texas.

As Professor Gunter points out, the Big Thicket once extended over 3 million acres. However, as a result of activities of special interests, this beautiful area has been reduced to less than 300,000 acres. With every day that passes, more than 50 acres of the Big Thicket are destroyed.

The Big Thicket has many features which make it truly a natural wonderland. Of particular interest is the large number of the world's record-size trees. In or near the Big Thicket can be found the world's largest eastern red cedar, largest black hickory, largest holly, largest yaupon, largest redbay, largest planertree, largest of common sweet leaf and largest two-wind silverbell.

In addition to the rich plantlife for which the area is famous, the Big Thicket also provides a home for many varieties of rare birds, including the red-cockaded woodpecker, Bachman's sparrow, the golden eagle, the bald eagle, and perhaps the legendary ivory-billed woodpecker, long thought to be extinct.

If the Big Thicket is to be saved, action must be taken immediately. This is why I have introduced S. 4, a bill which would establish a 100,000 acre Big Thicket National Park. If enacted, S. 4 would preserve at least a portion of the Big Thicket for future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Prof. Pete Gunter, entitled "The Big Thicket: 'Wilderness on a Deathbed,'" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG THICKET: WILDERNESS ON A DEATH-BED

(By Dr. Pete Gunter)

Indians called it the Big Woods; they travelled there from as far away as Oklahoma and New Mexico to hunt its abundant game. Pioneers, striking out from Louisiana in the 1820's, turned back from its jungle-like growth to find more tractable routes west; they called it the Big Thicket, and the name stuck. For well over a century the Big Thicket was to remain wild and remote, a last sanctuary for bears, panthers, rare birds and plants. Within its three million acres draft evaders hid during the Civil War, easily evading Confederate troops sent in to capture them. (During the first and even the second world wars descendents of these men successfully escaped there for the duration of the conflict.) In its secluded clearings Thicket settlers lived a simple life little changed from that which the first pioneers knew. Escapees from state prisons headed for its deep swamps and interminable brush tangles. As late as 1938 naturalists could claim that the Big Thicket contained over a million acres "as yet untouched" by lumbering and farming. Within that million acres roamed east Texas' last bears and panthers; alligators foraged in its sluggish bayous; in its recesses stood vast stands of pines and hardwoods that had never echoed the sound of an axe. Almost within sight of the rising skyscrapers of Houston and Beaumont stretched a primordial wilderness; dense, lush, and all but forgotten.

All but forgotten, that is, except for the lumber and oil interests which regarded it as a resource to be exploited. In his recent Farewell to Texas supreme court justice William O. Douglas recounts the manner in which these interests have overseen the Big Thicket's needless destruction. Today, Justice Douglas laments, the original Thicket is reduced to three hundred thousand acres, and is disappearing at a rate of fifty acres or more per day. Only immediate action, he insists, can prevent the final demolition of the once-mighty wilderness.

There are those, to be sure, who greet all plaintive cries on behalf of the Big Thicket with derision or a shrug. They are often the same persons to whom the cutting of redwood trees or the damming of the Grand Canyon are simple signs of Progress. In the case of the Big Thicket, however, a shrug may at first seem appropriate. The region has no lofty mountains, no broad lakes or

valleys. It is related to no great historical event. Its climate is less than ideal. What is there about the shaggy, sprawling Thicket that makes it worth saving?

There are many possible answers to this question. Probably the most convincing of these is the richness, variety, and size of the area's plant life. Unusually large trees in the Big Thicket are called "champions". Some of the "champions" in the Thicket are distinctly minor-league: that is, they are the largest in their species, but only for the state of Texas. I have never seen a precise account of the Texas "champions" in the area, but there are many, and their number continually increases. Two were found last year on the Alabama-Coushatta Indiana reservation (Texas' only Indian reservation, on the northwest border of the Thicket) while others doubtless remain to be discovered. There are, moreover, many international champions in the area. In or near the Big Thicket grow the world's largest eastern redcedar, black hickory, holly, yaupon, redbay, planer-tree, common sweet leaf and two-wing silverbell. Not long ago what has since been certified as the world's tallest cypress tree was discovered in a swamp along the Trinity River. A still larger cypress, I am told, stands further back in the swamps. No one has made the effort to trek in and measure it, however; oilwell overflow killed it years ago. More recently, the treasurer of the Big Thicket Association, noticing that the Chinese tallow tree in her back yard was unusually large, called in the Forest Service to make measurements. Not unpredictably, the Forest Service pronounced it the world's largest Chinese tallow tree.

If the size of Thicket trees is striking, the variety of life-forms in the area is really unparalleled. There, within a space no more than thirty miles across, wild orchids (twenty-two varieties in all) and moss-bearded cypress flourish cheek by jowl with western mesquite, yucca and cactus, while plant growth patterns identical with those found in the temperate Appalachian highlands persist alongside subtropical forests of wild jasmine, and jungle-like growth so thick that it can be penetrated only by hacking a trail with a knife. Visitors to the area can hike through open beech forests, meadows thick with wildflowers, or deep piney woods; they can explore sluggish bayous overgrown with giant palmetto palms, where turtles sun on mossy logs and alligators submerge, suddenly, in murky water; or they can fish for trout in swift, chill creeks in the Thicket's northern reaches. The Big Thicket Association terms the Thicket "The Biological Crossroads of North America". The slogan is no exaggeration. Nowhere else in North America does there exist such a mixture of botanical life: temperate and tropical, western and eastern.

Even were there no giant trees and biological diversity in the region, its function as a natural bird sanctuary would by itself constitute a sufficient reason for setting aside large portions of the Big Thicket as "off limits" for poachers and hunters. The rare red-cockaded woodpecker and Bachman's sparrow frequent the Thicket, as do the golden eagle and the bald eagle (both of which area sportsmen shoot on sight). The dense woods provide one of the major resting places along the Gulf Coast for migratory birds, while the area's ponds, marshes, creeks and bayous house an unsurpassed variety of water birds: little blue heron, black-crowned night heron, yellow-crowned night heron, roseate spoonbill, snowy heron, kingfisher, wood duck, American egret, green heron, water turkey, and a recent immigrant, the African cattle egret.

Most important of all, however, is the claim that the rare ivory-billed woodpecker inhabits the deep woods of the Big Thicket. Bigger than a crow, gaudily plumed, the ivory-bills require vast stands of virgin timber as a habitat, and are unmistakable targets for hunters. The last official sighting of an ivory-bill was in Northern Florida, in the 1950's. Until recent sightings in the Big Thicket, it was assumed that the ivory-billed woodpecker was extinct. Should the Thicket become extinct, it is hardly necessary to point out, it is certain that the last ivory-bills would disappear also.

There is much more in the Thicket that one could catalogue in its defense, from extensive stands of insect-eating plants and rare (but not "champion") trees to the remnants of a disappearing folk culture, from unique "fern valleys" and "baygalls" to plants of interest to medical science. All this, however, would be simply a lengthened catalogue, and like any catalogue, abstract. To really understand the beauty of the Big Thicket, one would have to ride horseback through its palmetto thickets, float down its cool trout streams, or immerse himself in the deep hush that broods over its swamps and cabin clearings.

The value and the beauty of Texas' "last wilderness" has long been appreciated by those familiar with it. Unfortunately, the dawning awareness by conservationists, naturalists and the public generally of the existence and importance of the Big Thicket has been paralleled by an increased rate of destruction of its wilderness features. Efforts by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.) to create a Big Thicket National Park have, in fact, sparked apparent efforts to dismantle what remains of the area's natural beauty. "The Big Thicket?" snapped one local lumber executive, "Give us five years and there won't be any Big Thicket." Cutting schedules have been accelerated, as hitherto untouched areas disappear. In particular, efforts have been made to cut out slow-growing magnolia trees—though they are worth almost nothing on the lumber market. In an article in the August, 1968 New Yorker, Berton Rouche describes the killing of what was judged to be the oldest magnolia in the United States. The giant tree, which stood at the intersection of three counties in the densest part of the Thicket, was drilled in nine places and poisoned with arsenate of lead. Executives of the lumber company on whose land the tree stood claimed that they had never heard of the tree: though the "judging tree" was famous, and though the company keeps a record of every sizable tree in its possession.

Calculated destruction has not been limited to plant life, however. Similar efforts have been made on behalf of area bird populations as well. Not long after the poisoning of the old magnolia tree an entire heron rookery was found dead, poisoned from the air with tree defoliant. Lance Rosier, a self-taught naturalist whose persistent appeals for conservation have earned him the Title Mr. Big Thicket, commented with characteristic bluntness: "This wasn't just any boys playing pranks. These people know what they are doing." Other evidences of international destruction of bird life, Rosier insists, are plentiful. In support of his claim he points to piles of spent shotgun cartridges heaped up along swamps and marshes where—and when—ducks and geese are not to be found.

Conservationists were, of course, not ignorant of these developments. It was chiefly through their insistence that the Department of the Interior, in the summer of 1966, released plans for a Big Thicket National Park of "thirty-five thousand contiguous acres". Among the proposed park units were Texas' last extensive stand of virgin pine, an untouched beech forest, a savannah with a perennial crop of insect-eating plants, a cypress swamp, and a ten mile long strip containing cross-sections of every type of terrain in the area. If conservationists breathed easily on hearing of the plans for a park, however, their relief was premature. Almost immediately, the untouched beech forest was cut down, and the "Beech Creek Unit" thus destroyed. Similar plans, moreover, were revealed for the "Loblolly Pine Unit"; the last segment of the original pine forest left standing. A year later the "Menard Creek Unit" was bulldozed to make room for a vacation subdivision whose billboards advertised the glory of life in a "real wilderness"—air conditioning and central heat, extra.

There is no need, I hope, to end this tale of destruction with a moral tag. The moral is altogether too obvious. (And besides, Victorianism is dead.) I would only like to point out what perhaps is obvious also; namely, that the problem of the Big Thicket is not merely a local problem. It is part of the stained fabric of our national attitudes towards nature generally. It is part of a pioneer legacy which, quite simply, costs too much to sustain any further. Somewhere and somehow we are going to have to learn to treat nature kindly, before it begins (as it already has) to treat us harshly in return. The Big Thicket is only one of many places where a reversal of attitudes must be made. But, conversely, it is as good a place as any to begin.

ISSUANCE OF "OLD DRUM" STAMP

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the delivery of the famous "Old Drum" address by Senator George Graham Vest, who represented Missouri in the U.S. Senate from 1879 to 1903. It was at Warrensburg, Mo., on September 23, 1870, that Senator Vest made his memorable "Tribute to a Dog" in summing up to a jury the loss of "Old Drum."

Many Missourians, including citizens of Warrensburg and Johnson County, have recommended that a stamp be issued at Warrensburg, Mo., to commemorate this significant moment in American history.

The tribute and Old Drum, the dog which it immortalized, have become classics among the countless millions who have owned and loved a faithful dog. The issuance of a commemorative stamp would mean a great deal not only to the people of Missouri but also to dog lovers throughout the country.

An article, entitled "Old Drum," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of December 14, 1969, recounts the story and contains the text of the tribute. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD DRUM—HE IS THE EVERLASTING HERO OF THE ANIMAL WORLD

(By Shirley Althoff)

The canine population of Warrensburg, Mo., can scoff at the human statuary around town because they have their very own hero to worship.

The handsome larger-than-life bronze statue is of Old Drum, the black and tan hound who inspired the famed Eulogy to the Dog by Senator George Graham Vest back in 1870. And ever since, other pooches like this little fellow named Gus, who belongs to the Carl Foster family of Warrensburg, have been reaping the benefits of this dramatic tribute.

Old Drum belonged to a Johnson County farmer named Charles Burden. He was known around his part of the country as the "the dog that never lied" because he never gave a false alarm when on the trail of raccoons, deer or wolves.

However, one of Burden's neighbors, Leonidas Hornsby, was not a dog lover. Complaining that he was losing sheep in night raids by dogs, he made it known that he would shoot any dog prowling on his property. One fall day in 1869, a member of his family told him there was a strange dog in the yard. "Shoot him," Hornsby ordered and the man did.

The next day Old Drum was found dead near the Hornsby home.

Not a man to stand idly by after having his best coon hound killed, Burden filed suit against Hornsby in a Justice of the Peace court, asking for $50 damages. The first jury failed to agree; the second awarded Burden $25. Hornsby then appealed to the Johnson County Court of Common Pleas and won. But Burden wasn't beaten yet. He went to nearby Sedalia and came back with the best legal talent he could find, John F. Phillips and George Vest.

A motion for a new trial was sustained but some of Burden's friends who thought almost as much of the hound as he did squashed it by threatening to horsewhip one of Hornsby's witnesses if he repeated his story. However, a fourth trial was finally scheduled.

The rest of the arguments that day in 1870 have been lost in history but not George Graham Vest's.

After he recalled from history, legends and literature instances where dogs had displayed fidelity to mankind; cited the Biblical reference to dogs soothing Lazarus and quoted Byron's verses in "Don Juan," Vest began his dramatic summation.

"Gentlemen of the Jury. The best friend a man has in the world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son and daughter that he has reared with loving care may become ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name, may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him when he may need it most. Man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees and do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolutely unselfish friend a man may have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is the dog.

"Gentleman of the jury, a man's dog stands by him in prosperity and poverty, in health and in sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground when the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he may be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer, he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince.

"When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens. If fortune drives the master forth an outcast into the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him, to guard him against danger, to fight against his enemies, and when the last scene of all comes, and death takes his master in its embrace and his body is laid in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by his graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws and his eyes sad, but open, in alert watchfulness and true, even unto death."

When Vest finished, jurors and spectators were in tears and one of Hornsby's lawyers whispered to another:

"Old Drum's dead, but he's won. We'd better get out of this courtroom before all of us are hanged."

One account of the settlement in the case says Burden was awarded $25 but other stories claim the amount was $500, far more than he asked for.

For his stirring oratory—later reprinted all over the world—which won the verdict, Vest received a $10 fee. In 1879, he was elected to the U.S. Senate and served there until 1903. During much of that time his fellow Senator from Missouri was Francis M. Cockrell, one of his opponents in the Old Drum case.

In 1956, the Warrensburg Chamber of Commerce launched a drive to collect $2500 for a memorial to Old Drum and Reno Gastaldi, a St. Louis sculptor was commissioned to do the work. Money poured in from dog lovers throughout the country, including $500 from former President Harry Truman.

And in September 1958, the statue was formally dedicated, a permanent tribute to man's best friend and also to the dog's best friend—George Graham Vest.

ADDITIONAL DEATHS OF CALIFORNIANS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, between Friday, December 12, 1969, and last Thursday, January 15, 1970, the Pentagon has notified 22 more California families of the death of a loved one in Vietnam.

Those killed were:

Pfc. Reynaldo L. Barragan, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Reynaldo L. Barragan, Sr., of San Diego.

Pfc. Billie M. Bedsworth, husband of Mrs. Laura E. Bedsworth, of Mountain View.

Pfc. Tanner M. Brown, Jr., son of Mrs. Marjorie A. Brown, of Van Nuys.

Sfc. Monte R. De Vere, father of Mrs. Beatrice M. Fields, of Carlsbad.

S. Sgt. John T. Gage, husband of Mrs. John T. Gage, of Oceanside.

Pfc. Arthur T. Gallagher, son of Mrs. Pauline I. Gallagher, of Blythe.

Pfc. Neil E. Harvey, husband of Mrs. Peggy L. Harvey, of Downey.

Sp4c. Thomas M. Hires, son of Mrs. Naoma L. Hires, of Redwood City.

Pfc. David W. Jero, husband of Mrs. Susan J. Jero, of San Bernardino.

Aviation Mechanic Larry R. Johnson, husband of Mrs. Joyce A. Johnson, of Imperial Beach.

Pfc. Terry L. Joslin, husband of Mrs. Jacqua Joslin, of Sacramento.

Lance Cpl. James E. Lowry, son of Mrs. Juanita F. Lowry, of Mantega.

S. Sgt. Raymond L. McCaslin, husband of Mrs. Irene D. McCaslin, of Oceanside.

Lt. Paul C. Medlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lorin C. Medlin, of San Francisco.

Sp4c. Joseph L. Mendoza, son of Mrs. Florentina M. Mendoza, of San Jose.

Sgt. Beryl G. Peters, husband of Mrs. Maria R. Peters, of Duarte.

Maj. Larry W. Robinson, husband of Mrs. Virginia R. Robinson, of Oceanside.

Sgt. Richard A. Thomas, husband of Mrs. Barbara J. Thomas, of Carmel.

Sp4c. Roger L. Venters, husband of Mrs. Patricia L. Venters, of Chula Vista.

Sp4c. Lawrence R. Warf, son of Mrs. Wilma L. Warf, of Bakersfield.

Pfc. Jimmy A. Whitson, son of Mr. Charles E. Whitson, of San Bernardino.

Lance Cpl. Robert A. Yates, son of Mr. William B. Yates, of Los Angeles.

They bring to 3,923 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

THE RUNAWAY ECONOMY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on January 7, I had the opportunity to appear before the Exchange Club of Highlandtown, in Baltimore, Md. I used that opportunity to discuss what has clearly become our No. 1 domestic problem: Inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the Exchange Club be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS BEFORE THE EXCHANGE CLUB OF HIGHLANDTOWN, BALTIMORE, MD., JANUARY 7, 1970

We are currently in the grips of one of the worst inflations in this Nation's history. To date, the government has failed to bring it under control. What I want to explore with you this afternoon is the various proposals and counterproposals that have been offered as a care for our ailing economy. For effective action is sorely needed.

As you know, the U.S. enjoyed great price stability in the first half of the "sixties." It was not until Vietnam war costs began to accumulate in 1966 that prices began to rise.

However, it was during the past year that inflation finally raced out of control. The statistics are frightening.

Over the past year consumer prices rose nearly 6 percent—the largest increase since Korea.

Over the past year interest rates on short-term commercial loans shot up from 6 percent to more than 9 percent—their highest level in one hundred years.

Over the past year FHA mortgages climbed from 6 and three-quarters percent to 8 and one-half percent. Realtors in the Greater Baltimore area report houses selling for $20,000 one year ago that cannot be bought today for less than $25,000.

Over the past year the prices of basic materials skyrocketed, increasing costs to small producers and consumers. The price of copper, for example, rose a whopping 24 percent in 1969. During the first seven months of 1969, steel rates rose at an annual rate of 7.1 percent—roughly equal to the percentage increase for the entire 8 year period from 1961 through 1968.

Over the past year the price of basic consumer goods and services increased faster than at any time during the last two decades. The cost of medical care is up 8 and one-half percent. The price of eggs in some areas has nearly doubled; in Baltimore eggs now sell for 93 cents a dozen. Blue Cross-Blue Shield premiums for the average family in the Baltimore-Washington area have gone from $31.82 a month to $40.95 a month. New automobiles are up $125 or more over last year. Indeed, inflation is so rampant in this country that the rates being paid on savings deposits do not even equal the loss in purchasing power resulting from rising prices.

To make matters even worse, the Administration's faltering efforts to curb inflation have confronted us with the strong possibility of a recession in the coming year. As a result of the Administration's tight-money policies, we face the real risk of suffering an economic tragedy for the average taxpayer in the form of an inflationary recession, a two-headed monster combining runaway prices with declining business activity and profits.

The recessionary danger signs are all there. The Dow-Jones Industrial Averages dropped 19 percent from May to December. New housing starts are down nearly a third, from 1.8 million in 1968 to 1.2 million in 1969—the lowest level since the end of World War II. Economists are predicting a drop in corporate profits of as much as 15–20 percent in the coming year. And unemployment rates have begun to creep upwards.

The Administration has created this dangerous situation because of its unwillingness to confront the cost-push aspects of inflation. And it is cost-push inflation which created the recessionary inflation of 1958–1959.

As I indicated earlier, prices of basic commodities, particularly in concentrated industries, have skyrocketed since last January. These price increases have driven up production costs of goods and thus the costs to retailers and consumers. As prices have risen, labor unions have sought to protect their members against the rising cost of living by demanding wage increases. This in turn has increased costs in basic industries which have ultimately been passed on to small businesses and consumers in the form of higher prices.

It's a vicious circle in which no one really benefits.

Union members don't benefit. Their average 6 percent increase in wages in 1969 was completely wiped out by a 6 percent increase in the cost of living.

Small businessmen don't benefit. They are trapped by rising costs in highly competitive markets which do not permit these cost increases to be fully passed on; the result is shrinking profits.

And the biggest loser of all is the average American consumer, particularly the elderly or retired on fixed incomes.

What most disturbs me is that through all of this nary a sound of protest has been heard from the Administration. Indeed, seven days after his inauguration, Mr. Nixon announced that the government would not intervene in price and wage decisions; that the battle against inflation would rest on fiscal and monetary policy without "extorting labor and management" to exercise restraint.

The experience of the post-war years has clearly demonstrated that the White House alone is in a position to curb this kind of cost-push inflation. The President has asked Congress not to enact wage-price controls. Yet, as *The Wall Street Journal* and many economists have pointed out, he has failed to employ the only other weapons that can be effective in this fight—the enormous moral power of the Presidency to set voluntary price and wage guidelines and to mobilize public opinion in support of them.

Only the office of the Presidency possesses the authority and prestige to persuade the giant corporations and labor organizations of the nation to keep price and wage increases within limits consistent with the economic well-being of the country. I shall certainly support firm action by the President to moderate inflationary trends in these basic industries.

Certain members of the Administration have sought to cover up their failures by attempting to shift the blame onto Congress. But the facts simply do not support them.

The President contends that Congress added fuel to the inflation by authorizing more government spending than he requested. The fact is Congress reduced 10 of the 14 appropriations bills that came before it this year with a net overall *cut* in President Nixon's budget of $5.6 billion. If we had given President Nixon what he requested, the fiscal year 1970 budget would be $5.6 billion *more* than it actually is.

The President contends that Congress enacted an inflationary tax reform bill. The fact is the tax bill will produce a surplus of roughly $7 billion in federal revenue over the next two years; that is, it will be anti-inflationary, not inflationary. Indeed, if the tax bill had been written along the lines suggested by Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy in the testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, the bill would have cost the Treasury nearly $3 billion *more* in federal revenue between 1970 and 1972 than the legislation Congress enacted.

Finally, the President contends Congress acted irresponsibly by raising Social Security benefits 15 percent rather than the 10 percent he requested. The fact is the overall cost of the legislation Congress passed is slightly *less* than the Social Security package requested by the President. The action by Congress is slightly more expensive this year than the President's proposal only because Congress put the new Social Security rates into effect in January rather than waiting until May.

So a careful review of the record shows clearly that Congress took a more prudent and responsive fiscal position than the President. At the same time we significantly reordered national budgetary priorities.

We cut billions in waste out of the military budget—though much fat remains.

We used some of these savings for improved health and education programs.

We raised Social Security benefits for the old and the sick in a fiscally responsible fashion.

And at the same time we managed to cut $5.6 billion from the budget the Administration requested.

These are the facts.

It was the Administration that was the big spender this year, not the Congress.

What then should be done to halt this inflation and prevent a possible recession?

The most direct and controlled way to get money out of the economy is to cut government spending. Elimination of waste and duplication from the Pentagon's budget would permit major reductions in federal expenditures of at least 10 to 15 billion. Inefficiency also exists in many domestic programs which would permit further cuts.

Another effective means of pulling money out of an overheated economy is to close more tax loopholes. We did not go far enough in the Tax Reform Bill of 1969. But to restore real equity to our tax system and increase federal tax revenues, we will need the Administration's active support.

I offered an amendment to the tax bill that would have brought $20 billion that currently escapes taxation each year back into the tax system. But I could not get Administration support and the measure was narrowly defeated in the Senate. I plan to offer the Amendment again this year.

Inflationary oil-import quotas which cost gasoline consumers at least $4 billion a year should be reduced or scrapped.

Measures such as these—further cuts in government spending and the elimination of remaining tax loopholes—ought to take care of the demand-pull aspects of inflation. And, I might add, they would do so in a more equitable manner than the Administration's tight-money policies and the imposition of a surtax which do greatest damage to the small businessman and the consumer.

As for the cost-push inflationary pressures, as I indicated earlier, the President will have to begin exercising the influence and prestige of his office. We will need some resolute moral leadership from the White House to successfully inhibit inflationary price and wage increases in our major industries.

Gentlemen, in all candor I am extremely concerned about the prospect for the economy in the coming year. Sacrifices are going to be demanded of all of us if the economy is going to be restored on a sound footing. I shall do all I can in the Congress to bring about the changes I indicated above. And I stand ready to cooperate fully with the President on any Administration effort to bring this runaway inflation under control.

This is too big a problem to be tossed around as a political football. The best from all of us will be required if we are to succeed.

WHY HAVE HOUSING COSTS SKYROCKETED?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on January 16, Daniel Poole, the real estate editor of the Washington Star, wrote a perceptive article entitled "Who Gets the Most of Housing's Pie?" Mr. Poole points out that the two largest components of total housing costs are the price of the land and the cost of financing.

Since more than one-half of a homeowner's mortgage payments goes for interest charges, it is obvious that escalating interest rates are the principal factor in the high cost of housing. On the other hand, only 10 percent of the average homeowner's monthly payments can be attributed to the cost of labor.

Another way of looking at the problem is to consider the monthly payments a returning Korean war veteran would have paid in the mid-1950's. If he bought a $10,000 home with a 4-percent mortgage, his monthly payments would have been approximately $50 per month for principal and interest.

Today he would be extremely lucky if he could purchase the same quality house for $20,000 with a mortgage of 8 percent. This would involve monthly payments of approximately $150 per month.

The cost of the house has doubled, the interest has doubled, but the monthly payments have tripled.

It is the rising cost of money which is causing a squeeze upon the average homeowner and making it virtually impossible for many moderate-income families to buy their own homes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GETS THE MOST OF HOUSING'S PIE?
(By Daniel Poole)

Everybody knows that the prices of new houses have spiraled—more than doubling in the last two decades. What one may wonder, however, is: Who is getting the biggest piece of the pie?

One frequent answer is labor—the carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, electricians and painters who build the house. But on-site labor costs actually have decreased, from 33 percent of the cost of a house in 1949 to only 18 percent in 1969.

This indicates a considerable shift to prefabricated homes and manufactured housing components, permitting a sharp rise in on-site productivity. It also indicates major increases in other costs.

Another answer is materials—the lumber, bricks, pipes, paint and plaster that go into the house. And they have increased slightly, but only from 36 percent of a 1949 house to 38 percent of a 1959 house.

Thus while the actual structure represented a whopping 70 percent of the total cost in 1949, it represented only 56 percent in 1969.

Then it must be the builders who are getting rich, you say. But during the last 20 years, his overhead and profit have decreased

from 15 percent of the house cost to 13 percent.

So what's the answer?

It's land and financing that are taking bigger bites out of the pie, according to Michael Sumichrast, chief economist of the National Association of Home Builders.

Land nearly doubled, jumping from 11 percent of a 1949 house to 21 percent of a 1969 house. And financing did double over the 20-year period—from 5 percent to 10 percent.

The President's Committee on Urban Housing, headed by industrialist Edgar Kaiser, reports that all of these costs, however, account for only about half of a homeowner's total monthly costs after he has made his down payment and moved in.

"According to the Kaiser Committee's report, debt retirement—on principal and interest—is only 53 percent of the monthly occupancy cost of a single-family home," says Nathaniel Goldfinger, research director for the AFL–CIO. "Other costs include such factors as taxes (26 percent), utilities (16 percent) and maintenance (5 percent)."

The on-site labor cost of a house, therefore, represents approximately one-fifth of the mortgage payments, but only about one-tenth of the total monthly costs paid by the homeowner, Goldfinger writes in the American Federationist, the AFL–CIO magazine.

But since more than half of a homeowner's mortgage payment goes for interest charges at today's high interest rates, payments on the principal account for only about 25 percent of the total monthly costs, says Goldfinger.

And since on-site labor represents about one-fifth of the sale price, the actual on-site cost—excluding interest payments on the labor cost—comes to only about 5 percent of a homeowner's total monthly costs, he says.

"All of this adds up to some very clear facts: The major part of housing costs to the renter or homeowner is interest charges—the price of borrowed money to the developer, builder, landlord and homeowner," Goldfinger says. "The on-site labor cost accounts for only a small part of the price of the property and a much smaller portion of monthly occupancy costs to the owner."

The point of the argument made by the research director of the AFL–CIO is that to solve the nation's housing shortage, breakthroughs are needed far more urgently in land and financing costs than in labor costs.

As the Kaiser Committee admits: "All on-site labor costs represent such a small percentage of monthly rents that a general reduction of 20 percent for all workmen would mean only a reduction in rent from $100 a month to $98 in a typical unit."

And that includes the share of the mortgage payments covering the labor costs, notes Goldfinger. When all interest charges are excluded, a 20 percent change in either wages or productivity of on-site labor involves only about $1 of each $100 in monthly rent or occupancy cost of a single-family home.

"If the costs of housing are to be reduced—or if such rising costs to the consumer are to be slowed down—interest rates and land prices, as well as labor and materials costs, have to be reduced or curbed and managerial efficiency has to be improved," Goldfinger says, adding:

"Anyone who focuses sole or major attention on the labor-cost component of housing costs—whether it be an administration spokesman or college professor—is dodging the key issues of financing costs and land prices. Unless these costs are cut or curbed, it will be impossible to bring the consumer's housing costs under some manageable control."

This is true, he says, regardless of what technological breakthroughs are made in such worthwhile areas as pre-fabrication and the manufacture of housing components.

"CRIB" DEATH—THE MYSTERIOUS KILLER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on December 2, 1969, Mr. Saul Goldberg, president of the International Guild for Infant Survival, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., presented some very important testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. The guild, which I have the privilege of serving as a member of the honorary advisory board, is a nonprofit charitable and educational organization comprised of citizens across America who are deeply concerned with the tragedy of thousands of infants who died each year soon after birth.

In his presentation before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Goldberg discussed a little known and little understood form of infant mortality called "crib" death. It takes the lives of 15,000 to 25,000 infants a year; yet, we understand nothing of its cause or its prevention. In a Nation that prides itself on its medical advancement and scientific sophistication, this situation is nothing short of criminal. As Mr. Goldberg so eloquently points out, it is clearly time we began devoting the attention and the research resources to this mysterious killer that it demands.

To all who are interested in this critical problem, I strongly recommend Mr. Goldberg's excellent statement. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SAUL GOLDBERG

I have been asked to be brief in my testimony. I wish I were not here at all for the purpose I must be. I come before this distinguished subcommittee as president of The International Guild for Infant Survival, Inc., a non-profit charitable and educational organization of parents and other citizens throughout the United States tragically bereaved or deeply concerned by the horrible loss of helpless infants who are not here to speak for themselves. I speak to you now in their name: the tens and hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of innocent babies who have died suddenly and unexpectedly in years past. I speak to you also in the name of the 15,000–25,000 normal, healthy babies in our 50 states who are dying in this same bizarre manner this year of 1969. More importantly, I speak for the untold thousands and hundreds of thousands of the babies in future generations who face this same terrible fate at the very beginning of life.

These precious babies of ours are with us no longer. There is no "poster child" for us to bring here to remind you of this tragic problem. There is no handicapped youngster to accompany me to evoke your sympathy and help. Their passing comes so quickly and silently, these infants have little time to become known outside their own family and the general public is thus unaware that this dilemma even exists. Yet, for every victim, death is final. And all that remain are an empty crib . . . a tiny grave . . . and broken hearts.

Who will speak for these departed children? Who will come forward to plead for the lives of future generations? A group of stricken parents and some who have been spared but feel a deep compassion, a deep empathy, have banded together as The International Guild for Infant Survival to serve as the voice of all these dear children, to provide comfort and information to bereaved families, to give encouragement and support to scientific research activities in this field, and to bring the seriousness and scope of this major health problem to the widest public attention.

We cannot keep silent and watch more children die in vain without lifting a finger. We cannot ignore what is happening before our very eyes, seeing these loveable babies slip through our hearts and homes. We cannot stick our heads in the sand in the mistaken belief that somehow all this tragedy will disappear. And America can no longer afford to sit idly by while millions of hours of manpower and talent which could be put to peaceful and productive purposes are buried forever.

Our growing group of Americans represents an important point of view in many parts of this great country which I would like to respectfully bring to your attention at this time.

1. I would like to inform you, first of all, of the actual existence of this mysterious phenomenon which concerns our most precious asset—our babies and their very lives. It is known only as sudden infant death, or sudden death syndrome, or "crib death." So little is known about it, there is not even a medical or scientific name to describe it.

2. Sudden infant death kills infants from 10 days to 2 years old, most being between 2–3 weeks and 6 months of age, without any warning and for no apparent reason.

3. From all reports given by parents, pediatricians, and medical examiners, these babies were perfectly normal and healthy. Some had been given a medical examination a few days before. Some had fathers who were physicians themselves—at home at the time—and they could do nothing. Yet the same set of circumstances is repeated over and over again. A mother put her young child to sleep or to nap and when she goes to check on the child later on, the baby is found dead.

4. This distressing mystery is all the more puzzling because it persists in an era when babies have been made more safe from fatal diseases today than ever before. Years ago, families were purposely large because it was expected that one or two babies would die in infancy. The old scourges like diphtheria, whooping cough, typhoid fever, polio, and others now have all but been eliminated. Yet our infant mortality rate remains too high. It is the very success of modern medicine today that has ironically exposed this serious sudden infant death problem—for which there is still no known cause, no prevention, no treatment, no cure.

5. Sudden infant death provokes serious feelings of guilt, self-recrimination, and inadequacy. After the first few moments of stunned disbelief, the stricken parents usually start blaming themselves and wondering what they did wrong. How else can you explain the loss of such a beautiful little baby? The emotional impact of such a traumatic experience can have lasting effects: disrupting families, unbalancing other children, wrecking marriages, and fostering personal chaos to such an extent that some will dare not think or speak about it for years. Others think this tragedy is something of a personal stigma to hide from and forget. Some place the guilt on an innocent third party, such as the doctor, the baby-sitter, or a housekeeper.

6. Yet there is no foundation in fact for these feelings of guilt, frustration, and failure. Upon medical investigation and detailed autopsy, the vast majority of reports in these cases reveal no explanation to account for death. Sometimes there may be some evidence of a slight infection or a cold in the family, but nothing to medically cause death

itself. Frequently, there is no clue at all. Everything is negative and normal.

7. Experts and investigators cannot tell us how extensive this problem actually is. The most conservative estimates start at 10,000 deaths each year in the United States alone. More realistic estimates range between 15,000–25,000 deaths a year, while some refer to incidences as high as 35,000 annually. This then represents from 10% to 25% of *all* infant mortality after the first few days following birth. One reason it is not known how many sudden infant deaths there are is because most states do not permit the frank term, "death unexplained" or "sudden unexplained infant death", to officially appear on certificates as the cause of death, even though most high medical authorities recognize this dilemma for the tragedies they are. To place these figures in better perspective, this frequency of sudden infant death is almost as high *each year* as the total number of Americans killed in Vietnam over *several* years!

8. Sudden infant death can strike any home, any time, any place. It is no respecter of race, color, religion, creed, nationality, national origin, geography or socio-economic status. It does strike all kinds of families from every background—from the poor ghetto family to that of your colleague from Connecticut, Senator Ribicoff.

9. How significant is this sudden infant death problem? The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, specifically involved with this problem, helped to support only the Second International Conference on sudden infant death, bringing together over 40 medical experts and concerned scientists in infant mortality earlier this year. From this important meeting came the news that sudden infant death is the leading cause of death among all health problems of young children. In some communities, it was mentioned, sudden infant death even surpassed accidents as the number one cause of death among all children.

10. So challenging and disturbing is this mystery that some medical men have taken it upon themselves to do some investigation on their own without significant progress thus far. Several theories have been offered, but none as yet withstand the test of careful scrutiny. However, it now appears certain that suffocation and neglect are not the answers, nor did anyone with the baby at the time do anything to contribute to his death. More recognized experts have become concerned in recent months and have spoken of their theories and research ideas, hoping for the financial resources to pursue their interest in saving these young lives. Regrettably, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development specifically, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare generally, have such comprehensive responsibilities and such limited budgets that up until now there has been too little incentive to encourage these efforts, interests, and plans.

11. In summary, therefore, sudden infant death is a leading killer of our most precious asset—our children. Yet so little is known about it, there is no scientific name, no exact accounting of the number of these deaths, no known cause or prevention, let alone a cure, and this tragedy contributes significantly to our high infant mortality rate. Knowledgeable medical men and health officials recognize these losses of young life as one of the most distressing and puzzling problems in the entire field of medical practice—and want to devote their time and effort to this kind of research in the face of a limited research budget for this specific dilemma.

12. It seems apparent to us that there is a definite need for this distinguished panel to seriously consider an increased research budget to find out all we can about what sudden infant death really is once and for all. It seems vital to us that larger research appropriations are required through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare commensurate with the magnitude and scope of these deaths in today's infant mortality picture and the extent of medical ignorance to this day. This is a major health problem which is concerning a growing number of citizens and professional men—that we respectfully suggest deserves your fullest attention and consideration.

The President has stated that one of this Administration's major concerns is the first 5 years of life. His predecessor was equally concerned with our high infant mortality rate. The Vice President has generously given us and the lives of our dear babies his personal support, as has our own Maryland Congressional delegation led by Senator Tydings. Senator Ribicoff's family knows of this tragic experience first-hand.

No one can say who will be touched in the weeks and months ahead. We do know there will unfortunately be many, far too many. How much longer will our babies die so tragically and so unnecessarily? How much do we really value life itself? Today, you have a golden opportunity given to very few . . . the opportunity to save thousands of lives every year! Speaking for all our children, you hold in your hands and minds the power to speed the day when no more happy, healthy, precious babies—so full of life—face this terrible fate of sudden death.

For those who may question personal involvement, permit me to quote from John Donne's famous paragraph (Devotions, XVII): "No man is an island, entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main. . . . Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

For those who see the task too difficult, allow me to recall the words of Senator Robert Kennedy: "Some men see things as they are and say, Why? I dream things that never were and say, Why not?"

Our dear babies can be given *life*. For as another of our great Presidents once said: ". . . here on earth, God's work must surely be our own."

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, throughout the hearings which the Subcommittee on Labor has been holding on proposed occupational health and safety legislation, it has been unmistakably clear that a strong program for dealing effectively with hazards of the workplace is most urgently needed. The annual toll taken by occupational accidents and illnesses is of frightening proportions, and existing efforts to meet this problem are plainly insufficient. Unfortunately, the public seems to be all too unaware of the health and safety dangers which arise in the workplace. However, I am glad to note that the matter seems to be getting increased attention from the press. Examples are a series of articles written by Morton Mintz and Thomas O'Toole and published in the Washington Post on December 28, 29, and 30, 1969; an article written by Walter Rugaber, and published in the New York Times of January 2, 1970; and one written by Miles Benson and published in the Jersey Journal of January 3, 1970. I am hopeful that such articles will have an impact in focusing public attention on this most important subject. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 28, 1969]

INDUSTRIAL HAZARDS EXACT A RISING TOLL

(By Morton Mintz and Thomas O'Toole)

"When are we going to start placing the priority where it belongs—on the value of human life?"—Rep. Ken Hechler (D-W. Va.), Oct. 27, 1969

The debate on coal mine safety had peaked that afternoon, when Congressman Hechler rose to recall the disaster in Farmington, W. Va., where 78 miners were killed just before Thanksgiving last year.

His voice rising with emotion, Hechler told the House of Representatives that twice as many miners had been killed in mine accidents in the year since Farmington, that one out of every 300 men who went down into the West Virginia mines lost his life and that one out of ten suffered a lost-time injury in the mines in the same year.

"Did you hear that figure?" Hechler asked a hushed House. "One out of ten injured."

Unsafe as coal mining is, there are jobs in the United States that are not as safe.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. points out that electrical construction workers have an accidental death rate twice as high as coal miners and that tunnel construction workers die from mishaps three times as fast as coal miners.

Just as unsafe is the job of lumberman. Metropolitan Life says lumbermen have a death rate four times that of standard insurance risks, and are disabled by injuries of the spinal cord, bones and joints at a "disproportionate rate."

While Metropolitan Life calls the dangers in these jobs "uncontrollable," a growing number of safety experts wonder how it might describe the dangers through the rest of U.S. industry.

DEATH AND DISABLEMENT

In 1969, occupational accidents killed at least 55 people every work day or about 14,000 for the year. At the same time, 8,500 people were disabled on the job every work day, which adds up to 2.2 million for the year. Of the total, 90,000 were permenently disabled, meaning they could not go back to the jobs they held when they were hurt.

"Maimed and broken bodies . . . workers burned, blinded or gravely injured. This is the regular daily fare of hospitals in every part of the country," Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, told a Senate Subcommittee investigating on-the-job safety. "We are experiencing a continued national tragedy of occupational injury, disease and death."

Incredibly, the statistics used to dramatize the tragedy are misleadingly low.

In testifying before the Senate last year, Ralph Nader said that each year between 200,000 and 400,000 industrial accidents go uncounted by federal and state tallies. A partial explanation for this, Nader said, is that there are few incentives for reporting injuries and fewer penalties for not reporting them.

REPORTING INJURIES

A study made in 1965 for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce showed that 19 "jurisdictions" (the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) did not require employers to keep accident records, 16 did not insist that all injuries (only some) be reported and seven provided no penalty for a failure to report injuries.

Another source of misleading injury information, Nader said, is the narrow official definitions of "injury" and "industrial fatality."

Third-party deaths are exempt. When a sporting arms plant in Richmond, Ind., exploded not long ago, the official "industrial fatality" count did not include victims in nearby factories. A fire in a Manhattan garment works three years ago did not list the 18 people burned to death by the same fire on the floor above.

Leeway is often given company doctors in defining work injuries, and the practice of reassigning injured men to soft jobs or non-jobs to avoid reporting lost-time injuries is said to be common across the country.

"We have more reliable and possibly more accurate information," said Jerome B. Gordon, a labor consultant and onetime Columbia University labor lawyer, "on battlefield casualties on both sides in Vietnam."

If anything, the overall trend of death and injury on the job has grown worse in the last ten years.

This is at least partly due to the stepped-up pace of the nine-year business boom, which by 1967 had pushed the factory accident rate to a 13-year high.

"This is the way the workers feel," the United Mine Workers' Dr. Lorin Kerr told the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association in November. "They attribute it to the generalized speed-up that's occurred throughout all industries."

Studies by public health officials seem to bear Kerr out. Inspectors from the U.S. Bureau of Occupational Health and Safety recently restudied one state's lead and zinc smelters and found that controls put in 20 years ago were no longer any better than the controls they'd replaced.

A similar survey was made of the manufacturing plants in and around a large U.S. city, after which the plant managers were asked to evaluate their safety standards.

"HE FOUND HAZARDS"

"Three out of four considered their plant to be free of hazard," the Public Health Service's Chris A. Hansen told a House subcommittee investigating job safety. "But the industrial hygienist making the survey found a reverse proportion. He found hazards in three of four plants."

Job safety began to slip back in 1958, when the factory accident rate had fallen to a record low of 11.4 disabling injuries per million man-hours worked.

But by 1967, the accident rate had climbed close to 14.0 and by 1968 it reached 14.0 disabling injuries per million man-hours, an increase of more than 20 per cent in 10 years.

The worst since 1952, this rate of injury was called "unacceptably high" by Labor Secretary George P. Shultz.

Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that 12 manufacturing industries had higher rates of disabling injuries in 1968 than in 1967, while only five had lower ones.

The highest injury rates were in lumber and wood products, where 36.1 disabling injuries occurred for each million man-hours. The trucking industry was next, with a rate of 31.6. Three categories of construction followed, with rates between 28.3 and 26.1.

The rate of injury tells nothing of the severity, which is better measured by the number of days of disability for million man-hours worked.

By this standard, coal mining led the pack, with 10,071. Wood and lumber came second with 2,965, heavy construction had 2,926 and trucking and warehousing 1,832.

Some public officials use the Vietnam war as a yardstick. In the first half of 1967, noted Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.), chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor, more than 30 times as many men were disabled on the job here than were wounded or injured in Vietnam.

In the last four years, Labor Secretary Shultz points out, "more Americans have been killed where they work than in Vietnam."

WIRTZ TESTIMONY

Former Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz went even further than his successor. In testifying about job safety in 1968, he told Yarborough that "to rely in this area on statistics is to demean our humanity."

"If this kind of tragedy touched the family of any one of us," Wirtz went on, "we would become at that point committed crusaders. It cheapens us as individuals to let ourselves, especially if we carry public responsibility, find refuge in our personal good fortune."

Wirtz read aloud from a letter from a woman in Florida who'd been hurt by falling boxes where she worked.

"I still to this day walk on a cane," the woman wrote. "Why do I have to go without everything and live a life of pain? Why must I do this because the company had a man put a wooden leg under a conveyor instead of calling a welder in and doing it right? I lie awake at night and ask myself. There must be an answer somewhere."

Wirtz did not try to hide his own anguish. "All I can do is write back to these people and say, 'See somebody else,' " he said, "and I hate the hypocrisy of it."

Besides the agony of pain and personal loss that come from work injuries, public officials also cite the economic loss to the country.

In 1966, on-the-job accidents cost the country 255 million man-days of productivity, more than $600 million in medical expenses, $1.5 billion in wages and $1.8 billion in workmen's compensation payments.

"The direct and indirect effect of these accidents on the gross national product," said Wirtz, "was a loss of $6.8 billion."

Labor Secretary Shultz sees the problem in the same light. "Five times as many man-days are lost from job-related disabilities as from strikes," he said. "If present losses could be cut back only 20 per cent the result would be the equivalent of a new work force of 300,000 people."

The key question is whether all the bloodshed and broken bones in the work place is necessary, and to hear many health and safety experts tell it the answer is that it is not.

FIRST REAL REGULATIONS

A prime example is the 1958 Maritime Safety Amendments to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which brought the first real safety regulations to a highly hazardous occupation.

By 1968, the disabling injury rate in shipyards had fallen 52 per cent, to 18.6 per million man-hours.

"It is a guarded estimate," Shultz said, "That in that period over 37,800 injuries were prevented in the nation's shipyards and docks." Shultz estimated the nation had saved $56.7 million in the name of safety.

Shultz also emphasized that not all employers are accident-prone.

In 1967, he pointed out, the manufacturer members of the National Safety Council had an accident rate of 5.1, while non-members had a rate of 18.4—more than three times as much.

SURVEY OF FOUNDRIES

Over the last decade, National Safety Council members who had an accident rate of 4.6, almost one fourth the 15.6 of non-members. A Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of foundries disclosed that the accident rate for Safety Council members was 11.2, one third of the 30.0 for non-member foundries.

Overall, the safety record of smaller firms is poorer than larger ones. The National Safety Council calls these companies the safest on its list: Du Pont Co., Western Electric Co., Chemstrand and Boeing, all giant corporations. But the large firms employ only a fraction of the work force; two-thirds of the nation's work force is in firms with fewer than 100 employees.

Put another way, the Public Health Service figures only 15 million out of 30 million workers are protected by health and preventive services.

The blame lies with more than the employer, however.

It starts with the states, where on-the-job safety records are as ragged as the lines separating the states.

In the states spending an average of $1.1 million a year on safety, the death rate from work accidents is 19 per 100,000 workers. In the ten states spending an average of $240,000 on safety, the death is 110 per 100,000.

Idaho and Wyoming employ three safety inspectors each, Illinois has 62, New Jersey 69, Pennsylvania 90 and New York has a high of 174. A tally made by the AFL–CIO last year showed that 23 states had more fish-and-game wardens than safety inspectors.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 29, 1969]

POLLUTION AND NOISE: DANGERS—INDUSTRIAL HAZARDS FOSTER "SILENT KIND OF VIOLENCE"

(By Thomas O'Toole and Morton Mintz)

They work near furnaces and ovens, mixing vats and high speed spinning and grinding machines, inside foundries and shipyards, coal mines and cotton mills.

Some have cancer, others have lifelong skin troubles. A few have diseased blood, many have chronic headaches. A vast majority have trouble breathing. Their ailments have names like asbestosis, byssinosis, suberosis and talicosis and they are the victims of what Ralph Nader calls a "silent kind of violence."

Nobody knows how many Americans suffer from diseases they have picked up from their work, but estimates range from one to two million.

California is one of the few states even attempting to find out how many of its residents get sick on the job, and if their findings are any national sign then occupational diseases strike as many as half a million American workers every year.

"Our national record in occupational disease is not a good one," says Charles C. Johnson Jr., administrator of the Consumers Protection and Environmental Health Services division of HEW. "We have allowed too many people to become disabled and to die prematurely, because we have not paid attention to controlling the dust, fumes and vapors to which they are exposed."

On-the-job diseases are nothing new to the United States. Fifty nine years ago, President William Howard Taft sent a message to the 61st Congress, protesting the conditions under which match workers labored. Hundreds and hundreds of match makers, he told Congress, were coming down with phosphonecrosis (destruction of the jawbone) from inhaling the fumes of the white phosphorus they used to make matches.

But far more destructive occupational diseases are on the national scene today.

DUST THREATENS

The worst are the "dusty" diseases, so called because they come from a buildup of mineral dusts and fibers in the lungs and chest cavities of workers.

"The dust-caused diseases," says Dr. Philip Lee, assistant secretary for Health under the Johnson Administration, "are the greatest single group of occupational diseases in the U.S., both in terms of disability and compensation costs."

The Social Security Administration receives more than 35,000 claims a year for emphysema, one-fifth of them originating from people who claim they caught the lung disease from exposure to on-the-job dust. Social Security also gets as many as 8,000

claims a year for disability due to tuberculosis and pneumoconiosis of on-the-job origin.

By far the best known of all the dusty diseases is the pneumoconiosis or the "black lung" disease of the soft coal miner, whose lungs stand a one-out-of-four chance of being immobilized by coal dust before he retires from the mines.

The United Mine Workers estimates that 100,000 American coal miners have X-ray evidence of black lung disease.

"These men are respiratory cripples," says the UMW's Dr. Lorin Kerr. "They cannot work because they cannot breathe."

Most diseases caused by dusts and fumes don't get the attention black lung gets, but that doesn't make them less dangerous.

One out of five insulation workers in New York City, says Dr. Irving J. Selikoff of New York's Mt. Sinai Hospital, dies of lung cancer from inhaling tiny asbestos fibers on the job. A rare cancer of the chest cavity called mesothelioma also strikes asbestos workers, causing as many as 75 deaths in the asbestos trades in the past five years.

GAS FROM OVENS

A study of men working the coke ovens in the steel industry showed they suffered a lung cancer mortality rate 62 per cent higher than the average steel worker, who does not breathe the sulfide gases exhausted by the coke ovens.

More than 125 underground uranium miners have died of lung cancer in the past 10 years, and the U.S. Department of Labor concedes the death toll might run upwards of 1,000.

Not all of today's occupational diseases rest in the lung or are caused by dusts and fumes. A growing complaint is loss of hearing, due to excessive on-the-job noise. In the five years ending in 1966, Wisconsin alone settled 102 cases of on-the-job hearing loss.

One of the most nagging occupational health problems is the skin disease of the chemical industry, best illustrated by the worker who caught a chronic rash from contact with epoxy resins, was forced to quit work but kept irritating the rash by having to drive by the epoxy plant on the way to his new job each day.

"Our best estimates," former Surgeon General William Stewart said last year, "are that there are 800,000 people who suffer some form of occupationally caused dermatitis every year."

There is a growing feeling among health experts that the number of on-the-job diseases is increasing in both size and scope.

"Technology has created a whole new kind of work environment," is the way HEW's C. C. Johnson puts it—"with a whole new set of hazards and potential hazards."

COTTON HAZARD

Illustrating Johnson's concern was the recent trip of five doctors from Yale University School of Medicine to two North Carolina cotton mils.

The doctors found the mills clean and largely free of the airborne dust that marks most textile mills, but on examining 158 workers at the two mills, they found one out of five suffering from byssinosis, a lung ailment caused by cotton dust that leaves its victims chronically short of breath.

Digging further, the doctors discovered the disease was being caused by progress—high speed, modern machines that churn up very fine dust particles for the mill hands to inhale without even realizing it.

'Our results were obtained in mills with good hygienic conditions," the Yale team wrote in November's Archives of Environmental Health. "In the face of low dust levels . . . (it) thus seems that technological changes account for the byssinosis."

While it must take part of the blame, technology is the cause of less than half of the on-the-job disease today.

Part of it is due to carelessness, or worse. Eight years ago, Pennsylvania health authorities found bladder cancer among dye workers to be 30 times higher than normal. They traced it to a chemical called betanaphthylamine and banned its use in the state.

In quick order, a large chemical company stopped making it and the Manufacturing Chemists Association put out a bulletin describing its dangers. But today, Pennsylvania is the only state that bans betenaphthylamine, and a small plant in Georgia (employing 31 persons) is still making it.

The first cases of bladder cancer cropped up 12 years after betanaphthylamine came into use, which spotlights still another reason for the rise in occupational disease—that many of the serious ailments are only recognized to be diseases years after on-the-job contact is made.

A typically progressive ailment is beryllosis, a lung disease caused by the inhalation of dust or fumes from the space-age metal beryllium.

While some workers exposed to beryllium during World War II quickly came down with beryllosis, many are only now contracting it. A woman living near Boston had her ailment diagnosed as beryllium poisoning last year, though it was 23 years since she'd worked with it. Another woman was admitted to a rural Pennsylvania hospital with beryllosis three months ago, 27 years after she last handled the toxic metal.

Little is known about job-caused diseases, which explains still another part of the problem.

"Many occupational diseases baffle us," says Labor Secretary George P. Schultz. "While considerably more may be known about industrial safety, job-related illness represents a less explored frontier."

Take the question of on-the-job exposure to carbon monoxide, an issue industries have wrestled with four years.

A team of doctors studying workers in New York's Holland Tunnel 20 years ago concluded there were no special hazards in breathing the carbon monoxide fumes of automobiles, so long as the tunnel workers took time out to breathe cleaner air.

The study led other health experts to set a carbon monoxide safety standard. If a man worked near carbon monoxide fumes, the standard said, he'd be safe as long as the carbon monoxide concentration did not rise above 50 parts per million parts of air.

NEW INFORMATION

But in the past year, two new studies have been done on carbon monoxide.

The first was done by the National Academy of Sciences, which came to the tentative conclusion that carbon monoxide can damage a person's health at concentrations of 10 parts per million.

The second study revisited tunnel workers and came to some striking conclusions about their safety.

Even accepting 50 parts per million as a safety limit, researchers found workers in the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel and the Queens Midtown Tunnel breathing air with more than 100 parts of carbon monoxide per million in times of normal traffic—and more than 200 parts during rush hours.

In one month's time, the union representing the tunnel workers reported that five men "blacked out" from a lack of oxygen in their brains.

Still another part of the problem with on-the-job disease is money—or the unwillingness to spend it.

Silicosis is a chest disease caused by the inhalation of silica dust, to which an estimated four million American workers are exposed. The disease has been known for almost 50 years and was at its peak during the hard days of the thirties.

HIGH COST OF ILLNESS

But in the 10 years ending in 1962, industry compensated more than 34,000 workers for silicosis, at a cost to itself of almost $200 million.

When a follow-up study was done a few years ago, it was found that industry could have prevented almost all its silicosis cases by spending $19 million, one tenth of what it paid out compensating for the disease.

Whatever they do to prevent disease, industrial managers often complain that nothing helps, that workers are so inherently careless they undo everything done for them.

This matter was discussed somewhat by the British Medical Journal, in a November article about cancer among machine workers exposed to lubricating mineral oils.

The article told about a widow who was awarded $28,000 because her tool-setter husband had died from cancer of the scrotum, attributed to exposure to mineral oil. It went on to note that the man had worked "one of the bigger and cleaner factories" and that his case had given rise to a whole new awareness of how long-term exposure to mineral cutting oils can cause cancer.

"Despite these efforts," the article went on, "a visit to some engineering factories would probably still show men not wearing aprons, men wearing oil-soaked overalls and putting oily rags in their trouser pockets."

Should the workers be taxed for their carelessness? "It is an unwritten basic human right," the British Medical Journal reluctantly said, "that a man cannot be forced to keep himself clean."

The Journal urged that safer cutting oils be developed and that employers give workers mandatory medical exams every six months.

"At least a beginning could be made," the Journal said, "with those occupations in which there is an established risk."

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1969]

VIRTUAL INDIFFERENCE TO JOB SAFETY ACCOMPANIES RISE IN CASUALTIES

(By Thomas O'Toole and Morton Mintz)

World War II cost the nation 300,000 dead and 700,000 wounded. Since then, more Americans have been killed and permanently disabled where they work than in the five years of history's most devastating war.

In the last 25 years, more than 400,000 Americans were killed by industrial accidents and disease, which is more than were killed on the battlefields of both world wars. The same time span has seen almost 50 million Americans suffer disabling injuries on the job, which is 30 times as many as the number wounded in all the wars in American history.

Despite statistics like these, there seems to be almost an indifference to on-the-job safety in the United States. Politics provides the best example.

President Nixon said yesterday he would sign the Coal Mine Safety Act, but its benefits are confined to that industry. It has been more than 30 years since the nation passed a broader law to protect workers on the job. But the advance of knowledge and technology quickly made the 1936 Walsh-Healey Public Contract Act obsolete. Today, on-the-job safety has become one of modern society's most pressing problems.

"This situation is getting worse," former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said not long ago. "Every minute we talk about it, 18 to 20 people will be hurt severely enough to have to leave their jobs, some of them never to work again."

When he was elected to the Senate in 1948, Hubert Humphrey asked for legislation to set up a Bureau of Accident Prevention in the Department of Labor.

No chief executive called the problem to public attention until President Johnson proposed the first Occupational Safety and

Health Act in January of 1968. Telling Congress that "this loss of life and limb and sight must end," he called for quick passage of the milestone bill.

But like Humphrey's and Murray's before it, Mr. Johnson's bill died in the dusty hearing rooms of congressional labor committees.

NO CHANCE

"All the classic ways of beating a bill were used on this one," said Esther Peterson, the Johnson administration's Assistant Secretary of Labor. "It never had a chance."

President Nixon has also introduced an Occupational Safety and Health Act into Congress, where it is now being debated by the Labor subcommittees of the House and Senate.

The chances of its passage are said to be less than 50-50, though some Democrats in Congress think that tougher bills brought forth by subcommittee members stand a better chance than Mr. Nixon's bill.

"The atmosphere is different than it was two years ago," said one lobbyist for a safety bill. "People are more aware of what the problems are."

If they are, it marks a major shift in official thought processes.

For years, AFL–CIO economist George Taylor has said, occupational health and safety in the United States has been treated "like an illegitimate child at a family reunion." Senate Labor Committee Chairman Ralph Yarborough (D.-Tex.) has called on-the-job safety efforts "like a sneeze in a hurricane."

LITTLE KNOWN

One of the biggest complaints about job safety is that so little is known about it. But research spending to uncover the riddles has totaled less than $20 million in the last 10 years. In stark contrast, spending on heart research was $1.3 billion in the last decade and on cancer research $1.5 billion.

In 1969, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare spent between $6 million and $7 million for job safety and health activities. The Labor Department chipped in another $2 million, most of it to check safety procedures in connection with federal contracts.

The states, counties and cities spent as much as $50 million and industry (mostly insurance) spent $36 million, which adds up to $95 million for the year. While it might sound like enough, it amounts to $1.35 for each of the 80 million workers in the United States, or as one labor consultant put it, "about the price of a good cafeteria lunch."

"It's like treating measles," Commissioner Chris A. Hansen of the Environmental Health Administration told the American Public Health Association recently, "by painting every spot."

SPEAK DIFFERENTLY

The federal agencies responsible for job health and safety insist they give it the highest priority, but the facts speak differently.

Up to 1967, the occupational health activities of HEW was performed by its Division of Occupational Health, which had two levels of bureaucracy (The Bureau of State Services and the Public Health Service) between it and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

In January of 1967, Occupational Health was amalgamated (with the Divisions of Solid Wastes, Shellfish Control and Arctic Health) into the National Center for Urban and Industrial Health, moved into an ancient brick building in a rundown part of Cincinnati and moved back three levels of bureaucracy from the HEW Secretary.

Last year, Occupational Health was shuffled back out of Cincinnati to Washington and renamed the Bureau of Occupational Safety and Health. While it sounded like a good move, it was another step down. The "bureau" now has four levels of bureaucracy to climb to get to the HEW Secretary.

OTHER WAYS

There are other ways HEW shows its regard for job safety and health. Only last year, the Bureau of Occupational Health was forced to kill a joint experiment it wanted to undertake with the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect new satistical data on occupational disease. The reason: it could not get the $100,000 it needed to fund the study.

The year before last, Congress authorized a $1 million boost in job health spending, but HEW decided to "tap" this money along with another $250,000 from the Bureau of Occupational Health to finance the unfunded National Center for Urban and Industrial Health. Last year, the same thing happened. Congress voted another boost in occupational health funds, only to have HEW "tap" it for more than $1.5 million to finance what it felt were more urgent activities.

"By whatever measures is used," said Bill B. Benton Jr., former program officer of the Bureau of Occupational Health, in testimony to Congress last October, "occupational health ranks at the bottom of the federal establishment."

The Labor Department bears its share of the shame for the indifference to job safety and health.

The only law on the federal books that deals with industrial safety is the 1936 Walsh-Healey Public Contract Act, which provides for the reporting of work injuries and inspection of establishments working with federal contracts. This is no small burden. An estimated 27 million workers are theoretically covered by this act.

But the Wage and Labor Standards Administration has only seven men to operate the inspection program. There is more than a three-year backlog of reports on work injuries in Wage and Labor Standards' office, and even more of a logjam on inspections to be done. The Bureau of Labor Statistics cut back its reporting on injuries to once a year from four times, because of lack of funds.

One of the worst examples of non-use of the Walsh-Healey Act involved the 5,700 men who mine uranium below ground in the United States. For 17 years, the federal government (which buys almost all the uranium mined in the United States) failed to set up Walsh-Healey safety standards to protect the uranium miners from on-the-job hazards.

1,000 MEN

"From all we can find out," former Secretary of Labor Wirtz told Congress two years ago, "there are 1,000 men walking around in this country who have cancer in their lungs they picked up from radiation in the mines."

Wirtz went on, "There isn't anything we can do about it now. It's too late. But we can stop a repetition of it."

With a few exceptions, the states have little to be proud of in the field of job safety and health.

In 1965, the last year of record, the states spent $23 million for industrial safety, about 30 cents per worker. Washington spent $1.67 per worker, Oregon $2.11 for each resident on a payroll. Oklahoma and Texas spent two cents for each of its workers.

The 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia employ about 1,800 occupational safety inspectors. New York, California and Pennsylvania account for more than 700. Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico and North Dakota have none.

While all 50 states have workmen's compensation laws, they cover less than 62 per cent of the nation's labor force. No fewer than 23 states have "elective provisions"—employers may accept or reject the compensation laws.

More than half the states exempt employers with fewer than 15 employees, which takes in almost 70 per cent of the manufacturers in the United States. Less than one-fourth of the state laws cover the nation's 3.3 million farm workers.

Eleven states do not provide full medical coverage for accidental injury, while more than 40 per cent of the states give limited or no medical coverage at all for occupational disease. Almost 60 per cent of the states pay benefits amounting to less than half an injured worker's earnings. In Louisiana, maximum benefits for permanent disability are $35 a week, with a ceiling of $14,000 regardless of the injury or the accident that caused it.

In their attempts to analyze why job safety and health lag so far behind the social norms of our times, health and labor experts attribute part of the blame to indifference and part of it to the "special interests."

At no time were both forces more evident than in 1968, when Congress conducted months of hearings on President Johnson's Occupational Safety and Health Act.

CURIOUSLY MISSING

The unions were curiously missing from many hearings, and those that testified often did so with little enthusiasm and even less expertise. The AFL–CIO's George Meany testified only once, and United Auto Workers' President Walter Reuther never spoke for the bill at all.

The attitude of the one million-member International Association of Machinists was typical of the biggest unions. When members voted to rank the "issues" of the '70s, they placed on-the-job safety ninth, behind pensions, cleaner air and water for recreation and law and order.

"It is extremely difficult to understand the reasoning of the (union) leaders," remarked Dr. Isidore Buff, a Charlestown, W. Va., physician campaigning for job safety, "except possibly that they are more interested in staying in power than in doing a good job for their members."

HARD AT WORK

The "special interests" that Senate Labor Committee Chairman Yarborough warned against were hard at work against the bill, too.

At one point in the hearings, somebody suggested drawing safety inspectors from the hard-core unemployed. At once, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce attacked the suggestion in a three-page article in its magazine, Nation's Business.

"Imagine yourself sitting in your office a few months from today," the article read. "A young man barges in. You reognize him as a man you once refused to hire. He had no education and no potential talent you could use. His main experience consisted of cashing welfare checks . . . and he threatens to padlock your gates and fine you $1,000 a day if you don't do as he says."

When he introduced news clippings on accidents into his testimony, Wirtz inadvertently backed them up with photographs that were 20 years older than the news clips.

The following conservation then took place between a member of the Senate Labor Committee antagonistic to the bill and a vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

"Are you saying that the photograph . . . is something out of yesteryear?" the senator asked. "Which you say could happen today, but happens with a lesser incidence?"

"OLD FILES"

"We do not know where these photographs come from," replied the NAM man. "But they have been selected obviously from very old files, giving the impression tha it is intended to give as a reason for this required federal legislation."

It was exchanges like these that kept the 1968 bill in committee, where it finally lan-

guished and died long before the end of the 90th Congress.

But even now, hearings are being held by the 91st Congress on Mr. Nixon's Occupational Safety and Health Act, and while job safety adherents are not optomistic about its chances neither are they pessimistic.

Social critic Ralph Nadar does not like the Nixon administration's safety bill, calling it weak and a "sham not worthy of consideration." The Nixon bill calls for safety standards to be set up by an outside board of experts, a provision that Nader feels would give industry control over health and safety standards.

Without fanfare, Sen. Harrison Williams (D-N.J.), chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee, has already introduced his own bill on job safety. On the House side, Rep. Dominick V. Daniels (D-N.J.) is drawing up a bill and expects to submit it to the subcommittee he chairs in the early months of 1970.

Both bills are tougher than the Nixon bill, calling for more frequent and widespread reporting of injuries, authorizing no exemptions from standards, providing criminal penalties for willful violations and a board to set the standards inside the Department of Labor.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1970]

RECORDS SHOW THAT LAX GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS ALLOW OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS TO GROW

(By Walter Rugaber)

WASHINGTON, January 1—Thousands of American industrial concerns violate the Federal Government's occupational safety and health requirements every year, but the available penalties are almost never invoked against corporate offenders.

While inspectors discover hazards in more than 90 per cent of the factories they enter, only about 1 percent of the companies responsible are ever called to formal account, and barely one in a thousand is ever punished.

Records at the Department of Labor show that during the six-year period from 1963 through 1968 the authorities filed safety and health complaints against only 154 companies and imposed sanctions against only 15 of them.

The Government's long-standing distaste for a stronger, more aggressive enforcement policy is an important issue even though safety and health requirements now cover only about 25 million workers in plants with Federal contracts.

The Government's preference for a coaxing "educational" approach is important because an attempt is underway to work out new legislation aimed at providing better protection for about twice as many men and women.

NEW PROCEDURES SOUGHT

New procedures proposed by the Nixon Administration, now before Congress, would in many ways resemble the existing system. A five-member board, instead of a single examiner, would hear the selected cases and set the penalties, if any.

The Nixon Administration's proposal would use many of the existing methods. But neither it nor other industrial safety measures now before Congress is regarded as having a strong chance for passage soon. Meanwhile, the present limited system remains.

The hazards of an industrial job, however the Government approaches them, are quite real. The chances of mangling a hand or breaking a leg on the job have grown steadily better since 1958 and are now the best since Korean War days.

The most recent available surveys by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the number of disabling injuries per million man-hours worked in the nation's manufacturing industries has climbed from 11.4 in 1958 to 14.0 in 1968.

More than 14,000 workers are killed each year, Federal surveys show, and there are more than two million disabling injuries. The loss from accidents is said to be 10 times the loss from strikes.

A 30-YEAR-OLD LAW

The everyday realities bound up in attempts to control this array of hazards by Federal regulations are shown in detail in Washington's experiences with a rather obscure 30-year-old law called the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

It was designed during the Depression to keep the Government from doing business with companies that sought to squeeze profits not only from unsafe plants but also from substandard wages, child labor and long hours.

Both President Nixon and former President Lyndon B. Johnson have found the safety and health provisions lacking, but leading industry spokesmen have turned their criticisms around and cited them in arguing against Washington's intervention.

For example, business forces have contended that safety standards can be most successfully administered on the state level, while Mr. Nixon has faulted this approach for spotty qualities that "appear to be increasing."

Also, industry has traditionally asserted that Americans are safer on the job than anywhere else, while the President has remarked that "the quality of the workplace" is still "a critical factor for Government attention."

SAFETY DRIVES NOTED

The manufacturers have pointed to a number of highly successful safety drives within their own factories, while a Federal official has pointed out that "the vast majority" of plants have no meaningful safety and health programs.

Industry's feeling about Federal regulation has colored practically every important phase of the Government's present safety and health efforts, but Washington has also frequently contributed to the gradual shaping of the program.

Business lobbyists have worked regularly to hold down appropriations for enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act, and several sources in the Labor Department suggested that the pressures have been effective.

An official said the department now receives $530,000 a year to police some 75,000 Government contractors. This is enough to inspect between 2 per cent and 3 per cent of all the plants covered by the law.

When the department exercised its option to enforce the requirements in areas where is thought the state laws had gone soft, Congress reacted by refusing to increase the program's appropriation unless state authority was restored.

FUNDING SQUEEZE RELAXED

It took three years to persuade the lawmakers that many of the states had become sheep in wolves' clothing. The funding squeeze was relaxed after 1966, but the department still can deploy only 27 safety engineers and five hygienists.

Federal inspectors walk through plants and point out hazards on the spot. They also list the problems and send the company managements written bills of particulars. The companies bid for time to make the corrections.

They can almost always win a month, or two months, or three months. And in three out of four instances the Government never follows up to make sure the changes actually occur. Corporate assurances usually are enough.

Manufacturers that skip even a pretense of compliance can win more substantial delays. A really recalcitrant enterprise can be pushed into line eventually, but only after a persistent and determined campaign.

The only penalty provided by Congress is the blacklist: The Secretary of Labor can declare a company that violates the safety and health standards ineligible to deal with the Government for three years.

There seem to be many reasons for the Government's reluctance to use this power, but not all of them are entirely clear. Some sort of accommodation is generally worked out sooner or later.

FIFTEEN PENALIZED FROM SIXTY-THREE TO SIXTY-EIGHT

There is evidence that many of the more safety-minded concerns will eliminate the hazards quickly, and there is evidence that while large but indifferent contractors go to the brink of blacklisting they will not step over.

It is clear from the records that are available only that the most powerful concerns, for whatever reasons, do not go on the blacklist. None of the 15 penalized from 1963 through 1968 was well known.

Those punished included, for example, the Vaughn Lumber Company of Forsyth, Ga., Fort Wayne Truck Parts and Equipment, Inc., of Fort Wayne, Ind., and the Clark Limestone Company of Logan, Iowa.

Many observers have attributed the Labor Department's rare use of the sanction to the feeling that it is too inflexible to impose in some instances, too drastic in others and hence impractical in any.

"It sure would help if we had some less serious penalties," one official said recently. "I'm not saying that we ought to do away with the blacklist, but we ought to have a fine or a court injunction or something more."

One example of the way these difficulties typically work out on the assembly lines can be found in the Federal response to extensive hazards found in a West Virginia plant first in 1963, again in 1965, and still again in 1967.

The earlier visits had brought some "temporary" action, a Government spokesman said, but investigators returned later only to find "that there [had] been relapse and additional contraventions of minimum . . . standards."

The Government finally filed a formal complaint against the company and, when the first in a series of hearings was held four months later, the main unresolved issues included the absence of a lunch room and a change room.

After another month the company announced that it had "definite plans" for a lunch room and a change room. This raised the prospect of a settlement, and the hearing examiner named by the Labor Department jumped at it.

The examiner had made it clear from the outset that he regarded all the proceedings "more or less as an educational process" and that he would be "most reluctant to make a special case" of the company if it should ever agree to comply.

"Conditions at the . . . plant have been horrible at times," the examiner said in September. "A lot of education was necessary, [but] I think the Government's interest at this point should be that education [takes] hold."

The examiner then broke off the proceedings to allow time for compliance. The first postponement was to Feb. 1, 1968. The second was to May 1. The third was indefinite. Some officials in the Labor Department began to grumble.

On Nov. 18, 1968, all was in readiness. The final hearing was conducted. It was brief and sanguine. The company, the examiner said, had altered its thinking and was "now interested in the safety and welfare of [its employees]."

"I think we do have an enlightened employer here," the examiner announced, "and I believe that this case could be used as an example to other employers."

The company eventually complied.

[From the Jersey Journal, Jan. 3, 1970]

CONGRESS SET TO ACT ON SAFETY LAWS

(By Miles Benson)

WASHINGTON.—After standing by for 30 years while the American work force suffered more fatalities on the job than American fighting forces suffered on the battlefield in three wars, Congress finally is getting ready to do something about it.

Inching through an ooze of apathy in both Senate and House are bills which would deal massively with the health and safety of industrial workers who are dying of work-related injuries and diseases at the rate of 14,000 a year, with another two million disabled annually.

The bills should reach the floor of both chambers early in the coming session.

Leading the way was the coal mine Safety Act signed this past week by President Nixon. This act, limited to one industry, sets federal safety standards for mines, and will compensate victims of "black lung" disease caused by a build-up of coaldust in the lungs.

The broader bills to follow would replace or bolster spotty state regulations governing industrial safety by establishing federal standards for all industries from farming to foundries, but contain no compensation provisions.

Among the worst man-killers, according to Sen. Harrison Williams, D-N.J., chairman of the Senate labor subcommittee studying the problem, are textile mills.

Just as coal-miners suffer from inhaling coal-dust, workers in textile mills develop a lethal affliction from breathing cotton-dust. "White lung" disease, Williams calls it. The dust is created during the "carding" process when des-sized bales of raw cotton are broken apart.

Williams, who several months ago led subcommittee members into a Pennsylvania coal mine to view conditions first hand, now is planning a cotton-mill tour, chemical plant tours, and steel-coking plant visits for a look at these high-risk environments.

Until recently, Williams often has been the only member of the subcommittee present at hearings on comprehensive occupational safety and health legislation.

But success of the coal mine act may have provided the precedent needed to change the climate of Congress. Previously it displayed no more ability to cope with industrial casualties than it has with highway carnage.

There seems to be agreement in Congress that some form of bill will be approved in the coming session. The hitch is over who will formulate federal safety standards for industry—government agencies or experts from the industries themselves.

A Nixon Administration bill, introduced in both houses, would create a new National Occupational Safety and Health Board (NOSHB) composed of nongovernment experts appointed by the president, to formulate national standards. The board, however, would be required to consult with industry officals, and in some cases adopt standards set by industries themselves, if they already exist.

Some critics have attacked this approach. They argue that industry can see no profit in worker-safety, and therefore standards set by them would be designed to minimize cash outlay, rather than maximum protection of personnel.

Enforcement under the Nixon Administration bill, would be left to NOSHB. Penalties could run up to $10,000 but only for "willful" violation of standards, falsification or misrepresentation. Small manufacturers and farms would be exempted.

At a recent Senate hearing, consumer crusader Ralph Nader condemned the Administration bill as "a giant loophole, a sham, and not worthy of consideration." Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., who introduced the Administration's bill indicated he wants it strengthened.

CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, former U.S. Senator Harry Cain, now of Miami, Fla., recently sent to me an article written by Rev. Lester Kinsolving and published in the Miami News. It deals pointedly with the problems related to chronic kidney disease. It points up the moral dilemma of such activities as the Seattle Kidney Center's committees which determine the people who are to have access to the limited supply of dialyses machines.

My bill, S. 2482, the National Kidney Disease Act of 1969, attempts to deal directly with this problem and provides aid to those sufferers of kidney disease who face certain death despite the technical and medical availability to keep them alive. Only dollars and shortages of people and equipment stand between these people and life. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL SERVICE INSTEAD OF MEMORIAL SERVICE

(By Rev. Lester Kinsolving)

A growing trend towards the elimination of caskets and funeral services in favor of memorial services was officially endorsed recently by the Convocation of Canterbury, representing half the Church of England.

The resolution endorsing memorial services also encourage clergy to ask their parishioners to donate organs for transplant.

Massachusetts' famed moral theologian, Rev. Joseph Fletcher, in an article in the book "Religious Situation 1969" entitled "Our Shameful Waste of Human Tissue" affirms:

"We are being prodigally wasteful in our funeral practices . . . in complete and selfish disregard of the health and even survival needs of the living."

Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz of Brooklyn's Maimonides Hospital contends that "it is not right to bury 17 other good organs when a man dies. They should be considered as a part of the nation's resources and used for the living."

Dr. Fletcher notes that:

In New York City each day there are 50 to 100 victims of kidney disease waiting for a new kidney—but in 1967 there were only 700 renal transfers, because donors were so hard to find.

In 1963, 4,000 livers were needed, but nearly all available were either buried or burned.

In 1964, some 7,400 cadavers were needed for optimum instruction in U.S. medical schools. But the schools were obliged to double up students because, other than 2,000 unclaimed bodies from morgues, only 600 bodies were bequested for medical research.

Dr. Fletcher also points to the moral dilemmas of a committee set up recently in Washington State to determine which people are to have access to a limited supply of dialyses machines in cases of acute kidney disease. Should the decision be based upon wealth, or education, or position, or the most dependents, or the degree of sickness, or the degree of hope for recovery, or first-come-first-served, or "women and children first," or the casting of lots?

"If we abhor such decisions," he writes, "why not shout for donors? A refusal or failure to be a donor in one way or another amounts to choosing death for somebody else."

Dr. Fletcher recognizes that there is resistance to such use of the bodies of the recently deceased, even by those who would not hesitate to donate their own blood or one of their kidneys "out of respect for the dead."

He notes that such an attitude is strenuously cultivated by many morticians, one of whom he quotes as saying: "With no body there is no funeral. If there are no funerals, there are no funeral directors."

There is an added problem of some conservative ecclesiastical reluctance, such as 350 of Israel's Orthodox Jewish leaders. In 1967, they demonstrated against the Knesset (Parliament) demanding repeal of a 1953 law allowing autopsies—and added to their Yom Kippur liturgy:

"Our Father, Our King; repeal the evil of autopsies."

Marion C. Collins, a retired surgeon, is director of Medic Alert Foundation, 1000 North Palm Drive, Turlock, California 95380. This non-profit foundation has contact with the leading medical centers and medical schools where organ transplants and bodies are needed.

The foundation issues to all potential donors a wristband noting such desire, as well as such information as name and next-of-kin, whose consent is required for such donations by law of some states.

The foundation's 24-member staff maintains a 24-hour answering service, in order to expedite such donations, upon the death of any of the more than 300,000 people who are presently wearing these wrist bands. (Sole cost of this service is $7.) At the death of any of these 300,000 people, no matter where it takes place, the foundation accepts collect calls from the local authorities, who may need to secure immediate consent of next-of-kin as well as information as to the nearest medical facilities where such donations are needed.

FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on December 9, 1969, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) presented an excellent statement on our growing population problem before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is one of the most knowledgeable and insightful discussions of the need for a national family planning policy it has been my privilege to hear since I entered the U.S. Senate.

Senator CRANSTON'S remarks revealed an extraordinary grasp of the relationship of population to the deterioration of our environment. It is refreshing to have a U.S. Senator who really sees the population problem and is willing to speak out on it.

Mr. President, as those who are interested in the U.S. population problem will want to read Senator CRANSTON'S statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON, DECEMBER 9, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to appear before you this morning to speak on behalf of S. 2108, of which I am a co-sponsor. The bill would improve and expand family planning services and population research activities of the federal government. As a member of the Health Subcommittee, I have a deep interest in the issue of population planning.

It is possibly the most central concern for all of us today.

Senator Tydings has rendered a great service in introducing this important bill to provide the means needed to improve and coordinate the federal government's current activities and future planning in this area. His bill has provided this committee with an excellent focal point for a thorough examination of the entire population planning question.

S. 2108 would provide for two major improvements in our present federal family planning effort: better coordination among government programs; and expanded authority for grants for research, training, construction and provision of family planning services.

The pattern of population growth in the United States is an as yet little understood phenomenon. We have been accustomed to thinking of the "population explosion" as something which is happening only in the developing nations. Our own rate of population increase—the excess of births over deaths—has been decreasing. But there are increasing signs that the unique conditions we now face make our present growth rate undesirable and potentially highly dangerous.

There are three important areas of need in the United States today in the population field: (1) research into the nature and components of population growth, in order to provide the necessary information for defining and choosing among long-range policy alternatives by which we can ensure the attainment of national population goals; (2) improved availability of voluntary family planning services to all Americans, and especially to those now denied access to effective, safe family planning services because of financial need; and (3) a concerted effort to develop contraceptives which will be more effective and safer than those now available.

The need for the second and third efforts is generally recognized, although our response has been far from adequate. Of a total research budget of over $1 billion, the National Institutes of Health are spending only about $10 million a year for population-related research. As Robert McNamara put it: "Hundreds of millions of dollars for death control. Scarcely 1% of that amount for fertility control."

Awareness of the first area of need—for a national population policy for the United States—is far less widespread. I would like to discuss each of these three points in brief.

POPULATION TRENDS AND GOALS

We live in a world, and a nation, of finite resources. There are limits to the number of people who can be supported at any particular level of living. Today, the quality of life as we have known it is threatened by the sheer numbers and the degree of affluence of people who inhabit the United States. Our present population of 200 million will become 300 million by the end of this century if present trends continue.

We know the problems we have today in providing adequate education, housing, health services and meaningful job opportunities to all our people, even those who are not seen as poor or disadvantaged. Imagine the dimensions of the education, housing, health, and employment problems we will face in forty or fifty years if we continue to have children at our present rate.

As with every generation, we live in such a way as to determine the demographic and environmental world which our children and grandchildren will inherit. What is new about this generation is the enormous extent to which the decisions we take today will affect our total environment now and tomorrow.

Dr. Lincoln Day, associate professor of public health and sociology at Yale University, has said that because the attitudes and values of the young were shaped at a time when there were fewer Americans to share in the nation's resources, we are not sufficiently aware of the high ecological and social costs which we are exacting from our environment and which we will pass on to our children.

Population size, of course, is not the only factor determining the quality of life or the relationship between man and environment. But the interplay between demographic factors—the size of a population, its rate of growth or decline, etc.—and the surrounding social, economic and cultural conditions is still imperfectly understood. We need extensive research into the relationship of population trends to these other factors. We need to examine the effect on population growth of family size ideals, marriage rates, tax policies, rate of participation of women in the labor force, and overall job and housing opportunities.

This should enable us to determine what the optimum population is for the United States while there is still time to stabilize our population at something near that level. Some suspect that we have now reached, or even surpassed, our optimum population size. According to Dr. Day:

"There is no chance whatever of keeping our population at its present size. In fact, another surge of growth threatens just ahead as girls born during the 'baby boom' of 1945–50 begin coming of age, increasing the population of potential mothers by some 75 percent in the 30 years between 1960 and 1990."

Population growth cannot be turned off like water from a tap when the desired level has been reached. Dr. Day has pointed out that virtually all the world's mothers for approximately the next 20 years have already been born. Though our overall rate of growth is low (1.1 percent in 1967), the absolute numbers are very large. We are currently adding population at the rate of about 2.2 million per year.

Dr. J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, said in testimony last September before a House Government Operations subcommittee:

"We should work toward a zero population increase to bring our numbers into a reasonable balance . . . . We are in danger of bequeathing chaos to those who come after us if we do not take action now."

What are the reasons for our population growth? According to a National Academy of Sciencies 1967 report, the major cause is "the preference for larger families among those who consciously choose the number of children they have. . . ."

Dr. Day has written:

"It may come as a surprise to learn that very large families play only a minor role in this country's family patterns, and that family size is clustered within such a narrow range as two to four children. . . . The present situation in this country thus illustrates a new and tremendously significant fact: no longer is the large family a requisite of population increase. The low mortality rates of today permit rapid, sustained population growth when family size is of only moderate dimensions."

This fact is of enormous significance, for according to many respected experts in this field it demonstrates the necessity of changing our concept of the ideal family size from three children to two.

There is general agreement that a redefinition of the role of women in American society—including far more higher education for women, longer professional careers, and postponement of the age of marriage—would be an important factor in arriving at a smaller family-size norm. It is hypothesized by some that we should seek to alter the usual age at which women marry and begin bearing children. It is further suggested that enlargement of the proportion of the populace which does not marry at all would be desirable.

There are those, too, who believe that only legalization of abortion, in cases where contraception fails, will ensure against overpopulation and ensure that family size can be limited when desired.

The availability of improved contraceptive methods alone cannot halt population growth. Professor Kingsley Davis, director of International Population and Urban Research at the University of California at Berkeley, has cited evidence that population stability in Japan has been achieved not only as a result of the widespread availability of contraceptive devices, but also because of changes in family motivations due to crowded living conditions. In some Eastern European countries important causes of population stability have been the fact that women have had to work and that housing and consumer goods are scarce.

Few changes in social norms can be brought about by coercion in a democratic society, and certainly no change in motivation should be brought about by coercion. I cannot, Mr. Chairman, overemphasize the vigilance that must be exercised in protecting basic human rights when discussing population control. We are, after all, concerned with the quality of human life in this field and the abridgement of the freedom of any individual or group would mock our goal. Voluntary action and voluntary acceptance must be the key words in all information and service programs.

A massive educational effort has to be mounted at all levels of society, so that Americans will understand the implications of each alternative now available to them. We must be sure, too, that the government's effort in this area is to educate, not to indoctrinate. I only hope that we will not have to face conditions of terrible overcrowding or scarce consumer goods—as other countries have done—before we realize the urgency of this challenge.

Dr. Jean Mayer, now special consultant to the President, has explained the relationship of population size to existing resources as follows:

"The rich are as much or more of a problem as the poor . . . (since) the rich in effect create very much more pollution, use up much more natural resources, much more social resources, than the poor . . . if we take the country as a whole, as a rich country, we may have in many ways a population problem which is as acute as the population problem of the poor countries, although for very different reasons."

The need for population control is certainly very great among the non-poor. Studies of family size expectations show little variation between different income and education levels in this country. The great majority of couples at all levels now want and expect to have at least three children. Our rapid population increase derives only slightly from what many have considered excessive childbearing among the poor.

IMPROVE DELIVERY OF FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

Our present delivery system has failed, meanwhile, to provide necessary family planning services to at least five million women.

Mr. Chairman, other witnesses before this subcommittee have presented ample statistics to demonstrate the relationship between family size and poverty.

We must ensure that any family planning program we establish is equally available to the 5.3 million women in the United States who cannot now obtain these services.

Estimates of the economic benefits, direct and indirect, to society of extending family planning services range from 26 to 100 times the cost of preventing an unwanted birth.

These are not newly revealed facts, Mr. Chairman, and it is amazing that with this knowledge the federal government has been so timid in entering this field. What is even more amazing, and at this point, terribly frustrating is that Congress has tried to be-

gin to meet this need only to have bad administration hamstring program operation.

There have been some successes, however. The Economic Opportunity Act was amended to include family planning as a national emphasis program, and to authorize grants to establish family planning projects. Although funding has never really been adequate, this program has been very successful. There are now 230 family planning projects in 42 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico which will reach over 350,000 women this year. Seventeen of these projects are in California and the largest, recently begun in Los Angeles, is designed to reach 10,000 women.

Most family planning programs, however, are located under the aegis of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and there the record is nothing less than shameful. Titles IV and V of the Social Security Amendments of 1967 established a congressional mandate for action in the birth control field. Title V required that at least six per cent of all maternal and infant care grants each year should be used for family planning projects. The 90th Congress then reinforced this mandate by raising that minimum to 10 percent for family planning in fiscal year 1969. Twelve million dollars was available for this purpose in that fiscal year. A large number of communities and institutions began applying for the grants even before the law became effective in July 1968. Eight different applications came from California ranging from Sacramento to San Diego. Not one project was funded until so late in that fiscal year that only now are they beginning to serve women in need.

Until very recently, the Department was so totally lacking in personnel trained for this rather specialized field, its policies have been so confusing, its granting process so slow, its family planning responsibilities dropped into such unreceptive laps, that the program was stalled for over a year.

Family planning programs under Title V were, until recently, administered by the Children's Bureau of the Social and Rehabilitation Service.

This Bureau has been drastically understaffed and did not have one full-time family planning staff member either in Washington or in any regional office. Last month a new National Center for Family Planning Services was established in the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and given responsibility for the Title V program. The reorganization will provide for some full-time staff in Washington and the regions.

Two years ago an office of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population and Family Planning was established in HEW to formulate family planning policy, communicate that policy to the public to the Congress and to prrofessional groups, and to serve as a center within the Department for planning, coordination and evaluation of programs. The office is very close to useless. It has three staff members, almost no funds and no meaningful relationship to the administration of family planning programs. The office has been allowed to remain vacant since last May.

The Medical Services Administration and the Assistance Payments Administration also have some responsibilities in the family planning field, but have not been allotted full-time staff in Washington or the regions to carry out their responsibilities. Recent social security amendments require that welfare departments offer family planning services to recipients of aid to dependent children. Medicaid programs are also a source of funds for family planning services. However, neither of these sources have or can meet more than a small proportion of the need.

If these programs are important, and I believe they are vitally so, it is obvious that their administration must be improved. The establishment of the National Center for Family Planning Services is not sufficient in itself. Its director has no clearly defined responsibility for coordinating or evaluating other family planning services in HEW. The Center is still cut off from population research activities, and most important, no new money for research or services has been provided.

S. 2108 would remedy these weaknesses. It would provide more funds for both research and services. Funds ranging from $89 million to $306 million a year would be authorized for the fiscal years 1971–75. It would combine the research and services functions in a proposed National Center for Population and Family Planning, thereby speeding up the process by which new developments move into the services field.

The Center would be authorized to carry out, at a minimum, the following functions: public information, program planning and development, manpower development and training, supervision of field services, reproductive physiology research, contraceptive development, operational and evaluation research, behavioral research and grants management.

In addition, the Secretary of HEW would, through the Center, be provided with the authority to coordinate, administer and evaluate all family planning activities for the Department and would provide liaison with the activities of other federal agencies such as the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Secretary would be required to make a yearly progress report to the Congress on how all federal programs contributed to national population and family planning goals and the steps to be taken during the coming year.

POPULATION RESEARCH

There is no completely safe and effective means of contraception available to any woman, rich or poor. Eight million American women are presently taking contraceptive pills, and yet we know that these pills are not yet absolutely safe—although they may be less dangerous to the woman who takes them than childbirth itself. We must have an expanded program of research to discover improved methods of contraception which are safe, effective and simple to use.

A Center for Population Research was established almost two years ago as part of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. These activities should, however, be more closely related to the service programs, and a separate authorization should be made for population research activities. Both of these needs would be met by S. 2108.

In regard to the technical area of contraceptive research, I wish to emphasize the absolute necessity of progress in this area in order to develop the improved contraceptive methods which will contribute to accomplishing a significant turndown in the birth rate.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to begin to meet the challenge of continued population growth at home and abroad, we must as a first and indispensable step drastically increase our knowledge of population trends, needs and implications. We must have increased research into improved methods of family planning. We must have a more effective system for delivering these services to all segments of our society. We must also ensure that the knowledge gained from increased research is fully and widely disseminated. An educated public opinion is the crucial factor in deciding upon and maintaining our ultimate course of action.

Population increases occur without any definite warnings of alarm to call us to attention and to action. It is clear that we are sitting on a time bomb, with a slow but devastating fuse.

I strongly hope that we will see the early passage of S. 2108, for the time left to us to make a viable and realistic choice is steadily diminishing.

We need a strong national commitment to expanded population research, to improved services, and to the task of reaching national population goals.

I believe that S. 2108 is a significant first step toward achieving that commitment and toward defining and achieving that goal.

NIGERIA

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today I wish to comment on a matter which is close to the consciousness of us all—the situation in west Africa in the aftermath of Nigeria's tragic civil war.

The fighting has been over for a week. The surrender documents have been signed. The question now uppermost in every mind is how to speed relief to those who need it.

The prevention of reprisals and the control of the troops is the first essential condition for an effective relief effort. Without order, there simply can be no relief. The Federal Military Government of Nigeria has gone far toward maintaining order and discipline in the field, thereby providing the essential framework within which supplies can be distributed, and within which they can be accepted.

The FMG has also promised amnesty to all of the rebels. This promise appears to be well on the way to fulfillment. It has been accepted as made in good faith by the head of the Biafran Association of the Americas and by His Holiness, the Pope. The former Biafran commander, Lt. Col. Philip Effiong, has already returned to the region, and even now he and his fellow officers are moving into the bush with Nigerian patrols, bringing the word of reconciliation to those who are still in hiding.

The Nigerian Government has rejected the assistance of those nations and organizations which previously aided Biafra. The people of Nigeria believe, with some justification, that this support was instrumental in prolonging the bitter war, and that the food and weapons brought in from these varied sources—whatever the motives of the donors—in fact contributed to the death of countless thousands of people. Included in the ban are the Governments of France, Portugal, Rhodesia, and South Africa, and the organization known as Joint Church Aid, which has already disbanded itself and is in the process of turning its supplies over to the Red Cross.

However, the fact that these organizations can no longer operate in the area does not, as some have suggested, mean that no food is getting in.

The Nigerian Red Cross has been preparing for months to assume the task of operating a major relief effort. In Lagos, it has been ably assisted by an international advisory council composed of representatives of the ICRC, religious groups, and a number of friendly governments, including representatives of the United States. At the time that the war ended, the Nigerians had 17,000 tons of food ready to be distributed. This food was not, as has also been suggested, lying on the docks in Lagos. It had already

been stored at key distribution points close to the borders of Biafra, ready to be transported in as soon as the fighting ceased. 13,000 more tons of food were located in neighboring countries, ready to be fed into the pipeline. And forming the bulk of these stockpiles are the staple foods of the people—rice, beans, manioc, cassava, and dried milk. In addition, as conditions settle and normal means of communication are reopened, local foods will also become available for distribution.

Obviously, the Nigerian Red Cross has not been able to reach all of the people who are in need. But it is doing a commendable job. The teams which have moved in are, wisely, not solely Nigerian. Red Cross representatives and doctors from other countries are working side by side with Nigerian officials, and the head of the Biafran Red Cross has resumed his former position as deputy director of the Nigerian operation. Wherever possible these teams are using the familiar distribution points which were manned, until a few days ago, by the dedicated missionaries and relief workers who formed the vanguard of Joint Church Aid and Caritas. In cases where these workers stayed on the job, many of them are now helping the Nigerians to get food to the people.

Reports from the town of Aba, recaptured in the fighting only a few days ago, may be indicative of the way the situation is developing. There, a small west African village which was deserted during the fighting is already a thriving market town with over 100,000 inhabitants. These people and those who will join them in the days ahead are at a central and easily reached location; they are relatively easy to feed. Likewise, the photo on the front page of a Washington newspaper over the weekend showed three young boys preparing a meal in the streets of Owerri, the last major town to be retaken. They, too, will be relatively easy to reach and to feed.

There is still danger, though it is receding, of unanticipated outbreaks of violence which will set back the relief effort. There is danger of epidemic. And there are people hiding in the dense forest whom the best of relief efforts and the most conscientious of military patrols may yet be unable to reach. But word spreads fast in west Africa, and the need for special efforts to reach the more remote areas will decline substantially as order is maintained and food is provided in increasing quantities to all distribution points.

Nigeria's efforts to date have indeed been commendable. The Red Cross and the Ministry for Economic Development are, from all accounts, moving supplies in swiftly. Where facilities have been lacking, such as trucks and certain medical supplies, the Nigerians have not hesitated to ask the Governments of Britain and the United States to pick up the slack, and the necessary equipment has been forthcoming without delay.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the United States has not done enough. We have given $80 million to the relief effort over the last 2 years. We have provided planes, paid for sea transport of supplies, and made available medicines and doctors. More is certainly available when it is needed. But there are still those who believe that the Western governments should launch a massive airlift of supplies to eastern Nigeria.

Viewed in the context both of the planning and the operation of the relief effort to date, such suggestions are both unnecessary and unfortunately misguided. Suggestions of direct intervention are unnecessary because the Nigerians are making every effort to meet the needs of these people themselves, and because they are wise enough to ask for the equipment and supplies which they lack. And suggestions of direct intervention are misguided because such efforts could imperil the process of reconciliation.

Mr. President, I believe that the best service we can perform is to support rather than to attempt circumvention of the present efforts of the Nigerian Government. Despite all attempts at mediation, the war was finally brought to an end by the parties to the struggle, in direct contact. The same must now be true of the reconstruction.

With the conclusion of the war, the Ibo people will now find their security and their future within the Federal Government of Nigeria. And that security must be based on trust.

The many peoples of Nigeria must learn, once again, to work together. The process will be vastly facilitated if, indeed, it is Nigerians who provide aid to Nigerians, rather than Europeans or Amercans who provide aid to Ibos. Western observers certainly have a role to play. European and American participants are even now working side by side with Nigerians, and their presence in the war-torn areas is a great help in restoring confidence among the Ibos.

But Americans and Europeans cannot come between the former combatants. For if they do, the people of what was Biafra will look to outsiders for sustenance and security. They will not see the efforts of the Nigerian Government to help them. And, old differences far from being mitigated, will unfortunately be perpetuated, with possible dire consequences for the future.

This is what I refer to when I speak of the choice which confronts us. The easy, the politic, in some ways the most personally satisfying course of action would be to provide direct relief, with or without the consent of the Nigerian Government. But in terms of the long-range welfare of the people, in terms of the stability of the country, in terms even of saving the largest number of lives both now and in the future, this would be the worst choice we could possibly make. The harder choice, but the wiser one, is to support the government of Nigeria in its best efforts to reunite the country and to restore the badly shattered confidence of a large segment of its people.

General Gowon and those who work with him have conducted affairs in a manner which merits our confidence and support. They are the leaders of a sovereign state which in difficult times is seriously trying to provide for the welfare of its people. In this effort they have the support of the leaders of the former rebellious territory. We can best serve the interests of all concerned if we recognize Nigeria's sovereignty in this matter, if we assist the Government's efforts in the way which they deem most helpful, and if we refrain from any overt acts or suggestions which might serve to impede this constructive process.

I highly commend these efforts, and pray that the day may soon be at hand when there will be truly one Nigeria, with equal rights and full opportunity for its people.

FAIRNESS IN FRANCHISING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the combination of the desire of a man to own an independent business and the "good business sense" of hundreds of corporations today is producing a restructuring of the system of distribution of products and services.

Franchising is growing so fast that last week's figures are unreliable today.

But we do know that the number of such businesses now is approximately 670,000. And the forecast is that by 1975, 70 percent of all retail sales will be through franchising.

So far, this growth has occurred without a rule book adopted to assure fair play for all participants.

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly demonstrated for me that such ground rules were necessary. Therefore, I have introduced the Fairness in Franchising Act—S. 1967—upon which I hope the subcommittee will vote in the next few weeks.

In a letter in support of that bill, Robert M. Dias, president of the National Association of Franchised Businessmen, spells out the problems facing the franchise in business "for himself."

Because he sums up the problems so well, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dias' letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
FRANCHISED BUSINESSMEN,
Washington, D.C., November 25, 1969.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Our newly formed organization, the National Association of Franchised Businessmen, was formed to fill some serious voids in today's business environment. Namely, the lack of franchise representation and the absence of a source of unbiased public information on a major industry which is rapidly growing everyday. This growth has been due, in a large degree, to man's desire to work for "himself" and to improve his financial status.

Unlike other industries, the growth of franchising is extremely visable to the average man. For all, on a daily basis, in one way or another use one of the wide variety of goods and services offered by companies that use the franchise method of distribution. As a result, more and more individuals are investing in franchising every year, with the result that today there are over 670,000 franchised businesses, with annual sales of $100 billion.

However, the astoundingly rapid growth, together with a lack of definite legal standards to govern the anti-competitive and unfair practices of franchisors, and the grossly unequal status and bargaining power of the

franchisee has caused serious problems for the franchised businessmen. Among them are:

Fear of loss of investment through cancellation or termination for minor contract infringements.

Limited or no rights to transfer franchises.

Exhorbitant fees and royalty payments that are vastly out of proportion to sales volume.

Directed company purchases of merchandise, supplies, and equipment that could be obtained elsewhere for less.

Restrictions on selling price and product offerings—regardless of local competitive situations.

Constant pressure and control by the company to impose mandatory working hours, and high sales quotas.

These are only some of the problems, and unhappily they are not isolated instances. At the root of all these situations is the franchise agreement itself, which may be totally one-sided and unfair and specifically the termination provisions which encourage intimidation and coercion of franchises to accomplish anti-competitive and unfair ends.

When an individual signs a franchise agreement he regards himself as an independent businessman. Yet all too often he has absolutely no indication of the unfair practices persisting in certain aspects of franchising. At best, most franchised businessmen today, because of the provisions contained in their contracts, can only consider themselves quasi-independent.

This imbalance of contractual power is also being used by franchisers that are not only destroying the "American Dream" of "owning your own business," but they are "squeezing out" established franchises by ruthless exercise of their termination, and other one-sided contractual provisions. This latter practice threatens the very existence of the franchise method of distribution and seriously reduces competition in the "market place" and ultimately affects the consumer where it hurts most, "in the pocketbook."

The National Association of Franchised Businessmen strongly support your effort and the effort of your colleagues to curb the unethical practices and inequities which exist in franchising today. You can also be sure that every franchised businessman and every potential investor who has knowledge of the facts appreciate the work of your committee in proposing legislation which has been needed for so long.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. DIAS,
President.

FIGHTING CRIME IN THE CITIES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr President, I read with interest Attorney General Mitchell's recent announcement that $236 million would soon be distributed to the States under title I of the Omnibus Crime Control Act to help fight crime. If properly used, I am confident these funds would be most helpful in the war against crime. At present, however, I have little confidence that these funds will be well spent.

Title I declares it to be the policy of Congress to "assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement at every level by national assistance." Such assistance was to be in the form of planning and action grants to be distributed to the States by LEAA. Congress assumed when it passed title I that these planning and action grants would be used in those areas of a State that have the highest incidence of crime: that is, its urban areas. Yet the implementation of title I during its first year of existence has demonstrated that an appropriate percentage of the Federal funds received by the States is oftentimes not being expended in the cities. Rather, these crime fighting funds are frequently being wasted on projects which in no way meet the crime problems or our cities. For example, a disproportionate amount of the money distributed by LEAA last year was used by rural police forces to purchase two-way radio equipment. While appreciative of the desire of these nonurban law enforcement offices to have the most up-to-date equipment available, I do not think their needs should take precedence over the much more obvious and pressing requirements of our crime-plagued cities.

If it is admitted, as I think it surely must be, that crime is essentially, and most seriously, a problem of our cities, then there should be some better guarantee that these crime fighting funds will go where the problem is. To that end, I recently introduced legislation—S. 3171—which seeks to achieve that goal. Presently, Title I gives absolute control over the distribution of these block grant funds to the States themselves. My legislation would alter this approach by requiring the Justice Department to reduce the amount of money available to States which do not adequately deal with the special problems and particular needs of their major urban areas and other areas with high crime rates.

It also calls for the expenditure of $3 billion in the next 3 years to meet the crime problem. I firmly believe that if the war against crime is to be fought successfully, Congress cannot afford to authorize less. Clearly, the size of our commitment is, in large measure, determined by the amount of funds which we set aside for the objective.

I view this legislation as a responsible attempt to make State governments more responsive to the obvious needs of their cities. I am pleased that 11 Senators saw fit to join me as cosponsors of the bill. I am equally pleased that the National League of Cities organization, which has had a long interest in the implementation of title I, has felt strongly enough to pledge its support to S. 3171. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Patrick Healy, the executive director of the National League of Cities, expressing his organization's agreement with the objectives of S. 3171, be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

If the war against crime is to be won, we must have every assurance that the limited funds available will be well spent. Currently, no such assurance exists.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1969.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: The National League of Cities strongly supports S. 3171 which you have introduced to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. We believe that this bill, if enacted, would substantially reduce the problems in the program which have caused concern for many of the nation's mayors and which were highlighted in your excellent statement introducing the bill.

Under the program as presently constituted, many cities with major crime problems are not receiving their fair share of the crime funds or having their particular crime control problems recognized properly in state crime plans. Your bill would substantially improve the position of cities with high crime problems to receive adequate funding under this program. At the same time it gives states an inducement to deal responsibly with the crime problems of their major urban areas by allowing those states which adequately recognize urban crime problems and commit resources to aiding the crime cotnrol effort an even greater share of funds than they are presently entitled to. In doing so, S. 3171 encourages important new concepts in federal-state-local relations, allowing a greater state role in local programs for states which demonstrate a commitment and concern for solving local problems while assuring that local governments in those states which do not make a sincere commitment to solving urban problems will still receive their fair share of federal funds.

We also strongly support the $1 billion level of authorizations which you have proposed. Such substantial federal support will stimulate meaningful state and local programs making necessary changes and improvements in a criminal justice system to assure more effective crime control efforts.

We hope that efforts to secure enactment of S. 3171 will be successful and pledge you the full support of the National League of Cities to this end.

Sincerely,

PATRICK HEALY,
Executive Director.

A PEACEFUL MISSION FOR FORT DETRICK

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, President Nixon's historic announcement of November 25, when he renounced the development and first use of weapons of chemical and biological warfare, has given us a great opportunity to redirect the resources employed in CBW research to the service of mankind.

The Nation's leading facility for research in defensive biological warfare is Fort Detrick, in Frederick, Md. Fort Detrick has a large corps of highly trained, highly skilled civilian scientists and a research plant unparalleled in the entire country. The talent and facilities gathered at Detrick have already made significant contributions in fields such as biology, agriculture, and public health as byproducts of defense work. It is now imperative that the full energies of this vital installation be focused on our most pressing environmental and health problems.

Accordingly, I have initiated discussions with Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Science Advisor to the President, and with Detrick officials, DOD personnel, and officers in the National Institutes of Health. They have begun to explore a number of possibilities for new missions for Fort Detrick. But the reductions-in-force recently announced by DOD have underlined the need to move rapidly in order to hold together the unique research team now at Detrick, and to realize the full potential of this installation for peacetime research.

The conversion of Fort Detrick to unclassified research would be fully consistent with the President's statement of

November 25. It would be an effective step toward a full national return on the great investment we have made in this important installation. It could lead to historic breakthroughs in health research.

I intend to pursue this matter, in cooperation with Representative J. GLENN BEALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my letter of January 9 to Dr. DuBridge, and editorials on the subject published by the Frederick Post and the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1970.

Dr. LEE A. DUBRIDGE,
Science Advisor to the President,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. DUBRIDGE: Although the reduction-in-force at Fort Detrick, Maryland, announced today is primarily budgetary in character and also reflects a change in its historical mission, I am confident that you are reviewing carefully the need to find at Detrick, with its unique facilities, a new goal shaped to peacetime realities.

If ever the biblical entreaty that man beat his swords into plowshares had a latter-day meaning, it is in the historic decision of the President on November 25 that the United States would renounce the use of lethal biological and chemical warfare. But the instruments devoted to such warfare are also particularly fitted to contribute to the solution of the nation's primary environmental and public health problems.

To this end, I have been in touch with the National Institutes of Health. With the Public Health Service, NIH has had a continuing scientific relationship with Detrick, its laboratory facilities and its contaminated material disposal facilities over a period of years.

Fort Detrick has a research plant unparalleled anywhere, with an acquisition cost of nearly one-quarter billion dollars and a replacement cost far higher. With such an investment, it is simply essential that the facilities and the scientific personnel which have been using those facilities are given a national mission commensurate with their potential. We must not render this installation useless because the teams of scientists and technicians have scattered to the four winds. I do not have to tell you how difficult it is to regroup a team of scientific experts once circumstances have appeared to dictate to them the need to move on.

It is wholly consistent with the President's policy statement that we move promptly and urgently to find a permanent new theme—a permanent new role and mission—for Fort Detrick.

To be sure, Detrick officials, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and the Surgeon General have begun preliminary explorations to find this new theme. But I believe that prompt and effective coordination must be achieved at an early date if we are to hold together the unique team that presently serves the nation at Detrick.

I need not tell you of the relationships between peace-time research in biological and chemical fields and the defense-related work of this type of facility. Fort Detrick's research has already resulted in many advances, as byproducts of its defense work, in the peace-time fields of agriculture, biology, and public health, among others.

Further, there can be a new purpose served, conceivably, in pursuit of a breakthrough in cancer research. There is a direct relationship between the excellent environmental quality control available at Detrick and the requirements of this type of cancer research. I understand, for example, that the laboratory space at Detrick itself presents an unparalled advantage. The Government has already invested $90 per cubic foot in these facilities, as against the $60 per cubic foot of space found in the finest college laboratories in the nation.

These are only a few suggestions on the road to finding a new purpose there. I look forward to discussing them with you personally. If joint use of Detrick's facilities by civilian scientific agencies proves feasible and desirable, we will indeed be able to add another advance to mankind's quest for peace.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Frederick (Md.) Post, Jan. 10, 1970]

DETRICK CUTBACK

While rumors had been circulating for many weeks regarding the impending cut of personnel at Fort Detrick, the announcement of a cutback of 219 positions comes as a shock to the community.

And if one wants to believe the rumor mill, there will be even more in the works.

The cutback was due, according to the announcement, to economy reasons. What makes Fredericktonians and Fort Detrick personnel wonder is how will the post be affected by President Nixon's announcement of late 1969 that this country will no longer be involved in production and stockpiling of biological weapons which could be used offensively.

While the cutback is about 10 per cent of the civilian personnel at Detrick, an earlier cut announced in November and early retirements taken in October have heightened the impact of the announced economy move.

Efforts of both Sen. Mac Mathias and Congressman Glenn Beall at arranging a White House conference to discuss the status of Detrick are to be applauded. The physical facilities as well as the trained, highly skilled teams of scientists and scientific investigators represent too great an investment to be dumped without thorough study.

An announced plan to study the possibility of transfering fuctions of Detrick from the Defense Department to another Federal Department where the research machinery and personnel can be used is also a proper one, which will be greeted with much interest by Detrick and Frederick residents.

Fort Detrick for almost 27 years has been an integral part of Frederick. From the earliest years of Detrick, the integration of personnel into the framework and fibre of Frederick and its social institutions has been the hallmark of the interassociation between the two communities.

We firmly hope that a resolution of the Detrick "problem" will be made and will be beneficial, not only for Detrick and Frederick, but for the nation as a whole.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1970]

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

. . . and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.
—Isaiah 2:4

It is an unfolding paradox that the secrecy-enshrouded biological warfare laboratories at Fort Detrick, Md., could be used for important research in problems of the environment and public health. President Nixon's decision to take the country out of the biological warfare business has left the future of the installation's fantastic laboratories and superb research staff in doubt. Persons familiar with Fort Detrick insist that civilian research agencies will be clamoring for pieces of the $250 million facility near Frederick, Md., once they learn more about its capability. Already, the National Institutes of Health has indicated interest in Detrick for possible cancer virus research. It has robot-like devices which would permit such research to be conducted without exposing the researchers to the hazard of cancer virus infection. Similarly, the Surgeon General is said to be interested in the facilities for the safe disposal of contaminated research materials.

Senator Mathias has asked the President's science adviser, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, to consider developing a new national civilian mission for the laboratories before its "teams of scientists and technicians have scattered to the four winds." Clearly, without such a mission, they will soon leave for more challenging assignments. There is also the question of continuing defensive biological research in immunization and safety in accordance with the President's decision. But surely ways can be found to marry these two objectives. To do so would be to carry out the spirit of the President's historic decision to end biological warfare.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have watched recent developments in the U.S. Middle East policy with growing concern and on January 18 had an opportunity to address the Beth Jacob Congregation of Baltimore on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks to the Beth Jacob Congregation and a letter which I wrote to the President, urging him to reaffirm U.S. support for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab governments to determine all substantive elements to a peace settlement, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

As you are well aware, the press has reported some serious developments in recent months regarding America's Middle East policy. This morning I would like to share with you some thoughts on these developments and their possible implications for the achievement of a meaningful peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States.

Following the 6-day war of June, 1967, the official U.S. position on a Mideast peace settlement was based on the principle that a lasting settlement could only be achieved through direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab governments on all matters of substance. As President Johnson stated on June 19, 1967, "The parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. . . . It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together."

President Nixon reaffirmed American support for the principle of direct negotiation as the only avenue to a durable peace as recently as last September.

Then, as you know, last month the newspapers reported two U.S. proposals to the Soviet Union suggesting possible terms for an Israeli-Egyptian and an Israeli-Jordanian settlement. Secretary of State Rogers confirmed the existence of these proposals.

Immediately, several of us in the Senate asked the State Department for an explanation of the significance of the U.S. settlement proposals. For these proposals appeared to indicate a dangerous departure from the official U.S. position: A step in the direction of substituting a settlement imposed by the Big Four Powers for one reached through direct negotiations between Israel and the Arabs.

The State Department emphatically denied that its proposals signified any shift in U.S. policy. I hope this is the case. But their denials to date have been less than convincing.

The State Department claims that its proposals merely represent a framework within which Arab-Israeli negotiations can take place. However, a framework on which all parties have agreed already exists: The United Nations Resolution of November 22, 1967.

Our proposals to the Soviets appear to be an attempt to go beyond that framework; an attempt to define the substantive terms of an eventual settlement such as permanent boundaries, the status of Jerusalem, and the resettlement of refugees.

The State Department further claims that the U.S. proposals are merely "suggested" settlement terms and cannot reasonably be viewed as "imposed." But this, too, is unconvincing.

In a recent briefing for my office, State Department Officials conceded that it would be very difficult for Israel to reject the terms of a settlement agreed to in advance by both the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Therefore—and I hope I am wrong—I fear a dangerous retrogression in U.S. mideast policy is occurring. I say retrogression because it appears the administration is sliding back to the distastrous middle east policy of John Foster Dulles.

As you recall, after the 1956 Suez campaign the U.S. and the Soviet Union imposed settlement terms on Israel and Egypt instead of requiring direct negotiations. The result was an unstable peace which Egypt had no intention or interest in maintaining; A false peace that was shattered by renewed hostilities a decade later.

The present State Department actions appear to ignore this and similar lessons of history. They presume a real interest on the part of the Soviet Union in a Middle East settlement now.

But the facts are that the Soviet Union continues to be the main source of support for Arab acts of aggression against Israel and Arab hostility towards the United States. There is no evidence that the Soviet Union's present leaders wish to abandon tension in the Middle East as a principle part of her own national interest.

The lessons of 1956 ought to be clear. Much as we might desire it, there is no short-cut to a durable peace in the Middle East. Our own national interests dictate that we stand firm behind the principle of direct negotiation. Negotiations between Israel and the Arab Governments in which all major substantive questions are decided.

For there can be no lasting peace in the area until all of the parties to the conflict truly want peace. And as the Israelis have properly pointed out, willingness to negotiate directly is certainly a reasonable test of a sincere commitment to a peaceful resolution of differences.

Therefore, I have just written the President urging him to reaffirm American support for the principle of direct negotiation. And I intend to speak out on his matter on the Senate floor in the coming weeks.

In the meantime, until a permanent peace is possible, it is essential that the U.S. provide Israel with the economic and military assistance she needs to survive. I believe we must to do so for two principal reasons.

First, the U.S. is morally committed to the preservation of Israel as a Jewish homeland. History has made tragically clear the necessity for a place to which Jews may turn in the face of the persecution which has continued to infect western history. The spectacle of Jews vainly seeking a haven from Hitler's death camps must never be repeated. No man of conscience can believe otherwise.

Second, until a meaningful peace settlement is possible, the best deterrent to open conflict in the Middle East is an Israel strong enough to maintain a regional balance of power vis-a-vis her Arab neighbors. I shall certainly support adequate assistance to insure Israel the means to defend herself successfully.

I wish I could predict an imminent settlement of all outstanding issues in the Middle East and the onset of a just and permanent peace. Unfortunately, I cannot. The hates and hostilities still run too deeply.

The best we can hope for in the coming decade is a policy which prevents the outbreak of a fourth round in the Arab-Israeli war and which buys more time. Time to heal the bitterness and salve hurt pride. Time for dialogue and communication. Time for the mutual trust and understanding to take root which are the foundations of lasting peace.

JANUARY 16, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write out of a great sense of urgency created by what I perceive to be a dangerous retrogression in U.S. Middle East policy. Those who authored this policy change are no doubt sincere in their desire for a just peace in the Middle East and a balanced U.S. position. Nonetheless the effects of this policy shift deeply concern me and many other Americans.

It has been my understanding that from the conclusion of the Six Day War between Israel and her Arab neighbors in June of 1967 until the fall of 1969, the official U.S. position on a Mideast peace settlement had been based on the principle of direct negotiations between the governments of Israel and the Arab States on all matters of substance. This was made clear by President Johnson on June 19, 1967, when he stated, "the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace . . . It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together." You reaffirmed our commitment to direct negotiations as the only way to secure a true and lasting peace in the area, as recently as last September in your address before the U.N. General Assembly.

It was not until last month, with the publication of reports of U.S. proposals to the Soviet Union outlining possible terms of an Israeli-Egyptian settlement and an Israeli-Jordanian settlement, that evidence of a significant departure from the official U.S. position appeared. For the existence of these U.S. proposals, confirmed by Secretary Rogers in his speech of December 9, 1969, and his press conference of December 23, 1969, constitutes a major step towards the substituting of a settlement imposed by the Big Four powers for a settlement reached through negotiation between Israel and the Arabs.

The claim that these U.S. proposals merely represent a framework within which Arab-Israeli negotiations can take place is not a convincing one. A framework on which all parties have agreed already exists: the U.N. Resolution of November 22, 1967. The U.S. proposals of October 28 and December 18, 1969, represent an attempt to go beyond that framework and to define the substantive terms of a settlement, including such specific matters as permanent boundaries, the status of Jerusalem and the settlement of refugees.

The further claim that these U.S. proposals are merely suggested settlement terms and cannot reasonably be viewed as "imposed" terms is equally unconvincing. In a briefing for my office, State Department officials conceded that it would be very difficult for Israel to reject the terms of a settlement agreed to in advance by both the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

The substantive terms of the U.S. proposals aside—and I regard some of them as highly debatable—the real question before us is whether it is consistent with the national interests of the U.S. to abandon the principle of insisting on direct negotiations as the only means of achieving a lasting Middle East settlement. As you recall, the U.S. and the Soviet Union sought to settle the 1957 Middle East conflict by imposing settlement terms on both sides instead of requiring the parties to the conflict to sit down and negotiate their differences. The result was an unstable peace which neither side had a vested interest in maintaining; a fragile settlement that was shattered by renewed hostilities a decade later.

The present State Department actions appear to ignore this and similar lessons of history. They presume a real interest on the part of the Soviet Union in a Middle East settlement now. But the facts are that the Soviet Union continues to be the main source of support for Arab acts of aggression against Israel and Arab hostility towards the United States. There is no evidence that the Soviet Union's present leaders consider the reduction of tension in the Middle East consistent with their own national interest.

Thus in my view, the reports of U.S. proposals of October and December, 1969, indicate the ominous beginnings of a return to the disastrous policy of an imposed settlement that failed in 1957. Our failure to support the only meaningful approach to a durable peace settlement can only lead to a fourth round of hostilities in the area and the renewed possibility of a U.S.-Soviet confrontation in the Middle East.

Therefore, in the name of U.S. national interests, our commitment to the survival of Israel, and our desire for a lasting peace in the Middle East consistent with the just demands of Arab and Israeli alike, I urge you to reaffirm U.S. support for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab governments to determine all substantive elements of a peace settlement. Nothing could better serve the interests of peace at this time.

OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, during the continuing controversy over oil import policy, a Washington correspondent for the Houston, Tex., Chronicle has made a most timely and pertinent assessment of the inconsistency of the arguments being used for doing away with the oil import quota system.

I have pointed out before that some of the staunchest advocates of import control legislation are from New England States. They favor the protection of their shoe and textile industries from cheaply produced imports, but, at the same time, they urge the President to do away with oil import quotas.

Mr. Jack Cleland, of the Chronicle's Washington Bureau, wrote an article entitled "Shoe Now on Other Foot—Pinches PROXMIRE."

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE has long been a battler for the dairy industry which is of such importance to his State of Wisconsin and has fought the threat of cheaply produced dairy imports. At the same time he has led the fight by nonproducing oil-State representatives for reducing the oil depletion allowance and doing away with oil import quotas.

As dairy imports again threaten a basic industry in Senator PROXMIRE's State, Mr.

Cleland compliments the Wisconsin Senator for fighting for his constituents, the dairy interests. I only wish the Senator and some of his colleagues from New England would recognize that the same principles or ground rules also apply to oil imports as they affect the economics of the oil-producing States.

It is a mystery to me why Senators PROXMIRE, MCINTYRE, and MUSKIE, and other Senators, have singled out oil prices to be pushed down by imports, while at the same time advocating quota limitations on imported dairy products, shoes, and textiles to protect those industries in their States. Obviously, the shoe does pinch when it is on the other foot.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOE NOW ON THE OTHER FOOT—PINCHES PROXMIRE

(By Jack Cleland)

WASHINGTON.—While the petroleum industry is waiting for the other shoe to drop—new import regulations on top of the cut in depletion—it should take heart that it isn't the only segment of commerce having its troubles.

According to Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., the dairy industry, which is very important in the state he represents, is having trouble with cheap foreign milk product imports.

Proxmire wrote the Agriculture Department last month expressing concern over daily import control recommendations made by a departmental review panel.

Apparently Proxmire spotted some possible loopholes in the proposed new regulations involving chocolate crumb and Monterey cheese imports. He received assurances from the department these items would be studied.

Proxmire is an old hand at spotting loopholes in import regulations. About a year ago he blew the whistle on Standard Oil Co. of Indiana for using its petrochemical import quota to bring in products which could be earmarked for gasoline.

FOES OF PROGRAM

This isn't to say the senator is a champion of the oil import program and wants to see it run by the book. In fact, he's one of the most persistent foes of the program and wants to see it drastically revised to allow easier flow of crude and product imports.

It's Proxmire's contention the present program is costing the consumers billions in added fuel costs. In his latest press release on dairy imports he makes no mention what tariff regulations mean in added costs to consumers of ice cream, cheese and chocolate products.

A critic of state proration laws, Proxmire also makes no mention of the fact that milk in this country comes under federal marketing orders which "stabilize" prices in designated market areas.

Of course, it's unfair to accuse Proxmire, or any politician for that matter, of inconsistency or parochialism. That's the name of the game on Capitol Hill.

Proxmire would be derelict in his duty to his constituents if he didn't fight for the dairy interests which are vital to Wisconsin.

Conversely, because there's no oil and gas production in that state, he's free to blast the petroleum industry.

CRITICIZE GOVERNOR SMITH

Some people might think it unfair of Proxmire to criticize Gov. Preston Smith of Texas for visiting Labor Secretary George Shultz while his task force was preparing its recommendations for changes in the oil import program.

In all fairness to the senator, he conceded Smith and other oil-producing state governors have every right to protect the interests of their respective states. It was the timing that bothered him because the visitation occurred after all views had been filed.

Proxmire is watching with keen interest what comes from the supposely secret recommendations sent the White House from the cabinet committee task force. It is doubtful that what President Nixon does short of abandoning all import controls, will satisfy him.

A Proxmire aide has indicated the Senator and other industry critics on Capitol Hill will keep pressure in the weeks ahead to insure the recommendations are not filed away and forgotten.

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE U.S.A.?

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, an extraordinary citizen of my State, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, has written an editorial, published January 1 in the Arizona Republic, which should be circulated far and wide across our land.

"Gene" Pulliam is one of the most respected journalists in America today. He has been named the recipient of the William Allen White Award for journalistic merit to be presented to him on February 10. He is a founder of the journalistic fraternity Sigma Delta Chi and a member of its executive council.

During his newspaper career, he has owned and operated 47 newspapers, as many as 23 at one time, in eight different States.

Although he has been professionally associated with journalism since working as a reporter for the Kansas City Star, he is also well known for his work in humanitarian and civic endeavors. He is also active in the Citizens Committee on Postal Reorganization.

In a front-page editorial on January 1, Gene Pulliam said what many Americans were thinking, yet which few of us possess his deft ability to express. He spoke from his mind as well as his heart. He said that ours is a great Nation—the greatest in history. This is the Nation in whose hands rests the fate of the world. I believe the magic of his message lay in the fact that he cut straight through to the heart of the matter. While acknowledging the unsolved problems, the setbacks, disappointments, and frustrations, he resoundingly affirmed his belief that America is still America—America on the move—and I agree. Gene Pulliam expressed my sentiments when he said we will succeed only if we try. We must try. We must pull together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, in which Mr. Pulliam—as he so often has in his distinguished career—has touched the heart of our national problem, be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press dispatch telling of Mr. Pulliam's award from the William Allen White Foundation be printed following the editorial.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 7, 1970]

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE U.S.A.?

What is the matter with us in America?

Here we stand, on the threshold of the '70s—the strongest, freest, most compassionate and humane nation on earth; yet from all sides we daily hear intemperate assaults on our way of life, our cherished values, our inspired traditions and our national character. And millions of us in the "silent majority" tolerate those assaults.

For more than ten years a hodgepodge of downgraders of America has tried to persuade us that everything we believe in, everything we have done in the past and everything we plan to do in the future is wrong. Their violent actions on college campuses, their desecreation of public buildings, their despoliation in our cities—mostly unhindered and unchecked—are paraded before us in newspapers and magazines and on TV as though these people were the harbingers of some glorious future instead of destroyers of both necessary public institutions and private property. These downgraders are willing to shout out against everything that is wrong with America but they are unwilling or unable to see anything that is right with America.

The so-called "American establishment" is accused of permitting poverty to continue in this country. Don't the accusers know that even an American living on welfare or unemployment insurance in the United States has a higher income than almost any Chinese, almost any Italian, almost any citizen of Africa or Latin America?

We are told by the downgraders of America that our system is oppressive of freedoom. Can they name a country that permits more personal freedom, willingly extends more private charity (over $6 billion per year), guarantees more civil rights, has more democratic institutions, more free speech, more freedom to travel, more of every quality that makes life good, rewarding and promising?

We are told we should feel guilty for helping our allies in Korea and Vietnam maintain their independence from communism. We may have made mistakes in the way we have conducted these wars; but assuredly we should not feel guilt for honoring our promises, for helping others to resist aggression, and for fighting—with no hope of material reward—for the right of these people to live in peace and freedom.

What is the matter with us?

Don't we know it is not fear that brings progress and achievement? It is faith—faith in God, faith in our country, faith in ourselves.

Don't we know that cowardice will not provide security and preserve peace? It is courage and confidence in the rightness of our course and the honor of our cause.

In 1837 Abraham Lincoln warned us "never to violate the laws of the country and never to tolerate their violence by others . . . let reverence for the law . . . be taught in the schools, seminaries and colleges, let it be written in primers, spelling books and almanacs, let it be preached from the pulpit and proclaimed in the legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice . . . In short, let it become the political religion of the nation."

If we object to the law, let us amend it, modify it, repeal it—but while it is the law, let us obey it. The law is a protector of all citizens, white and black, dissenters and supporters. Violence in expressing opposition to the law cannot be tolerated. A permissive attitude toward such violence is one of the real evils in American life today.

What is the matter with the U.S.A.? Nothing is the matter that cannot be corrected and cured if the great "silent majority" will throw off its apathy and become involved in restoring support for the government and

respect for the law. The "silent majority" must speak out, stand up, and be counted—and demand action that will put an end to the destructive blackmail by the hodgepodge of America's downgraders who would destroy the democratic foundations on which this country was founded.

PUBLISHER OF REPUBLIC WINS AWARD

LAWRENCE, KANS.—Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of The Arizona Republic and The Phoenix Gazette, will receive the William Allen White Award for journalistic merit here on Feb. 10.

Pulliam, a native of Kansas, also will deliver the William Allen White Lecture at the University of Kansas that day.

The honor, given annually for the past 20 years by the university's William Allen White Foundation, goes to the American journalist who exemplifies White's "ideals in service to his profession and his country."

The citation is presented annually on the birthday of White, renowed editor of the Emporia, Kan., Gazette, who died in 1944. The foundation which bears his name was founded shortly after his death in order to prepetuate his memory and the principles for which he stood.

Other foundation goals are service to the profession and to the William Allen White School of Journalism at the university.

Pullian's other newspapers include the Indianapolis Star, the Indianapolis News, the Muncie, Ind., Star, the Muncie Press, and the Vincennes, Ind., Sun-Commercial.

He is a member of the Associated Press board of directors and first vice president of that organization.

The publisher began his newspaper associations at the age of 6, delivering the Iola, Kans., Register, owned a newspaper at Atchison, Kans., shortly after graduation from De Pauw University, and early in his professional life worked as a reporter for the Kansas City Star.

During his newspaper career he has owned and operated 47 newspapers, as many as 23 at one time, in eight states.

Former winners of the White award are: Walter Cronkite, managing editor, CBS News; Mark Ethridge, editor emeritus, Louisville Courier-Journal; Wes Gallagher, general manager, the Associated Press; Gardner Cowles, publisher, Des Moines Register and Tribune and Look Magazine; Earl J. Johnson, former editor, United Press International; Clark Mollenhoff, former Washington Bureau chief, Des Moines Register and Tribune and now a White House aide; Paul Miller, president, Associated Press and an executive of Gannett Newspapers; Bernard Kilgore (deceased), former publisher, Wall Street Journal.

Also, Hodding Carter, publisher, Greenville, Miss., Delta Democrat-Times; Jules Dubois (deceased), Latin America correspondent, Chicago Tribune; Ben Hibbs, former editor, Saturday Evening Post; Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor, Tulsa Tribune; Irving Dilliard, former managing editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Roy Roberts (deceased), former editor and publisher, Kansas City Star; Norman Isaacs, executive editor, Louisville Courier-Journal and Louisville Times; Grove Patterson (deceased), former editor, Toledo Blade; E. Palmer Hoyt, publisher, Denver Post; Erwin Canham, editor-in-chief, Christian Science Monitor; Ernest K. Lindley, former editor, Newsweek; and James Reston, executive editor, New York Times.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, one of the major weapons in President Nixon's fight against crime is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. LEAA was created by Congress in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to assist State and local governments in combating crime and improving criminal justice in this Nation through a system of direct grants to States and units of local government. This measure recognizes that while crime is a problem of national magnitude, it must in the first instance be dealt with at the local level. Under the LEAA, an effective working relationship has been established between the Federal Government and the States and cities and counties of this Nation to encourage and assist action at the local level. U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell has announced that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration will allocate $236 million in direct grants to States and cities and counties for planning and action programs to combat crime. This is more than a 400 percent increase over last year's expenditures for this program. This will be money well spent. I am particularly delighted that my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will receive $998,000 for planning grants and $10,591,000 for action grants.

As a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures that helped to draft this measure, I am familiar with the many steps already taken by LEAA to combat crime and improve criminal justice in this Nation, as well as the great promise that this program holds for the future. President Nixon is to be commended for making this significant commitment to a safer and more just society.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn today that Attorney General Mitchell has again expressed his support of the program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. In announcing the allocation of the block grants going to the several States in fiscal year 1970, Attorney Gentral Mitchell said:

The allocations we are announcing today represent a promising beginning for the federal-state partnership to defeat crime in the streets. The first prerequisite for any effective anticrime program is sufficient funding, not expansive rhetoric. We hope that the states will submit imaginative and well-conceived plans for the use of these funds.

Mr. President, the programs administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration are the Nation's first comprehensive anticrime programs and are authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. LEAA gives both planning and action block grants to all 50 States and four territories in order that these jurisdictions may develop programs aimed at strengthening and improving the criminal justice system in our Nation. These funds can be used to make improvements in all elements of the criminal justice system—police, courts, and corrections.

With only a small budget of $63 million of fiscal year 1969, LEAA directed the development of comprehensive plans for the improvement of law enforcement in every jurisdiction authorized to participate in the program. In fiscal year 1969 the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency received $410,541 in block grant funds and participated with other States in two discretionary grants of $600,000 to develop the prototype of a criminal justice information and statistics system and $80,000 to plan criminal justice improvement programs for the Four Corners Indian area. In addition to these amounts, four Arizona colleges received a total of $69,100 to enable them to make grants and loans to in-service and preservice law enforcement students.

In fiscal year 1970 the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency will receive $228,000 planning funds and $1,503,000 action funds to continue their crime program designed to make improvements in our State criminal justice system. Mr. President, I have been pleased with the first year operations of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Its programs have been beneficial and promise to bring about many innovative and helpful changes in the areas of crime prevention and the administration of criminal justice.

There is an excellent overview of the program of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration contained in the first six pages of the LEAA first annual report. I ask unanimous consent that these pages be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMARY OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

GRANTS

The first comprehensive national crime control program enacted by Congress formally began operations on October 21, 1968. By June 30, 1969, plans for criminal justice reforms had been submitted by 50 states, Washington, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam—and they had received action grants totaling more than $25 million to carry out the plans.

The plans varied, since states set their own priorities for use of the federal funds, but all included programs to improve police, corrections, and courts. Here are examples of the diversity of state projects supported by action funds:

Alabama will modernize police departments and conduct juvenile delinquency prevention projects.

Alaska will create a state-wide criminal justice teletype network.

Arizona is using one-third of its funds for police training.

Arkansas will expand police research, begin public education in crime control, and purchase new police equipment.

California is allocating more than $800,000 to improve prevention and control of civil disorders.

Colorado will obtain new communications equipment to serve a number of police jurisdictions.

Connecticut will create crime prevention programs and community homes for delinquents.

Delaware will develop community relations units and conduct corrections research.

Florida is using $312,000 of its $867,100 grant to build a criminal justice information system.

Georgia will begin a pilot program of work release for inmates of correctional institutions.

Hawaii will support crime laboratory facilities.

Idaho will conduct training seminars for judges and develop a procedures manual for magistrates.

Illinois will study approaches to controlling organized crime and conduct drug abuse education.

Indiana will work to reduce racial tensions, strengthen narcotics control, and support defense of indigents.

Iowa's largest budget item is for prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

Kansas will strengthen corrections programs.

Kentucky is stressing crime prevention and police research and training.

Louisiana will develop a uniform court records system.

Maine will use half of its funds to improve police selection and training.

Maryland will work to reduce recidivism by former inmates.

Massachusetts will improve management and operations of criminal justice agencies.

Michigan will spend one-tenth of its $1 million grant to train juvenile court staffs and probation aides.

Minnesota will enhance police education and training and create a riot-readiness program.

Mississippi will improve training standards for police and corrections personnel and develop a uniform crime reports program.

Missouri will strengthen prosecutors' offices and create a criminal justice information system.

Montana is developing a program of public education, crime prevention, and community involvement.

Nebraska will improve law enforcement communications systems.

New Hampshire will expand rehabilitation programs for adult offenders and combat drug abuse.

Nevada will improve police communications and equipment.

New Jersey will strengthen crime prevention and control through a project to reduce police response time.

New Mexico is spending 20 percent of its funds to improve corrections.

New York will improve police patrol, and combat organized crime.

North Carolina will revise its criminal code and improve case preparation, court sentencing and scheduling, and rehabilitation of offenders.

North Dakota will work to control alcoholism and crime.

Ohio will enhance police training and equipment and develop a criminal justice information system.

Oklahoma is expanding both its probation-parole services and police-community relations programs.

Oregon will create ways to improve apprehension and prosecution of offenders.

Pennsylvania is expanding juvenile delinquency and courts-prosecution-defense programs.

Rhode Island is consolidating police support services in the Western part of the state and improving the police communications system in Providence.

South Carolina will expand police training and re-codify its criminal code.

South Dakota will create a juvenile court center and strengthen narcotics control.

Tennessee will intensify training for corrections and police personnel and unify the court system.

Texas projects will improve communications and information systems for police and community relations programs.

Utah will enlarge police operations and revise the criminal code.

Vermont will improve police training and communications and develop a law enforcement manual.

Virginia will create regional crime laboratories and study its court system.

Washington State is beginning a variety of delinquency and youth projects.

West Virginia will improve prosecution programs, conduct anti-burglary projects, and survey organized crime.

Wisconsin is giving priority to improved police training, purchase of emergency communications equipment, and strengthening community relations.

Wyoming will develop a police communications system covering all counties in the State.

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was signed into law on June 19, 1968 after being approved by the Senate on May 23 and the House of Representatives on June 6. Title I, creating the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), began with this statement:

Congress finds that the high incidence of crime in the United States threatens the peace, security, and general welfare of the Nation and its citizens. To prevent crime and to insure the greater safety of the people, law enforcement efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective at all levels of government.

Congress finds further that crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by State and local governments if it is to be controlled effectively.

It is therefore the declared policy of the Congress to assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement at every level by national assistance. It is the purpose of this title to (1) encourage States and units of general local government to prepare and adopt comprehensive plans based upon their evaluation of State and local problems of law enforcement; (2) authorize grants to States and units of local government in order to improve and strengthen law enforcement; and (3) encourage research and development directed toward the improvement of law enforcement and the development of new methods for the prevention and reduction of crime and the detection and apprehension of criminals.

This first annual report by LEAA to the President and to Congress contains details of the program and describes how the general objectives of Title I have been met. The report is for fiscal 1969—July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969—though LEAA operations were compressed into a shorter time period, as these dates indicate: August 9, when Congress approved a $63 million budget; and October 21, when LEAA's first administrators took office. With the exception of riot prevention and control funds awarded in August and selective continuation awards for projects approved under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, grants could be made only by the Administrators.

The preface to Title I said one program objective was to encourage state and local governments to prepare plans for comprehensive law enforcement improvements, and this was accomplished. Each state created a planning agency and drafted plans for criminal justice system improvements, as did Washington, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Another objective called for award of grants to state and local governments for improvement programs, and this also was done. Planning grants to the states totaled almost $19 million. Action grants totaling more than $25 million were given later to carry out the plans. LEAA also awarded $4.35 million under its discretionary authority to aid cities and states and to finance numerous criminal justice projects.

The Act stressed research in crime control and prevention, and this, too, began. The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the research body of LEAA, awarded grants for a variety of programs and began studying development of new police equipment.

Prior to the Act, no comprehensive national program existed to improve the criminal justice systems of the states, but every state during the year became deeply involved, with city and county governments, in intensive planning. Each state then took the critical second step—initiation of action programs to improve law enforcement.

The federal partnership role recognized the important components of the criminal justice system:

Police departments need more manpower, more equipment, better training, greater public support if they are to apprehend more criminals and prevent more crime;

Courts need assistance to help eliminate large backlogs of cases that exist in many parts of the country;

Corrections systems need more resources to reduce the high rate of recidivism, since rehabilitation is crime prevention.

Those are the major areas of concern of LEAA. Though approaches often vary since states set their own priorities, every important aspect of the nation's crime problem is being reviewed, whether it ranges from civil disorders to organized crime, street attacks to burglaries, juvenile delinquency to drug control.

THE GRANT PROCESS

Aid given by LEAA is reflected in a breakdown of its $63 million budget: $19 million for planning grants, $29 million for action grants, $3 million for research and development, $6.5 million for academic assistance, $2.5 million for administration, $3 million for FBI programs—which the FBI administers itself.

For planning grants, each state received a basic $100,000 and an additional amount based upon population. Totals ranged from $118,225 for Alaska to $1,387,900 for California. All planning funds went to the states in block grants, and they proceeded to make at least 40 percent available to local governments.

Action grants first were allocated solely on population, ranging from $33,278 for Alaska to $2,351,610 for California, but an additional $350,000 in discretionary funds later was awarded to provide 11 low population states and Washington, D.C. with a minimum of $100,000. Eighty-five percent of the total action funds were given to states in block grants—$25 million of $29 million—and the states will make at least 75 percent available to local governments. LEAA used $4 million for discretionary awards.

Since most states had no planning agencies when the program began, 20 percent advances on planning funds—totaling $3.2 million—were made to 48 states in the fall of 1968 to begin Title I operations. Full planning awards were made in January.

The states then began preparing comprehensive law enforcement improvement programs, and the procedures involved large numbers of persons, including professional staff planners and supervisory boards of public officials and private citizens. To help states meet the deadline for submitting action plans, LEAA in March simplified first-year application requirements. The states originally were required to submit detailed 5-year plans, plus detailed descriptions of administrative procedures. The new process required only the first-year program in detail.

The first action plan submitted was from California on April 10, containing 5,896 pages in 26 volumes. The planning had a broad base—with some 1,500 persons participating. Other plans soon arrived and were studied closely by the LEAA staff to make certain they were as comprehensive as possible and otherwise met statutory requirements. Some states broadened and expanded portions of their plans after consultation with LEAA. The first action grant was to California on May 22. Awards to other states followed quickly, and every plan was approved by June 30. Not all improvement funds are federal. For most action projects, the federal share is 60 percent, the state-local share 40 percent. The federal share is 75 percent for

organized crime and civil disorders programs. For construction projects, the federal share is 50 percent, the state-local share 50 perment. The federal share is 90 percent for planning programs.

Distribution of $63 million—LEAA Funds, Fiscal 1969

[In millions]

Administration	$2.5
Expansion of FBI training	3
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice	3
Discretionary action grant funds	4.35
Academic assistance	6.5
Planning grants to States with 40 per cent to local governments	9
Action grants to States with 75 per cent to local governments	24.65

(The first LEAA awards were special grants, to states applying by August 31, 1968, for riot prevention, detection, and control. A total of $3.9 million was given to 40 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico—all that applied.)

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

Planning and action grants to the states comprised the bulk of LEAA financial assistance, but there also were other important grants. Part of the $4 million in action funds available for award at the agency's discretion was used to help meet urgent needs of a number of cities and states.

In May, LEAA made available $1.1 million to the nation's 11 largest cities—up to $100,000 each—for special crime prevention and control projects: New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, Dallas, Cleveland, San Francisco, and Milwaukee. All received funds by June 30. Projects were varied: Philadelphia a program to prevent violence by youth gangs; New York, a high-speed system to transmit fingerprints; Chicago and Houston, rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; Baltimore, anti-crime patrols by helicopter.

A $600,000 discretionary grant was awarded in June to Arizona, California, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York to help develop the prototype of a computerized criminal justice statistics system. The project will develop standardized offender records, and may serve as a forerunner for a national system to collect statistics for every important aspect of criminal justice.

Since no minimum was set for action grants, 11 states and Washington, D.C. would have received less than $100,000 each. To make up for this, $350,000 in discretionary funds was awarded in April to all 12. Though the amounts varied—Alaska got $72,000 more, Hawaii $10,000—in most cases they were enough to provide a more meaningful start on programs.

An $80,717 grant to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) financed conferences on such problems as civil and campus disorders for police chiefs of 150 major cities. A $230,000 grant to 64 state and local law enforcement agencies helped finance participation in the FBI's National Crime Information Center.

Other grants included:

$150,000 to help develop a computerized intelligence system for organized crime that could serve as a prototype for the states.

Some $1.3 million to continue projects begun by the old Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, including research and demonstration programs of general application.

Nearly $100,000 each to the American Correctional Association for state conferences on how to improve corrections systems and to WGBH Educational Foundation in Boston for police training programs televised throughout New England.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

The LEAA Division with basic responsibility for processing state block grants and discretionary funds is the Office of Law Enforcement Programs (OLEP), the biggest section of the agency. Its four regional desks gave assistance to states in drafting their programs, and their personnel made hundreds of trips through the 50 states. Other planning aid included a detailed *Guide for State Planning Agency Grants*, containing step-by-step instructions on the grant application process, guidelines on state planning agencies, makeup of supervisory boards. LEAA also sponsored a number of meetings for state planners.

OLEP contains the agency's program divisions, and two—organized crime and corrections—began operations to assist the states in planning preparation, serve as consultants for specific action programs, and conduct personnel training. The Organized Crime Division designed a series of regional conferences, to begin early in fiscal 1970, for selected policemen and prosecutors on how to create more effective enforcement programs. The Division also was involved in development of a computerized intelligence system and began writing manuals for police and prosecutors.

The Corrections Division's assistance ranged from consultation on the corrections components of state plans to advising states on specific improvements in education and vocational training programs and design and renovation of institutions. It also helped process discretionary grants, supported preparation of a handbook on prevention and control of prison disturbances, and gave grants for personnel training. Program divisions for police, courts, and riots and civil disorders began.

RESEARCH

Criminal justice research is the responsibility of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and its centers cover Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation, Criminal Justice Operations and Management, Law and Justice, and Demonstrations and Professional Services. The Institute conducts research with its staff members and awards grants to scientists, universities, research groups, and other government agencies.

The Institute began work on development of two items of equipment a national survey indicated are most needed by police. One is a personalized miniature radio transceiver that would enable a foot patrolman to keep in touch with headquarters. The other is a night vision device for police patrols in dimly-lighted sections of urban areas. The Institute is working with the Department of Defense to adapt a similar military device for police use.

The Institute began development of a study on ways to measure conditions indicating when riots are about to erupt, and worked with the Federal Communications Commission to initiate a system for police to use military radio frequencies during riots. Another project involved study of the causes of a variety of violent crimes—and ways to prevent them. A $150,000 grant went to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Another grant was for a study of the penetration of legitimate business by organized crime. Police programs included ways to: speed arrival time of officers at a crime scene, enhance personnel selection and training, prevent more crime through better antiburglary and theft devices, predict where robberies are most likely to occur, and better utilize police patrols.

ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE

The third major part of LEAA, the Office of Academic Assistance, provides funds for college degree studies by law enforcement and corrections personnel and promising students preparing for careers in those fields. A total of $6.5 million was given to 485 colleges and universities, which administer all grants and loans, in time for use in the second half of the 1968–69 academic year. Approved courses included those offering degrees or certificates in police science, criminology, criminalistics, police administration; law enforcement technology, criminal justice, public safety administration, corrections, penology, and correctional administration. Work also could be done in such related fields as psychology, sociology, and computer technology. Loans of up to $1,800 per academic year were available for full-time study. Grants of up to $200 per quarter or $300 per semester could be used for full- or part-time study. More than 23,000 students received financial aid in the second half of the 1968–69 academic year and in the following summer session.

STAFF SIZE

At the end of the fiscal year, the LEAA staff totaled 121 persons. Slightly less than half were professionals, the rest clerical. When the LEAA program began, there were 15 professional and 10 clerical employees.

This opening chapter has been designed to give a general view of the program. Following chapters will discuss it in greater detail. The appendices contain grant lists and related material.

ORGANIZED CRIME—TITLE I OF S. 30

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on December 9, 1969, the junior Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) announced that he was seriously considering opposing title I of S. 30 when that title comes up for debate. On December 18, 1969, I discussed Senator GOODELL's tentative position to title I and included in my remarks a history of grand jury reports in New York so that this body might have the benefit of the New York experience. I also had reprinted in the RECORD a well-written and scholarly article written by Mr. Richard H. Kuh that was published in the Columbia Law Review. Mr. Kuh's article more than satisfactorily replies to the charges against grand jury reports commonly made by those in opposition to them.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I do not believe that this body should be satisfied with a theoretical and abstract debate largely focusing on a speculative possibility of abuse when more factual information is available. For this reason, on December 5, 1969, I had printed in the RECORD a grand jury report from New Jersey, which authorized grand jury reports on common law grounds. I should now like to make available a similar report from New York, which only became public this year. I emphasize particularly the New York report, since title I of S. 30 is modeled on the New York law that governed the issuance of this report. Upon request, Mr. Burton Roberts, district attorney of Bronx County, N.Y., furnished me a copy of the report, which is, of course, now a public document under New York law.

Mr. President, on December 5, I noted that the New Jersey grand jury report probably contained some information which could not have been published under title I. The report prepared in Mr. Roberts' district probably represents the maximum of the "fancied evils" alleged to exist under title I. With these reports in the RECORD, therefore, this body will have the benefit of two actual examples, which fully illustrate the outer limits of title I to aid its deliberations on this title. One of these reports deals with organized crime; one does not. There

should not be any doubt in this body now as to what we are voting for or against.

Mr. President, I ask each Member of this body to ask himself whether the corruption of legitimate endeavors by organized crime in New Jersey should be reported to the public. In light of the allegations of governmental corruption in some States, I believe that there must be dual jurisdiction to publish these reports. Each Senator must ask himself whether he believes that voting fraud, such as apparently exists in the Bronx, should be reported to the public. Each Senator should ask himself whether those responsible for such occurrences should be made known to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Bronx County grand jury appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have also obtained a copy of a 1967 grand jury report from Northampton County, Pa. I also commend this document to this body. Although the report shows that there was evidence of an organized gambling ring, it would have been difficult, apparently, to show by a preponderance of the evidence that a national syndicate was involved. Nevertheless, I believe that this sort of report showing the public the extent of illegal activity should be allowed, even though on one reading of the meaning of the phase, it might be possible to suggest that organized crime was not involved.

I note, too, that we should compare this report with the newspaper accounts set out in the report. Each Member of the Senate should then compare this well-written and cautious report with newspaper accounts within his own knowledge. I ask this body, Is not the public, and the cause of justice better served by this type of report than by often sloppy, biased and inadequately researched articles in the public media?

I ask unanimous consent that this report appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT OF THE NOVEMBER 1968 "A" TERM OF THE BRONX COUNTY GRAND JURY

Supreme Court of the state of New York, County of Bronx: Trial term: Part XII, In the Matter of the Board of Elections of the City of New York.

To: Justice Presiding, Part XII, November 1969 Term.

Pursuant to its statutory mandate to inquire into all crimes committed or triable in Bronx County (Code Crim. Proc. § 245), the November 1968 "A" Term of the Bronx County Grand Jury conducted an investigation of possible violations of the New York State Election and Penal Law which occurred in Bronx County during and subsequent to the presidential election of November 5, 1968. The impetus for this inquest was provided by a complaint which alleged that some time during the period from November 5, 1968 to November 19, 1968, three voting machines—used in the 14th, 15th and 45th Election Districts of the 86th Assembly District respectively—had been tampered with and intentionally damaged in an apparent effort to change the results of the election for the position of State Assemblyman of the 86th Assembly District.

Beginning November 25, 1968, and in the course of four sessions, thirty-five witnesses testified before the Grand Jury. They included a Commissioner of the New York City Board of Elections, the two candidates for the office of Assemblyman of the 86th Assembly District, the police officers present when the machines in question were canvassed, and some twenty-eight employees of the Bronx County Office of the Board of Elections. In addition, the physical operation of the voting machine used in this election was demonstrated and explained by its inventor and manufacturer.

The evidence before the Grand Jury demonstrated that at some time between the first canvass of votes, taken on the night of November 5, 1968, and the recanvass, which took place from November 13th to November 19, 1968, the three machines in question had been opened without authorization and the counters reflecting the votes cast for the candidates running for Assemblyman in the 86th Assembly District had been manipulated in an apparent effort to reverse the election results as recorded on the night of November 5, 1968. While the proof conclusively established that criminal acts did occur, it was impossible to charge any one individual with specific culpability.

The evidence, however, did reveal to this Grand Jury certain irregularities in the operations of the Bronx County Office of the Board of Elections during the time in question which fell far short of the standards imposed by law and which seriously compromised the integrity of that office as it existed and as it presently exists. Moreover, one man—Mr. Michael Squitieri, the Deputy Chief Clerk of the office—was repeatedly criticized in the Grand Jury by both superiors and subordinates for certain abuses and incompetence prior to and during the election.

Since no specific instance of criminality could be established, Grand Jury action is limited by law to the issuance of a report concerning non-criminal misconduct, nonfeasance or neglect in office by a public officer or employee as the basis for a recommendation of removal or disciplinary action and which also may propose recommendations for legislative, executive or administrative action in the public interest (Code Crim. Proc. § 253-a (a), (c)). This Grand Jury would normally be loathe to criticize any one individual on the basis of its proceedings in the absence of an indictment; and we regret that such action is warranted in this situation. However, in our view, it is essential that the voting process itself take place in a wholly impartial setting, for, as Mr. Justice Black stated:

"No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined." *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 17 (1964).

Accordingly, this report tangibly manifests the Grand Jury's desire to discharge both its legal obligation and moral responsibility, by urging that steps be taken to safeguard the integrity of the election process and to ensure that it be kept free from any possible taint.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS CONCERNING THE TAMPERING WITH THE MACHINES

On November 5, 1968 citizens of the 86th Assembly District were called upon to cast their vote for thirty-two candidates running for various national, state and local offices. On Line 32, the bottom line of the ballot, Joseph Fusco and Anthony Stella were listed as the candidates for the position of Assemblyman. Candidate Fusco was the Republican (Line A) and Conservative (Line C) nominee, while Candidate Stella was the nominee of the Democratic (Line B) and Liberal (Line D) parties.

When the polls closed on election night all concerned believed that Mr. Stella had won the election. Public media declared him to be the winner with a plurality of between 500 and 800 of the total votes cast in the entire Assembly District (31–32).[1] The candidates themselves had formed similar opinions. Mr. Stella believed himself to be the victor though he did not receive any message of concession from his opponent (60). Similarly, Mr. Fusco's supporters informed him that he had lost by 506 votes (442) and he did not ask for a recount or for an impounding of the machine at that time (94). And Mr. Stella's margin of victory was also reflected by the totals on the three machines in question. The results of the official canvass of these three machines alone—which was recorded by police officers and election inspectors—indicated that Mr. Stella had a total of 733 votes while 314 votes were cast for Mr. Fusco (33–39).

The recanvass of votes, as required by law, was started by personnel of the Board of Elections in their offices in Bronx County at 1780 Grand Concourse on or about November 13, 1968 (248, 281). Until then the machines, which were brought over by truck, had been at their respective polling places (73, 425).

During the recanvass, it was discovered that the three machines in question had been opened in violation of law. When the votes on these machines were tallied in the recanvass, a sharp change from the totals recorded on election night was noted. Mr. Fusco now had 633 votes to Mr. Stella's total of 299. Significantly, though the recanvass included an examination of the totals for every candidate on the ballot, the only discrepancy was with regard to Line 32. No other office was affected (39–44)[2]

A physical examination of the machines in question also indicated the criminal tampering. Mr. Ransom Shoup, the machine's inventor, explained the operation of three devices which were designed to detect such activity. He explained that every machine has a protective and a public counter, both of which record the total number of votes cast in a given election. These counters differ in that the public counter is reset at zero at the start of every election while the protective counter, much like an odometer in a car, cannot be reset and thus shows the total number of votes cast on the machine since it was first used. Instead, the total showing on the protective counter at the start of an election is recorded and then at the end of an election is subtracted from the new total on the protective counter. Finally, he stated that any effort to change the totals shown for any candidate would have to be made by using a device known as the reset screw (148–49). If such an effort were made, however, it would be reflected by the protective counter which, in addition to counting the number of votes cast on the machine, is designed to increase by the number of times the reset screw is turned. Thus, since all the votes cast in a given election register on both the public and protective counters, their totals when the polls close should be the same after the prerecorded number on the protective counter is subtracted. Any discrepancy would indicate the number of times the reset screw had been operated in the interim.

In each of the three machines in question, the totals of the protective counter were

[1] Parenthetical references are to the numbered pages of the stenographic Grand Jury minutes.

[2] The totals for each candidate on each machine, both before and after the tampering was discovered, are shown in the appendix attached hereto.

from one to three digits higher than had been recorded during the canvass on November 5, 1968 (154–56), which indicated beyond any doubt that the machines had been tampered with after the polls had closed.

In addition, the Grand Jury learned that although each machine can be opened by the use of its assigned key, seals are placed on the front apron of the machines before election. These seals are only to be opened after a recanvass to get the official vote tallies from the machines. On each of the three machines in question, these seals were broken at some time before the recanvass started and the lock to the door on one machine was also broken and a hinge was sprung (136–44).

FINDINGS, INCIDENT TO THE INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL TAMPERING

The Board of Elections of the City of New York is designed, by statute, to have a bipartisan membership. Four commissioners—two Republicans and two Democrats—head the organization. They are appointed to a four-year term by the City Council upon the recommendation of their respective county committees (8, Election Law § 30).

The method of selecting subordinate personal in the Bronx County Office is quite similar and appointees do not have to meet competitive Civil Service standards. Republican and Democratic county leaders indicate their choices to the Chief Clerk of the county office, who, in turn, forwards the names to the Commissioners who ultimately make the official appointments (14–15, 434). Only Mr. T. Vincent Stapleton, the Chief Clerk, qualified by Civil Service examination when he first came to the job (435).

Salaries range from approximately $4500 for a clerical worker to a top of $12,500 earned by Mr. Stapleton, the Chief Clerk with 39 years service (379, 418). Virtually all witnesses, particularly those in supervisory capacities, conceded that the low salary scale made it difficult to hire qualified personnel (498). As a result, individuals appointed were often those whose private business ventures failed in the past (389, 509); or who were retired (497); or who were housewives seeking to supplement their family's income (513).

Of the 28 employees of the Board who testified before this Grand Jury, 15 were appointed upon the recommendation of the Republican Party, while nine secured their appointments with the recommendation of the Democratic Party. Other than party affiliation, no further credentials were apparently required and no training was given. However, custodians who were responsible for the maintenance of the voting machines had to attend some courses in that connection (162–63, 375–79).

With their political affiliation as the only requisite for employment with the Board, several witnesses actively supported their political organization either by working on the district level or by financial contribution. Of these 28 witnesses, seven were politically active in their local clubs (233, 242, 259, 370, 391, 512, 530) and seven stated that they went to their party's county-wide dinner on a regular basis (200, 250, 273, 387, 487, 500, 532).

While such political activity normally would not be criticized, there were several indications, that it was inspired by something other than a genuine party loyalty. Three witnesses acknowledged that they bought more tickets to the county dinners after either being promoted or appointed to the Board than they did before (392, 402, 488). Two other witnesses stated that they believed some form of retribution, whether it be a lack of advancement or an admonition, would await those who refused to attend the dinners as asked (266–67, 533). Finally, one witness testified that he was asked to resign from his position with the Board of Elections because he had not been participating actively enough in his local political club (260).

And it is in this regard that the members of this Grand Jury note the conduct of Mr. Michael Squitieri—who allegedly demanded the resignation mentioned above.

Mr. Squitieri was the Republican Party District Leader in the 76th Assembly District and was appointed Deputy Chief Clerk of the Bronx Office of the Board of Elections in 1966. As a district leader he acknowledged that he had exhorted his club members to work actively in the Republican campaign but stated that this was only up until Election Day (252). He further stated that according to "county regulation", each Republican employee of the Board of Elections in Bronx County was required to buy at least one and "maybe two" tickets to the yearly county dinner. He denied, however, that a failure to honor this "assessment"—at a cost of $50 per plate—would compromise the job standing of an employee who refused to attend (249–50). Also, as district leader, Mr. Squitieri was personally responsible for the appointment of one of his club members as an employee in the Bronx Office of the Board of Elections, while two other members of his club had obtained their jobs before he came to power (242).

As Deputy Chief Clerk, however, Mr. Squitieri's efforts were clearly less productive—and his abuse of authority was not at all infrequent. Two employees of the Board testified that on several occasions Mr. Squiteri solicited personal favors from them which often consisted of their providing him with automotive transportation during working hours (261, 349). Yet another witness, similarly employed, testified that at least one errand he performed for Mr. Squitieri consisted of picking up campaign literature from Republican County Headquarters for distribution to the local clubs (532).

In addition, no fewer than ten of Mr. Squitieri's subordinates were critical of his effectiveness as Deputy Chief Clerk, often stating that they rarely saw him do any work or had no idea what his function was (174, 199, 264, 289, 312, 335, 345, 352, 522, 545). And his immediate superior, Mr. Stapleton, stated that his interest, performance and knowledge of his duties were not adequate (420–23).

Perhaps the most significant example of his ineptitude was his unwillingness or inability to assume the responsibilities that were properly his during the instant election.

Shortly before the election was held, Mr. Stapleton as Chief Clerk and head of the Bronx County office, took an unplanned leave of absence due to the death of his wife. He did not return to work until November 23, 1968 (418–19). In his absence Mr. Squitieri, as Deputy Chief Clerk, became responsible for the operation of the entire office—which authority was emphasized by the fact that Mr. Squitieri was one of the first few people to be given official notification by Commissioner O'Rourke when the damage to the machines was discovered (419, 420, 444). Accordingly, as the acting head of the county office, it was properly his duty to designate the custodians and clerks needed to perform the recanvass of the voting machines—at least this was the understanding of Mr. Stapleton (423–24). Yet, notwithstanding this delegation of authority, Mr. Squitieri claimed that two of the administrative assistants had the responsibility and he denied having made any assignments (243–44). Of these two assistants, one claimed that she asked Mr. Squitieri to make the assignments (180) and one of the workers actually assigned to the machines in question stated that yet a third administrative assistant had actually made the designation (272). In brief, this breakdown in the chain of command made it all but impossible for the members of this Grand Jury to determine just who was responsible for the assignment of the workers to the various machines—a focal point of the investigation which was not resolved.

And we would be remiss if we failed to note two practices of the Bronx Office which, considering the sensitivity of the office during an election, would seem to reflect a complete disregard for the concomitant need for security. First, according to the testimony of one supervisor, there was no regulation that prevented a worker from performing the recanvass of a machine that was used in the same Assembly District in which the worker resided (181). Second, the statutory requirement that the keys for voting machines be kept securely locked was, for all practical purposes, overlooked (Election Law § 264).

Three sets of keys were available for use with the machines. One of these sets was made up of master keys which were designed to fit groups of 25 machines. A second set designed to fit one machine each, was kept in a file cabinet. A third set, consisting of a duplicate key for each machine, was kept in a stockroom which was heavily trafficked during the day and to which all personnel had ready access though perhaps not the need to enter. The stockroom was locked only at night and the key to this room, in turn, was kept in the Chief Clerk's desk. Finally, with regard to the third set of keys, several witnesses stated that the whereabouts of these keys and the method of securing them was common knowledge shared by all employees (161, 188, 208, 432–44).

CONCLUSION

We repeat now what we said at the outset, namely, that it is the belief of this Grand Jury that the right to vote is among the most precious of those inherent to citizenship. As such, it is our further belief, that this privilege must be exercised in an atmosphere that is free from even the faintest shadow of suspicion. This report, therefore, manifests our hope to initiate reformation—particularly in our county but on a state-wide scale if necessary—which will promote the integrity of that environment.

Our efforts to evaluate the evidence presented, fairly and objectively, have led this body to conclude that the intense political partisanship that is native to the structure of the Board of Elections must be eliminated if our citizenry is to have faith in the electoral process; especially where there is only two party representation in that agency.

At present the Commissioners of Election are appointed by the City Council. Subordinate personnel in the Bronx County Office are appointed by the Commissioners. All depend upon the recommendation of political leaders for their jobs and many are quite active in political clubs during their tenure. The result is that those individuals who are duty-bound to regulate and supervise any election taking place in this county are those who have an avowed interest in the outcome. At best, this procedure makes it all but impossible to pinpoint the responsibility for an individual's appointment. Worse yet, such an environment is rife with potential conflicts of interest and abuse of office.

Mr. Squitieri's conduct is illustrative. In our view, his failure to take up the reins of responsibility, his manifest lack of interest and effort in his job, and, fundamentally, his abuses of requesting clearly personal and partisan favors from his subordinates during working hours, when taken together, have had a decidedly damaging effect on the Bronx County Office of the Board. We are compelled, therefore, to call for his immediate dismissal.

To be sure, we do not mean to condemn

political activity itself. Nor do we doubt that most employees of the Board of Elections are sincere and conscientious in the performance of their duties. But even the resignation of all employees—let alone that of one man—would not be the panacea. In the Grand Jury's view, it is not enough that the operation of the Board of Elections only be fair and impartial—its appearance as such should never be subject to question. And as we see it, so long as the present method of selecting personnel continues, incidents such as those we have already noted are sure to recur and the cloud of suspicion that arises will never be dispelled.

Accordingly, one recommendation is paramount: that the concept of political patronage—which all too often requires years of abject personal fealty and menial service to a partisan cause to obtain the favor of a local leader—be divorced completely and irrevocably from any role in the selection or advancement of employees of the Board of Elections.

Instead we suggest that individuals appointed in the future come from the ranks of wholly independent, civic-minded citizens who qualify for the job by meeting competitive Civil Service standards. Responsibility for appointments, as well as for all other operations, should be clearly defined. Toward that end, the Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Elections, somewhat like other city departments should be headed by one Commissioner, chosen by the Mayor for a term longer than his own so as to insure the Commissioner's independence. As a further safeguard, the Grand Jury recommends that subordinate personnel appointed to local offices be precluded by law from participating in partisan political activities in the county or district wherein they are employed.

We are not unmindful that to attract such men and women salaries will have to be raised, and to call for an increase in public expenditure may be criticized as an unrealistic approach. But with the right to vote as one of the great purposes of our scheme of government, and with groups of our citizens alienated by discrimination, poverty and age, the integrity of the environment in which that freedom is exercised can not be compromised and the remedial measures needed to correct its present state of deterioration in this country can not be ignored.

Dated, Bronx, New York, October 23, 1969.

APPENDIX

The following analysis shows the totals for both candidates on each of the three machines in question. The votes cast for Mr. Fusco, as the Republican and Conservative candidates, are shown on Columns A and C; while Columns B and D show the votes cast for Mr. Stella as the Democratic and Liberal nominee. The totals "Before" the tampering, as recorded on election night, may be found at pages 37 and 38 of the minutes while the totals "After" the tampering, noted during the recanvass, appear at pages 40–43 of the record. Thus, for example, it is readily apparent that as a result of the tampering with the machine used in the 45th Election District of the 86th Assembly District, 100 votes were taken from Mr. Stella as the Democratic candidate under Column B and 100 votes were added to Mr. Fusco's total under Column A.

TOTALS ON MACHINE USED IN 15TH ELECTION DISTRICT, 86TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

	Columns			
	A	B	C	D
Before	100	219	30	17
After	271	96	79	7

TOTALS ON MACHINE USED IN 14TH ELECTION DISTRICT, 86TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

	Columns			
	A	B	C	D
Before	90	307	19	21
After	189	106	19	21

TOTALS ON MACHINE USED IN 45TH ELECTION DISTRICT, 86TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

	Columns			
	A	B	C	D
Before	58	153	17	16
After	158	53	17	16

GRAND TOTAL

	Mr. Fusco (cols. A and C)	Mr. Stella (Cols. B and D)
Before	314	733
After	633	299
Net gain or loss	+319	−434

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF BRONX: TRIAL TERM PART XII, IN THE MATTER OF THE BOARD OF ELECTIONS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, REPORT OF THE NOVEMBER 1968 "A" TERM OF THE BRONX COUNTY GRAND JURY

Michael Squitieri, in response to the presentment of the Grand Jury herein, wishes to submit the following answer:

1. The facts presented to the Grand Jury does not show any acts of noncriminal misconduct, non-feasance or neglect of duties on part of myself.

2. That I am in agreement with the criticism by the Grand Jury as to the method of operation of the Board of Election and the selection of personnel but such facts presented before the Grand Jury, although sufficient for valid criticism, does not substantiate findings of misconduct, non-feasance or neglect of duties on my part.

3. The operation, management and control of the Board of Election were in the hands of the Chief Clerk, who personally would delegate authority to myself and other members of the Board as he saw fit.

4. That at the time in question considered by the Grand Jury, the Chief Clerk, prior to his taking a leave of absence, informed me that Mrs. Berger would operate and control the Board of Elections, and that she in fact did so and provided for security measures and ran the Board and made many decisions without the knowledge and/or consent of myself.

5. The inept system has been in operation at the Board of Elections prior to my appointment, has been continued under the management and control of the chief clerk, that many decisions were made and carried out without the chief clerk consulting me.

6. To single out myself for the ills and evils of an antiquated system is unfair in view of the facts and evidence that I was not allowed to manage, operate and control the Board during the absence of the Chief Clerk.

7. Said presentment is an accusation which affords me no opportunity to defer myself and prove my innocence of the accusations.

WHEREFORE, I respectfully request the Court to expunge that part of the report criticising me or sealing said report to prevent serious personal damage to my career and reputation, or for whatever relief that may be just.

MICHAEL SQUITIERI.

Dated: Bronx, New York, November 22, 1969.

STATE OF NEW YORK
County of Bronx SS:

On the 22 day of December 1969 before me personally came MICHAEL SQUITIERI to me known and known to me to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and who acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

DOMINICK A. FUSCO,
Notary Public, State of New York.

EXHIBIT 2

(In the Court of Quarter Sessions of Northampton County, Pennsylvania In re: Investigating Grand Jury, No. 138, February Term, 1967)

FINAL REPORT OF INVESTIGATING GRAND JURY

We are happy to report to your Honorable Court that we have completed the task assigned to us within the time alloted under the direction of Order of April 5, 1967.

Our task has been long and arduous, as expected, and, unexpectedly, beret with difficulties in its performance which should not have been encountered from the responsible agencies by which they were caused.

Nonetheless, we must assure this Court that for the most part the Jury was impressed with the cooperation extended to it by the majority of agencies and individuals to whom application was made for assistance.

Accordingly, we now make final report of our proceedings which we feel to have been fruitful and worthwhile and will result in some measure in the improvement of county law enforcement.

I. REASON FOR THE INVESTIGATION

It will be recalled that in January, 1967, the Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a gambling raid in the City of Easton and its environs which allegedly resulted from evidence elicited in a Federal Grand Jury Investigation into organized crime.

Prior to the raid, the Federal authorities had secured Federal indictments charging certain Northampton County residents with Federal gambling violations. Among these was one Joseph Migliazza. When arrested, a slip of paper was taken from his person which, among other things, bore the notation, "$200.00—Ice."

An Assistant U.S. District Attorney, J. Shane Creamer, described this notation to mean the payment of graft to a public official.

Morning Call, February 28, 1967—"Creamer Defined 'Ice' as Graft."

Bethlehem Globe-Times, February 25, 1967—"J. Shane Creamer . . . contended that papers seized on one of the arrested Easton gambling suspects showed what appeared to be a graft payment to someone in local government."

These comments, among others, on the part of a highly placed Federal official resulted in great local unrest. In addition, local responsible pronouncements relating to possible widespread corruption unsettled public confidence in law enforcement and local government. Only one such pronouncement need be recalled to illustrate:

"It is highly probable that some policemen and municipal government leaders were being 'iced' by the racketeers."

Editorial, Easton Express, March 2, 1967—"It is the responsibility of . . . government officials and prosecuting authorities to use every resource at their command in clearing up this question. If certain policemen and government officials have been part of this wretched system their crime is even more offensive than that for which such pay-offs are made."

In addition to the Federally inspired suspicions concerning the payment of graft to local public officials, the Federal authorities

described the Easton gambling operation to be an arm of the infamous Cosa Nostra:

Morning Call, February 28, 1967—"The Assistant U.S. Attorney said two branches of the Cosa Nostra enforced protection on gambling centers in the Easton area."

It was also common knowledge that gambling activities were being carried on in the County. For years reports had been received by the police and other law enforcement agencies about such activities. Particularly was this true about areas such as the Naturalized Citizens Americanization League, Bank and Pine Streets, Easton, Pennsylvania, Center Square in Easton and the Fourth and New Streets area of Bethlehem. Reports had also been received of such activities being carried on in a large scale in large plants and places of employment.

Sporadic raids made on these places and others by police agencies in some instances resulted in convictions of persons occupying minor positions in the gambling fraternity. On the majority of such instances, however, the raids were unsuccessful either because no evidence was found in such raids, or because such evidence was suppressed for legal reasons.

In one area, on two separate occasions within the past four years, undercover State Police agents were brought in from outside of the area in an effort to effect infiltration of the guilty circles and in that fashion to garner evidence sufficient to sustain convictions.

These efforts proved unsuccessful because of the identities of the undercover agents becoming known to the gambling elements.

It was apparent finally that the usual law enforcement procedures were not effective in dealing with the problem. This fact and the suspicions aroused relative to graft and pay-offs indicated the necessity of a Grand Jury investigation.

By virtue, in large part, of the foregoing, the Court was petitioned to authorize a Grand Jury investigation "into the nature and extent to gambling activities" in the County and into "the nature and extent of police efforts which have been undertaken to curtail and to suppress said activities" and "to make inquiry into the possibility of any public official being corruptly involved in the carrying on of any such activities."

On April 5, 1967, your Honorable Court granted the Petition and directed this Jury to conduct such an investigation.

II. METHODS EMPLOYED

The Grand Jury utilized a team of investigators under the very capable leadership of Detective Joseph Ritsick of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Working under his direction were county detectives and six Pennsylvania State Policemen specially assigned to the investigation, and five of whom were permanently stationed at localities outside of the Northampton County area. The services of local police officers were also utilized when occasions arose making this feasible.

It was at once apparent to the Jury that it would be a useless undertaking to immediately summon persons suspected or known to be active professionally in gambling circles—for the obvious prospect of receiving either perjured testimony or being met with the silence sanctioned by the Fifth Amendment.

The investigative team was therefore directed to initially compile lists of persons who, although not professionally connected with gambling operations, could reasonably be expected to have knowledge of such operations either through participation as players or bettors or for other reasons.

It was felt that it would be reasonable to expect truthful testimony from such witnesses and that such testimony would of necessity lead to and criminally involve the professionals. Such testimony would further subserve one of the Jury's paramount tasks—to inquire into the nature and extent of gambling in the County.

However, since "corruption" is by its very nature and of necessity a secret crime involving a "corrupter" and "the corrupted", its proof in most cases must depend on either of its participants admitting that it has occurred. This is especially true where no circumstantial evidence of corruption exists—such as great disparity between assets and income on the part of the one "corrupted".

Because of this realization the Jury stood ready to grant immunity in exchange for reliable evidence relating to corruption.

The investigators were nonetheless directed to investigate certain leads provided by informers, to investigate financial records, and, in some instances, to conduct surveillance in those cases where the Jury felt this was indicated.

Application was made to the Federal authorities through the office of the United States Attorney to furnish the jury with any information, evidence or testimony available to them bearing on the possibility of corruption.

A request to the Federal authorities to furnish a copy of the paper slip relative to the "ice" payment was not honored, nor was a request that they arrange for the appearance before the Grand Jury of the Federal agent who conducted the Easton investigation.

The Jury is at a loss to understand this reluctance on the part of the Federal authorities to furnish the Jury with information about local affairs under investigation by the Jury, especially since the local investigation was to a large extent triggered by the public disclosure of the Federal authorities of the existence of evidence relating to "ice". Since this was publicly described by the Federal authorities to mean graft, it is the opinion of the Jury that they should have made full disclosure of any other evidence in their possession on this subject, or, if they possess none, to have made admission to that effect.

Every police department in the County was notified that an intensive investigation was under way and request was made for providing any information they deemed pertinent to the investigation.

Countless interviews were held with police officers, public officials, informers and other persons whom it was felt could possibly supply information or leads relative to corruption.

As the result of these efforts the names of hundreds of prospective witnesses were secured by the Grand Jury. Résumés were prepared of what each of these witnesses could be expected to establish. Record was also kept relative to each witness concerning the person responsible for compiling the information concerning the witness and the person responsible for suggesting the issuance of a subpoena to him.

Ultimately testimony was taken by the Grand Jury from three hundred and ninety persons from all walks of life—police officers, politicians, executives, laborers, professional persons, professional gamblers and public officials.

Since the majority of those summoned were persons innocent of any legal wrongdoing an attempt was made to protect them from publicity by requesting the news media to refrain from publishing their identities. This attempt proved unsuccessful and the names were publicized by the news media.

It is felt that this publicity militated against the work of the Grand Jury in deterring citizens from volunteering information to the Grand Jury because of the fear of embarrassing publicity.

In addition to what the Jury feels was undue publicity given to its proceedings, its work was further hampered by descriptions of the proceedings as political in nature. These charges were leveled by both the press and persons in political life.

It is a matter of public record that the composition of the Grand Jury was bipartisan. Political considerations were of no concern to the Jury, nor were any of its actions influenced by politics.

Decisions made by the Jury were arrived at privately and solely by the Grand Jury. Neither the District Attorney nor any member of his staff at any time attempted to suggest or influence the Jury's actions.

All arrests made and the timing of the arrests were the result of Grand Jury recommendations, not the recommendation of the District Attorney or any member of his staff.

The District Attorney was not in control of, nor did he attempt to control the Grand Jury. Decisions concerning arrests and their timing was the decision of the Grand Jury alone.

III. EXTENT OF GAMBLING—DIFFICULTIES IN SUPPRESSING

The Grand Jury finds as a fact that gambling on horses, numbers and sporting events is widespread throughout the County, particularly in the Cities of Easton and Bethlehem, and the Borough of Northampton. We find as a further fact that the paramount reason for this condition is the apathy of the public—general acceptance of the belief that it works no harm—a feeling that if people wish to gamble they should be permitted to do so. Much of this apathy was evident from the attitude of many of the witnesses who appeared before the Jury who, if not downright hostile, were anything but frank in their testimony and saw fit to withhold information from the Jury which the Jury had reason to believe they were in a position to impart.

In those instances where perjury in material testimony was detected and its proof fully supported by the evidence, arrests for perjury were recommended.

These recommendations were not made lightly nor for any ulterior purpose, but were made because of the seriousness of the offense of willful violation of the judicial oath.

Since these proceedings are secret the Jury cannot understand the refusal of some witnesses to testify to the truth, causing the Jury to harbor suspicion concerning their motives or purposes in withholding the truth.

The fact that some of these recommendations related to police officers emphasizes the seriousness of the problem. For such witnesses to testify to anything less than the truth in this type of proceeding leads to substantial doubt about all of their activities.

Proper law enforcement also suffers from lack of public cooperation caused by fear of reprisal. Whether such fears are well-founded or not, they exist and significantly impede police efforts to curtail gambling.

The Jury had also found that large proportion of the gambling emanates from large places of employment which are beyond the reach of municipal police supervision.

The Jury is convinced from the testimony that it has heard that "leaks" from police agencies frequently occur. Such "leaks" do not necessarily imply corruption and can result equally as well through improper security, or by way of two unrelated police agencies conducting investigations simultaneously on the same subject, or by way of relationship or friendship.

Another paramount obstacle to effective enforcement is the fact that all of our communities are relatively small. Since the task of investigating rackets is primarily limited to those persons who comprise the detective divisions or vice squads of our municipal police forces, the identity of these persons becomes widely known, especially to those engaged in illicit undertakings. They are useless, therefore, for undercover work

and must rely primarily on informers for information concerning illegal ventures. Such information can be, of course, valuable, but in many instances its value is lost because of the unreliable source from which it emanates.

Simultaneous widespread raids on suspected gambling establishments also pose serious problems of security because of the necessity to employ large parties of police in their staging and in their deployment after the raids commence.

Possibilities of corruption are of course always present in the staging of a raid and these possibilities can emanate from many different sources.

Thus, in the ordinary investigation of a gambling case, one or two detectives gather the preliminary information often employing an informer or informers for the purpose. They render periodic reports to their superior and he, in turn, reports to his superior. When the decision is made to stage the raid, a search warrant must be obtained. This usually involves contact with the office of the District Attorney where he or one of his assistants assist in advising the officers on the legal aspects of the raid and assist in the preparation of the affidavit to support the search warrant. When this is done the warrant must then be obtained from a Justice of the Peace or Alderman.

It can readily be seen that the possibility of intentional or unintentional leaks increases at each stage, until the possible sources of a leak can emanate from:

(a) The detective or detectives,

(b) Their superior or superiors,

(c) The informer or informers,

(d) The District Attorney or any of his assistants,

(e) The Alderman or Justice of the Peace,

(f) Any police officials ultimately called to assist in the raid.

The same possibilities also exist with respect to corruption. If one or any of those sources has been corrupted, the chances of a successful raid are almost non-existent.

NATURE OF GAMBLING

The Jury has already indicated that gambling on horses, numbers and sporting events is widespread.

Peculiarly, horse betting and bets on sporting events is predominant in the Easton area whereas numbers betting predominates in the Bethlehem area.

It was established in this investigation that there is a definite link-up of the gambling fraternity in Northampton and Lehigh Counties. The testimony established beyond doubt that the ultimate destination of a substantial amount of the Bethlehem gambling proceeds is our neighboring county. The chief beneficiaries of this operation are syndicate in proportion and they are governed, managed and working for one man.

The evidence also disclosed ties between Allentown and Northampton and Allentown and Easton. The existence of New Jersey and New York influences was also evident.

There is also some betting on treasury balance tickets in the Bethlehem area and the supply of these emanated from Mount Pocono and the coal regions.

"Football tickets" and "basketball tickets" are widespread in all areas. The evidence indicates these in large part originated in the area of the Borough of Northampton.

Most of the bets are collected by "runners" who, for a percentage, pick up the bets at bars, clubs, places of employment, homes and on the street. The betting information is in most instances relayed to the bookmaker or poolseller by telephone. In those instances where a number of bookmakers are affiliated with a "bank" periodic reports and adjustments of accounts are made. Some bookmakers, who are otherwise independent, "lay-off" large money bets to "banks" or other bookmakers. That is, they will accept the bet but transfer it to someone else, not wishing to themselves risk the loss.

All of the foregoing, being as extensive and widespread as the Jury had found it to be, cannot be attributed to recent Supreme Court decisions. This activity was as extensive and widespread before those decisions were handed down.

We find that to properly combat the condition, if the methods now employed are to continue, will require substantial increases in the personnel of our police departments so as to provide constant, unbroken surveillance of the places and persons involved in these activities and yet maintain all other usual and required police services.

As the matter now stands our municipalities are without the equipment, namely the personnel, to effectively and continuously combat this condition.

As an instance, the detective division of the City of Easton is composed of four police officers. To expect these four men to investigate every burglary, larceny, morals offense, offense of violence, major traffic violation, to investigate drug and prostitution cases and other misdemeanors in the City of Easton *and* to maintain constant, continual surveillance of every known gambler in the City is completely unrealistic.

Under these conditions, in all of our communities, gambling must continue to flourish, especially since a large segment of the population is inclined to engage in it as players.

If the public expects these conditions to be curtailed they must be prepared to pay for substantial increases in our police forces and to pay for substantial increases in the remuneration paid to police to insure qualified, competent personnel.

CORRUPTION

Because the discovery of a slip of paper bearing the notation "$200.00—ice" was found on the person of Joseph Migliazza in the F.B.I. raids which was described to mean "graft", the possible presence of corruption was at all times paramount in the consideration of the jury.

In its investigation the Jury originally turned to Easton where the raids occurred. Interviews and testimony caused the Jury to pause in a number of instances, and these, coupled with rumors which ran rampant, caused the Jury to take a long hard look at conditions in the City from the standpoint of its police department and its city administration.

Rumors were investigated. Police officers beyond any pall of suspicion were privately and secretly interviewed concerning corruption. City records were investigated. City officials were interviewed. City merchants were interviewed and their records examined. Police dockets were examined. The assets and liabilities of those involved in rumors were examined. Federal authorities were solicited and interviewed to obtain any evidence in their possession relating to corruption. Informers were contacted and interviewed.

On the basis of all of the evidence the Jury is of the opinion that corruption was present in the Easton Police Department, although limited to a small group. Unfortunately, however, the evidence is not sufficient to support prosecution, but is sufficient to justify those in charge of Easton affairs to take remedial steps.

There was also found to exist disturbing outside interference with the operation of the City of Easton Police Department in the manner in which promotions were at one time made.

On the question of corruption, the Jury examined closely the contents of a tape made by Joseph Migliazza to the Easton Express.

The circumstances under which this tape was made are of significance in evaluating it.

Joseph Migliazza was arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on January 25, 1967. He was arrested on County charges on the Grand Jury's recommendation on May 10, 1967.

On May 13th, 1967, he met with Donald Keith of the Easton Express for the purpose of recording a statement which he wished to make and which he described would "blow the top off the whole stinking mess."

It is to be noted that this tape was made on the eve of the May 16th Primary Election.

He indicated that the statement was given "to destroy completely the Democratic Party of this County."

In the course of his statement he averred that on three occasions over a period of at least four years he had made contributions for political campaigns of sums of money, that on one occasion in 1963 he made five World Series tickets available to a politician, and that he customarily donated from three to five thousand dollars per year to campaigns "always to the Democrats. The Republicans have never asked for five cents for a campaign in this community."

This tape was turned over to the District Attorney by the Easton Express, and the District Attorney immediately made it available to the Grand Jury.

Copies of the tape were also furnished to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Migliazza was invited to voluntarily appear before the Grand Jury to be questioned about the tape under oath but never did so.

He was not subpoenaed to appear because such a course, under our law, would have rendered him immune from prosecution on the State and Federal charges against him.

All persons whom he named as having received money or other considerations appeared before the Grand Jury, and under oath, vehemently denied his statement.

Because of Migliazza's past record, because he is presently facing pending charges, because of the timing of his statement and because of his averred purpose of destroying the Democratic Party, and because of his failure to voluntarily appear before the Grand Jury, the Jury considers the statement to be totally unreliable.

The tape is however, part of the record of this investigation and available for whatever use can be made of it by the proper authorities.

Copies of it are also in the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Attorney General.

The Jury also wishes to note that the statement contained no explanation, nor was any explanation asked for by Mr. Keith, of the meaning of the notation "$200.00—ice" which has been found on his person in the F.B.I. raid.

With respect to Bethlehem the investigators again were beset with "hearsay" type accusation of corruption against a limited number of police officers. However, no evidence which would support charges of corruption evolved.

The Jury is much disturbed, however, by certain events which evolved in the course of the Bethlehem investigation.

One of the events occurred when a Bethlehem police official turned over the names of a considerable number of persons whom he described as horse players likely to have information for the Grand Jury. The names were largely of prominent people of the highest reputation, filling responsible positions throughout the city.

These people, upon being interviewed, denied any contact with gambling circles. The police officer, when requested for his source of information, produced nothing which would satisfactorily answer that description.

The Jury feels this list of names was supplied to mislead and embarrass the investigation.

In the course of the Bethlehem investigation, it became apparent to the Jury that illegal wire-tapping had been employed by them. Numerous interviews were made in an effort to determine whether the illegal wire-tapping gave rise to any corrupt practices on the part of those employing it.

Since the evidence of wire-tapping related to incidents within the past four, but not within the past two years, prosecutions for these offenses were barred by the statute of limitations. Any corrupt use of same, however, would not be barred. The Jury was therefore interested in further investigation relating to the use put to information obtained by wire-tapping.

This caused accusations to be made that the Bethlehem Police were being singled out in the investigation solely to cause them embarrassment.

Suffice it to say that the Jury felt that definite evidence of illegal activity on the part of some Bethlehem officers required further investigation as to the extent and purpose of their illegal acts.

The Jury condemns the use of any illegal method by our police regardless of their motive. A high percentage of gambling arrests compared to other communities does not justify the use of illegal wire-tapping to obtain them.

The use of wire-tapping is too fraught with dangers of blackmail, corruption and oppression to be tolerated.

Other than the foregoing disturbing incidents the evidence did not establish any corruption in the City of Bethlehem Police Department.

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

In addition to the foregoing conclusions and findings made possible by this investigation it has resulted in the arrests on our recommendation of the following persons for the following gambling offenses:

1. Joseph Migliazza, Establishing a Gambling Place; Enticing Persons to Gamble; Conspiracy.
2. Marvin Joseph, Establishing a Gambling Place; Enticing Persons to Gamble.
3. Nicholas Calli, Establishing a Gambling Place; Enticing Persons to Gamble.
4. Louis Stampone, Bookmaking; Conspiracy.
5. Stephen Todaro, Bookmaking.
6. Naif Bader, Bookmaking.
7. Arthur Carmen, Bookmaking.
8. Andrew Patti, Bookmaking.
9. Joseph Thomas, Traffic in Lotteries.
10. Joseph Piperata, Bookmaking.
11. Caleen Bader, Bookmaking.
12. Michael Hajdu, Bookmaking.
13. Mary Fields, Pool-Selling.
14. John Trembler, Bookmaking; Perjury.
15. Stephen Gecsek, Bookmaking.
16. Louis Vinkovics, Pool-Selling; Perjury.
17. John W. Diehl, Bookmaking; Pool-Selling.
18. Joseph Gilliard, Pool-Selling.
19. Clinton Leibensperger, Conspiracy.
20. Michael Talaber, Bookmaking.
21. Pasquale Sinatore, Bookmaking.
22. John Yurasits, Bookmaking.

The investigation also resulted in evidence which resulted directly in the arrests of the following:

23. John Parenti, Conspiracy.
24. Rudolph Feichtel, Conspiracy.
25. Anthony Reginelli, Conspiracy; Bookmaking.
26. Theryn Snyder, Conspiracy.

Thus, twenty-six arrests resulted from 39 days of hearings. The arrests were made of persons who occupy high positions in the gambling fraternity.

We do not pretend to have exhausted the field. However, the success which was achieved in effecting these arrests justifies the approach to the investigation which was used and which has been described.

More important, the record of this proceeding will provide invaluable information for those authorities who will have access to it. It contains a complete description of the system of gambling rackets which exists in Northampton County and its relationship and ties with other jurisdictions. Such knowledge will provide a sure and sound foundation from which to launch future efforts to curtail these practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS—CONCLUSION

1. Because of public apathy and widespread public participation, it is highly unlikely that gambling as it is presently carried on in the County can be effectively curbed for other than short sporadic periods of time by means of the methods presently employed to do so.

2. Municipal police agencies do not have the necessary personnel to diligently and continously pursue gamblers and gambling activities and can at best, only conduct periodic drives against it.

3. Other than a limited number of State Police personnel available for that purpose, our municipal police forces are without any available undercover personnel to gather gambling intelligence.

4. Periodic concerted efforts should be made through the use of public programs and all of the news media available to impress upon the public the part they play in making what is mistakenly thought to be an innocent bet, but which is in truth a contribution to vice in all its forms.

5. Composition of municipal detective divisions of vice squads should be materially increased in both size and quality to make possible vigorous and *continuous* efforts to curtail organized gambling.

6. Uniformed personnel should be utilized to the fullest extent in observing and reporting the daily activities of those known to engage in gambling, either as players or professionally.

7. Special attention should be paid to efforts to obtain information from players concerning the persons with whom they deal and the customary methods employed.

8. Study should be given to the creation, from the ranks of all county law enforcement agencies, a group or pool of undercover agents to serve temporarily in communities where their identities are unknown.

9. Municipal law enforcement agencies should be divorced *entirely* from politics, including the appointment of Chiefs of Police by Mayors.

10. Further Grand Juries should be instructed to make private report to the Court of any information any of its members may have concerning organized gambling or corruption.

11. At the expense of losing experienced and capable personnel, the composition of vice squads should be impermanent. Periodic changes should be made in personnel.

12. Maximum imprisonment should be imposed on those who are in the future convicted of gambling offenses.

13. Finally, unless the attitude of a large percentage of the public changes concerning the evils of organized gambling, any efforts to curb it will be hollow.

We respectfully render this, our final reports, to your Honorable Court.

Ellwood R. Morris, Foreman; Guy Cump, Earl Schoeneberger, J. Edgar Kellow, Truman Searfoss, William Guddey, Leroy Semmel, Reta M. Petrocko, Doris L. Scott, Thad Salber, Jean Goldowitz, Helen Dasidore, Helen Hersh, Margaret E. Bond and Martha D. Evans.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL FILES AND TITLE VII OF S. 30

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last May 29 I took the floor to warn the Senate and the public of the serious adverse consequences I feared would flow from the Supreme Court's decision on March 10, 1969, in *Alderman* v. *United States*, 394 U.S. 165. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 14338.)

In that case, the Court had held that a Federal criminal defendant with standing to object to evidence derived from an unlawful Government electronic surveillance must always be allowed to examine confidential Government files on the surveillance, in his effort to show that the evidence presently being used against him is "tainted." The Court had refused to let trial courts screen obviously irrelevant files in camera to keep them secret, and its opinion had failed to discuss the need for an exception preventing disclosure of logs of a surveillance conducted so many years before the defendant's crime that they are clearly unrelated.

In addition, the opinion expressed no requirement that a trial judge ordering disclosure on motion of a defendant limit his order so that it compels public disclosure only when that is in the interest of justice. The failure of the Court to have placed such limitations on the rule it had announced in Alderman seemd to me gravely to threaten the public interest in effective prosecution of organized crime, the reputations and privacy of individuals, and the rights of defendants.

I gave voice to my concern and, joined by Senator HRUSKA, I introduced S. 2292, entitled "Litigation Concerning Sources of Evidence." That bill was designed to correct the defects in the Alderman rule, and to prevent it from causing great harm through application in cases involving electronic surveillance or other allegedly unlawful means of obtaining evidence. Enactment of the bill is within the constitutional power of Congress, since Alderman was decided in exercise of the Supreme Court's supervisory jurisdiction. Since then, the Judiciary Committee has inserted the provisions of S. 2292, with modifications, as title VII of S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, and has reported S. 30 favorably to the Senate.

While those bills were pending before the Judiciary Committee, the American public was stunned by a series of revelations of logs of conversations by identified members of La Cosa Nostra, overheard and recorded by the FBI between 1961 and 1965. The first material published was excerpts from "bugged" conversations in Chicago and Miami, which Life magazine obtained and printed in its May 30 issue. I discussed the significance of that disclosure, and had the material placed in the RECORD, on June 9—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 15086–15090.

The second major relevation occurred on June 10, when 13 volumes of transcripts of wiretaps and "bugs" on alleged New Jersey Mafia leader Simone "Sam the Plumber" De Cavalcante were placed in the public files of the Federal district court in Newark, after a defense attorney who had requested their disclosure had neglected to ask that disclosure be limited to himself and his client. See New York Times, June 15, 1969, page 52,

columns 1 and 2, and June 14, 1969, page 16, columns 4 to 8.

The third and most recent revelation came on January 6 of this year, when New Jersey Federal Judge Robert Shaw entered an order making public 1,200 pages of electronically recorded conversations involving defendant Angelo "Gyp" De Carlo, another alleged New Jersey Mafia chief, despite his insistence that the files be disclosed only to himself. See New York Times, January 7, 1970, page 28, columns 1 to 6.

All of the logs and transcripts which have come to light have been replete with bone-chilling accounts of murder, bribery, extortion, and nearly every other crime of cruelty or greed. They have added valuable public evidence of the Mafia's power, ruthlessness, and contempt for our laws, institutions and values. In those ways, the disclosures have spotlighted the urgent and compelling necessity for enactment of comprehensive legislation against organized crime. In addition, the manner in which those confidential files entered the public domain bears scrutiny, since it confirms my apprehension of the dangers caused by the existing disclosure rule of the Alderman case, and demonstrates anew the need for enactment of the remedial provisions found in S. 30's title VII.

The difficulties arise, in a typical example, when a defendant in a criminal case considers filing a motion for disclosure of any unlawful Government electronic surveillance as to which he has standing, and a motion to suppress any evidence obtained directly or indirectly through such surveillance. If, as a matter of fact, such a surveillance was conducted at some time, then both the prosecutor and the defendant find themselves torn between conflicting and complex goals which, under the inflexible Alderman rule, cannot be reconciled or accommodated by a compromise on disclosure.

The prosecutor's primary goal, of course, is to obtain a speedy, economical and accurate court determination of whether the defendant is guilty of the charge against him, in a proceeding which is free of error so can be sustained on appeal. Achievement of that goal cannot be taken for granted, and has been greatly impeded by the increased resort, especially by organized criminals, to pretrial hearings and postconviction appeals which can postpone a defendant's imprisonment for years while he continues, free on bail, to prey upon society. The flat rule of the Alderman case, which can give a defendant access to volumes of factual material to be used as the basis for complex objections, is a major factor preventing speedy justice.

Effective processing of the case against the defendant is not, however, the prosecutor's only goal. As the executive official charged with protecting the public interest, he should seek to prevent undue harm to the reputations and privacy of persons identified in surveillance logs, especially where such persons were merely referred to, and not themselves overheard. As New Jersey Gov. Richard J. Hughes is reported to have stated in this connection:

> There is a difference between rigid law enforcement and the dissemination of gossip and character assassination by braggarts and name droppers. (N.Y. *Times*, January 9, 1970, p. 1, col. 7.)

Each revelation of overheard Mafia conversations has included passages imputing corruption and other crime and immorality to numbers of identified publice officials and private citizens. Each of them has, as a result, been judged without judicial process by a substantial segment of the public, and doubtless many have been found guilty by the newspaper readership. I suppose that some are innocent, maligned by boastful hoods fencing for status and power, and that others are guilty tenfold of what was said of them in the transcripts. However, innocent and guilty alike lack any wholly effective means of cleansing their reputations. Civil lawsuits for defamation, such as that brought by a New Jersey county prosecutor based on allegations against him in the De Carlo logs—New York Times, January 12, 1970, page 48, column 3—are very difficult to maintain and at best offer only partial redress. Punishing a defendant to whom disclosure of logs has been made for further disseminating them in violation of a protective order is seldom possible, since it requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt and the other incidents of a criminal trial, and it can never rectify the harm done to an individual whose privacy or reputation already has been harmed by the further disclosure. A denial or restriction of disclosure to the defendant, not permissible under Alderman, is the ounce of prevention which uniquely can protect privacy and reputations, and it is one of the goals which the Government must consider seeking.

The Government must also think beyond the pending litigation to future cases and the likely effects of disclosure upon them. The prosecutor wishes to prevent disclosure to the defendant or others of facts which might assist criminals in identifying confidential informants and witnesses, apprise likely defendants of the Government's possession of key information, or otherwise compromise the status of pending investigations. He wants to prevent publicity which will make selection of impartial juries in Federal and State cases impossible. He would like to avoid dissemination of unlawfully obtained evidence so widely as to complicate the task of Federal or State prosecutors of proving that the evidence in later cases is not "tainted" by the dissemination. If States adopt rules like Alderman, their application will, in the same way, threaten future Federal prosecutions. And, in an era when Federal-State cooperation in law enforcement is encouraged, a prosecutor must try to avoid unnecessary disclosures of unlawful Federal surveillance which would impede State enforcement efforts by casting groundless doubt upon related but lawful State investigations.

While the prosecutive goals I have mentioned so far all would lead the prosecutor to seek denial or restriction of disclosure, they are only one side of the coin. Government officials also are well aware of the vital contribution which the recent disclosures have made to the public's awareness of the gravity of the organized crime problem, and to the national determination to deal effectively with the Mafia's threat to our society. For that reason, there are some cases, depending on all the circumstances, in which public disclosure would be desirable, perhaps even more important than completion of a given prosecution.

While secrecy and publicity both have their virtues in certain cases, the worst solution ordinarily is disclosure only to the defendant, since in reality that means selective further disclosure at the defendant's option. The defendant can leak information which embarrasses the Government to the newspapers. Leaks from one source or another often have occurred, as when Drew Pearson revealed in 1966 that national security surveillance had been conducted on the Dominican Embassy and that Bobby Baker had been overheard, after the court hearing the case against him gave Baker logs of the surveillance under a protective order forbidding him to make them public. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 9, 1969, page 15087.

While it is not possible, in the Baker case or many others, to identify the persons responsible for the leaks, they have led the Department of Justice to conclude that "protective orders have not been effective" to eliminate public dissemination of logs disclosed only to defendants.

Like the prosecutor, the defendant has conflicting purposes in a situation now covered by the invariable rule of Alderman. One, of course, is to examine the logs for indications that the case against him is "tainted," and thereby to obtain suppression of the Government's evidence and often acquittal or dismissal of the case for insufficient evidence. While that is the only defense interest to which the Supreme Court adverted in deciding Alderman, however, it often is not even primary among the defendant's aims.

As I have just pointed out, the defendant also would like to obtain disclosure under a protective order which gives him the ability, provided he is careful, to control further disclosure. Leaks to the public can so embarrass the Government, and leaks to the defendant's criminal friends can so hinder the Government's legitimate activities, that it will dismiss its case against the defendant rather than make disclosure and risk such leaks. Where that is the case, the Alderman rule gives the defendant what in effect is immunity from prosecution for all crimes, even those he then can feel free to commit in the future, regardless of how clearly unrelated they are to the past surveillance. How much more valuable that prize *is to the* defendant than mere dismissal of the pending case against him.

Where the Government makes disclosure, but the defendant cannot establish a connection between the surveillance and the evidence against him, as the Justice Department has found to be nearly always the case the defendant still has much to gain from the process. See Senate Report No. 91–617, 91st Congress, first session at 66, 1969. He can learn where the "bugs" and "taps" were, and,

according to both the Justice Department and Mr. Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court, the defendant sometimes can use the disclosed information to identify informants and witnesses against him. See Senate Report No. 91–617 at 65 to 67. Bitter experience has documented the willingness of organized crime figures to make drastic use of such information: The Department of Justice has lost scores of organized crime informants through violence and hundreds through fear for their lives. See Senate Report No. 91–617 at 59. The defendant also is able often to examine logs of conversations held by his mob associates while he was absent. Since murders and financial doublecrosses, such as the one in which Joe Valachi claims that Vito Genovese cheated him of tens of thousands of dollars on a single heroin transaction—P. Maas, "The Valachi Papers," 247–52; Bantam, 1969—are common enough even within the Mafia fraternity to be a constant source of concern to its members, the right to read logs and to decide how much of them to show his confederates may be worth a great deal to a Mafioso.

Finally, a motion for disclosure and suppression offers a racketeer defendant, under the unlimited Alderman rule, unparalleled opportunities to delay his trial, introduce confusion and distracting collateral issues into the proceedings against him, and pursue nearly endless appeals and habeas corpus reviews. Since the issues raised when an Alderman disclosure is made are largely factual, they can be reopened repeatedly by tenuous or perjured allegations of newly discovered evidence showing relevance of overheard conversations. Since some of the legal principles involved are of constitutional dimension, ample avenues of collateral review are available to Federal and State defendants. And since it is easy to present a colorable claim for review, it can be expected that defendants release from custody pending appeal will often be granted. Time is most valuable to a defendant facing the possibility of a prison sentence, and the leaders of La Cosa Nostra simply buy time with expensive lawyers and complex motions and appeals.

While the defendant has the reasons I have mentioned so far for seeking disclosure and suppression, there is again another side of the coin: He prefers that the general public not learn the violent and seamy details of his and his friends' illegal activities, nor the extent of their power and influence. It is not so much that he wants to avoid the unlikely possibility of prejudice to a jury which someday may try him—on the contrary, he welcomes a theoretical basis for appealing any conviction—but he wants to prevent arousal of the public concern that brings strict legislation and strenuous prosecution. Under the Alderman rule, the defendant really must weigh his fear of such publicity when deciding whether to file his motions. On January 9 of this year the New York Times reported that a substantial body of qualified legal opinion holds that there is at present no legal limitation on the power of a Federal judge to order public disclosure of transcripts of illegal electronic surveillance which are being revealed to a defendant in a criminal case. New York Times, January 9, 1970, page 19, column 1. Apparently, New Jersey Federal Judge Shaw agrees, for his order publishing the De Carlo logs was made in spite of the objections of De Carlo, who had moved for disclosure only to himself.

Among a defendant's reasons for seeking disclosure of surveillance logs, only the one the Supreme Court recognized—the desire for suppression and acquittal in the pending case—requires that the logs disclosed be relevant to the pending case; yet the Supreme Court permitted no judicial screening of logs for possible relevancy. The other, and often more important, goals of a defendant seeking disclosure are all achieved as well or better, and the proper goals of the Government in such a case are more completely frustrated, where the materials disclosed to the defendant include reams of utterly irrelevant conversations, as typically occurs under the flat rule of Alderman. However, the freedom of a judge to condition the defendant's access to the logs upon the public's, places the defendant in a dilemma similar to the Government's, and the more irrelevant, scandalous, and prejudical material is included in any disclosure order, the more excruciating are the choices of the defendant and prosecutor. That is why Alderman's requirement for disclosure—made without respect to the likelihood of relevancy, without even minimal judicial screening, and without the necessity of protective limitations on the disclosure order—frustrates the legitimate interests of both the defendant and the public. That has been massively demonstrated by the publications of the De Cavalcante and De Carlo logs, both ordered by Federal judges in compliance with Alderman. It is for the courts, not for me, to say whether among the 3,200 pages of conversations, there are any which were used to obtain evidence to be used in the pending prosecutions—but I can say, at the very least, that there are thousands of pages of material which is utterly irrelevant to those prosecutions and the disclosure of which has destroyed the privacy and good reputations of many citizens, and has served every purpose of the criminals and thwarted every purpose of the Government except that it has bared the Mafia's fangs for the world to see.

I do not mean to criticize the judges who have ordered those disclosures. Irrelevant and scandalous material may come to light for various reasons, as when the judge trying Cassius Clay for a draft violation made and then dissolved a protective order limiting publication of a log imputing immoral conduct to a relative of the defendant, since in the circumstances the judge found dissolution necessary to conduct the hearing on relevancy. See Senate Report No. 91–617 at 69. Indeed, the courts should give recognition to the public's need to know, and there will be circumstances in which all or part of logs ordered given to a defendant should be filed as public records in the interest of justice. This is for the court to decide. However, there is no question that the existing law, which requires needless disclosure to defendants and permits promiscuous disclosure to the public, protects neither individual privacy nor public safety.

If the Alderman rule is changed, the time soon will come when the Federal Government's use of electronic surveillance without court order ceases to plague defendants or the Government. That is true since the Department of Justice put a stop to the practice in 1965, and the Congress placed strict prohibitions and sanctions against wiretapping and "bugging" in title III of the 1968 Safe Streets Act. Since pre-1965 surveillance could not have led to evidence of crimes being committed today, soon virtually the only substantial claims that evidence is "tainted" will concern the occasional isolation violation of title III by a defective warrant or an inadequate showing of probable cause. That small volume of cases will present no problem of judicial administration, no major threat to privacy, and no bar to effective law enforcement, if disclosure procedures are devised to take account of the various interests at stake.

However, if the Alderman rule remains unqualified, or if judges are left completely free to order public disclosure, then for the next 50 years, until all the mobsters overheard before 1965 have met divine judgment, our courts will be occupied in rehashing masses of stale gossip and recriminations, and the public will be exposed by dribs and drabs to hearsay accusing persons truly or falsely of misdeeds from decades past. Our society ought not be so masochistic and to submit to that, when simple legislative measures can limit disclosure to that which circumstances warrant.

Three statutory provisions are necessary, and they are found in title VII of S. 30. The first recognizes what logic and the Justice Department's experience have shown—hearings at 551—that it is virtually impossible to use a wiretap or "bug" to obtain indirectly evidence of a crime which will not even be committed until at least 5 years later. By barring inquiry into such frivolous allegations that evidence is "tainted," title VII will conserve judicial and executive time and resources and prevent unnecessary disclosure of confidential files.

The second measure in the title provides that logs of a surveillance conducted less than 5 years prior to the defendant's crime may be ordered disclosed to the defendant only after the court finds that they "may be relevant" to the defendant's motion to suppress and that such disclosure is "in the interest of justice." The standard for weeding through the logs is a minimal one, presenting no threat to a defendant's desire to exclude evidence which really is inadmissible, yet it will be sufficient to prevent wholesale divulgence of utterly irrelevant material.

Third, title VII prevents a judge ordering disclosure to a defendant from automatically or unjustifiably ordering public disclosure as well. Disclosure of all or portions of confidential material to persons other than the defendant may be ordered only if it is in the interest of justice, and the order must specify that material to be disclosed and the persons

or classes who may see it. While protective orders in organized crime cases are often ineffective, sometimes a sieve is more useful than a funnel, and explicit limitations on a disclosure order may often be desirable where valued interests of privacy, reputation, and fair trial are involved.

The only sound resolution of the conflicting interests of defendants, other individuals, and the public is to require protective orders where public disclosure is not in the interest of justice, yet to acknowledge that the impossibility of fully enforcing protective orders requires that we avoid needless disclosure to defendants. Only the Congress has the power to enact such requirements and restrictions. It is essential that we pass title VII and do it promptly, not only for the aid which it promises to give to law enforcement authorities, but for the protection which it will furnish to individual citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the New York Times articles reporting the manner in which the De Cavalcante logs were disclosed, June 15, 1969, page 52, columns 1 and 2; setting forth exemplary excerpts from the De Cavalcante, June 14, 1969, page 16, columns 4 to 8; and De Carlo, January 7, 1970, page 28, columns 1 to 6 logs; containing the statement of Governor Hughes which I quoted, January 9, 1970, page 1, columns 7 and 8; and discussing the legality of ordering public disclosure January 9, 1970, page 19, columns 1 to 7.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 9, 1970]

LAWYERS DIFFER ON THE PROPRIETY OF MAKING PUBLIC FBI'S BUGGING TRANSCRIPTS IN JERSEY

(By Lesley Oelsner)

NEWARK, January 7.—By opening to public inspection 1,200 pages of conversations among alleged Mafiosi, recorded illegally by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Judge Robert Shaw has provided another tantalizing chapter in the annals of organized crime. But he has also provided a host of legal questions that have lawyers here and elsewhere shaking their heads in confusion and disbelief and even a bit of horror. According to many of the lawyers, Judge Shaw may have prejudiced the rights of Angelo De Carlo, whose case he is now hearing; he may have made impossible a New Jersey trial for scores of other men, and he almost certainly has established a precedent that, if followed, will allow a new dimension in the ability of the Government to expose the private actions of any of its citizens.

"The greatest evil here is not simply the loss of privacy," Arthur R. Miller, professor of law at the University of Michigan and one of the country's leading experts on the right to privacy, said in a telephone interview. "It's the massive reaction of the individual's concept of what his government is willing to do to him—'Today the Mafia, tomorrow me.' "

Yet other lawyers and prosecutors justify Judge Shaw's ruling, saying that unless such tapes are released to the public, the strength of the Mafia will remain hidden from view. There is no other way, they say, of convincing the American people that the Mafia lives, and lives in nearly every area of the country's life.

The confusion in the legal community comes from the fact that never before has a judge made such a ruling. There have, of course, been other cases in which the prosecution had illegally obtained information and in which the defense sought access to the information, but it was always the Government's lawyers who asked that the information be kept from the public.

And it was not until a few months ago that the United States Supreme Court ruled that counsel for the defense was entitled—under carefully prescribed orders—to see this information.

There was another case involving similar tapes—the case of Simone Rizzo (Sam the Plumber) DeCavalcante, also an alleged Mafioso, last year—but in that case the judge ruled only that the defense could see the Government tapes. There the defense counsel did not ask that the tapes be kept from the public and the prosecutor made them public.

De Carlo's lawyers had asked to see the F.B.I. tapes several months ago, but they also asked for a protective order under which the tapes could be kept from the public. Judge Shaw, while granting the first request, denied the second—so the question is whether or not he was legally entitled to make such a ruling.

This question is the one lawyers find most difficult. The law on the subject is virtually non-existent.

For in the 1969 Supreme Court case, the Government had contended that the defense should not be given the material because it might leak it to the public. As a result, the Court's ruling that defendant was entitled to the information did not mention a case in which the Government was entitled to the information revealed to the public.

The Government's acquiescence to Judge Shaw's order to release the De Carlo transcripts to the public, many lawyers feel, subverts the right of discovery, which the Supreme Court granted last year to defense attorneys.

"They're putting someone to a Hobson's choice," said Norman Dorsen, professor at New York Law School. "Either have no discovery, or have discovery and have the newspapers get the information."

Yet most lawyers, though they said that Judge Shaw acted unwisely—"I would say that the judge was not judicious," commented an official of the American Civil Liberties Union—said there is no specific legal prohibition to such a ruling.

It is precisely this apparent legality of Judge Shaw's ruling that many other lawyers—particularly those in district attorney's offices—point to bolster their view that the judge was right.

"The Mafia is into everything, and very deep," said one lawyer. "But the public doesn't believe it. They think we just exaggerate. Well now they can read these tapes and they can see for themselves."

Observers here say that the Shaw ruling fits in with a policy that the United States Department of Justice initiated about a year and a half ago: a massive publicity campaign waged by releasing transcripts or other records, and aimed at convincing the American public of the seriousness of the Mafia's infiltration.

They say, and many prosecutors here and in New York agree, that there is no other way to give the public a believable and complete picture of the problem.

Last summer, shortly after the DeCavalcante tapes were made public, a Federal agent explained the Justice Department policy this way: The information on the tapes "is authentic stuff. Some of it really stands your hair on end.

"Organized crime is deeper than almost anyone realizes. But we are convinced what is going on—and the bugs say it in words [the Mafia] uses—we need so that we can get in there will be public reaction there and clean the situation up."

A SURMOUNTABLE PROBLEM

The lawyers and prosecutors who take this point of view, recognize the prejudicial possibilities, but, unlike the lawyers who criticized Judge Shaw's ruling, they think that the problem is surmountable.

According to the latter group of lawyers, the transcripts released Wednesday have already gained such notoriety that a subsequent trial of De Carlo (on another indictment) or of any of the others mentioned in the tapes, could not be held in New Jersey or even in the Northeast.

Additionally, the men mentioned in the tapes can claim that their indictments were developed from leads in the tapes—a claim they might not have made if the tapes had not been made public, because they probably would not have learned of the existence of the tapes.

Professor Miller suggested still another possible consequence. He said that judges issued warrants permitting electronic eavesdropping on the assumption that the evidence gained by such eavesdropping would not be broadcast to the general public. Now they may be less willing to issue warrants—and, conceivably, more illegal eavesdropping could take place.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 9, 1970]

HUGHES CONDEMNS RELEASE OF TAPES—CHARGES FBI TRANSCRIPTS VICTIMIZE THE INNOCENT AND ENDANGER FREEDOM

(By Ronald Sullivan)

TRENTON, January 8.—Gov. Richard J. Hughes denounced today the public release of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's transcripts of recorded Mafia conversations.

The governors' charge that their "sensational treatment in the press" endangered American concepts of personal freedom, indiscriminately victimized innocent persons and did not "put a single hood in jail."

The Democratic Governor, who has just 12 days left in office, said: "There is a difference between rigid law enforcement and the dissemination of gossip and character assassination by braggarts and name droppers."

In his first major response to the release of the 1,200 pages of electronically recorded conversations involving Angelo (Gyp) De Carlo, a reputed Mafia chief in New Jersey, the Governor did not attack by name Federal Judge Robert Shaw, who ordered the release on Tuesday, or Frederick B. Lacey, the United States Attorney for New Jersey who sought their release and who is directing the Federal investigation of organized crime and official corruption in the state.

In Newark, the Federal trial of De Carlo and three others for allegedly conspiring to make extortionate loans to the late Louis B. Saperstein continued despite requests by defense attorneys that Judge Shaw disqualify himself. They argued in vain, that the judge had shown malice against the defendants by releasing the tapes of De Carlo's conversations.

The American Civil Liberties Union of New Jersey in Newark sided with Mr. Hughes and called on Mr. Lacey to seek criminal indictments against the F.B.I. agents who bugged De Carlo's headquarters in Union County as well as the officials who ordered the eavesdropping between 1961 and 1965.

Mr. Lacey said he had not read the A.C.L.U. demand and thus refused to make any comment.

The electronic bugs were illegal at the time and are inadmissable as evidence in trials.

The A.C.L.U. said also it would seek to help individuals named in the transcripts to instigate libel suits against the Mafia figures who mentioned them.

KEUPER AND AIDE TO SUE

However, two Monmouth County officials did not wait for the A.C.L.U. Vincent P. Keuper, the Monmouth County Prosecutor, and Capt. Andrew Manning, who is on Mr. Keuper's detective staff, announced that they would sue De Carlo and Anthony (Little Pussy) Russo, a reputed top Mafia racketeer in Monmouth, for $10-million in damages for alleging that they had taken bribes to allow gambling in the county.

Mr. Keuper said that the transcripts could be used in libel action.

Governor Hughes, who has served two terms and who turns his office over on Jan. 20 to Representative William T. Cahill, a Republican, was mentioned several times in the transcripts. Once was by a reputed Mafia figure who boasted that he had met him in 1962 and another time as reputed Mafiosi were speculating in 1961 on how they would do under a Hughes administration.

Mr. Hughes attacked the release of the transcripts in a two-page statement issued by his office here this afternoon. His aides said he would have no further comment. Although the Governor issued a statement on the transcripts, his aides said he would maintain his silence on the bribery indictment against Ralph DeVita, a Union County District Judge who was appointed by Mr. Hughes in 1966.

The aides said that Mr. DeVita, whose alleged Mafia associations were reportedly made known to the Governor prior to his appointment, was under indictment in a case involving organized crime, whereas the De Carlo releases were public knowledge.

SAYS HE ALONE NAMED KELLY

In his statement, the Governor said he was particularly incensed by the charge of De Carlo that he had got John V. Kenny, the powerful Hudson County Democratic boss, to get Mr. Hughes to appoint David B. Kelly as superintendent of the state police in 1965.

"No political leader or anyone else dictated or even suggested this appointment," the Governor said.

"It was my choice alone due to my knowledge of his outstanding record and unimpeachable reputation, and my decision was fully approved by the Attorney General of New Jersey. Colonel Kelly is one of the nation's finest law enforcement officials. That is why Federal authorities respect him so highly and why I appointed him and why Governor-elect Cahill has re-appointed him."

The Governor said that the allegations in the transcripts were "foreign to American fair play."

"We must think most carefully about our personal liberties," he said, "and cherish them most dearly against the threat of innuendo, slander and character assassination. We must begin to think hard about what is happening to our American way of life and to our system of justice."

According to the incoming Secretary of State, Paul Sherwin, Mr. Cahill discussed Colonel Kelly's reappointment with Attorney General John N. Mitchell and with Mr. Lacey and said that it was received with "great enthusiasm by both officials."

ATTACKS POVERINO'S BOAST

Mr. Hughes also said that another boast in the transcripts by Joseph (Indian Joe) Poverino, a co-defendant of De Carlo in a Federal conspiracy-extortion trial in Newark, that he had met with him in 1962 was absolutely untrue.

Poverino, according to the F.B.I. transcripts, said that he had told the Governor at the alleged meeting that he had raised $12,000 in his behalf in the 1961 gubernatorial campaign.

But the Governor said today, "Why should I have to dignify such a suggestion by pointing out that I know no Poverino and that no such meeting ever took place?"

"Men in public life," he said, "should never be surprised to hear the curses of the disgruntled, or to be the victims of boastful gossip, or to be mentioned by persons whose purposes may be enhanced by name-dropping or alleged connections with public figures who know nothing of them and have never had anything to do with them."

The Governor continued: "It is the duty of law enforcement officials to seek indictments and prosecution of those who break the law. I am familiar with rigid law enforcement, as a former assistant United States Attorney, as a Superior Court judge for many years, and as Governor."

However, the Governor added:

"The fulfillment of this duty is not served by excitement which results from public preoccupation with the alleged gossip of braggarts which can affect the reputation of honest men, whether public officials, or journalists, or clergymen or citizens of any degree. Nor does this course put a single hood in jail.

"The further tragedy of such indiscriminate and idle gossip is the harm done to hard-earned good reputations."

RIGHTS SEEN VIOLATED

In a letter to Mr. Lacey, the A.C.L.U. charged that the F.B.I. bugging violated the constitutional rights of those persons who were identified by the Mafia figures. The A.C.L.U. also said that the eavesdrops also deprived those named in them of their civil rights.

The A.C.L.U. told Mr. Lacey that he should have asked Judge Shaw to impound the transcripts rather than make them public.

"So gross are the violations of the civil rights stemming from electronic eavesdropping that further measures seem to be called for," the A.C.L.U. told Mr. Lacey.

"If as you say, you are interested in prosecuting official violations of Federal law, your course must be clear: you must seek the indictment of the agents, who conducted the eavesdropping as well as the official who ordered that the eavesdropping be undertaken."

In Monmouth, Mr. Keuper characterized the allegations in the transcript by Russo that he was getting $10,000 a year as fables."

"This suit," Mr. Keuper said, 'is the only way for county law enforcement officials to get our day in court so as to clear ourselves of this false and defamatory statement. I want to bring Russo into a courtroom where I can hear his ridiculous fables and have an opportunity to cross-examine him in person."

Mr. Keuper also said he planned to attend a meeting here Monday with Arthur J. Sills, the state Attorney General, and his successor on Jan. 20, George F. Kugler Jr., and a number of county prosecutors to discuss what action can be taken to protect law enforcement officials from unsubstantiated attacks.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1969]

BUGGING RELEASE AMAZES LAWYER—MAFIA COUNSEL THOUGHT UNITED STATES WOULD NOT COMPLY WITH BID FOR TRANSCRIPT

The lawyer for the underworld figure most prominently mentioned in the 2,000 pages of recorded Mafia conversations released by the Federal Government in New Jersey last week went into seclusion this weekend.

It was the lawyer, Sidney M. Franzblau, who originally moved in court to require the disclosures, thinking the Government would never agree to make them public.

But Federal prosecutors last Tuesday did agree—and the result was a sensational exposure of Mafia machinations and keen discomfort for the lawyer. He told a reporter on Friday he was going into seclusion over the weekend.

The first move toward airing the transcripts—recorded by Federal Bureau of Investigation agents between 1961 and 1965—was made by Mr. Franzblau in Federal District Court in Newark. This was a few days after his client, Simone Rizzo (Sam the Plumber) DeCavalcante, head of a New Jersey Mafia family, was indicted on March 21, 1968, on charges of interstate conspiracy to aid racketeering.

Mr. Franzblau evidently acted in the belief the Government would dismiss the charges rather than release sensitive information out of fear that other pending cases might be prejudiced.

There were many precedents to support such a belief.

POLICY IS CHANGED

Moreover, he knew that it was Justice Department policy at the time to oppose eavesdropping disclosures and that, in any case, the materials would not be admissible as evidence.

However, between the time of Mr. Franzblau's motion and last Tuesday, the Supreme Court handed down several eavesdropping decisions, one of which obliged prosecutors to turn over wiretap or bugging evidence to defense attorneys.

In addition, the Justice Department sharply modified its old policy so that it was not automatically opposed to wiretap or bugging disclosures, and two cases that might have been prejudiced by information in recorded conversations had been completed.

Thus, while the original motion had seemed routine, the situation had changed significantly by last Tuesday when United States Attorney David M. Satz, Jr., filed the 13 volumes of transcripts with the court, where they became public property.

ONE-HUNDRED PERCENT CONFIDENCE

The transcripts, which cannot be used to obtain indictments, detail Mafia intrigue and treachery, executions and morals, labor racketeering and extortion and attempts to take over legitimate businesses.

The release of the documents astonished Mr. Franzblau.

"I've never heard of the Government ever releasing such information before," he said.

The lawyer, a former assistant United States Attorney in Newark, was asked whether the release of the transcripts—which he might have blocked by asking for a so-called restrictive order—had damaged his relations with DeCavalcante.

"My client has 100 per cent confidence in me," he insisted.

Mr. Franzblau added that he was "seriously considering" asking for a dismissal of the indictments against DeCavalcante because of the widespread publicity generated by the release of the transcripts.

Asked how he could seek dismissal on such grounds when the Government had released the transcripts in response to his own motion, Mr. Franzblau said he had asked Mr. Satz to make the material available to him, not to the press and public. However, he did not move formally to restrict the disclosures.

Mr. Franzblau, known to friends as "Chris," is 38 years old and lives at 33 Edgemont Road, West Orange, N.J. He shares a law partnership with David M. Beckerman in Newark.

Mr. Franzblau attended Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pa., and received his bachelor of laws degree from Duke University. He was admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1955.

In the late nineteen-fifties, during the final years of the Eisenhower Administration, he was appointed an assistant United States Attorney in Newark, a post he held until October, 1961.

TOO MANY VIOLENT PEOPLE

Associates say it was about a year later that Mr. Franzblau first began representing underworld figures.

In one segment of the conversations recorded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on May 27, 1965, Mr. Franzblau was quoted as having told a DeCavalcante business partner that he was pulling out of a case in which he was defending Carmine Lombardozzi, a Mafia leader.

Asked why he was withdrawing, Mr. Franzblau said: "To many violent people in it."

He added: "I don't want to be a criminal lawyer. I don't take any gambling cases any more unless as a favor."

The incident that led to the indictment of DeCavalcante last year was a dice game holdup in 1966 and an alleged extortion plot against the gamblers.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1969]

EXCERPTS OF FBI RECORDINGS OF MAFIA MEETINGS

Following are excerpts from transcripts of electronic recordings made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1961 to 1965.

They were made at places frequented by Simone Rizzo (Sam the Plumber) DeCavalcante and two co-defendants, Gaetano Dominick (Corky) Vastola and Daniel Annunziata, in a conspiracy-extortion case awaiting trial.

The transcripts, filed in Federal Court in Newark, consist of direct transcriptions and F. B. I. summaries of such conversations.

LAWYER FOR MAFIA CHIEF DECIDES HE'S "PULLING OUT"

NK 2461-C, an informer for the F. B. I. reports the following verbatim conversation between Lawrence Wolfson, DeCavalcante's business partner, and a former assistant United States attorney, Sidney M. Franzblau (also known as Chris) DeCavalcante's lawyer, on May 27, 1965:*

C. I hope everything will be all right with that Bonanno [disappearance] grand jury.

L. Who are you representing?

C. Jerry [Catena].

L. Was he called before this grand jury?

C. Yeah.

L. This Joe Bananas—Sam thinks he's still around.

C. I do, too.

L. I don't think Joe Bananas will ever turn up again. It's been a year since he went [disappeared].

C. I don't think he'll turn up while this much heat is around.

L. This guy has been in trouble before. I remember Nick told me he was too aggressive.

L. One thing about these guys [Bonanno et al.] they never hesitated to pull the trigger.

C. I'm getting away from all this, Larry. I'm pulling out of the case tomorrow.

L. Who were you handling in that one?

C. Milton Parness. Lombardozzi.

L. He's in the can, isn't he?

C. Right.

L. How come you're pulling out of that?

C. Too many violent people in it.

L. They ain't gonna bother you.

C. Yeah, but the trial will take months and there's not enough money in it. Besides, I don't want to be a criminal lawyer. I don't take any gambling cases anymore unless as a favor.

YOUNG JERSEY SINGER GETS A MAFIA CONTRACT

On April 7, 1965, NK 2461–C furnished the following information to the F.B.I.:*

Sam was visited by Sal Caternicchio and his nephew, a singer, whose professional name is Nino Rossano. His true name is Giacobbe. He is 24 years old and lives with his parents at 437 Spencer Street, Elizabeth, N.J. Also present was Sidney M. Franzblau, or Chris.

Franzblau's function was to gather information for the drawing of a contract between DeCavalcante and the singer. Nino has been taking voice lessons from Carlo Menotti at the Carnegie Hall Studios, 831 58th Street, New York City. He has never made a personal appearance, although Sal assured Sam that Nino could sing better than Robert Goulet.

The terms of the contract will provide that Sam is to pay for Nino's singing lessons, certain expenses, plus $40 a week, in return for 55 per cent of all of Nino's earnings, if any. Sam plans to meet with Maestro Minotti (not to be confused with the composer, Gian Carlo Menotti) who works out the fees. He cautioned Nino that henceforth he was not to take a job without advising Sal and/or Sam.

Two months later, on June 3, 1955, James J. Verdino, an F.B.I. agent, filed the following summary:

Sam on location with unidentified person. Unidentified person is probably the singer Sam is trying to push. Sam tells unidentified person that a Mr. Bill Foster at N.B.C. wants to interview him and also audition him with a band. Unidentified person seems to be either Spanish or Italian.

Sam asks singer how are you getting along with Carl (Gambino). Singer is identified as Nino. Sam is telling Nino he needs polish. He sang at the orphanage racket and at the wedding but if he gets on the "Tonight" show with a connection by Sam there will be some critics that could hurt him. Nino is scheduled for the Ted Mack show, also.

Mr. Giacobbe's mother said yesterday that her son was now working at a nightspot—she did not know which one—in New Jersey and that he was living in Elizabeth with his wife. Mr. Giacobbe could not be reached for comment immediately.

FEAR OF WAR WITH BLACKS SAVES A MAN'S LIFE

NK 2461C, in an advisory dated May 24, 1965, gives the F.B.I. the following information:*

Rosario Cocchiaro, on 5/24/64, was assaulted with a shovel by Matthew Shumate, a Newark N.O.I. [Nation of Islam] subject [the Black Muslims consider themselves a sect of the Nation of Islam] and suffered broken ribs and a collapsed lung. Rosario was hospitalized until 5/26/66. Rosario and Shumate had a fight at a construction job in the Elizabeth, N.J., area.

The DeCavalcante "family" was initially infuriated by Shumate's action due to Rosario's father, Frank Cocchiaro, being a DeCavalcante "family" member. Frank asked for "satisfaction" and meetings were held to determine the family's retaliation measures. It was decided at first that Shumate would be physically beaten. Then it was decided that Shumate was to be murdered with a knife to make it look like a "nigger job."

It was also considered to murder Shumate by using a pistol, due to Malcolm X being murdered by this method. In back of all this murderous intent was the specter of the N.O.I. learning that Shumate would have been murdered by the DeCavalcante family and the possibility that the N.O.I. might retaliate in vengeance and cause an all-out war in the Elizabeth, N.J., area.

DeCavalcante finally decided to let this incident "cool off" for a month's time and persuaded the interested DeCavalcante family's members to wait for this period of time.

DeCavalcante met with Frank Majuri, his underboss, on 6/1/65, and at this time DeCavalcante said he had met with Carlo Gambino that day and had told Carlo of this matter. Gambino told DeCavalcante that a La Cosa Nostra member can ask for satisfaction in such an instance, but he doesn't have to get it if there is a risk of destroying the borgata [family]. Based on what DeCavalcante told him, Gambino recommended that any retaliation be held up for two to three months.

DeCavalcante and Majuri, from their conversation, now appear to be quite ready to hold retaliation in this matter in abeyance or forgetting about it altogether. From what was said, they believe Rosario might have avoided this trouble as he started the fight, and Majuri said Rosario wasn't injured that severely.

Furthermore, they said Shumate, being a Negro, wouldn't know about showing respect to DeCavalcante family members or their children. Majuri asked DeCavalcante if he had told Frank Cocchiaro of Gambino's suggestion in this matter. DeCavalcante said he hadn't.

DeCavalcante probably would have permitted almost instantaneous retaliation against Shumate if he wasn't a Muslim member. Frank Cocchiaro, not immediately known if this is the Frank Cocchiaro known to be a capo in the DeCavalcante family or some relative of his, had met with DeCavalcante family members on 5/7/65, and told DeCavalcante that he and/or Rosario are quite willing to retaliate against Shumate on their own. Frank Cocchiaro said that he didn't want to bring trouble on any other DeCavalcante family member as he considered this matter to be a personal threat.

DeCavalcante told him that he wouldn't permit Cocchiaro to handle any retaliation measure alone.

The following was logged by an F.B.I. employe on May 27, 1965:

Sam asks Frank [Majuri] "What do you think?" "Do you think we should go all the way?" They are still concerned with the fact that he [Shumate] is a Black Muslim. They are thinking about possibly using Corky to pose as a cop and bring the guy out on suspicion of narcotics because he is a narcotics addict.

Frank suggests that they wait a little while to see how the compensation case [Rosario's] works out and the stories that come out. In case the guy is knocked off it might look like a case of vengence if anyone told the real story about the beating.

On June 3, 1965, NK 2461-C reported the following outcome to the Rosario-Shumate incident:*

Concerning the Shumate affair, Larry [Wolfson, DeCavalcante's business partner] asked DeCavalcante what would be done in retribution for his [Shumate] having hit "that kid" [Rosario] with a shovel. Sam replied, "You can't do nothing to him."

PROMINENT NAMES DROP IN MAFIA CONVERSATIONS

The following information was furnished to the F.B.I. by NK 2461-C on April 12, 1965:*

Louis Larasso contacted Sam and they discussed the Carlie Majuri arrest. Sam said that Union County Prosecutor Leo Kaplowitz thinks there should have been a motion to suppress the evidence. Kaplowitz suggested that a lawyer named Isaacs (phonetic spelling) be retained.

Larasso referred to an offer in this matter and said he'd be willing to see thing settled for $3,000, even if it is a shakedown, rather than see the thing up to the county local, where there might be pressure from the F.B.I. to prosecute.

DeCavalcante indicated a willingness to expend $1,000—$500 to the judge and $500 to (Elizabeth Mayor) Tom Dunn—providing it could be handled in court.

[Mayor Dunn has said that he once received a campaign contribution from DeCavalcante before he became aware of DeCavalcante's reputation. But the Mayor said he could recall no other dealings with DeCavalcante.]

In a portion of the transcript, about 12 lines of which were apparently censored by the F.B.I. or the Justice Department, DeCavalcante and his cousin, Robert Basile, converse about a robbery in Newburgh, N.Y. and discuss a fellow Mafioso's unsuccessful shakedown attempts. The following dialogue was reported by NK 2461–C on Feb. 22, 1965:*

Bob. Censored.

SAM. Censored.

BOB. Lieutenant Jacobson (phonetic spelling) got in touch with the boys. Rudy said, "You know I'm getting a little sick of this, too. I'm going to wind up getting in a lot of trouble. And I don't know the first things about it." They went over to see him—Lieutenant Jacobson. He said, "We know the whole story—just give us back—or throw some of the stuff in the street. Like the sables and the chinchillas—then the whole thing will be closed." So Rudy said, "I don't know what the hell you're talking about." So he said, "Look, if you got any doubts about me—go see Toddomarino (phonetic spelling). He'll vouch for me."

SAM. The Lieutenant said that?

BOB. Yeah. So he asked me. I said, "Rudy, stay out of it. Don't ask nobody nothing." This Lieutenant Jacobs is the same guy involved with Johnny Rizzo, was involved with Frankie Dapper (Frank Robert Dapolito) and everything else. I think this guy is looking to make a score for himself. . . . I spent about an hour and a half with the kids yesterday—Dom Prado (phonetic spelling) Rudy—nice conversation. They're very sensible boys.

SAM. You ought to tell them, "Sam is doing everything to make you guys respected and see you make a living. He don't want nobody to use you guys.

BOB. So Corky (Vastola) came over yesterday and registered a beef.

SAM. Against Frank (Cocchiaro) again?

BOB. Not against Frank. It's against everything. He said, "You know, I was on that score. I didn't see no lousy money yet. Everybody's grabbing—fighting. But I didn't see no money. . . ." Sam, let me tell you something—let them go shift for themselves for a while. Let them fight it out amongst themselves—and when they're finished—then we'll see. Nobody's getting a fair shake. I told Corky yesterday, "You complaining—you've started 4,000 things. What happened to the Four Seasons? Where's the money?" He said, "Well, I didn't get. . . ." I said, "It's the same old story, Corky. You start all these things—everybody gets enthusiastic—runs around—and where's the results? Did you put those cans aside like you were told, Corky?" (He said) "No, not yet." I said, "You better put them aside."

(John Riggi entered and conversation shifted to construction business.)

The Newark Bureau of the F.B.I. then asked the New York Bureau to "suggest identities for Rudy (last name unknown), Larry (last name unknown), Lieut. (first name unknown) Jacobson, Toddomarino (phonetic spelling) and Dom Pradoo (phonetic spelling), all of whom are unknown in Newark; it appears that Rudy and Dom may be among those being proposed for membership in La Cosa Nostra."

On Feb. 5, 1965, NK 2461–C advised that Joseph (Bayonne Joe) Arthur Zicarelli, the alleged Mafia chieftain for Hudson County, N.J., visited DeCavalcante. When he arrived, according to NK 2461–C*, Emmanuel Riggi and his son John Riggi were also present, and DeCavalcante introduced them as "amico nos" [our friends.] NK 2461–C* filed the following summary:*

Riggi had been in the process of telling DeCavalcante of the progress of his deportation case. He mentioned that one Olivetti (phonetic spelling) formerly with a Government agency, had advised him to contact Representative Florence Dwyer, Republican, New Jersey, and Senator Harrison Williams, Democrat, New Jersey, in an effort to interest them in the case. Olivetti gave Riggi permission to use his name.

Zicarelli was aware of Riggi's troubles, having heard of them previously from DeCavalcante. In fact, he was able to report that, at DeCavalcante's request, he had spoken on Riggi's behalf to "my friend the Congressman" (Representative Cornelius Gallagher, Democrat, New Jersey). Zicarelli said he has not heard from his friend since because of "all the commotion." (Reference is probably to the SDNY [Southern District, New York] grand jury hearings.) Zicarelli indicated that he would follow the matter and said he was sure Gallagher could help if all else failed.

On Feb. 3, 1965, NK 2461–C reported to the F. B. I. a verbatim conversation between DeCavalcante and Zicarelli about three young New Yorkers who were arrested in Elizabeth, N.J., on Jan. 14, 1965, on suspicion of burglary. Zicarelli asked DeCavalcante to use his influence to have the charges dismissed. That request led to the following dialogue:*

SAM. These three guys—after I spoke to you they showed up and they were thrown out.

JOE. Yeah, I know. I tried to get you back and couldn't.

SAM. Well, what happened then. These guys are nuts.

JOE. They were there! We called right away and they said they were dismissed so they left.

SAM. You know when I called you—it was in the afternoon. I even called this guy back because he called the clerk and told him to postpone it for a week. They were there at 11:30 instead of 9:30.

JOE. What do we have to give this guy?

SAM. Nothing. Forget about it.

JOE. Why should I forget about it? These aren't three of my guys. They want to pay. Let them pay. What'd you give this guy?

SAM. I'm supposed to see him next week. Joe, if it's you . . .

JOE. It's not me! I don't know these kids, Sam.

SAM. Well, you sent them down.

JOE. You know Frankie Dee. These kids belong to Frankie Dee and Mike. Let them pay. Why should you pay anything?

SAM. Over here I'm supposed to see the judge and the police commissioner.

JOE. All right—whatever you go for let me know.

SAM. No. They're not your guys? Well let them go. I thought it was your guys. You asked for the favor.

JOE. You know who's my guys? Sure they're the same as I am. It's Mike and Frankie Dee. And these kids are around them. Mike came in to see me. . . .

SAM. Now . . . with one understanding. These kids are supposed to come around Elizabeth.

JOE. They know that.

SAM. And they're not supposed to sue for false arrest. I guaranteed that myself. I knew they wouldn't do that anyhow.

JOE. These are good kids. They've done plenty of work and they're around any time you want them.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1970]

EXCERPTS FROM FBI TRANSCRIPTS OF TAPES RELEASED AT THE DE CARLO TRIAL

(Following are excerpts of transcripts of electronic recordings made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1961 to 1965. They were made at places frequented by Angelo (Gyp) De Carlo—identified as Ray—who is a defendant with three others in a conspiracy-extortion trial now in progress in Federal Court in Newark.

(The transcripts were made public late yesterday afternoon and the excerpts are based on a preliminary reading. The transcripts consist of seven volumes of recorded conversations and F.B.I. summaries of such conversations.)

PARTICIPANTS IN RECORD

Following are descriptions of some of the persons whose conversations were recorded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in an investigation of the underworld in New Jersey and of some of the persons mentioned in the conversations:

Angelo (Gyp) De Carlo—Said to be a capo, or leader, in the camp headed by Gerardo (Jerry) Catena.

David Wilentz—Democratic national committeeman from New Jersey, former Democratic chairman of Middlesex County, former Attorney General of New Jersey, and who was said to have engineered Richard J. Hughes's nomination for Governor.

John V. Kenny—Former Mayor of Jersey City and the Democratic boss of Hudson County.

Leo P. Carlin—Mayor of Newark from 1954 to 1962; later served as special assistant for migrant affairs in the Department of Labor.

James (Jimmy Nap) Napoli—A convicted bookmaker and close associate of Mafia boss Thomas (Tommy Ryan) Eboli. Napoli was indicted last month in New York County on charges of criminal contempt in connection with an inquiry in the fixing of fights at Madison Square Garden.

Dominick R. Capello—Former Superintendent of the New Jersey State Police who retired in 1965 after more than 26 years of service. He served as Superintendent for two years with the rank of colonel.

Michael A. Bontempo, former president of the Newark City Council and an unsuccessful candidate for Mayor in 1966.

Harold (Kayo) Konigsberg, a convicted extortionist and reputed king of the loansharks, who is now completing a 10-year term in Federal penitentiary in Springfield, Mo., for possession of stolen merchandise.

Dennis F. Carey—The Essex County Democratic chairman since 1954.

Anthony (Jack Panels) Santoli—A Newark racketeer who allegedly ran a dice game in New York City.

Anthony (Little Pussy) Russo—Alleged protégé of reputed Mafia stalwart Anthony (Tony Boy) Boiardo, said to be running the rackets in Monmouth County and also investing in legitimate business in Miami.

Dominick A. Spina—Newark's Director of Police, who was indicted in 1968 and then acquitted of charges of "willful failure" to enforce antigaming laws.

Joseph (Joe Bayonne) Zicarelli—Reputed to be a key figure in organized racketeering in Hudson County.

Thomas Gangemi—Former Mayor of Jersey City, who resigned in 1963 after it became known that he was not a United States citizen.

Thomas (Taddo) Marino, an ex-convict and alleged Brooklyn Mafia member, who was involved in an official investigation of illegal gambling.

Joseph Columbo—Reputed head of the Brooklyn Mafia family.

Thomas Finn—Former administrator of the Jersey City Medical Center.

Frank Celano—A senior member of the Genovese Mafia family, the largest and most powerful underworld group in the nation.

Carmine Persico, Jr.—A member of the Brooklyn Mafia family headed by Joseph Columbo.

LOANSHARKING

Informant reported the following conversation between Angela De Carlo and Harold Konigsberg on March 31, 1961:

DE CARLO. Listen now, I got some people, some millionaires, but these people seem to know something about Jamaica. They would invest a million if there would be any gambling and they could have a piece of it.

KONIGSBERG. (Much of Konigsberg's statements at this point are inaudible, however, he mentions a $750,000 loan at 30 per cent apparently in connection with the hotel in Jamaica).

DE CARLO. How can he meet the payments at 20 per cent per week?

KONIGSBERG. That's 20 per cent for a year, not a week.

DE CARLO. Oh, 20 per cent for a whole year.

KONIGSBERG. Yeah, it's a one-year loan. I don't want to destroy the joint.

DE CARLO. Shylocks get 50 per cent or 100 per cent. Do you have a phone number where I can reach you?

KONIGSBERG. Yeah, sure, it's my office. Konigsberg did not repeat a phone number, but apparently gave De Carlo a card or wrote down a number for him). . . .

KONIGSBERG. It's the trucking office. I'm there Monday and Friday. It's in South Kearny.

De CARLO. You're there?

KONIGSBERG. Let me explain. I'm there when I ain't working. I'm making up my own shylock operation. I've been working day and night for four weeks now. I even had pneumonia.

DE CARLO. I want you to sit down with these people. One guy went to Europe who was here the other night. He said sure, if I thought there was any possibility of getting gambling, we would put the money up.

KONIGSBERG. Do you know who I'll get it from? Frank Sinatra.

DE CARLO. I'm going down there next week. I'll see Sinatra and have a talk with him.

KONIGSBERG. Is he going to be in Florida next week?

DE CARLO. He'll be there until the 12th or 13th. I'm going down there Friday so I'll see him before he leaves. As soon as I get there, I'll call up and leave where I'm at in case you need to get in touch with me. . . . What do you do? What kind of work?

KONIGSBERG. Shylocking, that's how we make a living.

DE CARLO. Use a little common sense. Go and book horses. All that stealing and all. . . .

At one point, De Carlo was said to be upset because Frank Sinatra refused to accept a telephone call from one of his aides, who "had made it clear he was calling for De Carlo," said another F.B.I. report. Purpose of the call was not made clear and Mr. Sinatra's name was not used again.

ONE INMATE DISCUSSED

The two individuals then discussed Charles Workman's efforts to get out of prison.

ADDONIZIO CITATION

KONIGSBERG. Will you tell me why everybody loves you so much?

DE CARLO. Well, because I'm a hoodlum. I don't want to be a legitimate guy. All those other racket guys who get a few bucks want to become legitimate.

(There then followed a conversation mostly concerning the shylocking racket which was inaudible until the following conversation was heard).

KONIGSBERG. If we loan a guy $5,000, we get $250 a week.

DE CARLO. $250 a week? We get $100 a week for $5,000.

KONIGSBERG. You're scabs. You'll have to organize you guys.

* * * * *

KONIGSBERG. What's coming in?

DE CARLO. Betting numbers, booking horses, sports. Sports is big, but so many crooked games. Basketball games are all crooked, and now and then you get a crooked football game. You get killed. You can't get anyone to take over a $300 bet on a fight except Demus, and he might take a thousand. He might.

(Demus is believed to be Joseph Covello).

* * * * *

An F.B.I. informant (N.K. 2251–C) tells of a conversation between De Carlo, Little Joe De Benedictis and Si Rega.

JOE. You know, Si it's going to take three weeks but we'll own this Hughie [Addonizio]. This guy here. I'll guarantee, we'll own him. I'll use that term—in three or four weeks. He wants to get rid of some crums around him.

RAY. Well, when you see him today, tell him that if he ever does business with more than one guy he won't last.

Conversation on Sept. 7, 1962, between Angelo (Ray) De Carlo and someone believed to be Joseph (Little Joe) DeBenedictis, in regard to setting up a company.

JOE. So that's the way it stand now. They got Someret County all tied up. They tied that up last night. Now how the hell are we gonna get to Kenny [John V. Kenny?]

RAY. You gotta make an appointment with him. Tell him I sent you. Tell him you and I is in with this it's a company we formed and were in with it. Hughie (Addonizio) helped us along. He give us the city. We'd like to get these towns and . . .

JOE. [Later in the same conversation]. I'll tell him I ain't even got my name down . . . Now this guy Bontempo, listen to what I say (inaudible).

JOE. This is a serious situation, Ray. We gave him a raw deal. We got him in a hole.

An F.B.I. informant (NK. 92–379) tells of a meeting at which De Carlo discussed the 1962 mayoralty race in Newark:

"Concerning the forthcoming political campaign for Addonizio, De Carlo again outlines his views on securing funds. He said only about five people would be invited to give and the $10-bookmakers' would have to make their own connections. De Carlo feels confident that his money will be well spent since gambling arrests will be made only by the gambling squad.

"De Carlo related that he had scheduled the meeting with Tony Boy (Anthony Boairdo) and Addonizio the following day for the purpose of having Tony Boy tell Hughie that he can control Oscar Girard's (a Democratic ward leader) support of Addonizio."

GAMBLING

Informant reported that Lou Martone met with Angelo De Carlo on Jan. 16, 1963: Martone reported, "I didn't get the check, but I called in yesterday and it's in the mail I'll bring you in at least $12,000. Don't worry, you've got it all coming," Pete Landusco met with De Carlo. Jack Panels reported to De Carlo that Joe Zicarelli had called him to report that he [Zicarelli] had determined that Louis Caporaso was in Brooklyn attempting to get money from relatives.

JACK. Jimmy Napp [Napoli] got a hold of me last night and he told me that this Smitty remember Smitty from Brooklyn, we went in with him years ago? Him, Joe Columbo, and another guy have got a crap game in Brooklyn. They've got a $500 limit and they're stuck $40,000. Jimmy says they've got a terrific game and Smitty told him they're looking for a partner. Jimmy said the only way he would take a piece of the game is if you would be interested.

JACK. Joe [Zicarelli] called up this morning and I called him back. He said: "Tell all your friends that the Treasury men are in town and they're going to be here today and tomorrow."

Conversation between persons believed to be Frank Toddo Marino, later joined by Louis Percello and Lucky Carl Silesia, Leash and Joe (the Indian) Polverino.

RAY. What's Babe last name?

LUCKY. Maraglia.

RAY. That's it. Tokyo [Joe Casamassa] said they're ready to grab him. They're looking for two Jews, too.

LUCKY. There's a Jew working in the office.

RAY. Do you know what this Cappy [N.J. State Police Superintendent Dominick Capello] wants?"

LUCKY. No. How much?

RAY. He wants $1,000 for Long Branch and $1,000 for Ashbury.

SI. For each town?

RAY. Yeah. Each town. And for the whole country, he wants to make another different price.

LUCKY. Tell him——

Summer rates higher

SI. Do you want to hear the rest of the story? June, July, August and September he wants double.

RAY. Here's what I figure. Let's move all the offices into Long Branch and we'll just pay him for Long Branch.

LUCKY. That's a good idea.

RAY. One setup. Move your office in there and Nicky [Allen, true name Nick Aldarelli] and everybody get a spot in Long Branch. When is Pussy [Anthony Russo] coming back?

LUCKY. The 8th or 9th.

RAY. Tip everybody off in Asbury, tell them be very careful, you're on your own.

LUCKY. We'll give him a G note for one town and get all the number guys in one town. If I had my way, I'd give him nothing.

RAY. Maybe we should have left him alone. They [State Troopers] couldn't stay there all the time.

LUCKY. They got a couple of Negroes working for them. We must have 20 license plate numbers. What would this guy want from a city like Newark if he wants that much from down there?

RAY. We used to pay him $1,500 for a crap game. $1,500 a month.

SI. In Bayonne, we paid him $2,500.

RAY. He's no good. He knows every racket guy in the state. We would have been better off with a dumb guy in there. There's only one way to handle this guy. Did you say you've got the town of Asbury?

LUCKY. I ain't got Asbury.

RAY. Well, what have you got? Have you got Neptune? [May be either Neptune City of Neptune Township.]

LUCKY. Yeah. We've got the chief, but we ain't got the judge.

[Re: Chief Edward A. Schumacher, Neptune City, previous information alleged he was being paid off.]

RAY. Pussy must have the judge in Long Branch.

LUCKY. Albino [phonetic spelling] yeah, he's all right.

RAY. He's Poagy's [Alfred Torriello] brother-in-law.

It should be noted that De Carlo has been anxious to contact Dominick Capello, who was recently confirmed as Superintendent of the New Jersey State Police, to have Capello stop the State Troopers from harassing his numbers operations in the shore area. Capello had been reluctant to meet him because of the newness of his appointment. De Carlo eventually arranged to have Tokyo Joe Casamassa contact Capello. Newark has opened a case on Casamassa to obtain full background and his activities inasmuch as he appears to be the intermediary between the subjects and Capello.

CONCERNING A MURDER

De Carlo, William Rega [Si] and Silesia discussed the recent killing at the Essex County Hunting and Fishing Club on March 13, 1963.

RAY. He's in a predicament with a bad prosecutor like Lynch [phonetic spelling]. I don't see how he [possibly Tony-Boy Boiardo] even let him give himself up.

LEASH. I couldn't understand that.

RAY. Tony Boy talked it over with Dick [Newark Police Director Dominick A Spina] and Dick said let him come in—we'll make it self-defense.

LEASH. Yeah, but if it was only them, but like you said before . . .

RAY. It was good the way the broad put it in—she said this boy began fooling around—he had an argument with her and the guy throwed the bottle—he grabbed a knife from the kitchen and stabbed the guy with it. While he's stabbing him, she's hitting him on the head with a bottle . . . According to [Dr.] Albano, he was killed from being hit on the head.

SI. Well, that's what they'll go by. Whatever she gets convicted of, he'll be an accessory.

10:20 P.M. The informant advised that Peter La Barbiera and possibly one other person joined the group.

SI. [Referring to La Barbiera's case which was recently dismissed] Congratulations!

PETE. They cleared everybody. Cleared the rat.

LEASH. Cleared the rat, too?

PETE. Yeah, and they cleared the guy who pled guilty.

RAY. I think Kenny [John V.] must have put . . .

PETE. Under five thousand Ray.

RAY. Huh?

PETE. Under that . . .

RAY. On, Federal can't come in them.

RAY. Who was the judge?

PETE. This guy from Camden. Madden.

RAY. Oh, Madden's a good man. He's a hell of a man! He was the guy that gave Rozzen [Phonetic spelling] that year only.

POLITICS

On Aug. 13, 1964, an F.B.I. informant in Newark said that Angelo De Carlo had told a switchboard operator at the Democratic convention in Atlantic City that year to write down all numbers called by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy and to furnish them to him. The operator agreed to do it.

Excerpt from F.B.I. report: Sept. 7, 1962:

Source reported that Mickey Bontempo was given $5,000 to drop out of the Newark mayoralty race and promised a job. Bontempo is angry because a State Water Commission job was given to his brother, Salvatore, and not him on the recommendation of Mayor Addonzio.

Following is an F.B.I. summary of a meeting between De Carlo and two other men.

"De Carlo expressed annoyance at Tony Boy (Anthony Boiardo) for having contacted Hugh Addonzio direct and offering him $5,000. Ray interpreted this as an expression of distrust and feels that Tony Boy was trying to pave the way for continuous personal contact with Addonizio. Ray would not blame Addonzio for taking the money [it was not clear whether he did or not] but feels that Hughie should tell Tony Boy that all money should come through De Carlo."

Here is a summary of information furnished on April 20, 1962: Source reported Bugsy [Last name unknown, might be Pescatore] contacted Dipsy Doodle [Lt. Frank Daniello, Bureau of Investigation, Hoboken Police Department] and asked him for the "Long Branch Number." It is reported that De Carlo was "expecting some information to be relayed through Dipsy relative to a Long Branch number having been called in connection with a bookmaking operation." It was further reported that "arrangements were made between Bugsy and Dipsy for De Carlo to call an unidentified male at City Hall the following day."

That same information says that De Carlo said to Bugsy: "They ain't gonna mess with you. You get hold of 'the Little Guy' anytime." Joseph Zicarelli is sometimes referred to as the "little guy," according to the information].

The report said that from De Carlo's remarks "it was apparent that he and an unidentified man were anxious to get something going in the county (probably Hudson) and when it gets going good they can 'sell it to the others'."

Elsewhere in the report it says that John V. Kenny, Democratic leader of Hudson County, is also known as "The Little Guy."

In a report dated Aug. 8, 1962, De Carlo called Mr. Kenny. Says the report:

"From De Carlo's portion of the conversation, the informant determined that Kenny requested to contact Newark Mayor Hugh Addonizio in an effort to have Kenny's man appointed as hospital administrator of Martland Medical Center. [It appears that Kenny's man is Thomas Finn], who was fired from a similar position recently by Jersey City Mayor Gangemi."

The report continues:

"De Carlo stated: 'What will I do with my man, make him call you or make him call Tom (Gangemi).—I don't know if I can locate Hughie tonight, but if you see him down there, you tell him you was talking to me tonight and I go along with this a million per cent. He knows I go along with anything you want. You can talk to him the way you talk to me.'"

An F.B.I. report dated Jan. 15, 1963, suggests that an associate of Mr. Kenny called De Carlo to tell him that he had some information regarding a job for Neil Duffy, former Essex County Sheriff.

The associate, Jim Corrado, was asked "if he could contact Cappy [Domenick Capello, Superintendent of New Jersey State Police] and ask him to stop bothering the operation in Long Branch and Asbury Park until they could get together with him."

De Carlo also mentioned to Corrado that a new Long Branch city manager was to be named on Feb. 15 [1963].

"He [De Carlo] said Corrado should ask his boss for the name of someone who is 'a million per cent' to whom they can give the job. He noted the city manager has charge of the Police Department."

On Nov. 20, 1963, De Carlo "contacted the Pollack Hospital in Jersey City, where he spoke with an individual, believed to be John V. Kenny," an F.B.I. memo said.

De Carlo's call was "to remind Kenny that he had recommended Steve Capiello, Hoboken Councilman and a sergeant at the Hoboken Police Department, to Jimmy Corrado [Mr. Kenny's aide-de camp]."

Mr. Kenny was said to have acknowledged having received the information and indicated he would make an appointment with Capiello.

At the same time, DeCarlo indicated that Dennis F. Carey, then the Essex County Democratic chairman, had met with Little Joe (Joseph DeBenedictis) and offered to put him on the payroll of Essex County.

On Nov. 11, 1963, said another F.B.I. memo, DeCarlo called Corrado, who was then assistant administrator of Pollack Hospital in Jersey City. The two men discussed "the recent success of C. Robert Sarcone in being elected Essex County Senator."

DISCUSSION OF METHODS

March 7, 1963—De Carlo, Boiardo, Larusso, Simone (Sam the Plumber):

The conversation drifted to a discussion of the recent killing of "Cadillac Charlie" in Youngstown, Ohio. All were critical of the method used and of the fact that his 4-year-old son was also killed.

DeCarlo said that as a result the word had been passed that no "hand grenades" will be used in the future. De Carlo further suggested that the best way to dispose of someone was to give the individual a fatal shot of dope and put him behind the wheel of his automobile where he will be found.

RAY. That's what they should have done with Willie (Moretti).

BOIARDO. Oh, yeah.

RAY. You got five guys there, you talk to the guy. Tell him this is the lie-detector stuff. You tell him "you say you didn't this_."

BOIARDO. How many guys are you going to con?

ROY. Well, if you don't con him, then tell him. Now like you got four or five guys in the room. You know they're going to kill you. They say, "Tony Boy wants to shoot you in the head and leave you in the street or would you rather take this, we put you behind your wheel, we don't have to embarass your family or nothing." That's what they should have done to Willie.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

HEW APPROPRIATION BILL MEETS NATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we begin the second session of this Congress with a vote that will draw the major public issue for the remainder of the year. That issue will be the nature and direction of national public investment. It will be the issue of whether we are going to get down to the business of providing for the needs of the American people.

The administration has, I submit, drawn a false issue in its opposition to this bill. It claims the bill is inflationary. This is a false issue because Congress has appropriated less money for fiscal year 1970 than the administration itself requested. Figures from the House and Senate Appropriations Committees show we have appropriated $5.6 billion less than the President asked for. The greatest blows against budgetary inflation were struck by the Congress when it cut $5.6 billion from the President's military and another $1.1 billion from his request for foreign assistance.

The total budget submitted by the President called for appropriations totaling over $135 billion. Congress voted a total appropriation of $129.5 billion or $5.6 billion less than the administration asked for.

Now the country is being told that for Congress to add money where the President does not want it spent is inflationary. The country is being told it is inflationary for the Congress to spend a modest amount of money that the President does not want spent, but that it is not inflationary to spend billions of dollars more, if the President requests it.

In other words, the country is being told that it is inflationary for Congress to add $1.125 billion in education, but nothing is said about $6.75 billion that Congress cut out of the budget for military expenditures and foreign aid. Con-

gress cut $6.75 billion out of the total budget for military expenditures and foreign aid and added $1.125 billion for health and education for the American people, thereby leaving a net saving to the people of more than $5.6 billion.

What the people have not been told by the news media is that Congress added $1.125 billion for education and cut the budget by more than $5.6 billion.

All this boils down to is that President wanted to spend more money in fiscal 1970 than the Congress allowed, and there is a difference of opinion between the White House and Congress as to what some of the money appropriated should be spent for.

In my travels in my State, I have learned that the people do not know that Congress made substantial cuts in the administration's budget. They think that these funds are being added on top of the President's budget. They need to be informed as to what the real situation is.

Under the Constitution of the United States, it is the duty of the Congress to levy taxes and decide where the money shall be spent. It is the duty of the executive department to take those appropriations and spend them as Congress has directed. Instead, this administration freezes money appropriated for education and for health of the people, and spends three-quarters of a billion dollars on the system and other wasteful programs that many of our greatest scientists say are pure folly.

What we have here is a question of whether Congress is to fulfill its constitutional duty and vote the appropriations needed, or meekly submit to Presidential pressure to vote only those appropriations that he believes are proper. Under the division of powers, it is our right to appropriate money, just as it is our unpleasant duty to levy taxes. In voting to uphold our own appropriations, we vote to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

IMPACTED SCHOOL AID DRAWS WHITE HOUSE FIRE

In H.R. 13111, Congress is taking only some very modest steps toward financing a few of the country's most urgent domestic needs. One step that has come under greatest attack from the White House is the money added for federally impacted school districts. It is stressed again and again that one wealthy county receives $5.8 million, and that only $3.2 million goes to the 100 poorest counties. The test is where the schoolchildren are, but the administration sidesteps this.

This argument is never made by the administration, for some reason, about the multitude of other Federal programs that provide money to counties, States, or cities without any regard whatever for their income. Should we cut out Federal aid for highways in counties wealthy enough to pay for their own roads? Should we stop financing airports in communities where ample resources exist to do the job without Federal help? Should we withhold public assistance and old age and blind benefits from counties and cities above the national average income?

Should we cut out that aid for cities such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, or other rich cities? There is no suggestion of that kind. It is only when we talk about education that the administration says that we should cut out impacted aid to certain counties, but not limit Federal highway aid or other Federal programs in the same counties.

I am not suggesting that we cut welfare or highway funds. I merely cite these examples to show the specious and fallacious argument of the administration.

Under title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act, which provides for the education of children from poverty level families, Westchester County, N.Y., gets money. It was not suggested that this money be withheld, but only money under the impacted area program, which involves children of Federal employees.

I think we have to say that the answer is "no" to this question. And the same answer applies to aid to federally impacted areas. This program has never been designed or intended to be compensatory in proportion to local income.

The Elementary-Secondary Education Act does make the right to payments depend on the percentage of poverty level families in the school district; however, this is not the case with respect to impacted aid. It is an entitlement derived from the fact that Federal property is not taxable and that Federal activities contribute to the number of schoolchildren that the local school district must educate. Therefore, the local school district must tax itself more heavily to educate children of Federal employees. That is the basis of the impacted aid law. It is not based on the number of children from poverty level families, as is title I of the Elementary Education Act; rather it is based on the location of the tax-exempt property and the Federal activities in the area.

Yet the White House statements have virtually hung the forthcoming veto on the $398 million the conference report added to the budget request to make good on this entitlement.

From the President's hang-up on federally impacted school aid one might infer that what he wants is more Federal money spent in school districts with meager resources. But no, this does not turn out to be the case, either.

The President plans to veto the $171 million added for school districts having many children from poor families. This is title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act. It is designed to be compensatory in terms of local financial resources. But it turns out the White House does not want money added to its budget there, either.

What other education funds does the President plan to veto? Fifteen million dollars additional for bilingual education. He asked for $10 million and the conference believed $25 million should be devoted to this program, which is just getting started. It is the most effective means yet found to educate children of non-English-speaking families, children who have such high rates of dropout even in elementary school, through no lack of intelligence or fault of their own.

Mr. President, as the distinguished occupant of the chair (Mr. CRANSTON) knows, being from the State in which 40 percent of all the Mexican American children in the country live, as I represent the State where 37.9 percent of all the children of Mexican American families live, making a total of 77.9 percent of all the children from Spanish-speaking families in the United States, and if we provide $25 million for the 3 million children from non-English-speaking families, whether it be Spanish or another language, we have then an appropriation of approximately $8⅓ per child per year; however, the President would veto this, saying it is inflationary to try to give those children a chance in life.

Another wise congressional action that the President plans to veto, is the $50 million Congress added for school libraries. He also objects to $30 million being spent for equipment and minor remodeling for schools because his budget provided nothing for either program.

A modest $33 million for construction of 4-year undergraduate college facilities is another item Congress added, upon appeals from our State institutions of higher education. They have construction backlogs of $582 million in State-approved buildings that cannot be built. The budget provides nothing for that program. It is a mere token; it is so low that I regret it was not four times that amount, to meet this backlog of $582 million in needed college building construction.

Then we added $67 million more in this bill for student loans than the President requested, and $120 million more for vocational education. The latter funds were added in order to carry out the improvements in the Vocational Education Act of 1968, most of which were left unfunded by the Bureau of the Budget and the White House. Yet these items are among those that the President plans to veto.

HEALTH INCREASES BY CONGRESS

A major area where we have increased the President's budget is in consumer protection and environmental health services. For this grouping of activities, the budget called for $227 million, and the bill provides $242.5 million. Congress proposes to add $16 million for research, development, and demonstration for air pollution control. Will the President veto this bill because it tries to do something about the pollution of the air we breathe? Air pollution has already reached such a danger point in certain great cities that on certain days of high pollution, the city health authorities warn mothers, not to allow their children to play in the yards or on the streets because the air is too dangerous for them to breathe.

Is this modest $16 million we have added for research, development, and demonstration for air pollution control something for the President to veto simply because we are trying to make the air safe enough for children to play in their yards without being poisoned?

The bill provides $8 million more than the budget for control of narcotics addiction and alcoholism. When weighed against the staggering economic cost of these social afflictions, this increase can only be called anti-inflationary. It is just a dollar apiece for all the people afflicted

with alcoholism and narcotics addiction. It is a mere, modest token that we used as a beginning point, in hopes it might be increased to a reasonable amount.

There is $10 million more in the bill for formula grants in partnership for health; $20 million more for operation and planning grants for the regional medical program; $4 million more for control of chronic diseases; and $104 million more for hospital construction.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that this year the President's budget struck out every penny for construction of hospitals, additions to hospitals, and remodeling of old hospitals. It struck out all the money for the Hill-Burton Act grants. It struck out every cent for this needed construction despite the fact that there are now in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, requests from the health officers of the 50 States for $5 billion to build new hospitals, and $10.5 billion to remodel old hospitals and add wings and new rooms. Why? Because the authorities estimate that within 2 years it will cost $100 a day for an individual hospital bed in the American hospitals, because we are so short of facilities. Yet, this administration strikes out these funds. We put in a modest $104 million, with all the States asking for $115.5 billion now, and the President says that is inflationary.

For the basic research into certain diseases, Congress increased the budget request for several of the institutes of health. We added $10 million for the Cancer Institute; $11 million for the Heart and Lung Institute; $9 million for the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases; $5 million for the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke; and $10 million for the Institute of General Medical Sciences.

In this bill, we have a total of $98 million more for the Institutes of Health than the President wants spent on research into these diseases. These increases in the basic research of different diseases and for the Institutes of Health are absolutely necessary in this country because 60 cents out of every dollar spent on medical education in the medical schools of America comes from the Federal Government. The cutback in the budget of the National Institutes of Health and for the different Institutes mentioned is a cutback on medical education. Two dental colleges in America have closed their doors in America in the last 12 months, while the dental profession itself is begging for more dental schools, despite the great shortage of dentists, this country having a shortage of 9,000 dentists at this time. While we should be expanding medical education, the President's budget cuts it back. The Congress has added money for medical education to try to stop the threatened closing of medical schools and stop the cutback on medical education required by the President's budget.

If the President vetoes this bill, if his veto should be upheld, this will be disastrous to the education of dentists, doctors, and medical personnel in America. It will be disastrous for the health of the people of America.

CONGRESS ADDED FUNDS FOR LIBRARIES

Mr. President, I mentioned libraries earlier, but I wish to mention this area again. The bill carries over from the budgeted items an area of increases for library construction and services. We have added, in this bill, $17 million for public library services and $9 million for construction. The $9 million is needed because there was no budget request for any library construction whatsoever in cities, towns, or counties—or for any public libraries. Every red cent was cut out by the administration. Every red cent was also cut out for library construction in grade and high schools. The only library construction left by the administration was a modest amount for colleges.

Mr. President, when we passed the elementary and secondary education library bill, of the more than 100,000 elementary and high schools in America, 66⅔ percent had no semblance of a library, and 80 percent no real library. Now we have built libraries, under that act, so that a majority of the public schools in America have libraries; however, there are still 46,000 schools in this country, elementary and secondary, grade and high schools, without a library. Yet the President's budget contains no money for libraries for grade schools, high schools, or for public libraries in cities, towns, counties, and villages in America.

The Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when asked about this last year, stated:

> This Administration does not place a high priority on libraries.

My construction of this statement is that this administration does not put a high priority on reading; it is the first administration in history which has discouraged reading by the citizenry of this country. It seems to be the first administration in history that is afraid for the people to read books.

We have also added $8 million to the $12.5 million budgeted for college library resources. This is a very modest increase.

NATION NEEDS H.R. 13111

Mr. President, it is certain that the President will veto this bill because of the items I have described that he does not support, for the education and health of the American people. I think it tragic that he has selected education, especially aid to federally impacted districts, and hospital construction as the test case of his administration. He has selected aid to the children of the men fighting in Vietnam as one of his main complaints as to why he will have to veto this bill as inflationary.

Beleaguered school officials, hospital administrators, medical researchers, local school boards, all are served notice by the White House that if the veto stands, they will have to obtain more local taxes to continue their services, or curtail, cut back, or close down education and health services to their people.

We began 1969 by debating the budget request for the anti-ballistic-missile system. The administration raised no question then of inflation, though the products of defense expenditures make no addition to our economic capacity. These programs add nothing to the health or the education of the people. Expenditures for education do add to our economic capacity, as do expenditures for control of illness and disease. They make a nation more capable of producing the things its needs.

Contrary to what the administration has charged, Congress has acted in a responsible manner in dealing with the problem of inflation. We cut over $5.6 billion, or 4.2 percent from the President's requested budget. These reductions are reflected in a table which I have included in my statement.

I ask unanimous consent that this table, "Appropriations Bills for Fiscal 1970," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FOR FISCAL 1970

[In millions]

	Fiscal 1969	Administration Request	Fiscal 1970	Final vs. request
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 11582)	$1,780.7	$2,780.7	$2,276.2	$−38.5
Agriculture (H.R. 11612)	5,531.3	7,237.6	7,488.9	+251.3
Independent offices-HUD (H.R. 12307)	14,570.4	15,338.0	15,111.9	−266.1
Interior (H.R. 12781)	1,285.0	1,390.9	1,380.4	−10.5
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary (H.R. 12964)	1,986.7	2,475.7	[1]2,354.4	−121.2
Labor-HEW (H.R. 13111)	18,566.6	18,608.1	19,747.2	+1,139.0
Legislative (H.R. 13763)	298.2	372.2	344.3	−27.8
Public Works (and AEC) (H.R. 14159)	4,608.4	4,204.0	4,756.0	+552.0
Military construction (H.R. 14751)	$1,758.4	$1,917.3	$1,560.5	−$356.8
Transportation (H.R. 14794)	1,634.3	1,840.5	1,929.7	+89.3
District of Columbia (H.R. 14916)	148.8	228.8	+ 168.5	−60.3
Defense (H.R. 15090)	71,869.8	75,278.2	69,640.6	−5,637.6
Foreign assistance (H.R. 15149)	2,479.5	3,679.6	[1]2,558.9	−1,120.7
Supplementals	5,846.7	314.6	278.3	−36.3
Total	132,364.6	135,200.0	129,595.8	−5,604.3

[1] Conference agreement.
Note: Figures may not add because of rounding.

Source: House Appropriations Committee, Congressional Record, p. 11026, Dec. 29, 1969.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this bill is needed by the American people. It is an essential part of a total appropriation action by Congress that reduces the total of budget requests and redirects only a small part of the emphasis of total Federal spending into some of the most critical areas of shortage, need, want, and necessity in this country.

Mr. President, this bill deserves to be enacted. It is a constitutional duty to appropriate these funds. We have said what we will do about it. The administration should not invade the jurisdiction of Congress by trying to dictate the amount of appropriations as well as how they should be spent.

I yield the floor.

(At this point Mr. DOLE assumed the chair.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have been asked to vote against H.R. 13111, the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the grounds that the addition of $1.1 billion to the budget request is inflationary.

Most of the increases are for education and health programs.

It also has been argued that because the money is being made available so late in the fiscal year it will be impossible for school districts to spend the funds wisely.

The bill is further criticized for adding money for a program which allocates funds to school districts whose enrollments are affected by Federal employment. The complaint in this case is that this aid goes to rich and poor school districts alike.

And finally, Congress will be charged with fiscal irresponsibility if it passes this allegedly inflationary bill.

Let me deal with each of those points, taking them in reverse order.

Mr. President, the figures show that even with the increase in education and health funds, Congress will have reduced substantially the budget requests submitted by the administration.

The figures go this way:

Of 14 appropriations bills, Congress cut the administration request on 10.

If we approve the administration's figure for HEW, we will have reduced the President's budget by more than $6.7 billion.

If we approve the HEW bill, even with the extra $1.1 billion for education and health, Congress still will have reduced the administration's requests by $5.6 billion.

In short, if one feels that trimming several billion dollars in Federal spending will affect inflationary pressures in an almost trillion dollar economy, then Congress has been more responsible than the administration in reducing the budget.

Turning to the argument that the entire increase in education funds should be junked because of dissatisfaction with one program, let me point out that the impacted aid program has been on the books for a good number of years.

While I share some of the misgivings about this program, the fact is that school officials have drawn up budgets based on entitlements from this program. If we are to eliminate or change impacted aid, let us do so in an orderly way. Then school officials will know what to expect. To cut this program in midfiscal year is to create budgetary chaos in many school districts.

Equally important, the program does provide a funnel to get money to school districts which need Federal aid.

For example, under the administration budget request and distribution formula, Detroit public schools would qualify for zero dollars. If full entitlement were available the district would receive $856,000 not an inconsiderable amount of money.

Other school districts in Michigan also would be affected by a cutback in this program.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the complaint that the appropriation is being made too late in the fiscal year misses two points.

If not all the money can be spent by the end of the fiscal year, then the bill, if it is indeed inflationary, will be less so than pictured by the administration.

More importantly, if Congress is to make clear to the administration that it wants budget cuts in areas other than health and education, Congress should pass this appropriations bill.

Congress has taken the lead in cutting budget requests and now wants to redirect less than 20 percent of those cuts into domestic programs.

That is a proper way to reorder national priorities. That is a responsible way for Congress to exercise its role in setting those priorities. This is what the debate over reordering priorities is all about.

And to make one final point, I for one do not accept that spending on education and health is necessarily inflationary. In fact, in the long run a cut in education programs might well have an inflationary impact.

Mr. President, if we are to defeat inflation on a long-term basis we will need the trained, educated manpower to make an automated society produce the goods demanded by our economy. A cutback in education now will undercut the capability tomorrow.

Mr. President, it is often argued that we can not cut back a particular Pentagon project because the layoff will mean a loss of momentum which will take longer than a year to regain.

If I may make a comparative out of truth, the same is even more true for education and medical research programs. A cutback in our research efforts today will be felt many times over in the decade ahead.

For example, a vote against H.R. 13111 is a vote to close 19 clinical research centers, to junk a 1-year old arthritis control program in Michigan and to reduce funds to build new hospitals.

If we must cut the Federal budget let us do it by limiting the amount of funds we pay people not to farm their land, by delaying deployment of an ABM system, and by holding up development of a supersonic transport plane, which can only add to pollution problems if we can ever find a place to land it.

For all of these reasons, I will vote for the $1.1 billion increase in funds for education and health programs. And I am glad that the issue drawn by the veto threat gives us the chance to clarify which branch—the Executive or the Congress—would seek to be the "big spender." If the Senate had rubberstamped the President's budget requests, $6.7 billion more would have been authorized than will have been authorized. That saving was made by the action of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE EDUCATION AND HEALTH BILL: A TRAGEDY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we have before us two duties. The one is to accept the conference report on H.R. 13111, appropriating funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. The other is to accept it so overwhelmingly that we shall make our intentions unmistakably clear to the President.

Normally, our task would be a simple one—ratifying the efforts of our conferees who have done an excellent job of working out the differences in the House and Senate versions of this bill, but recent pronouncements by the President have complicated our responsibilities. For some reason, the President has selected this bill for a political football. Traditionally, the money for our health and education programs has been voted with substantial support from both parties, but the President has sought to make the health of our people and the education of our children a partisan matter. He has taken the almost unprecedented step of announcing his intention to veto an appropriation bill for education and health, and we must ask ourselves why. Also, we have seen repeated efforts by the administration to muster support for this threatened veto among the Republican Members of Congress, and again we wonder why. Clearly, the President has determined that this will be a major, partisan issue. But what possible advantage could there be in withdrawing funds to heal our sick and educate our children? The answer lies in the less than successful administration's economic policy which has brought production to a standstill, but left prices rising steadily. By vetoing this bill, he somehow feels that he can dramatically demonstrate his dedication to sound fiscal policy and lay the blame for inflation at the feet of Congress. But we in Congress must unite, Democrats and Republicans alike, to show this Nation that we will not permit the health of our people and the education of our children to become but new pawns in the game of political image-building. We must do this for two very good reasons. First, the bill as it now stands presents no threat to sound fiscal policy, so the rhetoric on this point is sheer fabrication. Second, the moneys appropriated in this bill represent some of the most vital programs in our Nation and to reduce them any further would have far-reaching detrimental effects upon the whole structure of our society, not to mention the in-

direct effect of undermining the confidence of our people in their leaders' dedication to those things which should have first priority. We must make our understanding of these facts and our dedication to the principles which first led to the passage of this bill unmistakably clear and perhaps the President will reconsider his ill-advised threat.

That this bill presents no danger to sound fiscal policy should be almost self-evident. President Nixon apparently objects to a little over $1 billion which we have included in this bill beyond what he requested. But let us not forget that we have also cut about $5.9 billion from military requests and $1.1 billion on foreign aid. The consequent net result of appropriations passed by this Congress relative to Presidential requests is a decrease of Government spending by $7.5 billion. In short, the Congress has shown greater spending restraint than the administration's budget. Now how can the administration honestly tell us that to spend an extra billion dollars on education and health is inflationary, but an additional $5.9 billion on defense is not? This is sheer double talk.

They have told us that we cannot just shift funds around like this, as though it were not the duty of Congress to help set national priorities. They have further claimed that not all expenditures are alike in their inflationary impact. There is a dangerous half-truth hidden here, for there does appear to be a difference in inflationary impacts among different sorts of expenditures, but this difference points in the opposite direction from that implied by the administration.

The money spent on armaments tends to be highly inflationary—creating excessive profits and leaving consumer demands completely unsatisfied. Money spent on education and health, on the other hand, satisfies some consumer demands and is, thus, not as inflationary. In fact, in the long run money spent on health and education is anti-inflationary. By increasing the health and training of people we are increasing the value and amount of their production. In simple terms, inflation is often described as too many dollars chasing too few goods and causing their prices to consequently rise. By better health and education we can produce more and better goods and thereby reduce inflationary pressures.

What we in Congress have done, then, is to make a careful, anti-inflationary reordering of priorities. This is the vital question that the people of our Nation are asking us—how have we spent their money. If the President vetoes this bill he will be saying that the health and education of all the people are not as important as a supersonic transport which will benefit only a very tiny minority. After all, it is the lives of people we are talking about—the lives of the people we represent. In this abstract debate we must not lose sight of the 200 million individual human beings whose interests and needs lie with their health and the education of their children—not with some mythical tally of Presidential support.

Consider for a moment the people of this country and how our actions may affect them—after all government is for the people, not for popularity or for graphs and charts of the economy. If we were to accept what is the apparent wish of the President we would actually have to take a step backward in the support of education. The President asked $3.2 billion for education, one-half billion dollars less than last year, and when we realize that the enrollment has increased and prices gone up, the net result is a 20 percent decrease in the quality and coverage of these programs. Let me cite just a few examples, from thousands of possibilities, to show the need to sustain this quite minimal increase of $1.3 billion.

If the President vetoes this bill and that veto is upheld, then there will be more than $170 million cut from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, about 12 percent of the funds. These are funds that were meant to assist those children who normally enter school with severe deprivation in their background and cannot participate fully in the benefits of education without programs such as those funded under this title. This is not only a denial of the right of education for these children, but it is also bad economy, because the money otherwise spent on their education will not be as effective.

Again if there is a veto, there will be absolutely no funds for guidance and counseling programs under title V–A of the National Defense Education Act. This has been one of the most important and effective education programs. In an age with increasing occupational complexity, it is tragic that there are whole counties without a single guidance person to assist the children in working out their study and occupational plans. We are leaving these children adrift if we do not have money for this program. And again to eliminate this program not only hurts the children, but it is poor economy since they will not be assisted in making the best use of that which has been offered them in school.

Let me take an example from higher education to illustrate how meager this budget is. In the bugdet there is a slight increase in the funds for the work-study program, but because of increasing participation and costs, this January South Dakota State University has been forced to eliminate approximately 50 students from its work-study program because of a reduction of about $35,000 in the money allocated it. The students assisted by this program are those hard-working individuals who do not have the money to attend college but work their way through, so their elimination from the program may mean that they will be eliminated from college. For want of less money than the salary of an engineer on the SST project, 50 future engineers, teachers, doctors, and scientists may not ever reach their goal.

Finally, let me call to your attention again a short article which I inserted in the RECORD last year that tells of a young girl dying of leukemia who wrote the President asking why there could not be more funds for health and medical research. She received the cold reply that matters of economy dictated these cuts. She was to die a few days later, perhaps not the result of misplaced emphasis in the budget, but a symbol of that distortion all the same.

It is the people of this Nation and their children who need these funds. Let us not forget them.

GOALS UNMET

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the goal of a quality education, comprehensive health care, and a decent standard of living for all of our citizens—a goal to which I fully subscribe—remains unmet.

And for all too many Americans, particularly those who live in our rural areas and in the ghettos of our cities, education, health care, and living standards do not even approach these goals. They are manifestly inadequate.

Yet the dream of creating a just society—a society in which all of our citizens are afforded an opportunity to employ their skills and reap a fair reward from their labor—cannot be achieved so long as spiraling prices threaten to undermine the fundamental integrity of the dollar and to wreak havoc upon our economic system.

The danger today is all the more acute since interest rates, having been raised to their highest levels in a century in an effort to combat inflation, now threaten to choke off further economic growth, thus triggering a recession.

Interest rates can be brought down, tight money eased, the stagnant housing market revived, prices stabilized, and inflation curbed—but only through the most vigilant constraints on Federal spending.

The President and his advisers fully understand the nature of this threat. All the evidence indicates they fully intend to meet it. The Federal Reserve Board can relax its severely tight monetary policy when it is convinced that the President and Congress really intend to cut Federal spending and control the rampant inflation.

Spiraling prices sap the wallets and pocketbooks of all Americans. But they exact the cruelest penalty from the very Americans who are the special concern of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose 1970 appropriation is now pending before the Senate in the form of a $19.8 billion conference report.

I refer to the 25 million Americans now receiving social security checks; the 9 million persons, mostly very young or very old or disabled, who are on public assistance; the aged and the poor, whose benefits under medicare and medicaid are imperiled by an annual 13 percent increase in medical costs—double the average rate for the general economy.

In the education field, school spending has reached record heights in the 1968–69 academic year but inflation has wiped out virtually the entire spending increase. As School Management magazine has pointed out:

> Inflation is roaring through education's fiscal forest like a fire blazing out of control. Dollars spent for books, building, salaries and services are going up in smoke . . . Until inflation cools down, school districts that increase spending will, in effect, simply be spinning their wheels.

To arrest this trend, it is vital that Congress do its part to insure a budget that at the very least will not stimulate inflation through deficit spending. The net result of congressional budget cuts in 1969 is a decrease in fiscal 1970 expenditures of only $400 million. But increases in fixed-cost items will claim at least $4 billion more than the official estimates made last April. Together, these items are enough to put the budget surplus originally forecast—and urgently needed for stabilizing the economy—in serious jeopardy.

Now that the President has analyzed the situation and made his stand clear, I would like to see the Senate recommit the HEW appropriation to the conference with instructions to make reasonable cuts in lower-priority programs, thus bringing the appropriation closer into line with the HEW budget request and putting the Congress on record in support of the administration's anti-inflationary drive. The parliamentary situation requires me to vote against the conference report in order to have the bill recommitted.

At the same time that programs of lesser priority are reduced, I would like to see the conferees restore the modest $25 million requested by the President to develop innovations in elementary and secondary schools and $9.3 million for the Teacher Corps. Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch informs me that such innovative programs are a key to reversing the dangerous decline of our public school systems.

In supporting recommital of the HEW appropriation, I am mindful of the fact that the President has pledged to veto the bill as it now stands on anti-inflationary grounds. Should such a veto be overridden by the Congress, the President has indicated that he would be obliged for anti-inflationary reasons to delete funds from those sectors of the HEW budget where he retains the discretion to do so.

I am informed that such an offset would prevent the Department from making any further discretionary loans or grants for the remainder of the fiscal year, no matter how urgent they might be. And even having taken that extreme action, only a half of the inflationary increase now under challenge would actually be offset. The consequences to high-priority programs, such as medical research, health services, air pollution, rehabilitation services and other vital HEW-supported activities are simply unacceptable to our Nation.

The task that now lies ahead for the Congress and the administration presents us with a high challenge. We must find the means of achieving our unmet social goals while preserving the basic integrity of our economy.

This means that outworn programs will have to be phased out, that the most stringent economies will have to be practiced to insure full value for the Federal dollar and that the basis of earlier strategic concepts that govern military outlays will have to be closely re-examined in the light of current national defense requirements. Only through these hard choices can we finally succeed in providing a better life for our people.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION—EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE CARSWELL TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has just received from the President the nomination of Judge Harrold Carswell, of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, to fill the vacancy existing on the Supreme Court.

I point out that Judge Carswell is a resident of the State of Florida. As a matter of fact, it was at my suggestion that the President last year nominated Judge Carswell for his present post on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I cannot think of anyone that the President of the United States could have nominated that would be a more distinguished jurist or would make a better Supreme Court Justice than would Judge Carswell.

Judge Carswell has spent almost his entire career in the Federal judicial system. He was a U.S. attorney, having been appointed in 1953 by President Eisenhower. He held that post for 5 years. He was the youngest U.S. attorney.

In 1958 he was appointed to be a Federal judge in Florida. At that time he was the youngest Federal judge in the United States. He served in that post with distinction for more than 11 years.

I understand, from checking with lawyers and jurists recently, that in the 7 months he has served on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals he has continued to add to his distinction as a Federal jurist.

The President has made an excellent nomination. I believe that when the Judiciary Committee and the Senate examine the record of Judge Carswell, they will agree that he will make an eminent jurist and will be a credit to the Supreme Court of the United States.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I had a colloquy with the manager of the pending conference report, the distinguished Senator from Washington. I attempted to shed some light on certain aspects of the problem relating to the budget which I am sure have troubled not only me but also a good many other Members of the Senate, members of the press, and members of the public.

My friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, provided for the RECORD a tabulation entitled, "Actions on Budget Estimates of the 91st Congress, first session, as of December 20, 1969," which shows that the budget requests considered by the Senate totaled $135.2 billion and that the amounts approved by the Senate were reduced to $130.3 billion.

The amounts agreed to in conference were reduced further to $129.6 billion, leaving a savings of $5.6 billion.

That did not ring true with what I had understood to be the budget picture. I attempted to point out that when we compare the action by the Nixon administration on the original Johnson budget, as President Johnson was leaving office early last year, a subsequent action by the Nixon administration, and a further subsequent action by the Nixon administration, all calculated to reduce the budget, it appears that the Nixon administration had cut spending considerably.

Then to come along and suggest that Congress had cut that amount by another $5.6 billion just did not make sense to me.

My friend, the Senator from Washington, assured us—and as I said earlier, I am sure he was quite sincere—that the figures which appear on the table which he provided for the RECORD represent a final figure on budget askings by the Nixon administration.

With all due deference, I must say that I do not believe the people have a complete picture. It is true, I am advised, that these do represent the final budget askings by the Nixon administration, or by the agencies of the Nixon administration. However, there are two points to be made. First, the Nixon administration, or at least some agencies of the Nixon administration, and especially the Department of Defense, without formal action on the budget requests, initiated action to cut spending by a good many billions of dollars.

So, the budget actually, as far as spending action was concerned, had already been cut by the time action was taken on the formal budget requests by the Appropriations Committee.

So, if we look only at the formal budget requests and forget about the initiatives taken by the Defense Department to cut $5 to $6 billion, we will not get a correct picture.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland. However, I want to complete the picture first.

The people would not obtain a correct impression as far as the true action by the Nixon administration is concerned. We have to differentiate between formal budget requests on the one hand, which are represented by the table, and the actual budget actions by the Nixon administration, which is really what counts.

Second, I have here the 1970 Budget Scorekeeping Report, Staff Report No.

14, of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures of the Congress of the United States, as of the end of the first session of the 91st Congress, December 23, 1969.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures is headed by the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative GEORGE MAHON. Also, among others on the committee, are the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA).

Mr. President, recognizing the make-up of this distinguished committee consisting of leading Members of the Senate and the House on both sides of the aisle, it seems to me that this report should carry great weight not only with Members of the Senate but also with members of the press and the public. On pages 4 and 5 of this report appears the analysis which I think the people should have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pages 4 and 5 from the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS AND INACTIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) DURING THE 91ST CONGRESS 1ST SESSION AS OF DECEMBER 23, 1969

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the revised budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the revised budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1970 actions on individual bills affecting budget authority and outlays:						
Appropriation bills—changes from the revised budget:						
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office (H.R. 11582, Public Law 91-74)	−42,382	−34,519	−38,482	−37,000	−30,600	−34,000
Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 11612, P.L. 91-127)	−160,907	+405,236	+251,341	+[2]53,000	+294,000	+166,000
Second supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400 P.L. 91-47)				−92,700	−64,700	−75,000
Section 401 outlay ceiling					(−1,900,000)	(−1,000,000)
Independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 12307; P.L. 91-126)	−471,325	−177,521	−226,099	−61,000	−25,900	−40,000
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 12781, P.L. 91-98)	−15,810	−8,090	−10,481	−15,300	−11,800	−7,800
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 12964, P.L. 91-153)	−130,070	−83,350	−111,272	−71,000	−40,600	−60,000
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 13111)	+1,078,365	+1,637,686	[4]+1,139,028	+521,000	+653,000	+565,000
Legislative Branch (H.R. 13763, P.L. 91-145)	−26,850	−29,842	−27,826	−7,900	−8,800	−8,700
Public Works (H.R. 14159, P.L. 91-144)	+301,469	+789,451	+552,030	+10,500	+67,400	+50,000
Military Construction (H.R. 14751, P.L. 91-170)	−466,741	−313,854	−356,844	−37,000	−26,500	−29,000
Transportation (H.R. 14794, P.L. 91-168)	+34,546	+106,679	+89,265	−172,000	−43,200	−133,000
District of Columbia (H.R. 14916, P.L. 91-155)	−40,151	−55,295	−60,332	−14,000	−13,800	−12,500
Department of Defense (H.R. 15090, P.L. 91-171)	−5,318,152	−5,955,544	−5,637,632	−3,000,000	−3,250,000	−3,200,000
Foreign Aid (H.R. 15149)	−1,071,544	−960,779	[4]−1,120,654	−167,000	−146,000	−120,000
Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 15209, P.L. 91-166)	−63,490	−17,721	−36,317	−5,670	+30,000	+19,000
Subtotal, appropriation bills	−6,393,042	−4,697,463	−5,594,275	−3,096,070	−2,617,500	−2,920,000
Legislative bills with spending authorizations—changes from the revised budget:						
Civil service retirement benefits (Public Law 91-93)	N.A.	N.A.	+145,000	+86,100	+94,700	+65,000
Defense: overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434)	+8,090			+8,900		
Veterans readjustment benefits (Public Law 91-22)	+1,362	+1,362	+1,362	+3,952	+3,952	+2,300
Veterans hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693)	+16,225	+16,225	[5]	+16,225	+16,225	[6]
Veterans care in State homes (P.L. 91-178)	+2,803	+2,803	+2,803	+2,803	+2,803	+2,803
Veterans care in community nursing homes (H.R. 692)	+5,954			+5,954		
Veterans outpatient care (Public Law 91-102)	+8,000	+8,000	+4,000	+8,000	+8,000	+4,000
Veterans nursing home care (service-connected) (Public Law 91-101)	+1,500	+1,500	[3]+750	+1,500	+1,500	[3]+750
Veterans non-service-connected benefits (H.R. 372)	+8,538			+8,538		
Additional district judges (S. 952)		+1,473			+1,473	
Additional clerks for House Members (H. Res. 357)	+3,600		+3,600	+3,600		+3,600
Appalachian highways (P.L. 91-123)	+20,000					
Food for needy children (H.R. 11651)				+100,000		
Veterans education assistance (H.R. 11959)	+206,500	+383,000	[6]	+206,500	+380,000	[6]
Veterans Vietnam insurance (S. 2003)		+1,700			+1,700	
Veterans additional $5,000 insurance (S. 1479)		+45,000			+45,000	
Veterans double indemnity insurance (S. 1650)		+100,000			+100,000	
Veterans dismemberment insurance (S. 2186)		+10,000			+10,000	
Veterans increased dependency and indemnity compensation (P.L. 91-96)	+61,565	+52,840	+31,300	+61,565	+52,840	+31,300
Navajo Indian road (S. 404)		+5,000				
Travel per diem (P.L. 91-114)		+13,000	+13,000		+13,000	+13,000
Federal salary comparability (H.R. 13000)	+750,000	+696,000	[5]	+750,000	+696,000	[6]
Public Health Service retirement (S. 2452)		+110			+110	
Prisoner-of-war medical care (S. 1279)		+1,017			+1,017	
Military lawyers retention (H.R. 4296)	+7,000			+7,000		
Judges' 20-year retirement (S. 1508)		+636			+636	
Housing and Urban Development Act (P.L. 91-152)	+1,500,000		+1,500,000	N.A.		N.A.
Outdoor advertising controls (S. 1442)		+15,000				
Expanding mortgage market (P.L. 91-151)	N.A.	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	+123,000	N.A.	+123,000
Adjustment of military retired pay (P.L. 91-179)	+14,000	+14,000	+14,000	+14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Unemployment trust fund (H.R. 14705)	+14,000					
Family separation allowance—residence (H.R. 110)	+9,000			+9,000		
Per diem allowance (P.L. 91-183)	+41,000	+41,000	+41,000	+41,000	+41,000	+41,000
Air evacuation subsistence (H.R. 9654)	+25			+25		
Federal-aid highways (H.R. 14741)	+26,000					
Additional super grade positions (P.L. 91-187)		+93			+93	
Legislative and judicial salaries (P.L. 91-67)		−38	−38		−38	−38
Social security benefits (P.L. 91-172)				+1,000,000	+1,900,000	+1,050,000
NSLI trust fund for veterans home loans (H.R. 9476)				+1,000,000		
Urban mass transportation (S. 3154)		+2,800,000				
Subtotal, legislative bills	+2,705,972	+7,209,721	+4,756,777	+3,457,662	+3,384,011	+1,350,715
Total, actions on individual bills	−3,687,070	+2,512,258	−837,498	+361,592	+766,511	−1,569,285
Inactions on legislative proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays, see Part I of supporting table No. 4, page 11	+1,313,513	+1,313,513	+1,313,513	+1,231,913	+1,231,913	+1,231,913
Total, fiscal year 1970	−2,373,557	+3,825,771	+476,015	+1,593,505	+1,998,424	−337,372

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, we can reconcile these tables with the table that the distinguished Senator from Washington placed in the RECORD earlier today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment? I have to leave the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has referred to the Senator from Washington. These are not my figures. They are fig-

ures from the Committee on Appropriations which I used in my speech and which the Senator from Louisiana used in his speech. They are figures on appropriations.

Is it not true that what the Senator is reading from—and I have it before me—is a supporting table on the expenditures? Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator read the title of the table which the Senator from Washington gave me earlier today. It is an estimate of new budgetary authority as of December 20, 1969. I want to make clear, and I emphasized this earlier today and again just a few moments ago, that as far as it goes it is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. These are expenditures. The table the Senator put in is a supporting table.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. It says so.

Mr. MILLER. The one the Senator from Iowa had printed in the RECORD from the joint committee is entitled "Supporting table."

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. Maybe I misunderstood the Senator from Iowa. I was talking about appropriations and he was suggesting that the expenditure tables are different, which they are. They are here. That is a minus $3 billion.

Mr. MILLER. I do want to say, as I mentioned earlier this afternoon, I did not believe we were on the same wavelength. This has been the difficulty that has caused the confusion not only among Members of the Senate but also among members of the press and of the public.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are two wavelengths to begin with and you cannot be on the same wavelength.

Mr. MILLER. So that one, without the other, will leave a misrepresentation. The wavelength my friend from Washington was on——

Mr. TYDINGS. Was the entire fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER (continuing). Was that Congress cut the Nixon budget by $5.6 billion and the inference one could draw from that statement would be, since we already saved $5.6 billion over the Nixon budget, why are we arguing about a little old $1.3 billion increase in the HEW appropriation bill.

As a matter of fact, that is not the case. The case is, as set forth in the two pages from the Joint Committee on Reductions of Federal Expenditures, which I insert in the RECORD, that insofar as the appropriations actions are concerned to which the distinguished Senator from Washington referred, there has, indeed, been a reduction of $5.6 billion in the formal Nixon budget requests.

Mr. TYDINGS. For fiscal year 1970.

Mr. MILLER. But that is not the whole case. One can find, following this $5.6 billion in the supporting tables from the Joint Committee on Reductions of Federal Expenditures, an amount of $4.7 billion covering various legislative bills, which entail expenditures, and another amount of $1.3 billion representing what are called "inactions on legislative proposals to reduce budget authority," so the net result is that, instead of Congress reducing the Federal budget outlays, by $5.6 billion which the taxpayers have to pay for, Congress has run up a deficit of merely a half billion dollars.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. If it were not for that picture, I do not think we would be arguing too much about the $1.3 billion HEW excess that has resulted in the threatened veto.

I hope this explanation will show that there are, indeed, two wavelengths and that the one I have given is the full wavelength, because it reveals the total picture as far as taxpayers are concerned and as far as inflation is concerned; how much money is going to be spent versus receipts.

This excellent report from the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Expenditures gives that picture.

I might add that I will reluctantly vote against the conference report, because, I understand, according to the parliamentary rules that the only way this bill can be referred back to conference with instructions is, first of all, to defeat the conference report. It would be my hope, if the conference report is defeated, that appropriate instructions would be given to preserve most of the impacted aid portion of this bill. We are rather late in the year already. Many school districts have budgeted on the assumption that pretty much the same amount of money that was appropriated for fiscal 1969 would be appropriated for fiscal 1970. However, there are some which are receiving windfalls which should be avoided.

There is a very able article printed in the National Observer of January 19, entitled "Impacted Aid and What It's All About," which indicates some of the defects in the present impacted aid program and what President Nixon would like to do about it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the National Observer of January 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACTED AID: WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

Since 1951, the Federal Government has been paying subsidies to local school districts that educate a significant number of children of Federal employes. It has done so because Congress decided that it was unfair for local taxpayers to put up all the money for educating children whose parents worked or lived on Federal property that is not subject to local school taxes.

Congress worked out a complicated formula for calculating these subsidies. The formula determines the average amount that local taxpayers spend on each pupil in their school system. Then it roughly matches this sum for each student who lives on Federal property. It pays half as much for each child of a Federal employe who lives on property that is subject to local school taxes. The law describes the fully subsidized students from Government reservations as "Category A" students, and those who are halfway subsidized as "Category B" students.

The program cost $30,000,000 in its first year. It has multiplied many times since because of growing Government employment, rising costs of education, and the discovery by additional school administrators that they were entitled to some of this Federal money.

The program accelerated three years ago when the payments formula was altered to allow any district with 400 "A" or "B" pupils to apply for funds, no matter how tiny a proportion this might be of the total student body. This brought in major metropolitan school systems like that of Chicago, which in fiscal 1968, its first participating year, received $3,000,000 in "impact" funds. However, children of either category must make up 3 per cent of the student body in school systems where they number less than 400; districts with less than 10 such children are not entitled to any money under the rules.

About 4,600 of the nation's 20,000 school districts took advantage of the program last year, on behalf of 400,000 "A" students and 2,400,000 "B" pupils. Congress appropriated $506,000,000 for the program last year, but it had grown so large that each district received only 90 per cent of what it was entitled to under the official formula. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that districts will be entitled to $725,000,000 next year if the same formula is used.

President Nixon wants to change the formula by dropping Category B students, and subsidizing only those children whose families live and work on Government property, mostly military bases. The $187,000,000 that he has requested would pay the entire subsidy to which their school districts are entitled, instead of the 90 per cent they received last year.

This change would sharply reduce subsidies to communities housing large numbers of Government workers, especially the suburbs of Washington, D.C. Officials of one suburban district, Fairfax County, Virginia, say that only 600 of their 110,000 students are in the "A" category, but 50,000 are subsidized as "Bs." Elimination of the subsidy for the "B" students, they figure, would cost the county $14,000,000 in Federal aid next year.

A few school districts would benefit from Mr. Nixon's version of the law if they contain many children who live on military bases. Alaska, for example, could gain more than $500,000 per year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it would be my hope that the Senate would reject the conference report and then prepare appropriate instructions to the conference with the idea of preserving most of the impacted aid for the current fiscal year, perhaps dropping off some of the windfall aspects from it and trying to approach the President's budget on the HEW appropriations. We could go then before the public and show that we have the resolve to do something about inflation.

I think it has been well pointed out that some of the aid that might be lost to education or to health programs because of some cuts proposed in the HEW budget is far, far overshadowed by the results of inflation on our schools, school districts, hospitals, and other health centers, so that we simply must do something about inflation. That should be and is, as far as President Nixon is concerned, the No. 1 target on the domestic scene for our country. Unless we do something about this inflation, things are going to get worse. We are faced with more inflation and high interest rates, so we must draw the line. I think it is time for us to draw the line. Congress has collectively made a decison on priorities when it passed the tax bill. As I said,

when I voted for it, I regretted what I regarded as excess tax relief in that bill, but a majority of Congress made the decision. The No. 1 priority was to be excessive tax relief and the No. 2 priority was to meet the needs of health, education, and social welfare.

What Congress should have done was to collectively decide that the No. 1 priority would be modest tax relief with enough revenue left over to meet the needs of education, health, and social welfare, but I regret that a majority of my brothers did not see it that way. They made the decision and now they have to live with it. If they are not willing to live with it, it means we are going to have more inflation and high interest rates. They cannot make a different choice. They cannot have their cake and eat it.

I hope my colleagues will see fit to vote against the conference report and join with me in instructions to the conferees to change the HEW bill generally along the lines requested by the President, but with the present level of impacted aid largely preserved.

My colleague from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) has been patiently waiting. I hope he does not mind that I have completed my statement, but if he has questions, I shall be glad to yield.

If my colleague does not have questions, I am glad my statement has been so clear.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am rather saddened and chagrined to learn that my colleague from the State of Iowa is going to turn his back on the schoolchildren of America; is going to turn his back on air pollution demonstration programs, mental retardation, hospital construction, health manpower, construction of medical training and research facilities, elementary and secondary education, instructional equipment, education professions development, student aid for higher education, vocational education, libraries and library services, and is going to respond to the directions of the White House.

I have listened with interest to the Senator's use of the supporting tables on pages 4 and 5 of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures of the Congress of the United States, but wish to point out to the Senator from Iowa that the label at the top of those pages is mostly on action and inaction on congressional outlays or expenditures during the first session of the 91st Congress, as of December 23, 1969.

The budget for fiscal year 1970, as submitted by the President, runs from July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970. No matter how the Senator from Iowa and no matter how the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania, view it, the budget requests of the President of the United States for fiscal year 1970 were cut by over $5½ billion after we inserted the items which the Senator is going to vote against, the aid to education, mental health, and health facilities in this Nation.

I would like to know how the Senator from Iowa can justify to his constituents why when the President asks for $1.1 billion more in foreign assistance, that is not inflationary—and he asked $1.1 billion more than we gave him—but when the Congress appropriates $1 billion more, for health and education, after we have already cut over $6 billion from the President's request, that is inflationary.

I would like the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Pennsylvania to explain to the American people why the President's request for $5.6 billion more in military expenditures—and we all know the extravagances and wastes in the Defense Budget which have been brought out by the congressional committees, the requests which the Senate and the House cut—was not inflationary, and yet $1 billion for health, for hospital construction, for vocational training, for aid to elementary and secondary education, for classrooms across the country, is inflationary.

I would like to know how the Senator from Iowa is going to justify to his constituents the position that $400 million more in independent offices appropriation bill—which we cut off the President's appropriation request—was not inflationary.

Why was the additional $38 million we cut off the Post Office-Treasury request not inflationary?

Why was the $10 million we cut from the Interior bill not inflationary?

Why was the $121 million we cut from State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation not inflationary?

I would especially like to hear from the Senator from Iowa why the $1.1 billion which we cut from the foreign aid request was not inflationary. When the President requests to spend foreign aid money which, in many countries, is just poured down the drain, why is that not inflationary? It is fine when the President requests it. It seems it is not a bit inflationary when the President requests $5.6 billion more than we gave him. Yet when we cut the overall fiscal appropriation by $5.6 billion, and yet within that cut we provide a little extra, $13 million extra, for air pollution research and demonstration programs, that is inflationary.

When we request $2 million for mental health, manpower development, that is inflationary. But $1.1 billion extra for foreign aid, when requested by the President, is just fine; that is not a bit inflationary.

When we request $10 million for comprehensive health planning and services, that is inflationary.

When we request $104 million for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program, that is just terrible. We cannot do that. Call the Republicans; crack the whip. Get the leader out and roll everybody in line. We cannot have that $104 million extra for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act.

It is all right for the President to ask for $5 billion more for the military, it is all right for him to ask $1.1 billion more for foreign aid. That is not inflationary. But, my goodness, we cannot have $60 million for research in cancer, heart, arthritis-metabolic diseases, stroke, allergy, and other diseases. That, according to the Republican economics, is inflationary.

My goodness, the very idea of $312 million for elementary and secondary education for American schoolchildren.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sorry. I gave the Senator his turn. Now I am going to speak.

Mr. MILLER. I thought the Senator was asking me a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. That aid to elementary and secondary education seems to be inflationary. The very idea of $312 million going for title I, supplementary educational centers, library resources, and dropout prevention programs. My goodness, that is going to disrupt the national economy. The administration thought it was all right to have $1.1 billion extra for foreign assistance, but Congress cut that. We thought it was inflationary, and we cut it. We cut $5.6 billion out of military spending. We cut 10 of the 14 budgetary requests submitted by the President. In that total we still allowed enough for extra money to go for education and health. And now the Senator is going to turn around and say to the schoolchildren of the United States that he is going to support the President's veto because it is inflationary.

I do not know how anyone is going to juggle the figures—and figures can be juggled—but there is no way to confuse the budgetary requests of the President for fiscal 1970, and there is no way to juggle the figures that Congress finally approved. There is no way to contradict the differences between the President's requests and the budget passed by Congress.

Let us look at some of these other items. Here is another inflationary item. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the item of $14,150,000 for education for the handicapped. That just should not be there. It is tremendously inflationary. It is quite all right to have the C–5A. That is fine. That has had an overrun of only $2 billion, but the very idea of having only $14 million for the handicapped, is just too much.

Here is another one: $12 million for education professions development. The idea of throwing away $12 million on teachers. The very idea. We could very well provide what the President wanted—another $1,100 million for foreign aid and assistance, for example. That is fine. That is not inflationary. That is just dandy.

Then look at this: Libraries, library resources, community services, $41 million. That would be a tragic expenditure. Much better, let us see if we cannot come up with something in military construction. Aha: Like the extra $356 million in military construction. That is not inflationary; that is just fine. But Congress thought it was. Congress cut it out. But it is not inflationary when the President requests it.

Aha, look at this: Instructional equipment, National Defense Education Act, $48 million. We cannot let that go through. We cannot have that inflationary item. We have got to support that veto.

Now, I should like to make one or two more comments about the actions by the 91st Congress on the budget requests of

the President of the United States. I do not know what sort of communications there are between the White House and the media in this country, but I know that the major media in this country, the newspapers and television, are apparently completely and abysmally ignorant of what Congress did to the President's appropriation requests this year.

Every time I have been interviewed by a newspaper reporter, a television reporter, or a radio reporter, they have had the idea that Congress was being wasteful, that Congress was increasing the expenditures, and that the White House was reducing them. I know Mr. AGNEW has good communication with the media, evidently, since he has castigated them a bit, but I would suggest to them that they get the message across to the American people that after the President had finished and reviewed the Johnson budget and made his additions and reductions—and he made some—then Congress came through and cut $5.5 billion from his requests and at the same time, we still provided sufficient funds for matters which we thought were vitally necessary in the fields of education and health.

Now we receive the word that the President of the United States feels that these are inflationary. His additional $5.6 billion in requests of the total budget were not, but this little addition to the health of our Nation and for the schoolchildren of America is inflationary, and he is going to veto it. He calls on all members of his party to stand by his veto and to turn their backs on the schoolchildren of America, the old people of America, the sick, the diseased, and the unhealthy. I certainly hope Congress stands on its own feet, and I certainly hope that if the President goes through with the veto of the HEW appropriations that Congress will act on the merits, and not at the behest of the party whip.

I am now prepared to yield the floor, though I shall be happy to respond to questions of the Senator from Iowa, if he wishes.

Mr. MILLER. I prefer to speak on my own time.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Maryland did not see fit to yield earlier, because I understood that he was asking me some questions. Perhaps they were just rhetorical questions. I am sorry if the Senator from Iowa stepped on some tender toes on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. TYDINGS. No problem.

Mr. MILLER. But we are quite used to observing people who are Members of Congress—I do not question their sincerity, though I question their judgment very much—who, any time there is a reduction in the purchasing power of the people's money as a result of inflation, which, of course, is based upon the operations of Congress in voting to spend billions of dollars more than we take in—are very sympathetic with the hardship that inflation has brought upon some people; but when it comes to trying to cut the spending, so that revenue and spending will be matched and there will not be inflation, then one can literally hear the crocodile tears starting to fall. Someone suggests that there be a cut in certain types of education programs—not that they be eliminated, just that they be reduced because there has been some waste found in them—and some Senator will immediately be heard to say, "Oh, you are turning your backs on the little schoolchildren of this country."

Anyone who would say that about the Senator from Iowa has not been doing his homework. The Senator from Iowa, in his 9 years here, has supported every major education bill passed by Congress. So I suggest to my colleague from Maryland that his point that I might be turning my back on little schoolchildren or upon people who are sick is not very well taken, and indicates a failure on his part to do his homework. I think that is too bad, because I would not accuse the Senator from Maryland of such a thing. I could very well turn it around and say that the Senator from Maryland has been voting for these multibillion-dollar deficits ever since he has been a Member of the Senate, which is the reason why we have inflation in this country, and he is going to have to face the music and bear his share of the responsibility when he goes before the voters this fall. I am sure he will be happy to do that, but I just want people to know who is responsible for the inflation and the high interest rates in this country, and that it ill behooves someone who has been talking about all the spending we are going to do for people to wring his hands and say, "Oh, we cannot charge these high interest rates, which are literally killing the little people in this country."

Mr. President, I think we need to put a little perspective into what is said around here, and I think the proper perspective is this: The Senator read a list of items from the HEW bill, but he forgot to mention those items for which the President himself had asked for an increase. He asked for increases in those programs which are needed, such as teacher training and programs to provide better opportunities for poor students to get an education. He requested increases in those. But he asked for some reductions in certain parts of the budget, and I can understand why the Senator from Maryland would be a little touchy on one of them. That one happens to be impacted aid. One of the biggest areas of abuse in this country is in one of the wealthiest counties in this country, and it happens to be in my friend's State. One of the wealthiest counties in this country receives one of the largest amounts of impacted aid—far more, as I understand it, than 100 of the poorest counties in this country. So no wonder he is a little concerned when the President suggests that impacted aid and the abuses therein be reduced or eliminated.

It is going to impinge upon some of his constituents. And it should, Mr. President. I will support the Senator from Maryland where he needs support, but do not let him come around and start to talk about the President, the Senator from Iowa, or anybody from this side of the aisle turning their back on little schoolchildren, because the record will not support it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the Senator going to tell school superintendents of Iowa when he votes against the items involved in the HEW welfare appropriations, which include, in the area of education alone, elementary and secondary education, $312 million? That is completely apart from impacted aid. What is the Senator going to tell them? Is he going to tell them it was quite all right for $1.1 billion on foreign aid, that that is not inflationary, but $312 million for education is terrible?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator asked to yield for a question, and the Senator from Iowa will be happy to answer the question. It is not necessary for the Senator from Maryland to try to put words in the mouth of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the Senator going to tell the schoolchildren of Iowa?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I will answer the question.

The answer is, Mr. President, that I already have told them, and I have told them this: that until we got this inflation under control, they would have to be content with the same level of spending that they had last year.

I am pleased to say to the Senator from Maryland that the response was favorable, because those school people, when you get right down to it, understand very well what inflation has been doing to their budgets and to their school costs and to the costs of construction—and it has hurt them terribly. The same is true about higher education.

The Senator from Iowa is not talking about turning backs on anybody. He is not talking about taking these items that the Senator from Maryland read and eliminating them. He is talking about holding them at current levels until we can get this inflation mess straightened out, and then we will have an opportunity either to enlarge them or to replace them by more efficient programs.

That is the answer the Senator from Iowa gave about 2 months ago in his State.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa why the $5.6 billion that the President requested for additional military expenditures and the $1.1 billion for additional foreign aid expenditures were not inflationary but the additional money, in millions of dollars, for education and health is inflationary.

Mr. MILLER. I think the answer is that one can say that anything in the budget by way of spending is inflationary. It is like saying if you go $1 over the income of the Treasury, that is inflationary. A technical, theoretical argument can be made about it. The Senator is not going to argue about foreign aid. He supported the committee on the reduction in foreign aid. It is not a matter of what is inflationary, so much as a matter of what is the current level of spending. I never worry too much about sticking with the current level when I am trying to reach a balanced budget. But I do worry about increases.

The Senator from Maryland has been around here long enough to know that the increases in the HEW budget and the HEW appropriations have probably been greater than in any other agency of the Federal Government, including the Defense Department. This does not mean that they should not have been greater. But it does indicate that rapid expansion and tremendous expenditures running into 20 billions of dollars give an opportunity for waste, and we have found waste.

He talks about waste in the Defense Department. There is waste in every department around here, and there has been for a long time. This is one reason why we had a change of administrations. There was too much waste in the previous administration, and we hope the present administration will continue its prudent policies which will enable this waste to be minimized.

But when it is asked, "Isn't it terrible to have such an inflationary item as a billion dollars of foreign aid?" I point out that this is the lowest foreign aid amount we have had since I have been in the Senate. We are reducing it and perhaps we should. That is why I supported the cut.

But, Mr. President, any time you have one of the wealthiest counties in the United States receiving impacted aid equivalent to what 100 poor counties are getting, I do not think you have a prudent expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The Senator from Maryland well knows that this happens in his State, and I think he should take the lead in trying to do something about this type of waste. That, indeed, is inflationary.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am interested to know just how the Senator from Iowa explains to his constituents in Iowa the fact that there is no more difference between $1.1 billion in foreign aid than $1.1 billion in aid to education and health right here in the United States, and that it is not more inflationary to spend money on foreign aid than it is to spend the money at home on our own schoolchildren and our own people. I would be very interested in that. I would be very interested to know how he is going to state that when we cut $5.6 billion from the President's request and still include a small increase in aid to education and health, that our action here is more fiscally responsible than the action of the President, who comes to Congress; and if we had rubberstamped his program, item for item, it would have cost the taxpayers of the United States $5.6 billion more.

I would be interested in the Senator's response.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator has asked two questions.

The first question has to do with the inflationary aspects of foreign aid. He knows the answer as well as I do. He has studied his economics. He knows that probably the most inflationary type of spending is for national defense, because it does not turn into productive type of resources. It is a wasting type of expenditure. But we have to have national security and live up to certain of our foreign commitments if we want to have an orderly and peaceful world. That is our No. 1 objective in this country—an orderly and peaceful world. I hope the Senator from Maryland is not going to say we will stop foreign aid because it is inflationary, because it is not particularly productive, and let the orderly and peaceful world go by.

Mr. TYDINGS. We ought to cut an extra $500 million from it.

Mr. MILLER. He is not going to do that at all, because he is for an orderly and peaceful world.

That is why we have some inflationary-type spending, for the sake of an orderly and peaceful world.

So far as the matter of education costs is concerned, nothing I know of is more productive than proper spending for education. But do not try to link that into the same ball park with paying millions of dollars to one of the wealthiest counties in this country for impacted aid. Impacted aid was conceived by Congress for the purpose of relieving taxpayers when people from military reservations sent their schoolchildren off the reservations into public schools in those school districts. The Senator from Maryland knows that. Then, a few years ago, before the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Maryland came to the Senate, Congress changed that. At least, they added to it, by saying that even though Federal employees are not living on a reservation, when they have children going to public schools, those areas will get impacted aid according to the population of that type of student.

That is why the Senator from Maryland has in his State a county, one of the wealthiest in the country, which has one of the highest impacted aid payments of any county in the United States. I do not think it is fair. I hope he does not think it is fair. I wonder whether he does think it is fair. Perhaps he would tell the Senator from Iowa whether he thinks that is fair and whether he thinks that is inflationary.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator be willing to let the counties involved tax the Federal installations located there at their value?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has not responded as to whether he thinks that is inflationary.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the counties involved in Maryland and elsewhere would be permitted to levy taxes on the great military and Federal installations which take up the land and which deprive the counties of an opportunity to raise revenue, if those installations were permitted to be taxed, then there would be a reasonable substitute for impacted aid to federally impacted areas.

However, as the Senator knows, that is only a small part. The entire school assistance in Federal impacted areas is only $600 million. We are talking about over 1 billion 100 million dollars for aid to education and aid to health.

This is going to be an interesting debate, and is not going to end today.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader. I make the following unanimous-consent request so that Senators may be on notice as to when we will vote on the pending conference report.

I am authorized by the able majority leader to propose the following unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that, immediately upon the further consideration of the pending conference report on tomorrow, debate be limited to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommitee, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the distinguished minority leader or whomsoever he may designate, and provided further that the vote on the conference report or any eligible motion related thereto occur not later than 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—has there been a previous order as to the time when the Senate will go into session on tomorrow and will there be a morning hour?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the previous order is that we recess at the close of business today until 12 o'clock tomorrow. So, there would be no morning business prior to the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I have consulted with the minority leader and also with the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking Republican member on the subcommittee. This arrangement is satisfactory as far as they are concerned. And I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, that during the further consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 13111 (the Labor-HEW appropriations bill) on January 20, 1970, debate be limited to 2½ hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), or his designee.

Ordered further, that the vote on the conference report or any motion related thereto, occur not later than 2:30 p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution No. 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 477), which was read by the bill clerk as follows:

H. CON. RES. 477

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 22, 1970, at 12:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 20, 1970, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19, 1970:

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Abe Fortas, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, January 19, 1970*

This being the day fixed by Public Law 91–182, 91st Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment of the Constitution, for the meeting of the second session of the 91st Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the 91st Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

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

Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.—Ephesians 6: 10.

O God and Father of us all, may we follow the leading of Thy spirit as we face another year and enter another decade. Bless us with Thy presence and help us always to be receptive to Thee and responsive to the needs of our fellow men.

At this high altar of prayer, the center of the spiritual life of our Nation, we pray for our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who labor with them, that they may be strengthened to meet confidently the searching demands of this stirring day.

Keep ever before us the goal of a better world with justice alive in our world, with peace between nations, and with good will in the hearts of men.

Hear us as we unite in offering unto Thee the Prayer of our Lord, *Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever.*

Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

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

[Roll No. 1]

Abbitt	Adams	Alexander
Abernethy	Addabbo	Anderson, Calif.
Adair	Albert	Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Fascell	McMillan
Arends	Findley	Madden
Ashbrook	Fish	Mahon
Ashley	Flood	Mann
Aspinall	Flynt	Marsh
Ayres	Foreman	Mathias
Baring	Fraser	Matsunaga
Beall, Md.	Frey	May
Belcher	Friedel	Melcher
Bennett	Fuqua	Meskill
Berry	Galifianakis	Michel
Biaggi	Gaydos	Mikva
Biester	Gettys	Miller, Ohio
Blackburn	Gibbons	Mills
Blanton	Gilbert	Mink
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Mize
Boggs	Goodling	Mizell
Bolling	Gray	Mollohan
Bow	Griffiths	Montgomery
Brasco	Gross	Moorhead
Brinkley	Gubser	Morse
Brock	Gude	Morton
Brooks	Haley	Moss
Broomfield	Hall	Murphy, Ill.
Brotzman	Hamilton	Natcher
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-schmidt	Nedzi
Broyhill, Va.	Hanley	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Nichols
Burleson, Tex.	Harvey	Obey
Burlison, Mo.	Hastings	O'Hara
Bush	Hathaway	Olsen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	O'Neill, Mass.
Cabell	Hechler, W. Va.	Passman
Caffery	Heckler, Mass.	Patman
Carter	Henderson	Patten
Casey	Hicks	Pelly
Cederberg	Hogan	Pepper
Chamberlain	Horton	Perkins
Chappell	Howard	Pettis
Chisholm	Hull	Pike
Clausen, Don H.	Hungate	Pirnie
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Poage
Cleveland	Hutchinson	Poff
Cohelan	Jarman	Pollock
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Powell
Collins	Johnson, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.
Colmer	Jonas	Price, Tex.
Conable	Jones, Ala.	Pryor, Ark.
Conte	Karth	Purcell
Corbett	Kastenmeier	Quie
Cramer	Kazen	Quillen
Crane	Kee	Railsback
Cunningham	King	Randall
Daddario	Kleppe	Rarick
Daniel, Va.	Kluczynski	Rees
Daniels, N.J.	Koch	Reid, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Reid, N.Y.
Davis, Wis.	Kyros	Reifel
Dellenback	Landrum	Reuss
Denney	Langen	Riegle
Dennis	Latta	Rivers
Dent	Leggett	Roe
Devine	Lennon	Rogers, Colo.
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Lowenstein	Rooney, N.Y.
Dowdy	Lujan	Rooney, Pa.
Downing	McCarthy	Rosenthal
Duncan	McClory	Roth
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Roudebush
Edmondson	McClure	Ruppe
Edwards, Ala.	McCulloch	Ruth
Edwards, La.	McDade	Ryan
Eshleman	McDonald, Mich.	Saylor
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Schadeberg
Evins, Tenn.	McKneally	Scherle
Fallon		Schneebeli
Schwengel	Stuckey	Watts
Scott	Symington	Weicker
Sebelius	Taft	Whalen
Shipley	Talcott	Whitten
Sikes	Taylor	Williams
Sisk	Teague, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Slack	Thompson, Ga.	Wold
Smith, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.	Wright
Springer	Tiernan	Wyatt
Stanton	Ullman	Wylie
Steed	Utt	Wyman
Steiger, Ariz.	Van Deerlin	Yatron
Steiger, Wis.	Vander Jagt	Young
Stephens	Vanik	Zablocki
Stokes	Vigorito	Zion
Stratton	Waldie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 283 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 775) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 775

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 776) and ask for its immediate consideration.