ENGINEERING

Aversano, Anthony J.
Baldwin, Robert L.
Bartholomew, David L.
Bartke, Harold L.
Billick, Dan R.
Blanchard, Gary F.
Bobo, Harold
Boyle, David J.
Butler, Robert E.
Chandler, Frank L.
Daniel, Jess M.
Deinhardt, John J.
Driscoll, Richard F.
Edwards, Bernard D.
Foss, Harry C., Jr.
Hale, Douglas A.
Harris, Thomas E.
Hill, Robert W.
Hine, Jerry G.
Hobbs, Hurshel B., Jr.
Horsfall, William E.
Howard, James E., Jr.
Jackson, Robert B.
Jones, Carlos
Kellum, William C., Jr.
Markle, Donald F.
McCleer, James L.
McElroy, Fred C.
Rand, Verl A.
Robertson, Bernard L. III
Rudden, Francis A.
Ruth, Herbert M.
Stewart, Lowell T.
Stiffler, James W.
Vick, Don A.
Zoglmann, Paul S.

HULL

Bailey, Defort
Binion, John I., Jr.
Delancey, James D.
Edwards, Raymond L.
Fuller, Emil A.
Hoyt, William H.
Johnston, Wilford P.
Jordan, Boykin B.
Lowe, Walter R.
Richardson, Billy E.

ELECTRICIAN

Brooks, Edgar T.
Cloutier, Lawrence P., Jr.
Haupt, Lloyd
Jensen, Gordon M.
Mathews, Carl L.
McGuire, David N.
Page, Alfred L.
Spears, Tommie E.
Stuck, James R.

ELECTRONICS

Arion, Ellsworth E.
Bradford, Billy C.
Brown, Robert E.
Campbell, Donald L.
Caton, Robert N.
Dekart, Donald F.
Eney, Neilson E., Jr.
Fridell, Robert A.
Grimes, David A.
Hall, Richard W.
Heuchert, Richard H.
Johnson, Thomas S., Jr.
Lechtenberg, Richard C.
Lee, Robert E.
Lentz, Joe B.
Majchrowicz, Edward J.
Miller, Roy A.
Moran, Matthew F., Jr.
Oehler, James C.
Pelletier, Ronald W.
Smith, Kenton L.
Tucker, Malcom R.
Tyler, Bobby D.
Weaver, Sterrie L., Jr.
Whiteley, William B.

CRYPTOLOGY

Goerg, Frederick C.
Haller, Bernard J.
Havenstein, Gene L.
Lopez, Clyde C.
Lovejoy, Jay E.
Peters, John W.
Popikas, Charles F.
Rakfeldt, Harry O.
Ross, Albert J., Jr.
Schaffer, Lawrence C., Jr.
Skipper, John W.
Walker, Arthur T.
Wyatt, Thomas V.

COMMUNICATIONS

Crowder, James D.
Enevoldsen, Jack
Fetter, Norman L.
James, Bobby C.
Loranger, Richard G.
Lucero, Seferino
Nichols, Paul M.
Palmer, Charles F.
Scheine, Murray
Shaul, Michael C.
Sparks, Howard F.
Woods, Gerald B.

AVIATION OPERATIONS

Emswiler, Robert B.
Gregory, Thomas
Vsetecka, Leonard J.

AVIATION CONTROL

Harry, Robert M.
Salter, Jesse E.

AIR INTELLIGENCE

Sronce, Frank T.

PHOTOGRAPHY

Husted, George G.
Marshall, Leo R.
Snyder, Ralph O.
Villemaire, Albert J.

METEOROLOGY

Fisher, Glen A.
Partesius, John S.
Smith, Kenneth F.

AVIATION ORDNANCE

Ashworth, Robert A.
Barker, Harvey W.
Malone, Robert G.
New, Melvin R.
Olson, John T., Jr.
Gordon, Harold L.
Lyon, Scott R.
Schmidt, Curtis J.
Tanner, William E.
Uptegrove, Edwin W.

AVIONICS

Braswell, Wallace E.
Chitwood, Orvis H., Jr.
Clabaugh, Ronald S.
Crain, Robert L., Jr.
Cudia, David T.
Delaney, Donald J.
Doehring, Robert F.
Howard, Donald R.
Lormor, Eugene H.
Michielson, Dennis C.
Olsen, Fredrick L.
Pohl, Matthew J.
Rodgers, Carl T.
Scherzer, James D.
Smith, Robert E.
Spear, Earl J.
Strickland, LeRoy H.
Thomason, William R.
Tibbs, John W.
Watson, Donald R., Jr.

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Akins, Olen C.
Benning, Vale J.
Black, James D.
Bond, Lester F.
Brown, Richard A.
Deutsch, Joseph K.
Donnellan, David F.
Etten, Gary A.
Gepford, Richard D.
Graff, Clinton G., Jr.
Hagensick, John R.
John, Paul M.
King, Orville C.
Nassar, Albert N.
Nechvatal, Charles J.
Rogge, John A.
Strong, Franklin E.
Terry, Robert J.
Thompson, Robert M.
Treadway, Alton G.
Tudor, Tommy N.
Whalen, Regis E.
Will, George F.
Wilson, James O.
Young, Neal R.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Moses, Raleigh W.
Strickler, James W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Olander, Edward A.
Taylor, Francis S., III

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Emison, Joseph B., Jr.
Stewart, Allen J.

Lieutenant Clifford J. Kamen, Jr., for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Beardsley, William F.
Bielefeld, James M.
Bonner, Jerold A.
Bowles, Hugh C.
Carroll, Richard J.
Cope, Stuart S., Jr.
Day, Richard S., Jr.
Kindle, Mickey E.
Kuykendall, George I., Jr.
Lathrop, Robert T.
Love, Glendel D.
McBride, Jon A.
Moon, Howard G.
Moore, Edwin T.
Noel, Raymond J., Jr.
O'Brien, Michael F.
Olmstead, Allen J., Jr.
Sapienza, Gerald J.
Wesh, Francis R.
Willems, Robert C.
Wolf, Edward J.
Woods, Robert A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Atkins, John W., III
Dittmann, Harry G.
Jamison, David C.
Jordan, Robert R.
Lemon, Harvey B.
Merritt, Thomas W.
Rodgers, Philip E.
Scott, William C.
Weissner, William W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bohn, Ronald G.
Lacy, Gordon R., Jr.
Lucas, John A., Jr.
McCaleb, Billy H.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Morton, Robert J., Jr.

The following named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Haynes, Edith E.
Hudson, Agnes S.

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Bielefeld, James M.
Burke, James L.
Daniel, David D.
Davis, Joseph W.
Flaherty, Timothy J.
Haynes, Edith E.
Hudson, Agnes S.
Kindle, Mickey E.
Lee, Howard F.
Marnane, Michael J.
Reidelberger, William H.
Sapienza, Gerald J.
Thunberg, Bruce E.
Valenty, John T.
Wolf, Edward J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Elliot, Ernest A.
Merritt, Thomas W.
Lester, Timothy O.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bohn, Ronald G.
Griffin, Harry G.

Norman H. Dahlgren, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Credle, William F., Jr.
Donshik, Garry R.
Grotenhuis, Paul W.
McDonald, Thomas G.
McLamb, James N.
Rowell, Maurice H., Jr.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 11, 1970:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Harold R. Parfitt, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 11, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God is not far from each one of us, for in Him we live and move and have our being.—Acts 17: 27, 28.

O God and Father of us all, we bow before Thee reverently and humbly as we begin the work of another week. Thou art with us every moment of every day. Help us, we pray Thee, to be aware of Thy presence as we endeavor to lead our people in right and just and good paths.

We thank Thee for brave words and courageous deeds which have made our Nation great among the nations of the world. In this moment we pray for those who with word and deed are seeking to keep our Nation great in this day—our leaders in Congress, the men and women in the Armed Forces of our country, those who labor for peace and freedom, and all who strive for liberty in law and law in liberty.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Give truth to our minds, love to our hearts, courage to our spirits, and strength to our hands that we may make patriotism shine with loyalty and love and life.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 7, 1970, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4145. An act to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Seminole Nations of Oklahoma dying without heirs; and

H.R. 10912. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the conditions under which the administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recoupment from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 15694. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

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

H.R. 9528. An act to require students and teachers in educational institutions and work training programs in the District of Columbia to wear protective devices for their eyes while participating in or observing certain courses of instruction; and

H.R. 15945. An act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11102) entitled "An act to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3778. An act to change the name of the Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir, Osage River Basin, Mo., to the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir, Mo.

MARITIME AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15945) an act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "$2,325,000" and insert: "$2,445,000".

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Maryland if the Senate-passed amendments are germane to the House-passed bill and the action of this body?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes, they are.

Mr. HALL. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it simply increases the amount of the House-passed bill by a matter of $135,000?

Mr. GARMATZ. By $120,000.

Mr. HALL. Would the distinguished gentleman tell this body what this increase involved, and, if it is germane, what justification there is for our accepting their action?

Mr. GARMATZ. The Senate amendment was to add $120,000 to cover the Great Lakes Maritime Academy at Northwestern Michigan College. This is a new State merchant marine school to train mates and engineers to meet needs of the Great Lakes. These needs are special because officers' licenses and operating requirements do not conform to U.S. Coast Guard requirements for the Great Lakes.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for responding.

Was that the only addition in the other body?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOUNG PEOPLE WHO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, during the weekend just past which was newsworthy because of the mass demonstrations targeted against the President, the Congress, and the President's action in Cambodia, several interesting and pleasant things happened to me.

Several young people of college and high school age called me by telephone—not to protest but to express their support of the President and the Government of the United States.

One young lady, a resident of a city within our district and presently a senior at a fine woman's college in Virginia said, "Mr. FLYNT, we have been watching the television showing the protest in Washington and I wanted to call and tell you that there are some of us who are not protesting and that we believe in our country and support our President and the action of the House of Representatives in backing him up last week." Her name is one well known to me and my family. Her words and her voice were both clear and sincere, and she spoke with a feeling of pride in her country and her Government.

When I asked her how her classmates and schoolmates felt, she said that most of them feel as she does. I asked her to check to be sure. She did and confirmed her previous statement.

She gave me several names of those with whom she talked and said that I could use their names in any way I saw fit.

She may have called some other young people after our conversation, because during the balance of the day and over the weekend I received several more such calls.

Mr. Speaker, I take note of this because it shows that there is clearly a difference of opinion among the college students of this country and that the supporters among that age group may equal or outnumber those who protested last Saturday. Certainly among my young constitutents the message came loud and clear that there were more supporters than there were demonstrators and protestors.

THE VIOLENCE OF THE SO-CALLED PEACE DEMONSTRATION

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up some of the misconceptions about the so-called peace demonstration this past Saturday, I would like to share some personal and firsthand observations of mine gained from Saturday morning until almost dawn on Sunday morning.

The protest was not as peaceful or nonviolent as the press would have you believe. After the reporters had evidently returned to their homes on Saturday night, parts of downtown Washington gave the appearance of being a no-man's land. Cars were burned, thousands of windows were broken, shots were fired at police, and monuments and Government buildings were disfigured with paint. The most violent act was the destruction of the front of the National Guard Association Building.

Of concern to all American taxpayers is the probable cost of over $1 million to the Government for providing police and military protection for the law-abiding citizens.

The right of peaceful assembly for the purpose of protest is a precious right. But this right has unfortunately been interpreted as a free ticket for wanton destruction of public and private property at the expense of the taxpayers.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman's emphasis on responsibility with respect to the right of dissent, or protest, or petition, or freedom. There is no privilege in freedom; it is only backed by responsibility.

I should like to ask Mr. Speaker, since we do fund the District of Columbia and its cleanup campaign out of the taxpayers' pockets, does the gentleman's statement include the cost of the cleanup after these demonstrations?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No. My figures do not include the cost of cleaning up Washington. I was unable to get those figures. I would put the cost of cleaning up Washington at between $150,000 and $200,000. Nor do my figures include repairs to Government buildings that were damaged nor repairs to private property that was damaged and which could possibly easily run to $1 million.

WALTER REUTHER: LABOR STATESMAN

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns the tragic death of a dynamic battler for social justice, Walter Reuther.

As a West Virginian, I am proud to remind my colleagues that Walter Reuther was born in Wheeling, W. Va. He gave new meaning to West Virginia's State motto, "Montani Semper Liberi"—Mountaineers Are Free Men.

We remember Walter Reuther for his courage. Who can forget the day when he stood at the overpass at River Rouge, standing up against the beating of the Ford thugs? Who can forget his courage when his life was threatened? Like Jock Yablonski, he never let the threat of assassination deter him from carrying on the fight for social justice.

We remember Walter Reuther because he thought of a union as something more than a selfish group interested solely in wages, hours, and working conditions. He carried the concept of unionism into the areas of war and peace, social justice, human rights, and the kind of world which young people would enjoy in the future. He knew that the fabric of peace, the strength of a nation, equality of opportunity, and the dignity of human beings everywhere were of prime importance in order to organize labor to fulfill its highest function.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a labor statesman and a great humanitarian.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from West Virginia and countless millions of others throughout the United States, I was grieved when I heard of the tragic death of Walter and Mrs. Reuther and the others who were accompanying them on the occasion of their sudden and tragic death.

I have known Walter Reuther for a number of years. I enjoyed a very close friendship with him. I entertained for him a deep feeling of respect. Walter Reuther had really earned by his constructive leadership and constructive efforts the title of the Labor Statesman. Even those who did not always agree with him completely respected his views, his sincerity, his courage, and his determination. Walter Reuther not only fought the battle of organized labor, but he fought the battle of unorganized labor. Furthermore, he fought the battle of the sick, the poor, the afflicted, and underprivileged, and those who were discriminated against. Walter Reuther was always found on the side of humanity and on the side of progress. His voice, his presence, and his influence are going to be sadly missed in the years that lie ahead.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the gentleman from West Virginia yielding to me.

It was a great tragedy that one of our outstanding citizens of Michigan, Walter Reuther, was unfortunately killed over the weekend in an aircraft accident near Pellston, Mich. It should be said, and I say it with emphasis, that Mr. Walter Reuther was one of the great labor leaders as well as political leaders in this past 30 years or more.

Oftentimes I had some disagreement with some of the policies advocated by Mr. Reuther. But on the other hand I admired his outstanding courage, his unquestioned integrity, and his total dedication to the cause or causes in which he believed so fervently.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the men who have worked in the automotive and related industries in my State and in other States owe a great debt of gratitude to Walter Reuther for the organization that he put together under most difficult and trying circumstances and the accomplishments that he achieved with the UAW on their behalf.

I am sure there is great sadness and sorrow among the 1 million or more automotive industry workers who have been the beneficiaries of Walter Reuther's leadership, ability, and dedication.

I extend to his family and to his literally thousands of friends in my State and elsewhere my deepest condolences upon his passing in this tragic accident. In Walter Reuther America has lost a leader among leaders.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia. As a person born and reared in Michigan, I wish to thank the State of West Virginia for giving us the honor of becoming the adopted home State of Walter Reuther.

As one who grew up in Michigan during the time of Mr. Reuther's greatest efforts, I, like many others, was inspired by him to believe that sincere people, working hard, could change a system which they felt alienated some segments of society. I feel his loss as does everyone in Michigan and as every other person in the country should at this sad moment.

Mr. Speaker, many groups of our society have tried to be recognized and have tried to believe that someone cared about them. Mr. Reuther gave new hope and faith to these people. I say this because I know of no other American who, throughout his lifetime, was believed in by both the old and the young. The tremendous record he built among all of the constituents of this country certainly went far, far beyond that which is expected of anyone.

Although Mr. Reuther was first and foremost the president and chief spokesman for his beloved United Auto Workers, his impact on the Nation's economic, social, and political life reverberated throughout every corner of the Nation and even throughout the world.

His hopes and his visions went far beyond the basic labor union goals of higher wages, shorter hours and better working conditions, although he did wage aggressive and usually successful fights to obtain these goals. Mr. Reuther saw organized labor as the advance guard in a battle to create a better world for all peoples.

He was an early battler at the bargaining table for such hard-won benefits as pensions, unemployment compensation, pay increases geared to the cost of living, supplemental unemployment benefits, profit sharing and early retirement.

On both the State and national level he fought for progressive legislation, and was always in the forefront of the battles for liberal causes.

Although Mr. Reuther was both a kind and gentle man, his life was marked with violence, even to his tragic death in an airplane crash.

He was beaten and bloodied at the now infamous "Battle of the Overpass" in 1937, when the UAW opened its campaign to organize the Ford Motor Co. During the early 1940's, he led a violence-marred campaign to oust Communist sympathizers from the UAW leadership. In 1948, he was the target of a would-be assassin, who gunned him down in his home with a shotgun blast through a kitchen window.

The name of Walter Reuther will loom large in the history of American labor when it is written for the turbulent three decades beginning in the late 1930's. He was instrumental in the 1939 merger of the UAW and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and in 1946 he was elected president of the United Auto Workers. Six years later he became president of the CIO. He was one of the prime architects of the 1955 merger of the CIO and the American Federation of Labor, and became a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

Two years ago, he led the UAW out of the AFL–CIO, charging that it had become too conservative and undemocratic. A year later, he laid the groundwork for the new Alliance for Labor Action, which involved a semimerger of the UAW and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Mr. Reuther had high hopes for the new ALA, which he envisioned as leading the fight for new political and social progress in the United States. His belief that the economic needs of workers were tied directly to politics was summed up in his now famous remark:

> The surest way to guarantee that your ice box is filled with good food is to see that the ballot box is filled with good votes on election day.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has been fortunate in having many great and good labor leaders. The UAW and the rest of organized labor will, I am sure, continue with their impressive gains for American working people. But no one, friend or foe, will deny that the cause of organized labor has been dealt a sad and heavy blow with the tragic death of Walter Reuther.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his remarks.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I think all will agree that this tragic accident has stilled one of labor's alltime eloquent voices. One could disagree with Walter Reuther, and many did. But none could help but admire his dedication, his great bargaining skills, and his humanitarian concerns.

The bargaining accomplishments that Walter Reuther has left for thousands and thousands of Eighth Congressional District workers and retirees can live on, as they will for millions throughout the country. He has left a legacy with the living.

We in Michigan have a particular closeness to this man. We well remember the now famous "Battle of the Overpass," a clash in 1937 with an auto firm during union activities. There were other sitdown strikes in Flint and Detroit in the middle 1930's which attracted nationwide attention.

Yes; many have not agreed fully with his philosophy or tactics, but you knew that he meant what he said and he stood by what he said.

The real tributes for Walter P. Reuther, leader of the United Auto Workers for 24 years, are truly a living memorial. I join with millions in mourning the passing of this giant in the American labor movement.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from West Virginia and others who have spoken these words of tribute to a great America, a battler for the things in which he believed, a front runner in every progressive movement for the past 30 or 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that I had the honor in my lifetime of knowing this dynamic, progressive, and devoted American.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great labor statesman, a great humanitarian.

THE LATE WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of condolence on the subject of the death of Walter Reuther.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late Walter Reuther.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther is dead at 62 as the result of an accident. His family, friends, and admirers mourn his death. As everyone in this House who followed his career knows, he was an extraordinary person who was more than simply an outstanding labor leader. His concern transcended unionism—it was a concern for the well-being of everyone in this Nation and in the world at large. Today, as we look about and see the involvement of youth in opposing the war and their willingness to engage in nonviolent protest in support of our constitutional rights, even at the risk of physical injury and sometimes death, it recalls the mid-thirties, a comparable turbulent period in our history, when Walter Reuther stood up for the rights of the working man. Since that time he has stood up on so many occasions for the underdogs of American society. He wanted to make the democratic system work, and to do so he challenged the establishment and, when necessary, opposed the status quo and on occasion risked his own life.

I met Walter Reuther on only one occasion and that was in Charleston, S.C., about a year ago. At that time a strike involving hospital workers was in progress. The private hospitals and the municipal authorities refused to engage in collective bargaining with the black workers. Those who thought it would be helpful to give moral support to the workers came to Charleston to spend a Sunday with them. I remember well Walter Reuther being called to speak and saying to the hundreds of blacks assembled there how important it was that blacks and whites stand together and support one another. And he went on to say:

> Not only are we with you in spirit but the U.A.W. sends its first installment check to help you because I know how important it is that you have support not only morally but financially.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther lived a life totally dedicated to helping his fellow man and his life was therefore filled with satisfaction. If each and everyone of us leaves this world having done just a small fraction of what Reuther did during his lifetime, this country would be considerably improved. Mr. Speaker, the UAW has lost a great leader and the United States has lost a great prince.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the country has suffered a tremendous loss in the untimely death of the international president of the United Auto Workers—Walter Reuther.

In 1943 I attended the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations held in Boston, Mass. There for the first time I met Walter Reuther, who participated in that convention.

Over the years, like many other Americans, it has been my privilege to watch his growth in the American labor movement. He rose through the ranks to the position of president of the United Auto Workers, and at the death of Phillip Murray, he became president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. As president of the CIO, he brought about the amalgamation of the AFL and CIO as it is constituted today, representing millions of American workers.

Walter Reuther possessed a zeal and a fervor on behalf of the industrial workers throughout the entire world. He was an outstanding champion of the little man. America, and the little people of America and the world, have lost a champion, and he will be missed.

They say that every man can be replaced. I doubt that Walter Reuther will ever be replaced. Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his two daughters, Linda and Lisa, and the other members of his family who survive him.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther is dead. A veteran of the labor battles of the thirties and early forties: he had become more than a labor leader, he was a symbol of social betterment in this Nation. He fought for better housing, better education, and better medical care for all Americans.

Accepting a relatively modest salary himself, he asserted that a union should be an advocate for more than fatter pay envelopes and better working conditions. Walter Reuther was continuing his 20-year-old fight for a guaranteed annual wage when a plane crash took his life.

On many occasions he expressed his opposition to the Vietnam war, believing that the war had hurt the living stand-

ards of the workers in his union, and distracted the country from its real and urgent domestic needs.

It will be difficult for the United Auto Workers to find a replacement of Reuther's stature. It will be equally difficult for America, which has also lost a great leader.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it came as a great shock to me over the weekend to learn of the tragic deaths of Walter Reuther and his wife. The loss of the dynamic man who led the United Auto Workers for the last 24 years is a serious blow to the American labor movement and the Nation as a whole.

Combining tough-mindedness with a determined sense of purpose, Walter Reuther has had great impact on the economic, political, and moral life of this Nation. His devotion to social justice has had compelling effect on the struggle for human rights.

As founder of the UAW, Walter Reuther worked determinedly to have the union function as a powerful voice in negotiations, protecting the interests of the rank and file, and as an effective leader in the governmental process, protecting the interests of the unrepresented. This dual purpose to which Walter Reuther devoted his energies and talents serves to remind us of the important role the American labor movement plays in our Nation.

The United States has lost a great union leader in the death of Walter Reuther. The world has lost a great international labor leader in his death. But I am confident we will be sustained by the legacy of his leadership.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend we learned of the sudden and tragic death of one of the greatest American labor and political figures in the history of the 20th century, Walter P. Reuther.

The manner of Walter Reuther's death was a personal shock and tragedy to those closely identified with him, and his death at the age of 62 is a tragedy of national and international dimensions.

It is difficult to contemplate a labor movement without Walter Reuther in a central role, a civil rights movement without Walter Reuther in the forefront, and an international democratic trade union movement without Walter Reuther giving it his special brand of guidance, and vision, and political toughness.

The Reuther brothers, Walter, Victor, and Roy, came out of the hills of West Virginia in the early 1930's and Detroit was never the same again. Thanks in large part to the efforts of these men, hundreds of thousands of workingmen and women and their families have enjoyed a decent standard of living and opportunities far beyond what could be dreamed of in the desperate days of the 1930's.

One measure of the greatness of this man, Walter Reuther, is the causes to which he devoted his extraordinary talents and energies: The organization of trade unions, the development of modern collective bargaining, workers pensions, cost-of-living increases, supplemental unemployment compensation benefits, medicare, civil rights, the war on poverty, aid to farm workers, the United Nations, the democratic trade unions in Europe and Africa, an enlightened foreign policy, cultural exchange, and urban redevelopment.

A second measure of this man's greatness is the quality of the men he attracted to work with him: His brothers, Vic and Roy, Emil Mazey, Leonard Woodcock, Doug Fraser, Jack Conway, Ken Bannan, and Paul Schrade within the UAW, and in national, political, and civil rights campaigns, the brothers, John F. and Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Francis Biddle, Herbert Lehman, Martin Luther King, Joseph Rauh, Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Paul Douglas, and Cesar Chavez among others.

Walter Reuther was a living legend for over three decades. He was such a fixture in the Detroit scene that it is hard to believe that he is gone. It is particularly sad that he will never be able to enjoy the retirement cottage that he was building with his own hands in Florida, nor see the completion of one of his pet projects, the UAW Educational Center at Black Lake, Mich., his destination on the night of the plane crash.

We not only will be deprived of his courage, vision, and leadership, but we can no longer hope for the great memoir of a rich and turbulent life which he could have written. Indeed, I know of only one full-length book on him, "The UAW and Walter Reuther," by B. J. Widick, and that was written in 1947, the year that Reuther began his 24-year presidency of the UAW.

I would like to have Walter Reuther remembered as a man who was at the top of his oratorical powers, speaking in the blazing heat of Labor Day to crowds of tens of thousands in Detroit's Cadillac Square. I would like to see him remembered as a man who walked the picket lines in labor's most difficult hours, as a man who braved threats of violence and triumphed over them, and as a man who had a keen sense of responsibility to economic, and political, and social democracy. I hope he is remembered as a man who led a clean union and himself led a life of moral rectitude.

Walter Reuther was a devoted husband and father. His wife, Mae, died with him. Two daughters survive.

A giant has been taken from our midst. I express my deepest sympathies to his family.

I think it appropriate at this point that rather than inserting one of the many obituaries which have been published today, obituaries which do not quite capture the flavor and energies of the man, I would insert a description of Walter Reuther in full throttle, written in 1947 by John Gunther in his book, "Inside U.S.A.":

MAN NAMED REUTHER

Walter P. Reuther, a modest but ambitious redheaded young man with an earnest smile and a beguiling sort of self-confidence, is one of the most stimulating men in American labor. For several reasons his story is worth telling briefly. In a way, despite the most obvious differences, he is almost as typical an American as Ford, if only for the qualities of savvy, industriousness, and enterprise.

Reuther (pronounced Roother, not Royter), was born in Wheeling, West Virginia, forty years ago, the son of a German brewery worker and devout old-school Socialist. Young Reuther had the polemics of the working class drilled into him from the cradle, and when he was still a schoolboy he organized a local shop. Then, finding the Wheeling horizon too limited, he set out to make his way in the world. He went to Detroit, and became an expert tool and die maker at Ford. He knew, however, that work was not enough. There was something known as school. So, while working an eight-hour day, he also worked his way through high school and three years of Wayne University. He got up at dawn, caught his first class at eight, did his school work till one, and then put in his stint at Ford from 3 till 11:30. After this—homework! His brother Victor, who is now director of the education department of the UAW, kept house and did the cooking. Before long, Walter stood first in his class, and was earning $12.00 a day. Then Ford fired him for "union activity."

Reuther passed his final examinations, drew every cent he had out of the bank on the day before the Detroit banks crashed in 1933, and then, with Victor, set out on a trip around the world. The Reuther boys were away for thirty-three months. As Walter says today, "We wanted to find out how the world was living." A trip like this is a fairly conventional thing for young Americans to do, but few have ever done it quite so thoroughly as the Reuther boys. They arranged their itinerary as a "tour in social engineering." It was a serious vocational attempt, very German and Socialist, to get underpinning for a future career. The boys worked their way across the Atlantic, bought push bikes, and cycled 12,000 miles in western Europe. Only twice in nine months did they sleep in hotels. If they ever bothered to look at the "sights," like the leaning tower at Pisa, this was mere frosting on the cake. What they really liked to do was visit mills in Lancashire and mines in Gelsenkirchen. Whenever they were broke they paused to get a job. They slept at student hostels in Germany, joined workers' groups, helped organize them, and, as Hitler was rising to power, made contacts in the Socialist underground. Victor spoke excellent German but, as Walter laughs about it today, "with such a wonderful West Virginia accent that the Germans thought we came from some remote part of Swabia."

Next, Russia. The boys traveled 18,000 miles in the Soviet Union. They are among the very few Americans who, in those days, reached Central Asia and saw Samarkand. Being skilled mechanics, they had no trouble getting jobs. Walter became, in fact, an instructor in the Ford plant at Gorki, and showed Russian boys how to build gasket dies with tolerances to one-seven-thousandth of an inch. "It was darned delicate work," he says today.

One day the Reuthers got a letter from another brother, Roy, telling them that the automobile situation was popping and to come home. They took the Trans-Siberian to Manchuria, bicycled briefly through Japan, and eventually arrived back in Detroit.

By 1936, Reuther had become an important cog in the stirring UAW. He organized a small local on the west side of Detroit. This he merged with six other locals, and so created the first Reuther "machine," membership seventy-eight. He borrowed three hundred dollars, opened an office, and bought a typewriter. In nine months he had 32,000 paid-up members, with organizations in forty shops. "To be a union leader in those days," he reminisces, "you had to run like blazes to keep up with the membership."

Reuther's first signal coup was the Kelsey-Hayes strike in December, 1936. He tied up Kelsey-Hayes, which makes wheels and brake drums for Ford, and which had

some 5,000 workers, though he himself had not more than thirty-five men in the plant. This was one of the first three considerable strikes the UAW won, and it presaged the organization of the whole industry.

This is how Reuther did it. He was busy passing out leaflets and making speeches at street corners. Such activity did not satisfy him. He wanted something more decisive and dramatic. But he had only a handful of people in the plant, and he could not get in himself, having been blacklisted as a notorious organizer. What the workers were protesting about most was not wages but the speed-up. Reuther had an idea. He was helpless unless he could contrive to get inside. He suggested that a girl on the day shift, in department 49, a brake-shoe line, should faint at the exact moment when the pace was fiercest. If the superintendent was duly deceived by this artifice he would pull a switch and stop the assembly line. Then there would be a scramble and the workers would quit and demand that Reuther, their leader, be called in.

The scheme worked to perfection. The girl "fainted" on schedule. Reuther was waiting at the end of a telephone. After much commotion the dialogue with the personnel director of the company went something like this:

Director. "Workers in 49 won't work. They say to call you up."

Reuther: "What do you want me to do?"

Director: "Put 'em back to work."

Reuther: "How can I? Will they listen?"

Director: "They listen to you on street corners."

Reuther: "I can't talk to 'em from here. Will you let me in?"

The company obligingly sent a car for him and by the time he arrived the strike had wild-fired, with several thousand workers milling around; Reuther climbed on a pile of boxes, and started to make a speech. The personnel director grabbed him by the coat, yelling, "What's going on here? You said you'd put 'em back to work." Reuther's single-line reply has become a classic in Detroit folklore: "I can't put 'em back to work," he shouted, "until I get 'em organized."

The rest of the story I have no space for, though it is full of punch and color. Reuther made a deal for a meeting between company and workers the next morning, and, as the night shift arrived, managed to harangue its members too. By morning, 2,000 men and women were organized. Then the negotiations failed. Reuther ordered his members (*a*) to stick by their machines, and (*b*) not to work at them. This, the most notable of the early sit-downs, lasted ten days, whereupon the company gave in.

Reuther strategy had a good deal to do with the great GM strike that followed in January, 1937. One incident is still recalled as "Reuther's feint." The key plant at Chevrolet was no. 4, which makes the actual motors. This became Reuther's object of attack. But he carefully contrived that everybody should think that he was going after no. 9, a bearing plant, not no. 4. Such stratagems were forced on him because he was not at all sure of his own men. Of key men in the Chevrolet local, he trusted only a few; some others might be stool pigeons. The upshot was that, by feinting at plant no. 9, he not only managed to win no. 4, but to find out who his traitors were. They tipped the guards off to protect no. 9, whereupon Reuther and his loyal cohorts promptly made for no. 4, half a mile away, which was denuded of protection. By the time the police got back, Reuther and his group were safe inside. They held out till the end of the forty-four day strike. This strike, which was national in scope and which was not predominantly fought on the issue of wages but on the right to unionize, turned the balance for the whole industry. The UAW was really "in" from this time on.

Another well-known Reuther accomplishment was the "strategy" strike in 1939, during the interval when GM was tooling for the next year's production. Reuther persuaded his colleagues that it was at this exact time that the industry was most vulnerable, and that by drawing out a few key men, tool and die makers, he could tie up the whole GM structure. He did so, and General Motors capitulated after an interval.

In these days violence was plentiful. Things have moved so fast that it is almost impossible to realize that, until the Flint strike, the great companies did not even answer letters from unions. Labor "negotiations" were matters for plug-uglies. Think by contrast of the great 1945–46 strike which Reuther also led against General Motors. Not a single person was hurt in a tie-up that lasted 113 days. There was not one bloody nose.

An attempt to beat up and possibly kill Reuther was made in 1938. Walter, Victor, and a group of friends were quietly celebrating a birthday in the family. Somebody ordered chop suey over the telephone. Half an hour later came a knock on the apartment door. Victor opened it, thinking the food had arrived. But two sluggers pushed their way in. One snapped, "We want Walter Reuther," and the other pointed out, "There's the ——— ——— in the corner. We're taking you for your last ride tonight." The sluggers, armed with a blackjack and gun, herded family and friends against the wall, and then appeared to lose their nerve. Remarks came like "We can't get him out of the room with all these people here," "Shoot him here," "Not before all these witnesses," and "Well, kill him with the blackjack." Reuther grabbed the blackjack from one of the thugs, and a struggle started. He was being beaten when a UAW man jumped out of the second-story window, and called the police. The sluggers ran. It took an hour and a half before the police came.

This episode was thoroughly aired in court subsequently. The two thugs were arrested and identified, and Reuther, who had not been badly hurt, got a telephone call from an anonymous informant, describing who had hired them, for what price, and why. After fierce commotions, the pair agreed to plead guilty, provided that the charge was made something less than assault with intent to kill, which carries a twenty-year sentence in Michigan. Reuther refused to reduce the charge. When the case came to trial the two men were acquitted. Some months after this, one of the sluggers called Victor on the telephone. He said that he hoped the Reuther brothers had no hard feelings, that he was simply carrying out a routine assignment, and he wanted to make amends by asking them out to dinner.

For the last half dozen years the outline of Reuther's career is well known. In 1940 the "Reuther plan," a project for the conversion of empty automobile plants to aircraft production, aroused national attention. It is an interesting fact that, when Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric, was running the War Production Board, he wanted Walter Reuther as vice chairman. Meantime his philosophy has solidified. Expressed in a sentence, it is to the effect that industrial and economic democracy must operate unhampered in the United States, if political democracy is to survive.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Walter Reuther, one of America's outstanding labor leaders and president of the United Auto Workers Union for 24 years, is a deep loss not only for organized labor and the cause of collective bargaining but of one of the Nation's most forceful voices for social reform. For Walter Reuther, the fight for enhancement of the human condition transcended geographic or national barriers. In his dramatic, terse style, New York Daily News feature writer Peter Coutros records the career of this fiery unionist who flirted with death many times during his colorful career until his chartered jet plane crashed into a forest in northern Michigan. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Coutros' tribute to Walter Reuther:

FOR WALTER, THE LAST STRIKE

(By Peter Coutros)

More than once in his stormy career, Walter Reuther flirted with death but managed somehow to escape its unyielding embrace. When destiny beckoned him to his ultimate rendezvous, it took a jet plane to deliver him.

The fiery unionist eluded death by inches in April, 1948, when an assailant blasted away at him through the kitchen window of his home in Detroit. His right arm was virtually torn away in the attack. Although surgery enabled him to retain the limb, doctors despaired of his ever being able to use it again.

Like the auto-company negotiators who had confronted him across the bargaining table, the medical fraternity did not correctly read Reuther's determination. It took him two years, but eventually, he was able to gain partial use of the arm.

Soon after assassination attempt, Reuther moved his family to Rochester, Mich., an hour's drive from Detroit.

"I built a new home for my family and a new arm for myself, all at the same time," he recalled later. "I hammered nails until tears came to my eyes."

At that, he was luckier than his brother, Victor, who lost an eye in a similar assault a year later. Neither crime has ever been solved.

The hazards of the road he chose came early and often to the red-haired Reuther. He got his first taste of harsh medicine forced to union organizers in 1937 when he was beaten savagely by Harry Bennett's security crew during the "Battle of the Overpass" at the Ford River Rouge plant.

"The worst of it," he told friends later, "was when two of Bennett's goons grabbed me by the ankles and dragged me down a flight of steps, banging the back of my head on every one of those 36 steel steps."

Born in 1907 in Wheeling, West Va., Reuther came into the world with a silver polemic in his mouth, a characteristic which made him the most articulate unionist since John L. Lewis. His dedication to the labor cause was a legacy from his father, Valentine, who headed one trade organization at the age of 23 and later helped organize the brewery workers.

By the time he was 19, Walter Reuther had put in four years as a factory employe in Wheeling, a stint interrupted by a suspension for encouraging other workers to protest having to work on holidays and Sundays.

Moving on to Motor City, Reuther found work in a tool-and-die shop at General Motors before shifting to Ford. At the same time, he managed to finish high school and complete three years of college at Wayne University.

When he was pink-slipped by Ford early in 1933 for trying to unionize his shop, Walter and brother Victor withdrew their savings to finance a bicycle tour of Europe. They acted just in time. Next day, President Roosevelt ordered a closing of the nation's banks.

The brothers' travels took them through 11 countries. By the time they reached the Soviet Union, their funds had depleted considerably. For the next 18 months, they worked in an auto factory at Gorki, teaching

Communist peasants the capitalist way of putting cars together. Critics who regarded Reuther as a radical suggested that he'd acquired the Marxist fervor at the plant in Gorki, which was built by Ford.

In 1935, Reuther resumed his nine-to-five tool-and-die chores in Detroit and pressed on with his organizing activities during, before, and after his hours in the shop. Within a year, he had increased the membership in the auto-workers local to which he belonged from 78 to more than 30,000 men. Not illogically, Reuther became the local's president.

He was a good worker, too, and, his efficiency was rewarded with a 10-cent hourly increase. Since the going rate was five dollars a day at the time—for those lucky enough to be employed—Reuther hardly scoffed at the dime increment. However, the raise—along with his job—went down the drain within 24 hours when the boss was apprised of Reuther's union affiliations.

He lamented once that he never got to work in a unionized factory, that he was invariably fired in the organizing stages.

On March 13, 1936, Reuther organized the happiest union of his life when he and May Wolfe were married. (Their ranks were increased subsequently by Linda, now 27, and Lisa, 23.) Organizing the auto workers was not so happy a task, and in doing it Reuther frequently resorted to the technique of the sit-down strike. He utilized this device to bring General Motors and Chrysler into line in 1937. But Ford, third member of the transport triumvirate, continued to resist. Other models had succeeded Henry's prototype vehicle, but the company stuck resolutely to his Model-T labor relations.

Not until 1941, and only after considerable pressure from Washington, did Ford capitulate and recognize the United Auto Workers, which rewarded Reuther with a vice presidency in 1942.

Like the fighter who grows restive outside the ring, Reuther was not one to rusticate behind a big desk and a bigger expense account. In 1945, he broke a siege of inconclusive contract talks by leading 175,000 GM employes out on strike. The walkout lasted 113 days, but the union achieved its goal. In what was tantamount to a battlefield promotion Reuther was elected to the UAW presidency within days after the settlement, in March, 1946.

He was reelected 13 times, most recently last month. His stewardship of 1.8 million UAW members (pensioners included) paid $33,000 annually. More than once, he himself rejected attempts to boost the figure.

A united labor movement had long been Reuther's goal, which he helped bring about in a 1956 agreement that joined craft (AFL) with industrial (CIO) unions into the AFL-CIO.

Ever the activist, Reuther took his auto workers out of the AFL-CIO, in July 1968, charging the leadership under president George Meany with "sitting on their fat status quo." Reuther and Meany engaged in numerous verbal slugfests after the "divorce" became official. The war in Vietnam which divided a nation further divided the house of labor with Reuther demanding an end to America's involvement while Meany steadfastly supported Lyndon Johnson and then President Nixon in their stance on the war.

Reuther, who neither smoked nor drank, parted company with the cigar-partial Meany on the civil rights issue and in the matter of support for Caesar Chavez's boycott of California grapes. In both cases, Reuther challenged Meany to do more. Vice President Agnew and Attorney General Mitchell became targets of Reuther's ire when he accused them both of engaging in repressive action.

The UAW chieftain found himself, with the teamsters and the United Chemical Workers, trying to organize larger segments of the working poor into labor unions, leaving himself time, of course, for negotiations with Detroit.

But even as he girded for the latest auto contract talks, scheduled to begin in two months, Reuther paused to enunciate his philosophy that unionism meant more than an extra loaf of bread on the table or an extra UAW-built car in the garage.

Reuther had seen the achievement of one of unionism's primary goals with the institution in 1976 of a guaranteed annual income for his men. This was one of many labor innovations spurred by Reuther. Others were the cost-of-living escalator clause and the annual improvement factor, which assures workers a piece of the profits resulting from cost-cutting technological improvements.

To Reuther, the needs of the working man transcended geographic and national barriers and his zeal to improve the human condition often took him to far corners of the world. His journey ended only with his life.

Decrying what he called "the scandalously high profits" of the auto industry in recent years, Reuther had warned that the next contract would not be based on the economy of 1970 (which he termed "Nixon's recession") but on what the future held.

For the rank-and-file, he dreamed also of a day when men who wore blue collars would feel equally comfortable inside libraries and museums and opera houses.

"We'll never know the Edisons or Pasteurs unborn because of the sheer human task of feeding families," he mused once.

"We'll never know the Edison's or Pasteurs or Rembrandts or Marian Andersons who never had a chance," said Walter Reuther, who owed his fame to Henry Ford, the automotive genius, the same Henry Ford who didn't believe in unions.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to Walter Reuther, one of the century's most forceful and far-sighted labor leaders. A benchhand in a steel plant at the age of 16, Mr. Reuther rose to head a union of 1.3 million auto workers. His influence on American life reached far beyond the shops and assembly lines of Detroit's auto factories. The role of a responsible labor leader, he felt, was to build a better society as well as a bigger paycheck.

The unfinished business of this century—

He once said—

is the problem of maintaining full employment in an expanding economy based upon the fair and healthy relationship of wages, prices and profits.

He pioneered in the development of health and pension plans for the Nation's working men and women. After a hoodlum's shotgun attack put him in a cast from wrist to shoulder in 1948, for example, he emerged from the hospital with a revolutionary plan for health insurance that set a pattern for hundreds of other unions throughout the United States, Even as a teenager—when he worked for 40 cents an hour at a Wheeling Steel Corp. corrugating plant—Walter Reuther was pressing for better working conditions. Protesting against work on Sundays and holidays, he was fired for what his employers termed "agitation."

His death in a plane crash yesterday is a loss for the Nation as well as for organized labor.

Perhaps more than any other man of this century, Walter Reuther made the labor union a powerful force for social progress.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a New York Times editorial on Mr. Reuther:

PIONEER IN SOCIAL CREATIVITY

The death of Walter P. Reuther is an even more substantial loss for the nation than it is for the labor movement. A social innovator of great creativity, he was the most zealous union proponent of the concept that labor must go forward with the community and not at the expense of the community.

When the crash of a private plane cut short his life, he was dedicating much of his energies to forging a broad coalition in support of universal health insurance. He was also working closely with many of the nation's foremost industrialists in seeking to apply space technology to the mass production of housing.

He showed enormous personal courage and dynamism in the bitter battles that marked the birth of the United Automobile Workers more than three decades ago. Over the years he was principally responsible for making that union not only economically powerful but a fountainhead of beneficial ideas for all labor. His most notable monuments in this regard are a comprehensive program of social security under the union label and a model system of safeguards for union democracy.

In the larger labor movement his influence was unhappily circumscribed by the increasing frustrations Mr. Reuther felt over his inability to push aside George Meany as head of the combined A.F.L.-C.I.O. The feud of these two srong unionists prevented the merger of which both were principal architects from ever achieving its full potential for national good. Yet Mr. Reuther's complaints of A.F.L.-C.I.O. stagnation and social sterility were predicated on far more than personal pique or ambition. In foreign policy and civil rights he blazed inspiring new trails.

His death on the eve of his unions' crucial negotiations with the Big Three automakers could prove extremely injurious to the total economy in this volatile period. But the void will be greater still in the realms of idealism and social inventiveness.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues in tribute to one of America's remarkable leaders, Walter Reuther. His tragic death is an immeasurable loss to the United Automobile Workers and the entire labor movement, as well as to the entire country.

Toughened by his pioneering struggles in the labor movement, Walter Reuther still retained the vitality and idealism of his youth. Throughout his career he invigorated the American labor movement by instilling union members, especially young activists, with a sense of purpose. He fought for raising the living standards of the downtrodden and for aiding them in gaining the dignity they deserve as workers.

During Walter Reuther's career, the United Automobile Workers, of which he eventually became presirent by rising through the ranks, went from zero to 1.6 million members. He led the fight to raise the wages of auto workers from Henry Ford's $5 a day pay scale to more than $5 an hour in wages and fringe benefits, including a management-paid

pension plan, a cost of living escalator, and a profit-sharing plan which he first pioneered.

But even more important than Walter Reuther's role as president of the United Automobile Workers was his role as a true leader of this Nation. He was one of the few to see the poverty and discrimination and injustice which are the shames of this country and then to have the will and the gift of leadership to attack these problems aggressively and effectively. He was a leader who saw all the problems of our society as the concerns of his union.

And his was the vision and the intelligence to see and plan for the long-range composition of our society. As he once said:

> The unfinished business of this country is the problem of maintaining full employment in an expanding economy based upon the fair and healthy relationship between wages, prices, and profits . . .
>
> Either we shall use our new machines and technology to help us create security and dignity in the construction of a brave new world, or the impact of jet propulsion technology upon a huffing and puffing Model T distributive system will dig our own economic graves.

For 35 years Walter Reuther has been in the forefront of the struggle against poverty, hunger, racism, and war. The causes which he espoused and led were the significant ones of our time. His leadership will be missed, and in his absence we will realize how much we needed him. Walter Reuther provided that kind of inspiration. To his family, to his friends, and to his fellow union members, I extend my sympathy for his loss and that of his wife, May. And for our country, I can say only that his memory must guide us all, as he helped to guide us in life.

I include at this point in the RECORD an excellent article by Damon Stetson which appeared in today's New York Times. Anyone who reads it cannot fail but realize how great is our loss. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1970]

WALTER REUTHER: UNION PIONEER WITH BROAD INFLUENCE FAR BEYOND THE FIELD OF LABOR

(By Damon Stetson)

Walter Philip Reuther went to work as a bench hand at the age of 16 and rose to become a labor leader who had a major impact on the economic, social and political affairs of his time.

A crusader for a better world, he cast a shadow far beyond the 1.3-million-member United Automobile Workers and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which he had headed.

His ascendancy in the labor movement marked a break with the approach of the old line union leaders who were interested primarily in winning a few cents more an hour for their members.

Mr. Reuther challenged not only labor but the country—and sometimes the world—to seek new and broader horizons.

"The unfinished business of this century," he said, "is the problem of maintaining full employment in an expanding economy based upon the fair and healthy relationship between wages, prices and profits. . .

"Either we shall use our new machines and technology to help us create security and dignity in the construction of a brave new world, or the impact of jet propulsion technology upon a huffing and puffing model T distributive system will dig our economic graves."

Mr. Reuther, boyish-looking even at the peak of his career, had red hair and was of medium height and solidly built. He was a cool, iron-nerved fighter; a shrewd, hard-driving negotiator; an ambitious social reformer and an articulate public relations man who sold his ideas with the fervor of a missionary.

Legend has it that after a heated bargaining session, the late William Knudsen, then head of the General Motors Corporation, turned to Mr. Reuther and said:

"Young man, I wish you were selling used cars for me."

"Used cars?" Mr. Reuther asked.

"Yes," said Mr. Knudsen, "used cars. Anybody can sell new cars."

In a world in which backslapping was often considered requisite to success, Mr. Reuther was no backslapper. He was not fond of jesting; he frowned on poker; he was frugal in his personal habits; he wore his wedding ring; he eschewed alcohol and didn't smoke.

FULL OF IDEAS

He always crackled with ideas that drove to the heart of contemporary issues. By day, he would scribble them on a pad on his desk—usually cluttered with books and reports—in his office in Solidarity House, the U.A.W. headquarters on the banks of the Detroit River at 8000 East Jefferson. At night, he would spring from bed to jot down a new thought.

A newspaperman, noting Mr. Reuther's capacity for speechmaking and conversation, said that he was the only man who could reminisce about the future. Another said, "Ask Walter the time, and he tells you how to make a watch."

Although some people considered him cold, Mr. Reuther inspired an almost fanatical loyalty among his subordinates and was admired and liked by many in high places, including President Kennedy, Adlai E. Stevenson, Eleanor Roosevelt and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey.

Some of Mr. Reuther's admirers regarded him as a Moses who had led the working man to pioneering achievements at the bargaining table—pensions, pay increases based on the cost of living and productivity rises; supplementary unemployment benefits, profit-sharing and early retirement.

But James R. Hoffa, imprisoned president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, considered him an antagonist more deadly than all anti-Hoffa industrialists combined. There was a basic clash of philosophy between Mr. Reuther and Hoffa. For Hoffa, unions were always a business with the basic aim of achieving fatter pay envelopes. But Mr. Reuther rejected the cash-register approach alone and always argued that labor should seek to build a better world.

In the late nineteen-fifties, when corrupt unions came under fire, Mr. Reuther supported George Meany in the clean-up of organized labor and the ouster of Hoffa and the Teamsters from the A.F.L.–C.I.O.

John L. Lewis, President emeritus of the United Mine Workers, once described Mr. Reuther as "a pseudo-intellectual nitwit." Gov. George Romney of Michigan, former president of the American Motors Corporation, once said that Mr. Reuther was "the most dangerous man in Detroit."

In 1946, Mr. Reuther, who was then 39, was elected to the presidency of the United Automobile Workers and six years later was elected president of the Congress of Industrial Organization.

An architect of the subsequent merger of the C.I.O. and the American Federation of Labor in 1955, Mr. Reuther became a vice president of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. and a member of its executive board. He also served as head of its industrial union department.

In the years that followed, Mr. Reuther did not see eye to eye with George Meany, president of the merged labor group, and the feud culminated in July, 1968, when the auto union withdrew from the A.F.L.-C.I.O., charging that the parent federation was moribund and undemocratic.

In the ensuing year, Mr. Reuther laid the groundwork for a revitalized labor organization involving a merger of the auto union and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. That merger brought the Alliance for Labor Action into being on May 26, 1969, with 3.6 million members.

At one point in 1962, Mr. Reuther, displeased with what he believed was the stagnation of the labor movement, considered challenging Mr. Meany's leadership, but the showdown did not materialize.

In the summer of 1963, Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany had differences over the Civil Rights March on Washington. Mr. Reuther strongly supported the march, but the A.F.L.–C.I.O. executive board, although expressing sympathy with civil rights objectives, refrained from endorsing the march itself.

U.A.W. HALTS ITS DUES

The showdown between the two labor leaders came in the spring and summer of 1968 after years of disagreement over the direction and structure of the merged labor movement.

In March, the U.A.W. president called for a special convention "to modernize and revitalize" the A.F.L.–C.I.O. executive board. The 29-member board agreed, but only on the conditions that the U.A.W. attend and "accept the democratically arrived-at decisions of such a convention."

Mr. Reuther rejected the conditions and, to apply pressure on the A.F.L.–C.I.O., began withholding the U.A.W.'s $1-million annual dues. On May 17 the auto union was suspended for the nonpayment of dues.

The final break occurred on July 3, when the auto union cut its last tie with the 14-million-member A.F.L.-C.I.O. Mr. Reuther charged at the time that the parent body's leadership had become complacent and undemocratic.

Nearly seven months later, on Feb. 24, 1969, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. issued a 40,000-word white paper answering charges accusing Mr. Reuther of misrepresentation, evasion and falsehood in what was called a two-year campaign of vilification by the auto union leader.

Ignoring the criticism, Mr. Reuther went ahead with plans to rehabilitate labor. On May 26, the auto union and the teamsters—the nation's two largest independent unions—merged in the Alliance for Labor Action with the objectives of organizing office and industrial workers not represented by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. It was also to direct its efforts toward political and social action.

The auto union leader, who always envisioned a greater day for mankind although frequently deploring his present plight, was an inveterate optimist. He looked forward to the day when the worker would spend less time at his job and more time working on a concerto, a painting or in scientific research.

"Technological advances will make that possible," he said. "In the future, an auto worker may work only 10 hours at the factory. Culture will become his main preoccupation. Working for a living will be sort of a hobby."

When will this golden age of factory workers composers begin, he was asked.

"I don't know," Mr. Reuther replied, grinning. "But it'll come sooner than the National Association of Manufacturers expects."

BROAD UNION ROLE

To Mr. Reuther the theory that a union's only job was to raise wages and improve working conditions was obsolete. Through the years he was busy with production and pricing problems, consumer projects, cooperative movements, civil rights, politics and world affairs, all of which he believed were the legitimate concern of a modern union.

He contended that a worker's economic needs were inseparably connected with politics.

"The surest way to guarantee that your ice box is filled with good food," he said, "is to see that the ballot box is filled with good votes on Election Day."

Mr. Reuther was always an earnest exponent of political action by the trade union movement. As an officer of the U.A.W., the C.I.O., and the A.F.L.–C.I.O. he was an active participant in political campaigns—mostly in directing strategy rather than in speech-making or work in the hustings. The political action programs of the U.A.W. were unusually well organized and well financed in Michigan and other areas where the U.A.W. was strong.

He supported President Roosevelt in 1936, 1940 and 1944; President Truman in 1948; Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956; President Kennedy in 1960, President Johnson in 1964, and Vice President Humphrey in 1968.

QUESTIONS ON OBJECTIVES

During negotiations with General Motors on one occasion, a company official raised a question about Mr. Reuther's objectives. A sharp exchange ensued.

"If fighting for a more equal and equitable distribution of the wealth of this country is socialistic," Mr Reuther said, "I stand guilty of being a Socialist."

One of the most persistent threads running through Mr. Reuther's thinking was the demand for a greater voice for organized labor in industrial planning. Too often, he maintained, industrial leaders were interested in keeping production down as a means of keeping prices up.

VIEW ON AUTOMATION

Mr. Reuther grew increasingly concerned about the impact of automation. Once, he walked through a Ford plant and saw scores of machines with only a few workers watching master switchboards.

"Somebody said to me," he later recalled, " 'How are you going to collect union dues from all these machines?' And do you know what I said? I said, 'That's not what's bothering me. What's bothering me is, how are you going to sell Ford cars to all these machines?' "

Mr. Reuther did not oppose automation, but he did contend that a balance ought to be achieved between the greater capacity made possible by automation and the people's purchasing power. And he felt that unions, industry and the government must find ways to employ workers displaced by machines.

An outstanding objective of Mr. Reuther's union career was the attainment of a guaranteed annual wage for workers. Such a guarantee, he declared, would attack the problems of mass unemployment at the root by shifting to the employer the cost of unemployment.

In March, 1953, he said that his union would demand, and if necessary, strike to achieve a guaranteed annual wage in the 1955 negotiations. At that time, Mr. Reuther and the union did not succeed in getting precisely what he had sought, but they did negotiate a precedent-setting supplementary unemployment benefit plan.

Under it, laid-off workers received payments from a fund built up through company contributions. The combination of unemployment insurance and the supplementary benefits meant that workers received about two-thirds of their regular take-home pay during layoffs. In subsequent negotiations, the benefits were improved.

Quite appropriately, Mr. Reuther was born Sept. 1, 1907, the eve of Labor Day. His grandparents had come to this country in 1892 to save their son Valentine from military conscription in Bismarck's Germany. They settled in Effingham, Ill.

Mr. Reuther's father, Valentine Reuther, moved to Wheeling, W. Va., but lost none of his parents' evangelical Lutheranism and economic liberalism. The elder Reuther was working for $1.50 a day and was running the local brewers union. He served as head of the Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly and at one time ran unsuccessfully for Congress on the Socialist ticket.

There were five children in the Reuther family—Theodore, Walter, Roy, Victor and Christine. On Sunday afternoons, when the dishes were finished, Valentine Reuther organized family debates on social problems. His sons learned their lessons well.

At 16 Walter Reuther quit school and became an apprentice at 40 cents an hour in the corrugating plant of the Wheeling Steel Corporation.

The seven-day-a-week job denied him the opportunity to attend the Sunday afternoon family debates, so he decided to mobilize a protest against Sunday and holiday work. Consequently he was fired and at that early stage had won a reputation as a youthful agitator.

At 19, Mr. Reuther went to Detroit. His first job was on a 13-hour midnight shift at the Briggs Manufacturing plant. Next he talked his way into a job as a tool and die craftsman at $1.05 an hour at the Highland Park plant of the Ford Motor Company. Within a few years he was bossing 40 men and was among the most highly paid mechanics in the company.

But the yeast of ambition was working in him. Averaging only a few hours of sleep in a night, he finished high school at evening sessions at Fordson High School in Dearborn. Next he enrolled at Wayne University in Detroit, which he attended for three years, majoring in economics and sociology.

When Norman Thomas ran for President as a Socialist candidate in 1932, Mr. Reuther mounted the soapbox, although he later repudiated the party as unresponsive to American needs. He and his brother Victor led a campaign against the establishment of a Reserve Officers Training Corps on the Wayne campus. But Mr. Reuther's activities of those days did not deter the university from conferring an honorary Doctor of Laws degree on him 18 years later.

In 1932, in the midst of the Great Depression, Mr. Reuther was laid off by Ford because, he said, of his union activities. He and Victor decided to tour the world. With about $450 each, they sailed from New York in steerage on an odyssey that lasted until 1935.

WORKED IN SOVIET UNION

They toured auto plants in England, cycled across the Continent and for nearly two years worked in a Ford-built plant in Gorki before they continued on to China and home.

Walter Reuther became a foreman in the Soviet plant but acquired no fondness for Communism, which he later fought so successfully in the U.A.W. He did, however, admire the Soviet people and their adaptation of new technical ideas.

On his return to Detroit, Mr. Reuther found a job in a tool and die shop and later at the Ternstedt plant of General Motors. He promptly joined the U.A.W.'s West Side Local 174, which was weak at the time because of workers' fears of reprisals for joining.

In 1936 Mr. Reuther was elected a delegate to the U.A.W.'s convention in South Bend, Ind. The treasurer gave him $5 for expenses—it was all the local had—and he hitch-hiked to the convention.

LED SIT-DOWN STRIKES

Mr. Reuther became president of his local but was fired from his job after he asked for a raise. Subsequently he and Victor led the first of the sit-down strikes at the Kelsey-Hayes plant on the West Side. The success of the demonstration spurred organization, and the local's membership jumped from 78 to 2,400.

By late 1936 the auto workers felt strong enough to tackle General Motors, the key to organizing the industry. The sit-downs in Flint, Mich., began after Christmas in 1936 and quickly became the center of one of the bitterest and most decisive struggles in labor history.

Mr. Reuther rushed a group of West Side volunteers to Flint to assist in the drive, which resulted in February, 1937, in recognition by General Motors of the U.A.W. as bargaining agent for the company's workers.

The Chrysler Corporation recognized the union a few weeks later, and the union's membership began to approach 500,000.

The Ford Motor Company, however, had announced that it would never recognize the U.A.W. On a cloudy afternoon in May, 1937, a group of U.A.W. members, bearing handbills, rode out to the sprawling Rouge plant of Ford in Dearborn. They climbed the concrete steps of the overpass between the plant and the parking lot.

ATTACKED BY GOONS

Mr. Reuther, by that time on the U.A.W. payroll, was one of the leaders. As he stood on the overpass, a voice rang out, "You're on Ford property."

Goons mobilized by Ford quickly rushed forward, pulled Mr. Reuther's coat over his head, bounced him down the steps, slugged him and left him bleeding on the ground below.

The bitter struggle that followed has been immortalized in labor history and pictures as the "Battle of the Overpass" but Ford held out against recognizing the U.A.W. until 1941.

In those hectic years of organizational activity, the U.A.W. had adopted the sitdown as an organizing technique of singular effectiveness, but the Supreme Court ruled in 1939 that the sitdown was "an illegal seizure of buildings in order to prevent their use by their employers in a lawful manner."

In the late ninteen-thirties, as the U.A.W. grew in size and power, so did Communist influence within the union. Mr. Reuther, then a member of the executive board, and his faction thought it necessary to face and end Communist domination of the union.

Mr. Reuther became an anti-Communist symbol and rallying point. At the 1940 C.I.O. convention (the U.A.W. had joined in 1939) which displaced John L. Lewis as president, Mr. Reuther embraced President Roosevelt's pre-war policy of aiding the Allies and denounced Communists as "colonial agents for a foreign government."

WAR-TIME ROLE

At the 1941 U.A.W. convention, the Reuther brothers pushed through an anti-Communist resolution and captured 12 of 20 seats on the executive board. However, R. J. Thomas, who was not particularly sensitive to the Communist threat of infiltration, remained as president, and George Addes, who had been charged with following the Communist line, stayed as secretary-treasurer.

When war came and auto production became war production, Mr. Reuther attracted more and more national attention. He declined several offers of Government posts in Washington; instead, as a union leader, he helped keep auto workers in line on the no-

strike pledge and induced them to give up extra pay for Sunday, night and holiday work and proposed an increased role for labor in management through industrial councils.

With the return of peace, he entered a long controversy with the union's demand for a 30 per cent increase in pay without an increase in the price of cars.

By this time he had a well-deserved reputation as an astute strike strategist, and in this dispute he evolved what came to be known as the "one-at-a-time" strategem or the whipsaw tactic. It was based on the belief that competition among the auto industry's Big Three—Ford, Chrysler and General Motors—was stronger than their distrust of the union. This ploy was used repeatedly in later years and proved well nigh unbeatable at the bargaining table.

The other tactic put forward by Mr. Reuther at that time was his demand for a "look at the books." This shocked not only industry but also some labor leaders, who felt that it was the union's job to win money and management's job to decide whether the stockholders or the public paid the bill.

General Motors rejected his wage demands and his request for a look at the books. He responded by calling a strike of 200,000 workers. After a stoppage of 113 days, Mr. Reuther finally settled for a wage increase of 18½ cents an hour.

VICTORY AND DEFEAT

The March, 1946, convention of the U.A.W. at Atlantic City was bedlam. Mr. Reuther had decided to run against Mr. Thomas for the presidency. Both sides arrived with their dukes up. There were battles on the boardwalk and in bars.

The party faithful tried to save Mr. Thomas, but Mr. Reuther won, 4,444 to 4,320. While Mr. Reuther's supporters were celebrating, however, left wingers captured two-thirds of the executive board, thereby making Mr. Reuther's victory a hollow one, indeed.

It was a hard, frustrating year, but at the 1947 convention Mr. Reuther swept in his own ticket by a 2-to-1 vote, and took firm control of the executive board and the union.

Back in Detroit, he initiated a drive for a more perfect union—firing Reds and drones, driving lottery operators from the factories and preparing for a militant stand at the bargaining table. He and his wife, May, were living at the time at 20101 Appoline Street in a brick and frame house they had purchased for $7,750.

GUNMAN'S VICTIM

It was in the kitchen of that home, on an April night in 1948, that Mr. Reuther was gunned down by a would-be assassin, who fled in the darkness. Buckshot from both barrels of a shotgun, fired at close range, struck the U.A.W. president in the chest and right arm.

For three months, Mr. Reuther was in a cast. He never recovered the full use of his arm, but through therapy and exercise he strengthened it so that he could gesture—somewhat awkwardly—and he was able to write, grasping a pen or pencil in an unusual, splay-fingered fashion.

Characteristic of his determination was the way he reacted to the injury. For hours he squeezed a sponge and pulled at the numb fingers. Resuming his former hobby of cabinet-making, he painfully forced his right hand to hold a hammer and to drive nails.

During his prolonged hospitalization, he became interested in medical problems, and by the time he was released, wearing a brace, he had a new kind of hospital insurance plan worked out. Subsequently, he and the U.A.W. led the way in the development of the Community Health Association in Detroit, a comprehensive hospital and medical program.

The executive board of the U.A.W. offered a $100,000 reward for information leading to the conviction of Mr. Reuther's assailant. Five years later a hood confessed that he had driven the would-be killer's car the night of the attack. He named two other men, but before the trial he gave police the slip and left the country, ending the case.

BROTHER ALSO ATTACKED

Thirteen months after the shooting of Mr. Reuther, a similar attack was made on his brother, Victor. His collarbone was fractured by a shotgun blast, and his right eye was destroyed.

In the course of his aggressive career, Walter Reuther had obviously made enemies, but it was never determined whether his assailant and his brother's were personal enemies, gangsters upset over his antigambling efforts, Communists or others.

The lack of convictions in any of the cases, however, accounted for the elaborate security system set up by the union to protect the Reuthers.

Walter Reuther, for many years afterward, always had a bodyguard at his side when he appeared in public, and he and his family moved from the city to the safety and seclusion of a new home in Rochester, a suburb 35 miles from Detroit.

He had bought the core of the house for $10,000 and then added improvements, many by himself, to the modern redwood home with its bulletproof picture windows.

From the road, a passerby could see only a nondescript white farmhouse, a tall steel-wire fence and a padlocked gate. The white building was really a barracks manned by an armed guard, and the fence was watched by four big dogs.

SHUNNED LUXURY

Although the unusual character of Mr. Reuther's hideaway made it seem elaborate, it was not a lavish or expensive home. In fact, he went to considerable pains to dispel any speculation that he lived in or sought after luxury.

He disliked wearing a tuxedo, ground his teeth over meetings of the executive board of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. at a plush hotel in Miami Beach, and fussed over what people might think.

His salary as president of the U.A.W. was $29,500 a year, which was low by comparison with leaders of many other unions much smaller and less affluent.

PRISONER EXCHANGE SOUGHT

In 1961, Mr. Reuther served as a member of the Tractors for Freedom Committee, which sought unsuccessfully to exchange 500 agricultural tractors for 1,214 Cubans taken prisoner in the April landings in Cuba. Serving with him were Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, as honorary chairman; Dr. Milton E. Eisenhower, then president of Johns Hopkins University, and Joseph M. Dodge, a Detroit banker at that time.

The widely publicized attempt brought 70,000 pieces of mail in response to the committee's appeal for funds. But the deal struck a snag when Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba demanded large and costly bulldozers, the release of political prisoners in the United States and finally $28-million in cash or its equivalent in tractors.

The Tractors for Freedom idea was praised for its humanitarian objectives but criticized by some as a move to capitulate to blackmail by Premier Castro.

Mr. Reuther directed the 1948 auto negotiations from the hospital room where he was recovering from his wounds. A contract with General Motors incorporating an annual wage improvement factor (based on productivity increase) and a cost-of-living escalator clause brought more fame.

In 1949, his union and the United Steelworkers of America blazed a new trail by negotiating employer-financed retirement pensions and expanded health and welfare benefits.

That same year Mr. Reuther served as chairman of a C.I.O. delegation that went to London and helped found the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

In 1953, Mr. Reuther achieved flexibility under a five-year contract (1950 to 1955) by introducing the "living document" theory. This held that a contract was not a static document but a living compact obligating both parties to work out any problems that might develop during its term.

The first step toward a guaranteed annual wage was achieved in 1955 when he and his staff negotiated the precedent-setting agreement with the Ford Motor Company that provided for special jobless benefits supplementing those paid by state funds.

CONTINUED TO PIONEER

In the bargaining field, Mr. Reuther and the U.A.W. continued to pioneer in the nineteen-sixties. In 1961, the union negotiated a profit-sharing plan with the American Motors Corporation, the first in the automotive industry.

In 1964, the union won huge new contracts from the auto companies, providing for earlier retirement, bigger pensions, improved wages, longer vacations and more holidays. Under the terms of the agreement a worker could retire after reaching 55 any time his age and length of service totaled 85 years.

The pact also provided for retirement at age 62 without reduction in benefits and a special retirement benefit under which a man 60 years old, with 30 years service, could retire on $381 a month. His pension, including Social Security, would drop to $316 a month when he reached 65.

The settlements of 1964 did not come, however, without strikes at General Motors and Ford. The issues were not terms of the national economic agreements but local working conditions and problems. Mr. Reuther and other U.A.W. leaders, sensing a restiveness about local matters, insisted that these be settled before national agreements were signed.

In the 1967 auto negotiations the U.A.W. struck Ford for two months. The settlement, described by Mr. Reuther as "the most substantial contract ever to be negotiated in any corporation in the industrial field in the United States," provided for a guaranteed annual income plan, sizable wage increases, higher pensions and improved medical coverage. The union subsequently negotiated similar contracts with both General Motors and Chrysler.

Mr. Reuther's wife, the former May Wolf, was a quiet, red-haired woman who frequently traveled with him to union conventions but never shared his public attention.

When she met Mr. Reuther in 1933, she was a 23-year-old teacher of health and physical education at Trowbridge Elementary School in Detroit. "It was simply a 'How do you do' thing," she recalled.

After the first meeting Mr. Reuther left Detroit for three years. When he returned in January, 1936, he met Miss Wolf on a streetcar where "we talked unions until my stop," she said. After a three-month courtship, they were married on Friday, March 13, 1936.

Mrs. Reuther gave up teaching and worked for the union full-time without pay as a secretary. The couple lived with Mrs. Reuther's parents for the first five years of their marriage.

Mrs. Reuther, a trim, 5-foot 4-inch woman who preferred tailored suits when accompanying her husband at union functions, occupied much of her time with civic affairs in the Detroit area, including children's aid and mental health associations, the Girl Scouts and parent-teacher activities.

The Reuthers resided in Rochester, a Detroit suburb, where they often received friends but were not given to partying. Their time together was often limited by union activities, but Mrs. Reuther recalled that there was time to teach her husband to dance.

Friends said that on the day the Reuthers were married, they dashed from the wedding to a union meeting, where Mr. Reuther was to speak.

"The stories may exaggerate how much time we courted at union meetings," Mrs. Reuther said, "but I know if I hadn't been interested in unions we would never have married."

A REFRESHING INCIDENT ON CAMPUS

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House this morning to a very refreshing incident which occurred on the campus of Nebraska State College in my home town of Kearney, Nebr., last week, an institution of approximately 6,000 students.

One afternoon in the middle of the week a group of 10 agitators from a sister institution at Lincoln, the University of Nebraska, came to our campus of Nebraska State at Kearney in order to attempt to get the students to go on strike, and to close the institution for the balance of this school year.

With great foresight the students had set up a vigilante committee in order to deal with such situations. This vigilante committee met with these 10 organizers from off the campus at Kearney to listen to their arguments, rejected them, and literally ran them off the campus and out of town.

Now back many years ago in the Midwest and in Nebraska, all communities had vigilante committees but they did not treat them quite so gentlemanly as the vigilante committee did last week at Nebraska State, because the committee did not tar and feather those gentlemen and run them out of town riding on a rail.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the students of Nebraska State for their appreciation of the value of an education and their appreciation of the fact that it is an honor and a privilege to attend a college in this country today.

CAMBODIA

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, to add to what the gentleman from Ohio just said, I wish there was some way to bring a little sanity out of the chaos that exists in this country today.

I wish there were some way of explaining to these people who for their own political purposes are leading the young people of America into anarchy; and to explain to them that Cambodia, as the gentleman from Ohio just said—Cambodia is a move to get our troops out of Vietnam and our boys who are being held prisoners, out of the ratholes of prisons in North Vietnam.

Every military man will tell you, and I think this is something that should be impressed—every military man will tell you that an orderly withdrawal of troops in the face of an enemy is the most difficult military maneuver. With sanctuaries just a few miles away from where our troops have to be loaded, and have to be taken from Vietnam, our troops are faced with an enemy that has no intention of letting up the pressure on them—that has no intention of letting us out without taking as heavy a toll as possible. We are confronted with this problem of withdrawal in the face of the enemy. This is serious business.

The purpose of Cambodia is to clean up these sanctuaries so that we can bring our American troops home and at the same time effect a peace that will get our boys, who are prisoners of war, out of the ratholes of prison camps.

AN EXAMPLE IN SPEECH AND BEHAVIOR, IN LOVE, FAITH, AND SINCERITY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I contemplated the meaning of the demonstration which occurred on the Ellipse last Saturday, I was reminded somehow of that verse of scripture which contains the admonition of Paul to his young coworker, Timothy. It is to be found in I Timothy, the 4th chapter, the 12th verse, which the Phillips translation interprets as follows:

> Don't let people look down on you because you are young, see that they look up to you because you are an example to them in your speech and behavior—in your love, and faith and sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in their love of country, their faith in the rights of free people to assemble and to express their dissent, and in their sincerity of purpose, the vast majority of the young people who met in Washington last Saturday did succeed in assuring the people of our country that rather than looking down upon them, we will look up to them with new hope for the future of our land. For I believe that many of these young people do have something to say to us in Government, and we should be listening. They represent a challenge to us to manifest similar love, faith, and sincerity.

CAMBODIA

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, since the President's decision to strike at Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia a number of his most pious and unflinching critics in the Congress have felt compelled to lecture him and their congressional colleagues outlining for us exactly where our responsibilities lie. While some of us are not quite ready to accept the self-appointed moral leadership of our esteemed colleagues, I submit that their real opportunity to exercise moral leadership was before the thousands of young people assembled Saturday on the ellipse. These young people were here for the most part to indicate agreement with the President's congressional critics. Theirs was a crusade against a clearly defined infidel, but lacking in lionhearted responsible leaders.

They would have profited from a few admonitions from the men they support concerning the obligations of the nonviolent students to control their violent members, about the limits of decent public behavior, the suggestion that they "cool" their dialog, that they not exempt the Nation's Capital from their ecological concern. But our colleagues failed to grasp the chance for their finest hour, the opportunity to be responsible leaders of these young people.

Although I disagreed with their position there was encouragement that this time so many of the young demonstrators visited congressional offices. It meant that they saw the wisdom of advancing their view through the representational system. They did not deserve to be left by their congressional leaders to the infantile rage of Dr. Spock, the obscenities of the new left, smiling hand waves from a visiting celebrity or two.

The young people who left town in boredom and frustration may be convinced that they are the leaders and that the Members of Congress who share their position are the followers, or perhaps that these men sanction violence.

In my opinion, a dangerous attitude has intruded into American political dialog—that there is always a "morally right" and a "morally wrong" position on national and international issues and that there are certain individuals among us endowed with special ethical capacity to separate the "right" from the "wrong." I would hope that the old notion that there may honestly be differing viewpoints of the course which will serve the best interests of the people, and that men of equal moral conscience may find themselves on opposite sides of an issue, has not entirely fallen into disrepute.

Surely, though few would disagree that it is the obligation of those who take up the mantle of righteousness to wear it with dignity, and with full understanding of the responsibilities it confers.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Walter Reuther and to express my sadness over his tragic and untimely death. Certainly he fought long and hard for the workingmen of this country and did so with great effectiveness.

On behalf of the approximately 100,000 UAW–CIO workers who live and work in my congressional district, I want to express their grief and their sadness over the loss of a man who has been such an

effective leader in their behalf. I am hopeful that those of us who are here will look at the things that this particular man spoke out about and worked to achieve and will personally commit ourselves to carrying this effort ahead.

ELECTION OF FLOOR ASSISTANT TO THE MINORITY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 995) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 995

Resolved, That pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 441, 91st Congress, which became permanent law by the provisions of the Legislative Appropriations Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–145, 83 Stat. 338), Joe Bartlett is hereby elected Floor Assistant to the Minority (position (1) (A) in H. Res. 441) to receive gross compensation of $36,000.00 per annum until otherwise ordered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House who have expressed their sorrow over the untimely death of United Automobile Workers President Walter Reuther. The mark of a man's greatness probably, after everything is said that can be said, is the amount of controversy that his activities stir up. Shelley wrote:

> The great secret of morals is love. A man to be greatly good must imagine deeply and comprehensively. He must put himself in the place of another—of many others. The pleasures and pains of his species must become his own.

Mr. Speaker, all that and more was Walter Reuther. America has lost much.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my other colleagues in paying a tribute and our last respects to Walter Reuther today. This was a man who had contributed much to the Nation, and in particular he was a man with great social conscience.

I think he was one of those who was attempting very valiantly to have the union movement be concerned with all segments of America. We shall miss him very much. I hope those who follow after him will carry on his great work.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join those expressing sorrow at the death of Walter Reuther. No matter when it came, his death would have been untimely; however, death at a relatively early age of a man in such a position and with such an imaginative and broad view of social and economic problems is a loss in initiative and other ways for millions of people in addition to the members of the UAW.

I extend my condolences to his family in this time of sorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL DAY AND FOURTH OF JULY HOLIDAY PERIODS

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Members that, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, it will be the intention of the leadership that the House recess for the Memorial Day holiday from close of business on Wednesday, May 27 to Monday, June 1, and for the Fourth of July holiday from close of business on Wednesday, July 1 to Monday, July 6.

THE 1969 REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my 1969 report on the operations of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968.

This treaty, which continues in modified form the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, embodies the oft-stated concern of the United States that the developing countries dependent on the export of primary commodities be able to achieve the stability in foreign exchange income essential for economic growth. The International Coffee Agreement, which involves the most important agricultural export of the less developed world, has evolved into an effective mechanism for influencing coffee prices toward levels which are equitable for producers and reasonable for consumers. While the Agreement is not designed to eliminate reasonable price fluctuations, it has been successful in 1969 as in the previous years of its existence in moderating price movements and preventing prices from reaching levels disastrously low for exporting countries or unacceptably high to the importing countries.

I am encouraged also by the progress which the Agreement has made in achieving long-term market equilibrium through the setting of production goals for the coffee year 1972–73 and the establishment of the Coffee Diversification Fund designed to bring the supply of coffee in line with demand. I hope that negotiations for United States participation in this Fund soon will be completed.

Agreement with Brazil was reached April 30, 1969 on a temporary arrangement regarding the export of soluble coffee from that country to the United States. Consultations toward a permanent solution to this problem are currently under way.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1970*

COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the International Coffee Agreement, which President Nixon has lauded in his report to Congress, has accomplished two things:

It has provided higher prices for the owners and operators of coffee plantations in foreign coffee producing countries and it has held coffee prices at consistently high levels to consumers in the United States.

In other words, Americans are paying a premium price for their coffee as another form of foreign aid and a subsidization of foreigners.

If picking the pockets of American consumers for the benefit of foreign producers is good then we have arrived at a sad and sorry day in this country.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 109]

Adair	Fallon	Mosher
Anderson, Tenn.	Farbstein	Murphy, Ill.
Ashley	Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspinall	Fisher	Obey
Baring	Fraser	Ottinger
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Patten
Beall, Md.	Friedel	Pepper
Bell, Calif.	Gallagher	Philbin
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	Pickle
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Pirnie
Blatnik	Griffiths	Podell
Brademas	Gubser	Pollock
Bray	Halpern	Powell
Broomfield	Hammer-schmidt	Preyer, N.C.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Mich.	Hawkins	Pucinski
Buchanan	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Cabell	Kirwan	Rivers
Carey	Kluczynski	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Cederberg	Landgrebe	St Germain
Celler	Long, La.	Sandman
Chisholm	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Clark	Lowenstein	Schneebeli
Clay	McCarthy	Sikes
Collier	McClory	Slack
Conyers	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Cramer	McEwen	Stokes
Crane	McKneally	Stratton
Culver	McMillan	Stubblefield
Dawson	Macdonald, Mass.	Taft
Delaney	MacGregor	Tunney
Dent	Madden	Watkins
Dickinson	Marsh	Watson
Diggs	Matsunaga	Weicker
Dowdy	Mollohan	Whalen
Edmondson	Moorhead	Whalley
Edwards, Calif.	Morse	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Morton	Wyman
Evans, Colo.		Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 310

Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE 22D BIRTHDAY FOR ISRAEL

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in the House in paying special tribute to the nation of Israel on the occasion of the 22d birthday of this bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

It is customary for Members of the House to take this opportunity to recall the events which led to the United Nations action in 1948 and to the establishment of the State of Israel. The events of 1970 and the continuing crisis in the Middle East require our attention to the future as well as the past in our participation in the 22d anniversary. The real meaning of our celebrating Israel's birthday is to realize that the basic element of an independent nation—its sovereignty—is still not universally recognized in the case of Israel.

This birthday for Israel, like past birthdays, is marred by the refusal of her Arab neighbors to recognize Israel's sovereignty and by the continued rejection by the Arab States of all efforts to bring about direct or indirect talks between the combatants in the Middle East. This occasion is also marked by some retreat in U.S. support for Israel, the extent of which is vague as of this time. Recent reports of Russian advisers and crews manning Russian equipment in the Middle East and the delivery of missiles to be used against Israel have placed the military security of Israel in great jeopardy, yet our Government has not reacted and has failed to meet a request for aid from our ally in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to consider current events in the Middle East as well as the history of Israel's birth as a sovereign state on this 22d birthday. I urge my colleagues to redouble their efforts to bring about a change in U.S. policy—a change which will set us back on the right course in the Middle East. Unless Israel is armed to meet any Arab military threat, the chances for attaining a lasting peace in that troubled area will become even more remote.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY).

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 670) to amend section 19(a) of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 19(a) of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 918; D.C. Code, sec. 3–218(a)) is amended by striking the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no adult child shall be responsible for the support of a parent who for a period of at least ten years in the aggregate during such child's minority willfully neglected or refused without just cause to provide for the support and maintenance of the child."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 670 is to relieve an adult child in the District of Columbia from the statutory requirement of providing support for a parent who "willfully neglected or refused without just cause to provide for the support and maintenance of the child" for a period of "at least ten years in the aggregate during such child's minority".

PRESENT LAW

The District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1952 (P.L. 87–807, approved Oct. 15, 1962, 76 Stat. 914; D.C. Doce, tit. 3, sec. 201) established the following categories of public assistance:

First. Old age assistance;

Second. Aid to the blind;

Third. Aid to the disabled;

Fourth. Aid to dependent children; and

Fifth. General public assistance.

Among other provisions, that law—section 19—provided that the husband, wife, father, mother, or adult child of a recipient of public assistance, or of a person in need thereof, shall, according to his ability to pay, be responsible for the support of such person; and the District was authorized to sue in court those named for the amount of public assistance granted such person or for so much thereof as the named relatives are reasonably able to pay.

At common law, there was no duty on the part of the adult child to support his parent.

PRECEDENTS FOR THIS LEGISLATION

The language of the reported bill is similar to that in effect in the State of Pennsylvania.

Under the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which established the medicaid program, relative responsibility in the case of adult children for fathers and mothers, as well as of mothers and fathers for adult children, was eliminated.

Finally, the question of financial responsibility of an adult child for his alcoholic parent was considered by your Committee and by the Congress in the legislation on the treatment of alcoholics—the District of Columbia Alcoholic Rehabilitation Act of 1967 (Public Law 90–452, approved Aug. 3, 1968, 82 Stat. 618, District of Columbia Code, title 24, sec. 521)—and a waiver of liability of an adult child was provided the rein. In that act, the person receiving care, treatment, or any other services thereunder, was liable to the District of Columbia, and such liability extended to his estate, then to his father, mother, spouse, or adult children. However, that law (District of Columbia Code, title 24, sec. 534(a)(2)) provided for waiver of such liability as follows:

Any person * * * who is liable to the District of Columbia under this section may apply to the Commissioner to have such liability waived. The Commissioner may waive such liability if he determines that it would be unreasonable to impose such liability because of the desertion or neglect of such person by the recipient of services under this Act or because of other factors similarly affecting the relationship between such person and such recipient. The Commissioner shall prescribe procedures for the filing and hearing of such application under this paragraph.

Your committee's report (H. Rept. 1015) stated on that particular section as follows:

Section 14 of the proposed act is the financial responsibility section. The person who receives services under this Act, or his estate, is primarily liable for the cost of such services. His father, mother, spouse, and adult children are secondarily liable according to ability to pay, contingent upon a determination by the Commissioner, after proper notice is given to the party sought to be charged. Liability of these third parties is retroactive for a period not exceeding 90 days prior to the date of notice to them the Commissioner is given discretion to waive liability of relatives or spouse upon a showing of neglect or desertion by the person who received the services, or other similar factors. Procedure for enforcement for such liability through court order is set out in subsection (b).

CONCLUSION

It is the conclusion of our committee that an adult child in the District of Columbia should not be liable for public assistance granted to its parent when, in fact, such parent willfully neglected or refused without just cause to provide for the support and maintenance of the child during the crucial period of such child's minority when its needs are greatest, namely, "for a period of at least 10 years" during the child's minority.

Our committee believes it would be manifestly unfair and inequitable to continue in force the present-law requirements insofar as an adult child is concerned under the circumstances indicated, and hence recommends the reported bill to the favorable consideration of the House.

REASONS FOR THIS LEGISLATION

At a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 5 of our committee on August 4, 1969, on this legislation, testimony was presented showing the inequitable effect of enforcing present law responsibility upon children of a welfare or public assistance recipient whom they never knew as a father and who deserted them and refused to provide for their support and maintenance.

Specifically, in one case presented to the subcommittee, the father had abandoned his wife and their 5-year-old son and 6-month-old daughter over 30 years ago. He thereafter had no contact with

them; they testified that they did not know he even existed; and in fact about 10 years ago they got word he had died in Philadelphia where someone claimed his body and he was buried, according to information they learned. However, in 1967 a detective or investigator came to their home in Washington; advised them that their father was alive and in the city; and that under the law cited above they were required to support him. They did not know him as an individual, much less as their father, when they then visited him, and in view of his neglect of them and refusal to provide for them, they felt under no obligation to maintain him. They appealed to the proper authorities of the District government who, while completely sympathetic with them, stated they had no recourse under present law, since they were employed, except to hold them liable.

A representative of the District Commissioner testified at the subcommittee hearing as to other instances of an adult child or children against whom support payments are sought, who had been abandoned or deserted by the parent during all or substantially all of the period when such child or children were minors.

The Deputy Director for Family and Children Services, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, testified that of the nearly 17,000 families receiving public assistance in Washington, there are less than 200 legally responsible relatives who are making some contribution to the support of their relatives on public assistance; and that the administrative costs involved in implementing and executing the relative-responsibility requirement, particularly with regard to adult children, are infinitely greater than the amount of the contribution received or collected.

All witnesses supported this legislation, and no one appeared or submitted any statement in opposition to the reported bill.

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

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9017) to permit the District of Columbia Council to make rules and regulations under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–107) is amended to read as follows: "The Council shall have specific authority to make rules and regulations for the issuance, transfer, and revocation of licenses; to facilitate and insure the collection of taxes; to govern the operation of the business of licensees, with full power and authority to prescribe the terms and conditions under which alcoholic beverages may be sold by each class of licensees; to forbid the issuance of licenses for manufacture, sale, or storage of alcoholic beverages in such localities in, and such sections and portions of, the District of Columbia as they may deem proper in the public interest; to limit the number of licenses of each class to be issued in the District of Columbia and to limit the number of licenses of each class in any locality in, or sections or portions of, the District of Columbia as they may deem proper in the public interest; to forbid the issuance of licenses for businesses conducted on such premises as they, in the public interest, may deem inappropriate; to forbid the issuance of any class or classes of licenses for businesses established subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act near or around schools, colleges, universities, churches, or public institutions, to prescribe the hours during which alcoholic beverages may be sold and to prohibit the sale of any or all alcoholic beverages on such days as the Council determines necessary in the public interest."

(2) Subsection (g) of section 11 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–111 (g)) is amended by striking out the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of restaurants and hotels, said spirits, beer, and wine shall be sold or served only (1) to persons seated at counters or tables, (2) to persons in an enclosed or screened off area in any such restaurant or hotel set aside for the accommodation of persons waiting to be seated at public tables, and (3) to assemblages of more than six individuals in a private room when such room has been previously approved by the Board. In the case of hotels, said alcoholic beverages may also be sold and served in the private room of a registered guest. In the case of clubs, said beverages may be sold and served in any room or area available only to bona fide members of such club and their bona fide guests."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. The last sentence of subsection (c) of section 3 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–103(c)) is amended by striking out ', other than champagne'.

"SEC. 2. Subsection (g) of section 11 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–111(g)) is amended by striking out the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of restaurants and hotels, alcoholic beverages may be sold or served only to (1) persons seated at counters or tables, (2) persons in an enclosed or screened-off area set aside for the accommodation of persons waiting to be seated at tables, or (3) assemblages of more than six persons in a private roof if such room has been previously approved by the Board. In the case of hotels, alcoholic beverages may also be sold and served in the private room of a registered guest. In the case of clubs, alcoholic beverages may be sold and served in any room or area available only to bona fide members of such club or their bona fide guests, or both."

"SEC. 3 (a) The first sentence of section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–118) is amended by striking out 'or knowingly employs in the sale or distribution of beverages any person who has, within five years prior thereto, been convicted of a misdemeanor under the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented, or, within ten years prior thereto, been convicted of any felony,'.

"(b) Section 25 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–125) is amended by striking out 'allow any person who has, within ten years prior thereto, been convicted of any felony, to sell, give, furnish, or distribute any beverage, nor'.

"SEC. 4. Section 26 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–126) is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'within the District' immediately after 'served' in the second sentence;

"(2) by inserting immediately after such second sentence the following new sentence: 'Without the District, but not more than twenty-five miles distant from the place of the hearing, such summons shall be served by a United States marshal or his deputy.'; and

"(3) by striking out 'United States District Court for the District of Columbia' in the third and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof 'District of Columbia Court of General Sessions'.

"SEC. 5. The proviso in the first sentence of section 13 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–114) is amended by inserting ', the holder of a retailer's license, class A,' immediately after 'wholesaler's license', and by inserting a comma immediatley before 'may store beverages'.

"SEC. 6. Section 35 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–133) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: 'For purposes of this section, the extension of credit by the holder of a class A retailer's license in connection of a sale by such license holder of any beverage through a credit card or other document or device intended or adapted for the purpose of establishing credit shall be considered a sale on credit of such beverage by such license holder.'."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if there is anything in this bill that will reimburse the holders of retail liquor licenses in the District of Columbia? I believe the gentleman will recall we had such a bill before the House not too long ago, and it was defeated, if I remember correctly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There was such a bill in the House. It was defeated. My understanding is that there is no such language in this bill.

If the gentleman will propound his question to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) who is a member of the subcommittee, I am sure he can get a direct answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to direct the question to him.

Mr. ADAMS. There is nothing in this bill at all to compensate anyone for the loss of a liquor license or anything of that nature. The bill is basically a series of technical amendments recommended by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board

here to make the law technically applicable across the board in such things as being able to do the same things in restaurants as are done in hotel lounges, as to either standing, sitting, or drinking. The bill also makes a definition of champagne as opposed to white wine apply across the board. It has nothing to do with the prior bill.

Mr. GROSS. With the explanation of the gentleman from Washington, I have no objection to the bill. However, I do want to note, for the benefit of the committee, that no report was available on this bill in the document room last Friday or Saturday. I would hope that in the future we may have reports to accompany bills, no matter how meritorious those bills may be.

Mr. ADAMS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. My information is that the report was filed. Why it was not available I do not know. The report was filed, according to the committee clerk, on Friday morning. Perhaps it was a little late, but it was filed in time. I guess the printing delayed it.

Mr. GROSS. The bill apparently is a meritorious bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is meritorious.

Mr. GROSS. I have no desire to throw up any obstacle to it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman raises a question about it. The reason for the delay is not because of any dilatory tactics on the part of the committee or its staff. We just had some printing delays at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I merely rise to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, a question. In the last several weeks in the District of Columbia there have been substantial rent increases. My inquiry is directed to the chairman as to what the District Committee is doing about this. I happen to live in the District, and I know from experience in the building that I live in that the total increases on this particular apartment complex will amount to over $95,000 and the increase in taxes, it is my understanding, is only $2,800. This is rent gouging of the worst kind. I think it is about time the District of Columbia Committee looked into the situation, because many, many wonderful people are being driven out of the District. All of us believe in a free enterprise system. We do not believe in rent control. However, I know I speak for the great majority of the tenants in my own building when I say that this is rent gouging and exploitation. I want to urge the chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the full committee, and the entire District Committee, to call in the real estate board and get some answers to this House as to what is going on in the District with reference to high rents.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has propounded a rather long question. In the first place, I am not the chairman of the subcommittee that reported the bill now before the House. In the second place, the bill before the House has nothing to do with rent control. In the third place, there is no rent-control legislation pending before the committee. If the gentleman wishes the committee to consider this subject, if he would introduce a bill on it, I am sure Mr. MCMILLAN, the chairman of the full committee, will set the matter down for a hearing and it will receive appropriate consideration.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I appreciate the answer of my distinguished friend, but I made that statement in the form of an inquiry. I am happy that the gentleman has stated his own position to the House on the matter. He can be sure that I am going to pursue this matter further, but I am asking for the cooperation of himself, the chairman, and the other members of the District Committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In conclusion, I would like to say to the gentleman that I am against high rent, high taxes, and high food prices. I am against things when they get high. Regrettably we just happen to be living in an era when everything is high.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I want to say to the gentleman that I voted for the surtax. I am not against high taxes, because you need taxes in order to pay your bills. So I am not one of these "anti" fellows. But I will tell you that I am against the rent racket in the District of Columbia, because it is a racket.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLYNT). The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ANATOMICAL GIFT ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 15033) to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think this is meritorious legislation, but again here is a bill on which I could not get a report over this weekend. I simply call this to the attention of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and hope in the future that all bills brought to the floor of the House will be accompanied by reports.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman raises a very valid question. The situation in this instance is just as it was in the other instance. There was nothing dilatory on the part of the committee or the staff. The committee filed a report and it should have been here. Regrettably there has been some printing delay down in the Government Printing Office. We can check on them and find out what the trouble is down there. However, I think the gentleman raises a very valid question.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Mississippi that reports are available now at the desk on the House floor. But this comes too late for those of us who like to read the bills and reports over the weekend that are coming up on Monday.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What I meant to say was that the reports did arrive late.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLYNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15033

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DEFINITIONS; SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. (a) As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "bank or storage facility" means a facility licensed, accredited, or approved under the laws of any State for storage of human bodies or parts thereof;

(2) "decedent" means a deceased individual and includes a stillborn infant or fetus;

(3) "donor" means an individual who makes a gift of all or part of his body;

(4) "hospital" means a hospital licensed, accordited, or approved under the laws of any State and includes a hospital operated by the United States Government, a State, or a subdivision thereof, although not required to be licensed under State laws;

(5) "part" includes organs, tissues, eyes, bones, arteries, blood, other fluids, and other portions of a human body, and "part" includes "parts";

(6) "person" means an individual, corporation, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership or association or any other legal entity;

(7) "physician" or "surgeon" means a physician or surgeon licensed or authorized to practice under the laws of any State; and

(8) "State" includes any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, insular possession, the District of Columbia, and any other area subject to the legislative authority of the United States of America.

(b) Sections 1 through 8 of this Act shall be known as the "District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act."

PERSONS WHO MAY EXECUTE AN ANATOMICAL GIFT

SEC. 2. (a) Any individual of sound mind and eighteen years of age or more may give all or any part of his body for any purposes specified in section 3, the gift to take effect upon death.

(b) Any of the following persons, in order of priority stated, when persons in prior classes are not available at the time of death, and in the absence of actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent, or actual notice of opposition by a member of the same or a prior class, may give all or any part of the decedent's body for any purposes specified in section 3:

(1) the spouse,

(2) an adult son or daughter,

(3) either parent,

(4) an adult brother or sister,

(5) a guardian of the person of the decedent at the time of his death, or

(6) any other person authorized or under obligation to dispose of the body.

(c) If the donee has actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent, or that a gift by a member of a class is opposed by a member of the same or a prior class, the donee shall not accept the gift. The persons authorized by subsection (b) may make the gift after death or immediately before death.

(d) A gift of all or part of a body authorizes any examination necessary to assure medical acceptability of the gift for the purposes intended.

(e) The rights of the donee created by the gift are paramount to the rights of others except as provided by section 7(d).

PERSONS WHO MAY BECOME DONEES, AND PURPOSES FOR WHICH ANATOMICAL GIFTS MAY BE MADE

SEC. 3. The following persons may become donees of gifts of bodies or parts thereof for the purposes stated:

(1) any hospital, surgeon, or physician, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy, or transplantation; or

(2) any accredited medical or dental school, college, or university, for education, research, advancement of medical or dental science or therapy; or

(3) any bank or storage facility, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy, or transplantation; or

(4) any specified individual for therapy or transplantation needed by him.

MANNER OF EXECUTING ANATOMICAL GIFTS

SEC. 4. (a) A gift of all or part of the body under section 2(a) may be made by will. The gift becomes effective upon the death of the testator without waiting for probate. If the will is not probated, or if it is declared invalid for testamentary purposes, the gift, to the extent that it has been acted upon in good faith, is nevertheless valid and effective.

(b)(1) A gift of all or part of the body under section 2(a) may also be made by document other than a will. The gift becomes effective upon death of the donor. The document, which may be a card designed to be carried on the person, must be signed by the donor, in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. If the donor cannot sign, the document may be signed for him at his direction and in his presence, and in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. Delivery of the document of gift during the donor's lifetime is not necessary to make the gift valid.

(2) Any such document referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection may be in the following form and contain the following information:

Anatomical Donor Card of

---

print or type name of donor

In the hope that my gift may help others, I hereby make this anatomical gift to take effect upon my death. The words and marks below indicate my desires.

I give:

(a) any needed organs or parts

(b) only the following organs or parts

---

specify the organ(s) or part(s)

(c) my entire body for anatomical study. For the purposes of transplantation, therapy, medical research or education

Limitations: ---

specify limitations, if any

This is a legal document under the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act or similar law.

* * * * *

(Other side of card)

Signed by the donor in the presence of the following two (2) witnesses:

Signature of donor

Date of birth

Date signed

Witness

Witness

(c) The gift may be made to a specified donee or without specifying a donee. If the latter, the gift may be accepted by the attending physician as donee upon or following death. If the gift is made to a specified donee who is not available at the time and place of death, the attending physician upon or following death, in the absence of any expressed indication that the donor desired otherwise, may accept the gift as donee. The physician who becomes a donee under this subsection shall not participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part.

(d) Notwithstanding section 7(b), the donor may designate in his will, card, or other document of gift the surgeon or physician to carry out the appropriate procedures. In the absence of a designation, or if the designee is not available, the donee or other person authorized to accept the gift may employ or authorize any surgeon or physician for the purpose.

(e) Any gift by a person designated in section 2(b) shall be made by a document signed by him, or made by his telegraphic, recorded telephonic, or other recorded message.

DELIVERY OF DOCUMENT OF GIFT

SEC. 5. If the gift is made by the donor to a specified donee, the will, card, or other document, or any executed copy thereof, may be delivered to the donee to expedite the appropriate procedures immediately after death, but delivery is not necessary to the validity of the gift. The will, card, or other document, or an executed copy thereof, may be deposited in any hospital, bank, or storage facility or registry office that accepts them for safekeeping or for facilitation of procedures after death. On request of any interested party upon or after the donor's death, the person in possession shall produce the document for examination.

AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF THE GIFT

SEC. 6 (a) If the will, card, or other document or executed copy thereof, has been delivered to a specified donee, the donor may amend or revoke the gift by—

(1) the execution and delivery to the donee of a signed statement, or

(2) an oral statement made in the presence of 2 persons and communicated to the donee, or

(3) a statement during a terminal illness or injury addressed to an attending physician and communicated to the donee, or

(4) a signed card or document found on his person or in his effects.

(b) Any document of gift which has not been delivered to the donee may be revoked by the donor in the manner set out in subsection (a) or by destruction, cancellation, or mutilation of the document and all executed copies thereof.

(c) Any gift made by a will may also be amended or revoked in the manner provided for amendment or revocation of wills, or as provided in subsection (a).

RIGHTS AND DUTIES AT DEATH

SEC. 7. (a) The donee may accept or reject the gift. If the donee accepts a gift of the entire body, he may, subject to the terms of the gift, authorize embalming and the use of the body in funeral services. If the gift is of a part of the body, the donee, upon the death of the donor and prior to embalming, shall cause the part to be removed without unnecessary mutilation. After removal of the part, custody of the remainder of the body vests in the surviving spouse, next of kin, or other persons under obligation to dispose of the body.

(b) The time of death shall be determined by a physician who attends the donor at his death, or, if none, the physician who certifies the death. This physician shall not participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part.

(c) A person who acts in good faith in accord with the terms of this Act, or under the anatomical gift laws of another State is not liable for damages in any civil action or subject to prosecution in any criminal proceeding for his act.

(d) The provisions of this Act are subject to the laws of the District of Columbia prescribing powers and duties with respect to autopsies.

UNIFORMITY OF INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. This Act shall be so construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those States which enacted it.

SEC. 9. (a) That part of section 3 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act (D.C. Code, sec. 2–252) which follows the definition of the term "Commissioners" is amended to read as follows:

"'Donor' means any person who, in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, bequeaths or donates his tissue for removal after death in furtherance of the purposes of such Act, and also means any deceased person whose tissue is donated or disposed of for the purposes of this Act, the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, or sections 675, 676, and 683 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 27–119a and sec. 27–125).

"'Tissue' means any body of a dead human or any portion thereof, including organs, tissues, eyes, bones, arteries, blood and other fluids.

"'Tissue bank' means a facility for procuring, removing, and disposing of tissue for the purposes set forth in the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, and for the purposes of reconstructive medicine and surgery, and research and teaching in reconstructive medicine and surgery."

(b) Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act are hereby repealed.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Coroner of the District of Columbia may, in his discretion, allow tissue to be removed from any dead human body in his custody or under his jurisdiction, if such tissue removal shall not interfere with other functions of the Office of the Coroner, and the person who, in accordance with section 2(b) of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, is authorized to donate tissue therefrom, shall first authorize such tissue removal."

(d) Section 683 of the Act of March 8, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 27–125), is amended by deleting "may be removed by or under the supervision of a person licensed under the authority of section 4 of such Act for preservation in a tissue bank operating pursuant to such Act," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act may be removed by or under the supervision of a person licensed under the authority of section 4 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act for preservation in a tissue bank operating pursuant to such Act, or for use in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act,".

(e) Sections 675 and 676 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 27–119a), is

amended by inserting immediately after "such Act" the following: "or the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, strike out everything above line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

UNIFORM DONOR CARD OF

Print or type name of donor

In the hope that I may help others, I hereby make this anatomical gift, if medically acceptable, to take effect upon my death. The words and marks below indicate my desires.

I give:

(a)—any needed organs or parts

(b)—only the following organs or parts

---

specify the organ(s) or part(s)

for the purposes of transplantation, therapy, medical research, or education;

(c)—my body for anatomical study if needed.

Limitations or special wishes, if any:----

(Other side of card)

Signed by the donor and the following two witnesses in the presence of each other:

Signature of donor

Date of birth of donor

Date signed

City and State

Witness

Witness

This is a legal document under the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act or similar laws.

Page 10, immediately after line 20, insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act is amended by striking out 'prescribing, without limitation,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'to carry out the purposes of this Act and the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, including, without limitations, rules and regulations prescribing.'"

Page 10, line 21, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Page 10, line 23, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Page 11, line 20, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, certainly on important pieces of legislation which are reported to the floor it is regrettable that reports thereon are not available. I appreciate the questions raised by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has to do with providing for a uniform law among the various States of the Union and the District of Columbia, making it easier for medical science to apply its new found knowledge to the field of transplantation, transfusions, and various other technology and knowledge which has come into being during the last few years.

For example, with the success of corneal transplantation and improvements in kidney transplants in the 1950's, some 40 States and the District of Columbia were stimulated to enact some type of legislation giving an individual the authority to donate an organ for medical purposes upon his death.

Mr. Speaker, transplantation is now a recognized therapeutic procedure in treating kidney disease, and other tisplanted for varying lengths of time: insues which have been successfully transcluding skin, cartilage, bone, tendon, nerve, artery heart valve, liver, and lung. Human organs and tissue are required for research into such problems as the cause of cancer. This type of legislation is necessary in order to make further advances in this area. Nationwide uniformity of the laws governing organ transplantation is necessary in order to further medical advances in this area. The passage of the Uniform Act in 45 States, including Maryland, within less than 2 years since the adoption by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is compelling evidence of its need and importance.

This need is particularly great in the metropolitan areas and I am very pleased that my colleagues from Virginia, Congressman SCOTT and Congressman BROYHILL, are cosponsors of this legislation, as well as my colleague from Maryland, Congressman HOGAN.

The thrust of this bill would clarify the authority of individuals and the next of kin to make anatomical gifts, and define the class of permissible donees and their obligations. It also sets forth the purposes for which donations can be made. Existing law in the District does not specify how the next of kin can make a donation or whether an individual's desire to make a donation can be overridden by his family. My bill provides detailed procedures for donation by next of kin and makes the wishes of the individual donor paramount. The document of gift may be in the form of a card carried on the donor's person to facilitate gifts in emergency situations. Most important, the bill clears up many of the ambiguities that now exist in the law.

This bill, H.R. 15033, I believe to be of the utmost importance if medical science is to continue its advancement. Certainly the time has come for the District of Columbia to join these other States in the passage of this act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and I hope the House will pass it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 15033, as amended and reported by your committee, is to provide in the District of Columbia a comprehensive and uniform legal environment for the donation and transplantation of human organs consistent with the recommendations of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, made in 1968. To further these objectives, the bill provides:

A simple mechanism for executing the gift after death of the body or parts thereof by persons 18 years of age and older.

A declaration that the donor has absolute priority over anyone who may frustrate such desire following death.

A priority list establishing the line of authority following the decedent for making a donation if the decedent had not indicated his desire.

A protection from liability for medical technicians and surgeons who act in good faith in carrying out the provisions of the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act.

A listing of permissible donees, including only those persons or institutions licensed or authorized to practice medicine and to engage in tissue banking and related matters.

A method by which the next of kin may authorize a gift via a telephonic recorded message with the hospital, physician, or institution involved.

A method of revoking a gift should a donor decide to do so after previously having made a decision to donate.

A reciprocity provision which honors the donation statute of other States.

This Uniform Act has already become the law in 41 other States.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1, definitions; short title: This section contains definitions of terms used in the act, and states the title of the act as the "District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act."

Section 2, persons who may execute an anatomical gift: This section grants authority to any individual of sound mind and 18 years of age or older to give all or part of his body for any purpose specified in section 3 of the act, the gift to take effect upon death. It specifically provides that the next of kin may give all or any part of the decedent's body for any purposes specified in section 3 and creates six priority classes of next of kin who may donate beginning with the surviving spouse, and followed by an adult son or daughter, either parent, an adult brother or sister, a guardian of the person of the decedent at the time of his death, or any other person authorized or under obligation to dispose of the body. Any of these persons, in the order of priority stated, when persons in prior classes are not available at the time of death, and in the absence of actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent, or actual notice of opposition by a member of the same or a prior class, may make the gift after death or immediately before the death.

If the donee has actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent or that a gift by a member of a class is opposed by a member of the same or a prior class, the gift shall not be accepted.

A gift of all or part of a body authorizes any examination necessary to assure medical acceptability of the gift for the purposes intended.

The rights of the donee created by the gift are paramount to the rights of others, except as they are subject to the laws of the District of Columbia with respect to autopsies.

Section 3, persons who may become donees, and purposes for which anatomical gifts may be made: This section provides that the following persons may become donees of gifts of bodies or parts thereof:

First. Any hospital, surgeon, or physician, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy, or transplantation; or

Second. Any accredited medical or dental school, college or university, for education, research, advancement of medical or dental science or therapy; or

Third. Any bank or storage facility, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy or transplation; or

Fourth. Any specified individual for therapy or transplantation needed by him.

Section 4, manner of executing anatomical gifts. This section provides that a gift of all or part of the body may be made by will, and the gift is effective immediately upon death without waiting for probate. If the will is not probated, or if it is declared invalid for testamentary purposes, the gift, to the extent that it has been acted upon in good faith, is nevertheless valid, and effective.

A gift may also be made by a document other than a will and becomes effective upon the death of the donor. This document may be a card carried by the person, which must be signed by the donor in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. If the donor cannot sign, the document may be signed for him at his direction and in his presence, and in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. Delivery of the document of gift during the donor's lifetime is not necessary to make the gift valid.

A suggested card form is included. The gift may be made to a specified donee or without specifying a donee. If no donee is named, the gift may be accepted and used by the attending physician. If a donee is designated but is not available at the time and place of death, the attending physician may still accept and use the gift. In this situation, however, the physician cannot participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part.

A donor may designate the surgeon or physician to carry out the appropriate procedures.

Any gift by the next of kin specified in section 2 may be made in writing or by telegraphic, recorded telephonic, or other recorded message.

Section 5, delivery of document of gift. This section provides if the gift is made by the donor to a specified donee, the will, card, or other document, or an executed copy thereof, may be delivered to the donee to expedite the appropriate procedures immediately after death, but delivery is not necessary to the validity of the gift. The will, card, or other document, or an executed copy thereof, may be deposited in any hospital, bank, or storage facility or registry office that accepts them for safekeeping or for facilitation of procedures after death. On request of any interested party upon or after the donor's death, the person in possession shall produce the document for examination.

Section 6, amendment or revocation of the gift. This section allows a gift to a specified donee to be amended or revoked by the donor or the execution and delivery to the donee of a signed statement, or an oral statement made in the presence of two persons and communicated to the donee, or a statement during a terminal illness or injury addressed to an attending physician and communicated to the donee, or a signed card or document found on his person or in his effects.

Any document of gift or any gift by will which has not been delivered to the donee may be revoked by the donor.

Section 7, rights and duties at death. This section provides that the donee may accept or reject the gift. If the donee accepts a gift of the entire body, he may authorize embalming and the use of the body in funeral services. If the gift is of a part of the body, the donee, upon the death of the donor and prior to embalming, shall cause the part to be removed without unnecessary mutilation. After removal of the part, custody of the remainder of the body vests in the surviving spouse, next of kin, or other persons under obligation to dispose of the body. The time of death shall be determined by a physician who attends the donor at his death, or, if none, the physician who certifies the death. This physician shall not participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part. A person who acts in good faith in accord with the terms of this act, or under the anatomical gift laws of another State is not liable for damages in any civil action or subject to prosecution in any criminal proceeding for his act. The provisions of the act are subject to the laws of the District of Columbia prescribing powers and duties with respect to autopsies.

Section 8 and 9, uniformity of interpretation. Section 8 states that the act shall be so construed as to effectuate its general purposes to make uniform the law of those States which enacted it.

Section 9 amends provisions of the Tissue Bank Act to conform with the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, repeals certain sections of the Tissue Bank Act which will now be covered by the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act and provides that regulations may be issued under the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Maryland (Mr. GUDE). I was pleased to join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) and the gentlemen from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. SCOTT) in sponsoring this bill, which I consider desirable for the residents of the District of Columbia.

This bill will provide for the District a comprehensive and uniform legal framework for organ donation and transplantation consistent with the 1968 recommendations of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

Without going into detail, the existing law in the District of Columbia on this subject is a confusing mixture of outdated laws and numerous statutes governing autopsies, unclaimed bodies, and coroners. With the increasing use of organ transplantation in the medical field, nationwide uniformity of laws governing such transplantation is necessary in order to further medical advances in this area.

This legislation will bring the District of Columbia laws into conformity with those of 41 States, including Maryland, which have passed the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act. Furthermore, it has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, and the American Heart Association, as well as many other medical or medically related associations, groups, and councils.

I urge your favorable consideration of this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from further consideration of an identical bill passed by the Senate (S. 2999) to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2999

An act to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DEFINITIONS; SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. (a) As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "bank or storage facility" means a facility licensed, accredited, or approved under the laws of any State for storage of human bodies or parts thereof;

(2) "decedent" means a deceased individual and includes a stillborn infant or fetus;

(3) "donor" means an individual who makes a gift of all or part of his body;

(4) "hospital" means a hospital licensed, accredited, or approved under the laws of any State and includes a hospital operated by the United States Government, a State, or a subdivision thereof, although not required to be licensed under State laws;

(5) "part" includes organs, tissues, eyes, bones, arteries, blood, other fluids, and other portions of a human body, and "part" includes "parts";

(6) "person" means an individual, corporation, government, or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, or association or any other legal entity;

(7) "physician" or "surgeon" a physician or surgeon licensed or authorized to practice under the laws of any State; and

(8) "State" includes any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, insular possession, the District of Columbia, and any other area subject to the legislative authority of the United States of America.

(b) Sections 1 through 8 of this Act shall be known as the "District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act".

PERSONS WHO MAY EXECUTE AN ANATOMICAL GIFT

SEC. 2. (a) Any individual of sound mind and eighteen years of age or more may give all of any part of his body for any purposes specified in section 3, the gift to take effect upon death.

(b) Any of the following persons, in order of priority stated, when persons in prior classes are not available at the time of death, and in the absence of actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent, or actual notice of opposition by a member of the same or a prior class, may give all or any part of the decedent's body for any purposes specified in section 3:

(1) the spouse,

(2) an adult son or daughter,

(3) either parent,

(4) an adult brother or sister,

(5) a guardian of the person of the decedent at the time of his death, or

(6) any other person authorized or under obligation to dispose of the body.

(c) If the donee has actual notice of contrary indications by the decedent, or that a gift by a member of a class is opposed by a member of the same or a prior class, the donee shall not accept the gift. The persons authorized by subsection (b) may make the gift after death or immediately before death.

(d) A gift of all or part of a body authorizes any examination necessary to assure medical acceptability of the gift for the purposes intended.

(e) The rights of the donee created by the gift are paramount to the rights of others except as provided by section 7(d).

PERSONS WHO MAY BECOME DONEES, AND PURPOSES FOR WHICH ANATOMICAL GIFTS MAY BE MADE

SEC. 3. The following persons may become donees of gifts of bodies or parts thereof for the purposes stated:

(1) any hospital, surgeon, or physician, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy, or transplantation; or

(2) any accredited medical or dental school, college, or university, for education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, or therapy; or

(3) any bank or storage facility, for medical or dental education, research, advancement of medical or dental science, therapy, or transplantation; or

(4) any specified individual for therapy or transplantation needed by him.

MANNER OF EXECUTING ANATOMICAL GIFTS

SEC. 4. (a) A gift of all or part of the body under section 2(a) may be made by will. The gift becomes effective upon the death of the testator without waiting for probate. If the will is not probated, or if it is declared invalid for testamentary purposes, the gift, to the extent that it has been acted upon in good faith, is nevertheless valid and effective.

(b)(1) A gift of all or part of the body under section 2(a) may also be made by document other than a will. The gift becomes effective upon death of the donor. The document, which may be a card designed to be carried on the person, must be signed by the donor, in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. If the donor cannot sign, the document may be signed for him at his direction and in his presence, and in the presence of two witnesses who must sign the document in his presence. Delivery of the document of gift during the donor's lifetime is not necessary to make the gift valid.

(2) Any such document referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection may be in the following form and contain the following information:

UNIFORM DONOR CARD

of

---

print or type name of donor

In the hope that I may help others, I hereby make this anatomical gift, if medically acceptable, to take effect upon my death. The words and marks below indicate my desires.

I give:

(a)—any needed organs or parts

(b)—only the following organs or parts

---

specify the organ(s) or part(s)

for the purposes of transplantation, therapy, medical research, or education;

(c)—my body for anatomical study if needed.

Limitations or special wishes, if any: ----

(Other side of card)

Signed by the donor and the following two witnesses in the presence of each other:

Signature of donor

Date of birth of donor

Date signed

City and State

Witness

Witness

This is a legal document under the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act or similar laws.

(c) The gift may be made to a specified donee or without specifying a donee. If the latter, the gift may be accepted by the attending physician as donee upon or following death. If the gift is made to a specified donee who is not available at the time and place of death, the attending physician upon or following death, in the absence of any expressed indication that the donor desired otherwise, may accept the gift as donee. The physician who becomes a donee under this subsection shall not participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part.

(d) Notwithstanding section 7(b), the donor may designate in his will, card, or other document of gift the surgeon or physician to carry out the appropriate procedures. In the absence of a designation, or if the designee is not available, the donee or other person authorized to accept the gift may employ or authorize any surgeon or physician for the purpose.

(e) Any gift by a person designated in section 2(b) shall be made by a document signed by him, or made by his telegraphic, recorded telephonic, or other recorded message.

DELIVERY OF DOCUMENT OF GIFT

SEC. 5. If the gift is made by the donor to a specified donee, the will, card, or other document, or any executed copy thereof, may be delivered to the donee to expedite the appropriate procedures immediately after death, but delivery is not necessary to the validity of the gift. The will, card, or other document, or an executed copy thereof, may be deposited in any hospital, bank or storage facility, or registry office that accepts them for safekeeping or for facilitation of procedures after death. On request of any interested party upon or after the donor's death, the person with possession shall produce the document for examination.

AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF THE GIFT

SEC. 6 (a) If the will, card, or other document of executed copy thereof, has been delivered to a specified donee, the donor may amend or revoke the gift by—

(1) the execution and delivery to the donee of a signed statement, or

(2) an oral statement made in the presence of two persons and communicated to the donee, or

(3) a statement during a terminal illness or injury addressed to an attending physician and communicated to the donee, or

(4) a signed card or document found on his person or in his effects.

(b) Any document of gift which has not been delivered to the donee may be revoked by the donor in the manner set out in subsection (a) or by destruction, cancellation, or mutilation of the document and all executed copies thereof.

(c) Any gift made by a will may also be amended or revoked in the manner provided for amendment or revocation of wills, or as provided in subsection (a).

RIGHTS AND DUTIES AT DEATH

SEC. 7. (a) The donee may accept or reject the gift. If the donee accepts a gift of the entire body, he may, subject to the terms of the gift, authorize embalming and the use of the body in funeral services. If the gift is of a part of the body, the donee, upon the death of the donor and prior to embalming, shall cause the part to be removed without unnecessary mutilation. After removal of the part, custody of the remainder of the body vests in the surviving spouse, next of kin or other persons under obligation to dispose of the body.

(b) The time of death shall be determined by a physician who attends the donor at his death, or, if none, the physician who certifies the death. This physician shall not participate in the procedures for removing or transplanting a part.

(c) A person who acts in good faith in accord with the terms of this Act, or under the anatomical gift laws of another State is not liable for damages in any civil action or subject to prosecution in any criminal proceeding for his act.

(d) The provisions of this Act are subject to the laws of the District of Columbia prescribing powers and duties with respect to autopsies.

UNIFORMITY OF INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. This Act shall be so construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those States which enacted it.

SEC. 9. (a) That part of section 3 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act (D.C. Code, sec. 2–252) which follows the definition of the term "Commissioners" is amended to read as follows:

" 'Donor' means any person who, in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, bequeaths or donates his tissue for removal after death in furtherance of the purposes of such Act, and also means any deceased person whose tissue is donated or disposed of for the purposes of this Act, the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, or sections 675, 676, and 683 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 27–119a and sec. 27–125).

" 'Tissue' means any body of a dead human or any portion thereof, including organs, tissues, eyes, bones, arteries, blood, and other fluids.

" 'Tissue bank' means a facility for procuring, removing, and disposing of tissue for the purposes set forth in the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, and for the purposes of reconstructive medicine and surgery and research and teaching in reconstructive medicine and surgery."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act is amend-

ed by striking out "prescribing, without limitation," and inserting in lieu thereof "to carry out the purposes of this Act and the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, including, without limitation, rules and regulations prescribing."

(c) Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act are hereby repealed.

(d) Subsection (b) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Coroner of the District of Columbia may, in his discretion, allow tissue to be removed from any dead human body in his custody or under his jurisdiction, if such tissue removal shall not interfere with other functions of the Office of the Coroner, and the person who, in accordance with section 2(b) of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act, is authorized to donate tissue therefrom, shall first authorize such tissue removal."

(e) Section 683 of the Act of March 8, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 27–125), is amended by deleting "may be removed by or under the supervision of a person licensed under the authority of section 4 of such Act for preservation in a tissue bank operating pursuant to such Act," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act may be removed by or under the supervision of a person licensed under the authority of section 4 of the District of Columbia Tissue Bank Act for preservation in a tissue bank operating pursuant to such Act, or for use in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act,".

(e) Sections 675 and 676 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 27–119a), is amended by inserting immediately after "such Act" the following: "or the District of Columbia Anatomical Gift Act".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABERNETHY

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 12, line 6, strike "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 15033) was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE FLYING OF KITES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 16476) to make it lawful to set up or fly any kite in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia", approved July 29, 1892 (D.C. Code, sec. 22–1117), is amended by striking out "to set up or fly any kite, or".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "to".

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and point out to the House that here in the capital of the free world there is no freedom to do the most 100 percent American thing that an American citizen can do—go fly a kite.

I do not intend to make a "long-winded" speech about this, Mr. Speaker, but a grave situation does exist in the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia local government, the Department of the Interior, and the Smithsonian Institution have all requested this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is more danger in the existing law than one might imagine. For example, if one citizen were to tell another to go out and fly a kite, he would be advocating the commission of a crime in the District of Columbia. I doubt that this ever happens in the District of Columbia, but just in case any citizen ever got high as a kite he would be in double jeopardy.

I do not want to shock anybody, but Benjamin Franklin would be out of luck in his Nation's Capital today.

I realize that there are other provisions in the same law that have raised some question this very morning—the same law that we are dealing with makes a crime of causing a dog to bite or setting dogs on persons or animals—the more I think about it I think it is a good provision.

Fastening horses to trees is also outlawed by this statute.

Also, it is a crime to drive a vehicle in excess of 12 miles per hour outside of Georgetown or in excess of 8 miles per hour inside of Georgetown.

So we have a long way to go, really. As President Kennedy said, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step, and I give the House my assurances, as the author of this bill, that I as an individual will look into these other matters if you will just help get this one off the ground.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman for his "erudite" presentation. Furthermore I think that the gentleman is very generous in contriving this bill, and I am glad that he pointed out Benjamin Franklin's propensities and the difficulties that he would encounter if he was in the District of Columbia today. They are modest as to natural lightening.

But, I wonder if the gentleman does not really think that this legislation is inspired, whether it is in his extrasensory perception or his subconscious mind or not, by instructions perhaps of the current President to his Secretary of the Interior? What I am really trying to say is: Did he tell Secretary of the Interior Hickel to "go fly a kite," and that that is the real reason for this legislation?

Mr. JACOBS. I plead the constitutional right not to interfere with another branch of Government, and I ask the gentleman to excuse me from answering the question, although according to the press that may well be true.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would be the last to ask that this distinguished "jurist" now in the well of the House forgo the principle of the sovereignty of powers. If I have erred in this direction, I want to withdraw and retract that. But I have heard it rumored in certain circles——

Mr. JACOBS. Is the gentleman saying that rumors are flying?

Mr. HALL. Yes, like father flown kites in Missouri springtime on Mother's Day. I have heard it rumored in certain circles that he is going to devote all of his personal memoranda paper to Chairman of the City Council, Washington, to be used in kite manufacturing process, and we the Congress must have surveillance and review over the process that might involve a "conflict of interest." I certainly do not believe we should take all of this paper from the Department of the Interior and turn it into kites just because of the gentleman's bill. It would be like propelling a steam engine with the hot-air emanating from these Chambers.

Mr. JACOBS. I know of the gentleman's admiration for some of the local newspapers and I might suggest a good use for them in this way.

Mr. HALL. I think that would clash with "red sails in the sunset." I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the Will Rogers of Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I will have to tell a story if you are going to do that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on bringing this bill to the floor because I am sure——

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman surely means "bringing up" this bill.

Mr. HUNGATE. Yes, I thank my colleague.

I think that is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of our retaining home rule right here in this Chamber so we can pass on kite flying.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill (H.R. 16476) is to make it lawful to set up or fly any kite in the District of Columbia.

This would be accomplished by repealing the prohibition against kite flying, which is contained in the act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 322, District of Columbia Code, title 22, sec. 1117).

This legislation was requested by the District of Columbia Government, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Smithsonian Institution.

No objection to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

While the language of the bill speaks for itself, a summary of the legislative history of the prohibition against kite flying in the District is pertinent hereto.

BACKGROUND OF PROHIBITION AGAINST KITE FLYING

The legislation which is amended by H.R. 16476 originated in the other body in 1892 during the 1st session of the 52d Congress, as S. 267, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia." It was referred to, and approved and reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia—Senate Report 32, January 18, 1892—and debated on February 15, 1892.

Section 4 of the 1892 bill provided as follows:

That is shall not be lawful for any person to *set up or fly any kite*, or set up or fly any fire balloon or parachute in or upon or over any street, avenue, alley, open space, public inclosure, or square within the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, under a penalty of not more than ten dollars for each and every such offense. (Emphasis added.)

Other acts forbidden in the 1892 statute, with appropriate money fines or penalties therefor, included:

Destruction, damage, or defacing public property.

Destruction or damage of building materials.

Throwing stones or other missiles in public places.

Cursing, obscenities, disorderly conduct in public, or in public buildings and grounds.

Boisterous assemblages; boisterous, rude, insulting, obscene talk.

Enticing prostitution.

Indecent exposure.

Causing dogs to fight, or setting dogs on persons or animals.

Disturbing religious services in churches.

Fast riding or driving in excess of 8 miles per hour in the cities of Washington and Georgetown and 12 miles per hour outside thereof, or turning corners in excess of 4 miles per hour; and driving or riding in public grounds.

Injuring public trees, or fastening horses thereto.

Kindling bonfires on public streets or places between sundown and sunrise.

Playing football, bandy, shandy, or other games with balls or stones in streets.

Appropriate money penalties were assessed for each offense specified.

Vagrants, prostitutes, and paupers were required upon conviction to give bond for good behavior for 6 months.

OCCASION FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE ORIGINAL PROHIBITION

In explanation of the occasion for the legislation, and the necessity for its enactment, the following statements were offered on the floor of the Senate on Feb. 15, 1892:

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado how it is possible to have an efficient government in this city or in Georgetown, to which I understand this bill applies, there being no council, there being no board of aldermen, unless we act. There is no power really to pass an ordinance, which is usally done in cities under a general provision of law empowering them to do it, and the Congress of the United States undertakes to legislate for this District. Therefore, in the absence of any other authority to make these minute laws, certainly the city can not get along without regulations and very precise ones, and until the people of the city of Washington shall be organized into local government empowering them to make their own rules and regulations and ordinances touching all these small matters, certainly Congress must do it.

Mr. FAULKNER. I hope the Senate will understand exactly the scope and object of this bill. The law as it is found in this bill is the law today of the city of Washington as known before West Washington, which was formerly known as Georgetown, was made a part of this city. There is no change in the law so far as this law is applicable to the city of Washington proper, within the bounds of the city.

Mr. TELLER. It is simply extended all over the District.

Mr. FAULKNER. No; all the provisions are not extended over the entire District. Some of them are limited to the city of Washington and West Washington or Georgetown, and the other provisions that are properly applicable only to the streets of the thickly settled portion of the city are not extended over the entire District of Columbia.

What the member—Mr. Faulkner—had reference to was the fact that when the District of Columbia was created, within that part of its 10-mile square area now comprising the District, there were three local governmental units in the portion ceded by Maryland, namely, the city of Washington, the city of Georgetown, and the county of Washington—which encompassed the rural countryside outside the two cities.

When the Congress consolidated these three units into a unified District of Columbia government in 1871, it validated the laws and city council ordinances then in effect, including the ordinance against flying kites.

Next, the 1892 act extended the kite ban to the city of Georgetown, in addition to the city of Washington already covered.

That concluded the debate insofar as kite flying is concerned, and after some colloquies on other sections, S. 267 was passed by the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 52d Congress, first session, volume 23, part 2, pages 1133–1135.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia considered and approved the bill (S. 267) and reported it favorably without amendment—House Report 2001, 52d Congress, First Session—on July 22, 1892. Four days later, July 26, 1892, the bill was called up under a unanimous request, and after only a very brief discussion—not concerning the kite flying prohibition—the bill was passed by the House. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 52d Congress, first session, volume 23, part 7, pages 6802–6803.

Neither the House nor the Senate reports referred to on S. 267 contain any justification of, or explanation of, the kiteflying prohibition—section 4; and the floor debates cited are the only references thereto in the legislative history thereon.

As stated, it was approved by the President on July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 322, D.C. Code, title 22, sec. 1117).

PROHIBITION ON KITEFLYING STILL VALID

As recently as April of this year our committee is advised the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia upheld the 1892 kiteflying prohibition and refused to grant a preliminary injunction against the enforcement thereof.

Hence the enactment of H.R. 16476 is necessary to repeal the section in question.

CONCLUSION

Our committee does not know of any reason for the continuance of the kiteflying ban but it has received numerous letters and calls in support of legislation to repeal the same.

The favorable recommendations attached to this report attest to the widespread interest yet extant in the sport of kiteflying and it would be almost inhuman to deny to the many still eager to participate in the thrills emanating from the tug of the strings on a breezy day or just the fun of watching the many-shaped, variegated objects cavorting in the sky.

H.R. 16476 is recommended for the favorable consideration of the House.

The District of Columbia Government requested the introduction and enactment of the legislation and was supported by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution:

I include the following:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1970]

ALL OF DISTRICT ISN'T ALSO WASHINGTON, SO KITE ISSUE REMAINS UP IN THE AIR

(By Jack Eisen)

It's against the law to fly a kite in the District of Columbia. Right or wrong?

Wrong.

If, like most kite fanciers hereabouts, you thought otherwise, you were misled—however innocently.

So was the Smithsonian Institution, which as a result has moved its annual kite-flying contest Saturday from the Washington Monument grounds to Ft. Washington, a park several miles down the Potomac.

But what about the law, the one that says you can't fly kites in Washington?

That's what it says: Washington. The City of Washington.

And, although all of Washington is in the District of Columbia, all of the District of Columbia is not Washington.

The city is a smaller area, pretty much that part of the District laid out in George Washington's day by Pierre Charles L'Enfant.

Assistant Corporation Counsel Robert F. Kneipp, who always thought he was born in the City of Washington, concluded reluctantly but tentatively yesterday that he entered life instead in Washington County, D.C.—or, at least, what had been Washington County before 1871.

The law that keeps the city technically in existence is ambiguous on the county's status. But, Kneipp agreed the city seems to be still around as a distinct geographic unit.

For most purposes, there is no legal difference in the distinction. Some government lawyers say they would prefer to forget it entirely since it bears on a number of old laws still on the books.

"It's pretty fuzzy," observed Kenneth Tapman, a lawyer in the Interior Department solicitor's office who was involved in the Smithsonian kite decision.

Carolyn Amundson of the Smithsonian Associates, who is helping produce the kite festival, said she was sorry she didn't know of the loophole when negotiations were under way for a convenient site with Interior's National Capital Parks.

The program would better be held in upper Rock Creek Park, or Anacostia Park, or other parklands outside the old city, she ob-

served. There is even a legal theory that it could have been held in East Potomac Park, since the man-made Hains Point promontory did not exist when the Washington boundaries were drawn.

Those boundaries, according to Title 1, Section 107 of the D.C. Code, are substantially as they existed on Feb. 21, 1871, with some expansion in 1895.

But let's get back to the beginning, which for these purposes is 1801.

That is when Congress created the District of Columbia, with three local governmental units in the portion ceded by Maryland. (There were two other such units on the opposite shore of the Potomac, but Congress gave those back to Virginia in 1846.)

The three on the north bank were the City of Washington, the City of Georgetown and the County of Washington. The county encompassed all the rural countryside outside the two cities, plus the Potomac bed, and had by far the largest area.

In 1871, Congress consolidated the three into a unified District of Columbia government. In the process, it validated the laws and City Council ordinances then in effect, but did not broaden their geographic application.

Hence an old Washington ordinance against flying kites and lofting hot-air balloons—the reasons for which are obscured—continued on the books.

But it applied only to the city, the area bracketed generally by the Potomac and Anacostia River shorelines, Rock Creek and Boundary Street (today's Florida Avenue).

The kite ban was reinforced in 1892 when Congress, with barely a ripple of debate, enacted it anew as part of an omnibus law that dealt with a variety of public offenses.

In its geographic effect, the 1892 law was specific. The ban on kites, ball-playing in streets and alleys and prodding one's horse to travel more than 8 miles an hour applied only to the two cities. Bans on dog fighting, obscene language and rock throwing were District-wide.

Three years later, Congress merged Georgetown into Washington, in the process ratifying the continued existence of Washington on paper. That law still stands.

And, in fact, as recently as 1956, the now-abolished Board of District Commissioners found it necessary to re-enact an antidiscrimination ordinance dating from 1869 to make it apply beyond the old city boundary.

Several other old laws, applying to the city alone, are sprinkled through the D.C. Code. The onrush of time has made some of them amusing.

For example, the law that requires Washington householders to keep their weeds cut applies also into "the more densely populated suburbs." In 1899, when the law was passed, that would not have extended beyond Cleveland Park.

Another law makes it illegal to establish a new cemetery within the District unless it is more than a mile outside the Washington city limits.

In relatively recent times, this law frustrated an effort by the late Elder Lightfoot Solomon Michaux, an evangelist, to create a burying ground on the Anacostia's east bank.

It is illegal for anyone to make Washington's city water supply "impure, filthy or unfit for use," but the law appears to be silent as it applies to the rest of the District. Officials say the city government has ample police power to deal with any such problem, specific law or not.

Another water law gives the city the right to levy a fireplug tax of $1 to $5 a month on any building not hooked into the municipal water system.

Yet another law forbids the federal government from using time clocks within the city to check on the attendance of its employees (a law honored in the breach by the city post office and possibly other agencies as well).

And there's the matter of overhead utility wires.

The ban against them along city streets (they're permitted in alleys) extended to streetcar trolley wires, as well. That's why Washington streetcars, until their final abandonment in 1962, drew their power from slots in the pavement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

BUSINESS OF DEBT ADJUSTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1458) to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1458

An act to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Debt adjusting" means an activity, whether referred to by the term "budget counseling", "budget planning", "budget service", "credit advising", "debt adjusting", "debt counseling", "debt help", "financial adjusting", "financial arranging", "prorating", or some other term of like import, which involves a particular debtor's entering into an express or implied contract whereby the debtor agrees to pay an amount or amounts of money periodically or otherwise to a person who agrees, for a consideration, to distribute such money among specified creditors in accordance with a plan agreed upon between the debtor and the person to whom the debtor makes or agrees to make such payments.

(2) "Person" does not include an individual admitted to the bar of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(3) "Partnership" does not include a partnership all the members of which are admitted to the bar of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, no person, partnership, association, or corporation shall engage in the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to those situations involving debt adjusting incurred incidentally in the lawful practice of law in the District of Columbia nor shall anything in this Act be construed to apply to any nonprofit or charitable corporation or association which engages in debt adjusting even though the nonprofit corporation or association may charge and collect nominal sums as reimbursement for expenses in connection with such services.

SEC. 4. (a) Whoever violates section 2 of this Act shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 and to imprisonment for not more than six months, or to both.

(b) Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strongest support for this proposed legislation designed to prohibit the insidious business of debt counseling, or debt adjustment, in the District of Columbia.

This subject has long been a matter of keen interest to me. I first introduced a bill to abolish this business in the District in the 85th Congress—13 years ago. The question of constitutionality arose at that time, and an amended version of the bill, which would have licensed and regulated this business, was passed by the House but failed of action in the Senate. I again introduced my original bill in the 86th Congress, at which time no action was taken. And in the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9806, which was identical to the bill which is being considered here today. Hence, I submit that my genuine interest and concern about this matter has long been established.

I oppose the existence of this shoddy business because it serves no useful purpose whatever, and makes no contribution to the people of the District of Columbia. In many instances, in fact, it acts to the detriment of the debt-ridden clients.

Ostensibly, the so-called debt counselor or debt adjuster operates by taking charge of a debtor's income and distributing it among his creditors according to a prearranged schedule of payments toward the debts, leaving the debtor only a small living allowance. In actual practice, however, the adjuster takes a substantial fee "off the top" and frequently leaves the poor deluded debtor eventually more hopelessly in debt than ever.

The people who turn in desperation to these leeches in most cases are poor, untutored, and gullible. As a rule, they are debt-ridden to amounts of $2,500 to $3,000 to small loan companies, automobile finance firms, and installment retail establishments. Easy credit, and especially the proliferation of easy-to-get credit cards, constitute the financial quicksand into which these persons, frequently of limited intelligence, sink. Various circumstances may provide the final impetus to financial desperation—loss of overtime work, costly illness in the family, or other unanticipated demands upon the meager income. As a result, the person may quickly find himself inextricably involved in mounting debt, and dunned by creditors from every direction. In his desperation, the debtor may seek out the plausible-sounding, glib debt adjuster as the answer to his plight.

The debt adjuster, indeed, through his craftily worded but misleading adver-

tising, may seem to offer these debtors a means of escape from their predicament. These ads are cleverly designed bait—but they do not actually offer to pay off the debtor's creditors, nor do they offer credit to the debtor. But the unsophisticated and poorly educated may easily interpret them otherwise.

When the debtor is in the tolls of the debt adjuster, the latter first takes his fee, frequently running as high as 25 percent, and then gives the debtor a meager amount on which to survive. The result is that in many cases, there is not enough money left in the victim's balance to satisfy the creditors. In many instances, indeed, nothing whatever is actually applied toward the debts, and the poor debtor has only succeeded in getting more deeply into the morass of debt. Meanwhile, when the creditors have increased their dunning demands, the debt adjuster typically advises the debtor to ignore this importuning, with the assurance that he, the debt adjuster, will take care of everything. Actually, having acquired his own substantial fee, the debt adjuster in most instances loses all interest in the debtor.

This so-called business not only is flourishing but has been growing here in the Nation's Capital. As these unscrupulous operators, having put up no capital of their own and taking no risks whatever, continue to reap a financial harvest from the poor, the uneducated, and the gullible who are enticed by their misleading advertising to seek out their help when they are over their heads in debt and facing the grim prospect of having their salaries garnisheed.

This unhappy business has been outlawed in 26 States, including my own State of Virginia, and the neighboring State of Maryland. Furthermore, some 70 jurisdictions have undertaken to rid themselves of this scourge by setting up nonprofit credit counseling services which are supported financially by businesses, labor groups, and civic organizations in those jurisdictions. There is no profit motive involved in these services, and the debtors are counseled and helped free of charge. I wish to point out that the bill S. 1458 authorizes such nonprofit service for the District of Columbia, and I am pleased to state that I understand such an organization is operating in this city, as a service of the AFL–CIO, and that others are contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have been victims of this type of business. These people have come to me in desperate financial trouble, and in some cases I have managed to serve them myself in the capacity of a debt counselor, contacting their creditors and arranging for some acceptable means of payment. Unfortunately, however, many of these people who have come to me have gone to these debt adjusters first, and as a result were hundreds of dollars deeper in debt than before.

I do not mean to imply that all debt adjusters operate in the unscrupulous manner I have described. But it is a fact that many do operate this way, and I contend that the time is long overdue to scourge these leeches from our Nation's Capital. The answer is not in regulating this business, for it is impossible to regulate a potential racket satisfactorily. The only solution is to rid the city of this business and to leave the business of debt counseling to proper hands; namely, practicing attorneys and nonprofit or charitable service organizations.

The question of constitutionality of such a prohibition was resolved by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1958. Now that the Senate has acted, I urge my colleagues to take prompt and favorable action on this bill.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia and congratulate him for his work in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the business of debt adjusting has lent itself to grave abuse of debtors in distress, particularly the poor. While promising help to the debtor in trouble, debt consolidators in fact add to the financial burdens of the debtor, without offering much in the way of counseling to help the debtor manage his obligations. The business of debt pooling has been prohibited in my own State of Maryland since 1968, and I hope the same rule will be approved for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse what the gentleman from Virginia has had to say about this situation in the District and also in support of the legislation. Frankly, I do not think this legislation goes far enough. This city has been filled with a number of just downright crooks and deadbeats who have been cheating people out of their money and actually pay none of the funds paid over to them on the debts owed by the debtors. I do not think this bill will correct that situation. Section 3 of the bill provides that the same situation may be carried on if carried on in the lawful practice of the law or in some other manner.

Here is what I think will happen. I think they will select some lawyer to become a member of the adjusting firm. They will conduct the business in his name, and conduct it in exactly the same fashion in which it has been conducted in the past. If I had my way, we would completely outlaw so-called debt adjusting in the District. It has been outlawed in numerous States of the Union. I think a majority of them, and that is what ought to be done here. Evidently this bill is about the best we can get.

My opinion is that we will probably be back here next year, or the year after that, with another bill which will do what we ought to do, and that is to completely outlaw this type of so-called services.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman is an attorney. I am not. However, I thought the bar association had a code of ethics through which they could police a situation such as the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will say to the gentleman that I think the proposed legislation improves the situation a little bit, but I believe we will find out after 3 months that something additional will be necessary.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The bill provides that the attorneys would perform such services only as are incident to their normal practice, and not as a special profession in itself.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know some attorneys whom I would not trust with a sum of money, and I think we will find that they have most of the business.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I support this legislation. I think we should make the legislative history clear about the intent of the bill. As stated by the gentleman from Virginia, we do not intend that lawyers go into the debt-adjusting business, but this exception was left in only for the purpose of enabling them to do these things in the normal and regular practice of law. If we find that this is being misused in the District, I am certain that we will be back up here again.

The purpose of the bill, S. 1458, is to prohibit the business of "debt adjusting" in the District of Columbia, except as an incident to the practice of law or by a nonprofit or charitable organization, even though the latter may charge nominal sums as reimbursement for expenses incurred in connection with such services.

The business of debt adjusting, also known by several other names, involves an agreement by a debtor to pay money periodically to the adjuster who agrees in return for a fee paid by the debtor to apportion the money among the creditors of his client. The adjuster does not advance or lend money to the debtor.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Members of both the House and the Senate have sought to obtain legislation in this area for the past 12 years. In the 85th Congress, H.R. 573, which would have provided for the licensing and regulation of this business in the District of Columbia, was passed by the House on August 12, 1958. Since that time, a number of other bills, designed either to regulate or to prohibit debt adjusting in the District have been introduced. And on July 19, 1968, the Senate passed the bill S. 1739, which was identical to the bill which is the subject of this report, S. 1458, which was approved by the Senate on July 8, 1969.

HEARINGS

A public hearing on S. 1458 and related House bills was conducted by Subcommittee No. 2 on October 16, 1969. At that time, representatives of the debt-adjusting business spoke in favor of regulation and licensing of the business in the District.

Spokesmen for the District of Columbia government, however, and other witnesses as well, testified emphatically in favor of banning this business in the city, as has been done in both Virginia and Maryland.

The practices involved in the debt-adjusting business have proved to be of sufficient concern in other parts of the country that it has been prohibited by law in 26 States, and regulated in 15 other States. The list of these States, and the year in which such legislation was enacted in each State, is as follows:

State:	Year enacted
Arkansas	1967
Delaware	1966
Florida	1959
Georgia	1956
Hawaii	1967
Kansas	1961
Louisiana	1968
Maine	1955
Maryland	1968
Massachusetts	1955
Missouri	1963
Montana	1969
New Jersey	1960
New Mexico	1965
New York	1956
North Carolina	1963
Ohio	1957
Oklahoma	1957
Pennsylvania	1961
Rhode Island	1964
South Carolina	1963
Tennessee	1968
Texas	1965
Virginia	1956
West Virginia	1957
Wyoming	1957

The following 15 States regulate this type of business:

State:	Year enacted
Arizona	1968
California	1957
Colorado	1965
Connecticut	1967
Idaho	1963
Illinois	1957
Iowa	1967
Michigan	1961
Minnesota	1969
Nebraska	1967
New Hampshire	1969
Oregon	1963
Utah	1963
Washington	1967
Wisconsin	1937

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

A series of articles which appeared in the Washington Star in 1967 served to highlight the evils of the deceptive commercial practices of many so-called debt consolidators operating in the District of Columbia.

These debt adjusters persuade debtors to refrain from making direct payments to their creditors, and instead to make payments to the adjuster. The adjuster, in turn, pays the creditors, but only after taking a substantial premium "off the top" for himself, from the debtor's payments. The debtor receives no real benefit from this arrangement. Rather, he adds a new creditor—the adjuster himself—to the already overwhelming list of his creditors.

It should be made clear that debt consolidation has nothing in common with moneylending institutions or credit-counseling services. A debt adjuster lends no money; he only takes it. In the process, he may mislead the harried debtor into believing that his creditors will all be repaid at once.

In its study of this proposed legislation, your committee has been impressed by certain facts which indicate that the business of debt adjusting should be forbidden in the District of Columbia, with the qualifications provided in S. 1458. These facts are as follows:

First. The fee charged by the adjuster for his services, which may be as high as 10 or 12 percent of each payment in addition to an initial conference fee, adds to the financial burden of the debtor and thereby postpones the day when he may be debt-free.

Second. The benefits to the debtor resulting from the services of a debt adjuster are questionable. Debt adjusters do not lend money, nor do they stop the imposition of finance charges by paying off the creditors immediately. Further, most debt adjusters make no attempt to counsel their clients nor to set up budgets for them. Also, it is sometimes the case that the debt adjuster does not assure that the payment schedule he devises will either meet the demands of the clients creditors or leave the debtor sufficient money on which to live.

Third. By promising quick results which cannot be obtained, the debt adjuster actually deters the debtor from seeking the financial counselling which he needs. Your committee is advised that in many instances, the debtor really needs counselling and the setting up of a proper budget, rather than prorated payments on certain outstanding debts. The debt adjuster, however, bases his fee on such prorating activity, and hence can be expected to confine his efforts to that aspect of helping his clients to discharge their debts.

Fourth. Deceptive advertising is often used to obtain clients. Copies of newspaper advertisements presented to the committee imply incorrectly that the consolidator would pay off the debtor's bills immediately and collect from the debtor in small installments. Significantly, these advertisements often fail to specify the total number of installments, the amount of the service charge, or the portion of each installment that would be applied to the outstanding debts. The potential client sees only a quick and easy way out of debt through payment of one weekly installment.

As has been pointed out, witnesses representing the debt-adjusting business testified in favor of regulation to eliminate certain objectionable features of the business and to control others. It was their contention that in the 15 States where the debt adjusting business is regulated, adjusters perform a useful service, free from corrupt and undesirable practices.

From the preponderance of the testimony, however, your committee is strongly of the opinion that simple regulation of debt adjusting cannot adequately protect the public, and that the debt consolidation business offers no useful service that should be fostered by the official approval implied by regulation.

EXCEPTIONS PROVIDED

S. 1458 provides two exclusions from the prohibition of debt adjustment in the District of Columbia, as follows:

First. Section 3 excludes from the prohibition those situations involving debt counseling and adjusting which may be incurred incidentally in the lawful practice of law in the District.

Your committee realizes that debtors finding themselves in situations approaching insolvency frequently need and seek legal assistance to marshal assets and to advise them on such matters as the legality of certain claims, legal remedies governing the debtor-creditor relationship, the applicability of the Bankruptcy Act, and so forth. This is a normal aspect of the practice of law, and of course should not be prohibited.

Second. Section 3 provides also that this act shall not apply to debt adjustment services performed by nonprofit or charitable organizations, even though such organizations may charge nominal amounts as reimbursement for expenses incurred.

Your committee is advised that in many States where the debt adjusting business is prohibited, public or private nonprofit agencies provide needed counseling to debtors who encounter difficulty in meeting their obligations. For example, the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Greater Baltimore, Inc., is a nonprofit counseling service in that city supported by contributions from finance companies, banks, credit unions, merchants, savings and loan companies, and other community-minded companies and individuals. Its policies are established and directed by a board of trustees repreresenting broad community interests and diversified business and professional backgrounds.

Here in the District of Columbia, budget planning, advice, and guidance is available through the consumer counseling program of the AFL–CIO community services activities and also by other nonprofit agencies. Also, overburdened debtors in the Capital City may obtain loans to consolidate their debts through credit unions and other credit agencies, together with free budget counseling and advice. The AFL–CIO community services activities provides budget planning and advice on all aspects of consumer buying and credit purchasing, as well as educational programs to aid persons in liquidating and avoiding indebtedness. Your committee is informed that his service, which is furnished free of charge, is available not only to union members but to the general public as well.

It is the view of your committee that the services of these and similar organizations are definitely in the public interest, and hence should properly be excluded from the provisions of the first two sections of this bill.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION

Section 4 makes a violation of the act a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

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

SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS, POLICEMEN, AND FIREMEN

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by directive of the Committee on the District

of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1968 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. FLYNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17138

TITLE I—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 102. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rate of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

SEC. 103. The rates of basic compensation

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service step						Longevity step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a)	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Fire private.									
Police private.									
Subclass (b)	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,835
Private assigned as:									
Technician.									
Plainclothesman.									
Station clerk.									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horsemounted officer.									
Class 2:									
Subclass (a)	9,775	10,340	10,905	11,470			12,035	16,600	13,165
Fire inspector.									
Subclass (b)	10,370	10,935	11,500	12,065			12,630	13,195	13,760
Fire inspector assigned as:									
Technician.									
Class 3	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Assistant marine engineer.									
Assistant pilot.									
Detective.									
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,050	11,600	12,150	12,700			13,250	13,800	14,350
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	11,645	12,195	12,745	13,925			13,845	14,395	14,945
Police sergeant assigned as:									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horsemounted officer.									
Class 5	12,750	13,390	14,030	14,670			15,310	15,950	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	13,815	14,505	15,195	15,885			16,575	17,265	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	14,875	15,620	16,365	17,110			17,855	18,600	
Fire captain.									
Police captain.									
Class 8	17,000	17,850	18,700	19,550			20,400	21,250	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	19,550	20,530	21,510	22,490			23,470	24,450	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									
Class 10	21,500	23,170	24,840	26,510					
Assistant fire chief.									
Assistant chief of police.									
Commanding officer of Executive Protective Service.									
Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.									
Class 11	27,000	28,000	29,000	30,000					
Fire chief.									
Chief of police".									

of officers and members to whom the amendments made by section 102 of this title apply shall be adjusted as follows: Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a salary class or subclass in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity step in effect on and after the effective date of this title, except that:

(1) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was assigned as technician I or plainclothesman in subclass (b) of salary class 1 or as technician II, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (c) of salary class 1 shall, on the effective date of this title, be assigned as and receive basic compensation as technician plainclothesman, station clerk or motorcycle officer in subclass (b) of salary class 1 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(2) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving as a fire inspector assigned as technician I or technician II in subclass (b) or (c) of salary class 2 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed and receive basic compensation as fire inspector assigned as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 2 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(3) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving in subclass (b) of salary class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 10 at the service step or longevity step corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(4) The Fire Chief and Chief of Police who immediately prior to the effective date of this title were serving in salary class 10 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 11 and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(5) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force and United States Park Police force who is performing the duty of a dog handler on or after the effective date of this title shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $595 per annum, except that if a police private is classed as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as dog handler, such police shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 104. Section 303(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829(c)) is amended by deleting ", (b), or (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (b)".

SEC. 105. The first sentence of section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–830) is amended to read as follows: "Any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class or subclass of a higher salary class shall receive basic com-

pensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher salary class or subclass which exceeds his existing rate of compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class or subclass from which he is promoted or transferred."

SEC. 106. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 401(a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–832(a)) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than three successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 1 through 4, and not more than two successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 5 through 9.

"(3) In the case of the officers or members serving in salary classes other than salary class 1, each longevity step increase shall be equal to one step increase of the salary class or subclass of a salary class in which the officer or member is serving."

SEC. 107. (a) Each officer and member in active service on the effective date of this title to whom section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title apply, who is receiving basic compensation at one of the scheduled service or longevity steps of a salary class or subclass other than subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1, and whose latest promotion has been subsequent to January 5, 1963, and prior to the effective date of this title shall (1) be placed in the service or longevity step of his salary class or subclass which provides a salary not less than the amount he would have received as a result of sections 102, 103, and 105 of this title had such promotion occurred on or after the effective date of this title, and (2) receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the salary class or subclass in which he is serving.

(b) The rate of basic compensation received by any officer or member under the provisions of section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this section.

(c) Any officer or member who receives additional compensation as a result of the enactment of this section shall be credited with any active service he has rendered in the service or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829, sec. 4–832).

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the date of enactment of this title and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the provisions of section 12 of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 108. All retired officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who at any time prior to October 1, 1956, held the rank of Assistant Superintendent shall be held and considered for the purpose of computing retirement benefits payable on and after the effective date of this title to have retired in the rank of Assistant Chief.

SEC. 109. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this title for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this title by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, services in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 110. (a) Paragraph 3 of section 102 of the Act of November 13, 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823d–1(3)), is amended by inserting after "5" the following: ", 6, or".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the effective date of this title.

SEC. 111. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to Government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 112. This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1969.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN POLICE MATTERS

SEC. 201. Paragraph (5) of section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–122), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The trial board shall be the exclusive body to receive, hear, and determine complaints against officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force."

SEC. 202. (a) The uniform of officers and members of the United States Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch showing the flag of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police Board in the case of the Capitol Police, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia in the case of the Metropolitan Police force shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(c) This section shall take effect one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 203. All laws of the United States in force on the date of enactment of this title in which reference is made to the White House Police force are amended by substituting "Executive Protective Service" for each such reference.

TITLE III—SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 302. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501) is amended by striking the salary schedules contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$35,000								
Class 2:									
Group A, Deputy superintendent	31,000								
Group B, Associate superintendent	29,000								
Class 3:									
Assistant superintendent	22,190	$22,720	$23,250	$23,780	$24,310	$24,840	$25,370	$25,900	$26,430
Class 4:	19,480	19,940	20,400	20,860	21,320	21,780	22,240	22,700	23,160
Director, curriculum.									
Director, staff development.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	17,600	18,040	18,480	18,920	19,360	19,800	20,240	20,680	21,120
Group B, master's degree	18,380	18,820	19,260	19,700	20,140	20,580	21,020	21,460	21,900
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,770	19,210	19,650	20,090	20,530	20,970	21,410	21,850	22,290
Group D, doctor's degree	19,160	19,600	20,040	20,480	20,920	21,360	21,800	22,240	22,680
Chief examiner.									
Executive assistants to associate superintendents.									
Director of food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to Deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level IV, principal	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level III, principal	17,345	17,770	18,195	18,620	19,045	19,470	19,895	20,320	20,745
Level II, principal	16,830	17,255	17,680	18,105	18,530	18,955	19,380	19,805	20,230
Level I, principal	16,315	16,740	17,165	17,590	18,015	18,440	18,865	19,290	19,715

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	$18,250	$18,675	$19,100	$19,525	$19,950	$20,375	$20,800	$21,225	$21,659
Level IV, principal	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level III, principal	17,735	18,160	18,585	19,010	19,435	19,860	20,285	20,710	21,135
Level II, principal	17,220	17,645	18,070	18,495	18,920	19,345	19,770	20,195	20,620
Level I, principal	16,705	17,130	17,555	17,980	18,405	18,830	19,255	19,680	20,105
Group D, doctor's degree	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level IV, principal	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level III, principal	18,125	18,550	18,975	19,400	19,825	20,250	20,675	21,100	21,525
Level II, principal	17,610	18,035	18,460	18,885	19,310	19,735	20,160	20,585	21,010
Level I, principal	17,095	17,520	17,945	18,370	18,795	19,220	19,645	20,070	20,495
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent of pupil personnel services.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	16,205	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715
Group D, doctor's degree	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715	20,105
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	14,800	15,175	15,550	15,925	16,300	16,675	17,050	17,425	17,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,190	15,565	15,940	16,315	16,690	17,065	17,440	17,815	18,190
Group D, doctor's degree	15,580	15,955	16,330	16,705	17,080	17,455	17,830	18,205	18,580
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,880	14,240	14,600	14,960	15,320	15,680	16,040	16,400	16,760
Group B, master's degree	14,660	15,020	15,380	15,740	16,100	16,460	16,820	17,180	17,540
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,050	15,410	15,770	16,130	16,490	16,850	17,210	17,570	17,930
Group D, doctor's degree	15,440	15,800	16,160	16,520	16,880	17,240	17,600	17,960	18,320
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	14,095	14,445	14,795	15,145	15,495	15,845	16,195	16,545	16,895
Group C, masters's d egree plus 30 credit hours	14,485	14,835	15,185	15,535	15,885	16,235	16,585	16,935	17,258
Group D, doctor's degree	14,875	15,225	15,575	15,925	16,275	16,625	16,975	17,325	17,675
Assis tant director, audio visual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult educational and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Gro up B, master's degree	13,670	14,005	14,340	14,675	15,010	15,345	15,680	16,015	16,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,060	14,395	14,730	15,065	15,400	15,735	16,070	16,405	16,740
Group D, doctor's degree	14,450	14,785	15,120	15,455	15,790	16,125	16,460	16,795	17,130
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	13,200	13,525	13,850	14,175	14,500	14,825	15,150	15,475	15,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,590	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190
Group D, doctor's degree	13,980	14,305	14,630	14,955	15,280	15,605	15,930	16,255	16,580
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	12,080	12,456	12,850	13,235	13,620	14,005	14,390	14,775	15,160
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,470	12,855	13,240	13,625	14,010	14,395	14,780	15,165	15,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,860	13,245	13,630	14,015	14,400	14,785	15,170	15,555	15,940
Psychiatric social worker.									

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$9,250	$9,660	$10,070	$10,480	$10,890	$11,300	$11,710
Group B, master's degree	10,030	10,404	10,850	11,260	11,670	12,080	12,490
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,420	10,830	11,240	11,650	12,060	12,470	12,880
Group D, doctor's degree	10,810	11,220	11,630	12,040	12,450	12,860	13,270
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Census supervisor.							

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 15:									
Group A, bachelor's degree			$8,000	$8,320	$8,640	$8,960	$9,280	$9,600	$9,950
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours			8,400	8,720	9,040	9,360	9,680	10,000	10,360
Group B, master's degree			8,800	9,175	9,550	9,925	10,450	11,000	11,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours			9,200	9,575	9,950	10,325	10,850	11,400	11,900
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree			9,600	9,975	10,350	10,725	11,250	11,800	12,300
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.									
Attendance officer.									
Child labor inspectors.									
Counselor, placement.									
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.									
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.									
Research assistant.									
School social worker.									
Speech correctionist.									
School psychologist.									

Salary class and group	Service step 8	9	10	11	12	13	Longevity step Y
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$12,120	$12,530	$12,940	$13,350	$13,760	$14,170	----------
Group B, master's degree	12,900	13,310	13,720	14,130	14,540	14,950	----------
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,290	13,700	14,110	15,520	14,930	15,340	----------
Group D, doctor's degree	13,680	14,090	14,500	14,910	15,320	15,730	----------
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Census supervisor.							
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	10,300	10,650	11,000	11,350	11,700	12,050	$13,000
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	10,720	11,080	11,440	11,800	12,160	12,520	13,800
Group B, master's degree	11,900	12,300	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,300	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	14,300	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	14,300	14,700	16,100
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.							
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspectors.							
Counselor, placement.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
School psychologist.							

(2) Section 2(c)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1511(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'plus fifteen credit hours' and 'plus thirty credit hours' mean the equivalent of not less than fifteen graduate semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree or thirty graduate semester hours beyond the master's degree as the case may be in academic, vocational, or professional courses, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the fifteen or thirty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such thirty credit hours. The term 'plus sixty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than sixty graduate semester hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the sixty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such sixty credit hours."

(3) Section 3 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1512) is amended by—

(A) striking out "For" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), for";

(B) inserting immediately after "position" each time it appears "or salary class"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) At any time beginning six months after the commencement of the probationary period of an employee in group A–1 of salary class 15, the Board of Education may appoint such employee to permanent status if he (1) has completed three or more years of satisfactory service in the District of Columbia public schools or in an educational system or institution of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board, or (2) has completed thirty accredited hours toward a master of arts degree. Any employee appointed to permanent status under this subsection shall be considered an employee of the Board on permanent tenure."

(4) Section 4 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1521) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Board of Education in group A of salary class 15 who possesses a bachelor's degree plus fifteen credit hours shall be transferred in accordance with section 10 (a) and (b) to group A–1 of salary class 15."

(5) Section 5 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Whenever a teacher or school officer is changed to a lower salary class or to a lower level in the same salary class as in the case of school principals in the public school system, the Superintendent of Schools is authorized to fix the rate of compensation at a rate provided for in the salary class or level to which the employee is changed which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation, except that if his existing rate falls between two service steps provided in such lower salary class or level, he shall receive the higher of such rates; if he is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level in which he is to be placed, he will retain his existing rate of compensation and receive one-half of any future increases granted his new salary class or level until such time as his rate of basic compensation is no longer in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level. This subsection shall not apply if such reduction to a lower salary class or level is (1) for personal cause, (2) at the request of such teacher or school officer, (3) as a condition of a previous temporary promotion to a higher grade, or (4) because of a reduction in force brought about by lack of funds or curtailment of work."

(6) Section 6(a)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is on service step 13 and has completed 15 years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. Each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is in longevity step X, on such effective date, shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service in salary classes 3 through 15 for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section."

(7) Section 6(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(b)) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee who has not reached the highest service step for his group, or, if his salary class has no group, the highest service step for such salary class, shall advance one such service step until he reaches the highest service step for such group or salary class. However, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement following any school year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(8) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 10

(D.C. Code, sec. 31–1535 (a) and (b)), respectively, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each promotion to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D within a salary class shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular Board meeting of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree or on the completion of fifteen credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree, as the case may be.

whichever is later.

"(b) Any employee in a position in a salary class in the salary schedules in section 1 of this Act who is promoted to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D of such salary class shall be placed in the same numerical service step in his new group which he would have occupied in the group from which he was promoted."

(9) Section 13(a) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended school year programs, adult education programs, and Americanization schools. The pay for teachers, officers, and other education employees in the summer school programs, adult education school programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist	$6.86	$7.61	$8.42
Psychiatric social worker	8.02	8.92	9.86
Clinical psychologist	8.35	9.29	10.28
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary school	9.69	10.77	11.92
Supervising director	10.02	11.15	12.33
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	10.69	11.89	13.15
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	6.86	7.61	8.42
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	7.54	8.38	9.27
Assistant principal	10.66	11.85	13.11
Principal	11.76	13.07	14.46."

(10) Section 13(d)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(2)) is amended by striking out "monthly" and inserting in lieu thereof "semimonthly".

(11) Section 14 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1543) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. On July 1, 1970, each employee assigned to salary class 15 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in twenty or twenty-four semimonthly installments, at the discretion of such employee, in accordance with existing law. All other employees covered by the provisions of this Act shall have their annual salaries paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments in accordance with existing law. Annual salaries for employees paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments means calendar year for purposes of this section."

SEC. 303. The increase provided in this title for the position of Superintendent of Schools under salary class 1 of the salary schedule shall be effective only with respect to individuals employed in that position on or after the date of the enactment of this title.

SEC. 304. (a) The third paragraph under the paragraph beginning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" under the center heading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." in the first section of the Act of May 26, 1908, entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine, and for other purposes" (D.C. Code, sec. 31–609) is amended by striking out ": *Provided,* That the salaries of other teachers shall begin when they enter upon their duties." and inserting in lieu thereof ". However, effective July 1, 1970, the salaries of employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, whose services commence with the opening of school and who shall perform their duties, shall begin on the first day of September and shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. The first payment shall be made on the first day of October, or as near that date as practicable; and the second payment shall be made fifteen days thereafter or as near that date as practicable. Subsequent payments shall be on the first and sixteenth days of the month or as near those date as practicable. The salaries of other employees in salary class 15 shall begin when they enter upon their duties."

(b) The fourth paragraph under the paragraph beginning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" under the center heading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." in the first section of such Act of May 26, 1908 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–630), is amended to read as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1970, the following rules for division of time and computation of pay for services rendered are established: Compensations of all employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act amendments of 1970 shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. In making payments for a fractional part of a month, one-fifteenth of an instalment shall be the daily rate of pay. For the purpose of computing such compensation and for computing time for services rendered during a fractional part of a semimonthly period in connection with the compensation of such employees, each and every semimonthly period shall be held to consist of fifteen days, without regard to the actual number of days in any semimonthly period thus excluding the 31st day of any calendar month from the computation and treating February as if it actually had thirty days. Any person entering the service of the schools during the a thirty-one-day month and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to pay for that month from the date of entry to the 30th day of such month, both days inclusive; and any person entering such service during the month of February and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to one month's pay, less as many days thereof as there were days elapsed prior to the date of entry, or one day's unauthorized absence on the 31st day of any calendar month one day's pay shall be forfeited.

SEC. 305. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1970.

TITLE IV—CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

SEC. 401. The first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–691) is amended by inserting after "for any purpose" the following: "authorized by the Board of Education".

SEC. 402. The Board of Education shall not establish any rules or regulations, enter into any contacts or agreements, or otherwise engage in any practices relating to the administration of labor-management relations in the District of Columbia public school system which are inconsistent with or which deviate from the policies provided in Executive Order 11491, dated October 28, 1969 (relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service).

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE LAWS

SEC. 501. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every resident a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	2% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$20, plus 3% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$50, plus 4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $5,000	$90, plus 5% of excess over $3,000.
Over $5,000 but not over $8,000	$190, plus 6% of excess over $5,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$370, plus 7% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $17,000	$650, plus 8% of excess over $12,000.
Over $17,000 but not over $25,000	$1,050, plus 9% of excess over $17,000.
Over $25,000	$1,770, plus 10% of excess over $25,000."

SEC. 502. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) and paragraph (3) of section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2702) are each amended by inserting after "wines" the following: "for human consumption other than off the premises where such liquors, beer, or wines or sold".

(b) The amendments made by this sec-

tion shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—PAY RATE FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

SEC. 601. (a) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 1 1889 (D.C. Code, sec. 39–201), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 7.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any person serving as the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall be paid at a rate equal to the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 55 of such title.

"(c) Any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States who, while serving on active duty, is detailed to serve as commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall, while so detailed, be entitled to receive only the pay to which he is entitled as an officer of the Armed Forces."

(b) The paragraph under the center heading "NATIONAL GUARD" in the first section of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961 (74 Stat. 25), is amended by striking out "at not to exceed $13,300 per annum".

(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this title.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENT TO ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ACT OF 1955

SEC. 701. The first sentence of section 1202 (a) of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41) is amended by inserting after "parts thereof" the following: "but excluding square numbered 764".

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the principal purposes of the bill H.R. 17138, as amended and reported by your committee, are as follows:

First. Provide salary increases for policemen, firemen, and teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia, and to provide certain other modifications in the salary schedules for such personnel;

Second. Provide exclusive jurisdiction in cases of complaints against officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to the Police Trial Board;

Third. Amend the present law regarding the limitation on the distance from the city within which members of the police and fire departments may reside;

Fourth. Authorize a program of labor-management relations between the District of Columbia Board of Education and the District of Columbia Teachers Union, consistent with the provisions of Executive Order No. 11491;

Fifth. Amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act and the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act;

Sixth. Amend the present salary rate for the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard; and

Seventh. Amend the additional House Office Building Act of 1955 with respect to the site of the old Providence Hospital.

POLICE AND FIREMEN

Section 102 of title I provides a new salary schedule for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, which will provide an overall average increase in such salaries of 13 percent. This new schedule, which it is estimated will cost some $10.1 million additional for a full fiscal year, will be effective retroactively to January 1, 1970.

The starting salary for privates will be increased from $8,000 to $8,500, and the maximum salary for the chief will be increased from $25,605 to $32,775.

It should be pointed out that this proposed new salary schedule is intended to provide an adequate career schedule for policemen and firemen in the private ranks, where most members spend their careers, by providing a 29-percent increase in scheduled salary between entrance and maximum service step after 7 years of service, instead of the present 16 percent. It has been established that a majority of voluntary separations from the police department occur in the first 5 years of service. Hence, by giving the young man interested in public safety some realistic salary incentive, it is hoped that this proposed salary schedule will reduce the rate of resignations among the younger members. This concept is based on the growing conviction that while competitive entrance salaries are necessary, those young men who really desire a career in public safety are looking beyond salary step 1.

A career in public safety, as in any other occupation, must offer a monetary growth which will allow an individual to plan a reasonable standard of living for himself and his family. Not only should no policeman or fireman have to resort to outside employment, but the shift requirements of these occupations make "moonlighting," or holding an additional job difficult for the uniformed member. These are the facts which may well determine whether or not a young policeman or fireman will decide to remain in this work or to seek better paying employment elsewhere.

It is for these reasons that the salary schedule for privates in this proposed scale has received the greatest percentage increase.

TEACHER SALARY INCREASES

Section 302 of title IV provides a new salary scale for teachers and other professional employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education, which will provide an overall average increase of 13 percent in such salaries, effective retroactively to January 1, 1970. The additional cost is estimated at some $13.4 million for a full fiscal year.

The minimum salary for teachers with the bachelor's degree is increased from $7,000 to $7,800, and the maximum from $12,040 to $13,000. For the teacher with a master's degree, the minimum salary will be increased from $7,700 to $8,580, and the maximum from $12,740 to $15,200.

Comparable increases are provided also for teachers in the other salary categories, such as those with the master's degree plus 30 credit hours, and for those with master's degree plus 60 credit hours or the doctor's degree. In addition, a new salary category is created in this salary scale for the teacher with a master's degree plus 15 credit hours, with salary ranging from a minimum of $8,190 to a maximum of $13,800. This salary category exists in the salary schedules of many urban school systems throughout the country, and it is the opinion of your committee that it should become a part of the District of Columbia teachers' salary scale at this time.

Also, the salary scale proposed in H.R. 17138 will reduce the number of years required for all teachers and other employees in salary class 15 to attain the maximum salary level from the present 18 years to 15 years. This provision, together with the particularly substantial increases in salaries provided in the higher service steps, is designed to augment the position of the District of Columbia public school system with respect to the retention of the more experienced teachers. This is in response to testimony before this committee indicating that this is presently the area in which the District's salaries for teachers are the most disadvantageous as compared with those paid in other school systems.

This proposed salary scale also will increase the salary of the Superintendent of Schools from $30,000 to $35,000, and that of the Deputy Superintendent from $26,000 to $31,000. Also, a new position title of Associate Superintendent will be authorized, at a salary of $29,000. It is the opinion of our committee that these provisions will enable the District of Columbia school system to attract and retain competent personnel at the top levels of administration.

The bill also provides substantial pay increases for teachers, officers, and other education employees engaged in the programs of summer school, adult education, and veterans' summer high school centers.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT

The first section of title V amends section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)), by providing a new personal income tax schedule, to take effect on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment. This new schedule, which was requested by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and which will defray the cost of the salary increases provided in this legislation, is as follows:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	2% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$20, plus 3% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$50, plus 4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $5,000	$90, plus 5% of excess over $3,000.
Over $5,000 but not over $8,000	$190, plus 6% of excess over $5,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$370, plus 7% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $17,000	$650, plus 8% of excess over $12,000.
Over $17,000 but not over $25,000	$1,050, plus 9% of excess over $17,000.
Over $25,000	$1,770, plus 10% of excess over $25,000.

This new schedule retains the present tax rate of 2 percent on taxable incomes not in excess of $1,000. However, the nine divisions of taxable incomes, as

compared with the five divisions in the existing schedule, together with some increases in the rates, will result in somewhat higher taxation particularly for persons in the higher levels of income. Some examples of the proposed new income tax levies, as compared with the present tax at several levels of taxable income, are as follows:

Taxable income	Present tax	Proposed tax
$1,000	$20	$20
$5,000	$160	$190
$10,000	$410	$510
$15,000	$710	$890
$20,000	$1,010	$1,320

It is estimated that this new schedule for personal income tax will produce some $25 million of additional revenue per year.

SALARY INCREASE COSTS AND FINANCING

The cost to the District of Columbia of the salary increases provided in title I and title III of this bill, both for a full fiscal year and for that part of the present fiscal year affected, together with the additional revenues which are predicted to accrue by reason of the amendments to the District of Columbia personal income tax provided in title V, have been presented to your committee as follows:

PAY INCREASE COSTS AND FINANCING

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1970	Full year fiscal year 1971
Total costs:		
Police and fire	5.05	10.1
Teachers and officers	7.9	13.4
Gross costs	12.95	23.5
Less absorption [1]	1.94	2.5
Net funds required	11.01	20.0
Additional revenues: Increase in income tax	[2] 12.5	25.0

[1] Your committee was advised by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia that 15 percent of these costs will be absorbed through administrative actions by the Police and Fire Departments and by the District of Columbia Board of Education.

[2] The increase which this bill will provide in personal income taxes is made retroactive to Jan. 1, 1970. It is true, of course, that the $12,500,000 of additional which will accrue as a result thereof for the 2d half of fiscal year 1970 cannot be actually collected during that 6-month period. However, your committee is informed that in a situation of this kind, the District of Columbia can secure an advance, or a short-term loan, from the U.S. Treasury of such potential amounts of revenue (or permission to defer repayment of other outstanding obligations to the Treasury in like amounts), and that thus the District can obtain the immediate benefit of this money at this time, even though it will not reach the District of Columbia Fund as collected revenues until later on.

It will thus be seen that the predicted additional revenues from the authorized increases in the District of Columbia personal income tax will be more than sufficient to offset the additional costs to the District of the provisions of H.R. 17138.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that the House is passing the District of Columbia police, firemen, and teachers pay raise bill today without defeating the committee amendment to change the retroactive pay date to January 1, 1970 and the original July 1, 1970, bill date.

Promises are almost as important as deserved pay raises that reflect the high risks and unique demands of a police or fire career in the District of Columbia. The entire police and fire force had been looking forward to a July 1, 1969 retroactive pay date before the committee decided to amend the bill in the interests of economy. The retroactive pay date was originally established to put District of Columbia police and firemen on a comparable level with other Federal workers in jobs of similar responsibility who received pay raises earlier last year.

This weekend the entire District police force and standby fire force displayed outstanding cool judgment and control that materially helped pass the weekend of antiwar demonstrations without incident and violence. Without the leadership, training and outstanding quality of character displayed by these personnel, the hot weather and hot tempers of antiwar convictions could well have erupted into violence, jeopardizing lives and property.

Time and again the District of Columbia police and fire forces have displayed their ability to cope with the unique demands of the Federal city. Yet the Members of the House failed to match job responsibilities with comparable pay for a 6-month period between July 1, 1969, and January 1, 1970.

I think I need not point out the obvious competitive job possibilities offered young men and women here in the District of Columbia, Mr. Speaker. Good employees with the potential to serve the public under hazardous conditions in the interests of public safety are eagerly sought. Although I am pleased that the House passed bill reflected a more realistic approach to salary differential between salary levels of responsibility within the departments which allows for career advancement and helps attract career oriented employees, I am nevertheless, disappointed that the House would risk jeopardizing the morale of District police and firemen by disallowing the July 1, 1969, retroactive pay date.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill which authorizes the wearing of the U.S. flag as an official part of the uniform of Federal law enforcement agencies serving in the District of Columbia is being hailed as a signal achievement by other law enforcement authorities throughout America. I refer to section 202 of title III of the bill.

Many local police and sheriffs departments have, for some time now worn an emblem depicting the flag of our country as a part of their uniform.

Public reaction in such localities has been noticeable since the flag became a part of the uniform. Authorities report a marked decrease in assaults upon their officers. The officers' morale has increased and John Q. Citizen, himself, seems to give a refreshing look of respect upon the uniformed officers proudly displaying the flag of our country.

This identification for our police has long been needed here in the District, with its soaring crime rate and its vicious attacks upon the peace officers.

I am proud to have had a role in helping initiate this portion of this legislation, which will pay special tribute to these Federal peace officers—the U.S. Park Police, the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia—and I look forward with great anticipation to the uniforms bearing an emblem of Old Glory. May it be successful in reinstilling the respect and the dignity that our dedicated keepers of the peace so richly deserve.

I support this legislation and ask that it be adopted.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: The Salary Schedule on page 2 is amended by striking out the material relating to Classes 4 through 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service steps 1	2	3	4	5	6	Longevity steps A	B	C
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,900	12,495	13,090	13,685			14,280	14,875	15,470
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	12,070	12,645	13,220	13,795			14,370	14,945	15,520
Police sergeant assigned as—									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horse mounted officer.									
Class 5	13,300	13,965	14,630	15,295			15,960	16,625	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	14,550	15,280	16,010	16,740			17,470	18,200	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	15,800	16,590	17,380	18,170			18,960	19,750	
Captain.									
Class 8	18,500	19,425	20,350	21,275			22,200	23,125	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	21,500	22,575	23,650	24,725			25,800	26,875	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service steps						Longevity steps		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 10 Assistant chief of police. Assistant fire chief. Commanding officer of the White House Police. Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.	23,800	24,990	26,180	27,370			28,560	29,750	
Class 11 Fire chief. Chief of police."	28,500	29,925	31,350	32,775					

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 3 in the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment strike out "28,560," "29,750".

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this is a technical amendment to conform to the steps considered by the committee amendment, and it was inadvertently omitted when the bill was printed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am pleased to commend my colleagues for their favorable action the bill H.R. 17138, of which I am cosponsor. While this is actually something of an omnibus bill, including provisions on a variety of subject matter, the principal thrust of the legislation is to provide well-deserved salary increases for the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as well as for the teachers and other professional employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

Title I of this bill is devoted to salary increases for the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen. The bill would increase the starting salary for privates in these forces from $8,000 to $8,500, and their maximum salaries from $10,300 to $12,240. At the other end of the scale, the salary range for the Chief, presently $24,000 to $25,605, will be increased to a range from $28,500 to $32,775. The overall average increase will be some 13 percent.

I am particularly pleased that this proposed salary schedule for policemen and firemen will offer the greatest percentage increase to members in the private ranks, where most of them will spend their careers. This is provided by a 29-percent increase in scheduled salary between entrance and the maximum service step after 7 years of service, rather than the present 16 percent. This is a proper step toward providing a realistic, attractive career incentive to these young men. While starting salaries are important, the fact is that most resignations from the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments occur within the members' first 5 years of service, and this trend can be reversed and these able young men kept in the forces only by providing an attractive salary schedule beyond the initial step, as this bill will do.

It pleases me also that this salary schedule, as amended by our committee, will provide for the first time some measure of proper comparability between the salaries for the officers in the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments and those paid in the classified Government service for positions of equivalent degrees of responsibility. This is a goal which has long been sought by myself and some of my colleagues, and I feel a deep sense of satisfaction that we have succeeded in accomplishing this aim in this bill.

Under the terms of the bill, these salary increases will go into effect retroactively to January 1, 1970, as requested by the District of Columbia Government. It is estimated that these increases will cost about $5 million for the second half of the present fiscal year, and some $10.1 million for a full year.

As for comparability with salaries for policemen and firemen elsewhere, the salary schedule in H.R. 17138 will raise the starting salary for police privates in the District, as compared with that paid in the 21 U.S. cities with populations in excess of 500,000 persons, from seventh place to fifth place; and the starting salary for fire privates would rise from eighth place to sixth place among these same cities. At the same time, the maximum salary for police privates will rise from 10th to second place, and that of fire privates from ninth place to second place.

As for the position of the District of Columbia salaries as compared with those paid to police and fire privates in the other six jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area, these will be the highest in the area, both minimum and maximum.

The proposed salaries for the higher ranks will also compare quite favorably with those paid elsewhere, as the minimum salary paid in the District will rank in fourth place or higher in virtually every rank from sergeant and above among the large U.S. cities, and the maximums for these ranks will be in first or second place among such cities. Locally, the District of Columbia salaries for officers, both minimum and maximum, will be the highest in the metropolitan area.

These increases thus are designed to provide adequate and attractive career incentives whereby the members of these forces will be encouraged to remain in these services, hazardous and demanding as they are, and also to maintain a favorable competitive position for the District of Columbia in recruitment and retention of capable personnel into these forces, by keeping the District salaries in the upper quartile among the major cities, and higher than the salaries paid elsewhere in the Washington metropolitan area.

There is no question that there is a valid need for a susbtantial increase at this time in salaries for District of Columbia policemen and firemen. The increases in the cost of living since 1967, the time of the last major salary increase for these personnel, and the increases in such salaries elsewhere during this same interim, amply justify this action now for the benefit of these District of Columbia employees.

There are two major provisions in title II. The first of these provides that the Police Trial Board in the District of Columbia shall maintain sole jurisdiction over complaints brought against members of the Metropolitan Police Force.

This Police Trial Board was first established in 1901 by an act of Congress, under which the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia were authorized to establish such a board or boards. While there was no provision in the law as to the makeup of such a Police Trial Board, the Board has always been composed of members of the Metropolitan Police Force and operated satisfactorily over a period of many years in its function of hearing and determining the merits of complaints against police officers. A complainant who is not satisfied with the findings of this Board has always been privileged to appeal such a ruling to the Board of Commissioners, or more recently, the District of Columbia Commissioner, and beyond that, of course, to a court of law.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, however, replaced this setup with the creation of a Regular Police Trial Board, a Special Police Trial Board, and a Complaint Review Board. The Chief of Police appoints the members of the two Police Trial Boards, and they are still composed of members of the police force. The Regular Trial Board tries cases of infractions of discipline within the department itself, while the Special Trial Board handles those cases involving complaints brought against police officers by outside persons.

The first Complaint Review Board, known as the Civilian Complaint Review Board, was appointed in 1963 by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. This Board served to investigate complaints against police officers filed with the Commissioners, and to report their findings to them. Thus, a division of authority was created, under which a citizen could air a grievance against a

District of Columbia police officer before a board which did not include a single member of the Police Department itself, and which was empowered to make recommendations as to taking such cases before the Police Trial Board—a function which had previously been reserved to the Chief of Police. Thereafter, for the first time, Members of Congress began to receive bitter complaints from members of the Metropolitan Police force regarding treatment afforded them by this newly created Civilian Complaint Review Board. For the past year or 2, however, this Complaint Review Board has not been active, and some semblance of harmony in this area has been restored as such work is again being carried on exclusively by the Trial Boards under the direct control of the Police Department itself.

Recently, however, the threat of a new and different Civilian Complaint Review Board has arisen, in connection with the Pilot Precinct project, which is an experiment in civilian or neighborhood control over the police organization and operation in that area of the city. I take a very dim view indeed on this entire project, particularly as one of its leaders is Marion Barry, whose antipolice activities are well known to myself and many of my colleagues. This group is planning to ask the law school of Howard University to act as Complaint Review Board, to hear and report its findings regarding complaints against police in that area to the Pilot Precinct Project for their action.

I cannot express too strongly my opposition to this or any other plan which will put people like Marion Barry in charge of any phase of law enforcement whatever. Therefore, I heartily endorse this provision of H.R. 17138, which will place the responsibility for handling complaints against District of Columbia police officers where it belongs, in the hands of the Police Trial Boards operating under the administration of the Police Department itself.

The other main provision of title II pertains to the distance from the city within which members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments are required to live. At present, the District of Columbia City Council has the authority to establish this area as anywhere between 12 miles and 25 miles radius of the U.S. Capitol Building. The former Board of Commissioners, which had this same authority, set the limit at 21 miles, and the District of Columbia City Council has shown no inclination to extend it farther.

Since 1964, when the present 21-mile radius was prescribed, the growth of the Washington metropolitan area has made this limitation a complete anachronism. The members of these forces, and particularly the younger members, are finding it increasingly difficult to find housing which they can afford, and which presents a reasonably attractive and healthful atmosphere within which they may raise their families, within 21 miles of this city. I have received numerous complaints on this subject, as the soaring cost of land and housing has made the plight of many of these men more and more discouraging to them. Furthermore, their resentment is deepened because the development of highways and transportation facilities has made it increasingly possible to travel into the city from ever-increasing distances in the suburbs, in the same space of time. This problem is causing a real problem in retaining these younger members in the District of Columbia forces, and the problem will only increase unless some corrective measures are taken.

In the face of this situation, the District of Columbia City Council has shown no inclination whatever to act within its authority to extend this present unrealistic 21-mile limitation. For this reason, I heartily endorse this provision of H.R. 17138, which will extend the radius to 25 miles and will also authorize the Chiefs of the Police and Fire Departments to waive this limits in cases where they deem such an exception to be justified. Thus, for the first time some degree of commonsense may prevail with respect to this problem.

Title III of the bill provides for salary increases for the teachers and other professional employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education. This proposed salary schedule will provide an overall average increase of 13 percent in such salaries. As recommended by the District of Columbia government, the increases will become effective as of January 1, 1970.

The bill proposes to increase the starting salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree from $7,000 to $7,800, and the maximum salary for such a teacher from $12,040 to $13,000. This maximum will be attainable in 15 years of service, rather than the present period of 18 years. For a teacher with a master's degree, which is required for all teachers in the senior high schools in the District, the minimum salary will be increased from $7,700 to $8,580, and the maximum from $12,740 to $15,200. The other categories in the present salary scale, for those with a master's degree plus 30 credit hours and those with a doctor's degree, would receive comparable increases. In addition, this bill will establish a new category for teachers with a bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours, whose salary scale would start at $8,190 and reach a maximum of $13,800. At the top of the scale, the salary for the Superintendent will be increased from $30,000 to $35,000. The salary of the Deputy Superintendent is increased from $26,000 to $31,000, and a new position of Associate Superintendent is created, at a salary of $29,000.

In these salary scales for teachers, there has been a deliberate effort to raise the levels for the experienced teachers to a greater degree than those in the lower salary steps. This, together with the reduction of the time required of all teachers to attain the maximum salary levels from 18 years to 15 years, is intended to place the District in a stronger competitive position with respect to the retention of the more experienced teachers—an area in which witnesses told us the District of Columbia salary schedules for teachers have been weak in past years.

As a competitive position, these proposed salary increases will place the District of Columbia in first place among the 19 U.S. cities of populations between 500,000 and 1,000,000 in minimum and maximum salaries paid to teachers with the bachelor's degree and those with the master's degree. Among the seven jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area, the District will also rank first in minimum and maximum salaries for teachers with the bachelor's degree, first in minimum salary for those with the master's degree, and second for maximum salary for the master's degree. In this latter category, the District salary of $15,200 attainable in 15 years will be exceeded only by Fairfax, with a maximum figure of $15,800 attainable after 17 years of service. The salaries referred to in the Washington area are those which will be in effect during the coming school year.

The cost of these salary increases is estimated at some $7.9 million for the last half year of the present fiscal year, and about $13.4 million for a full fiscal year.

This title also provides that District of Columbia teachers will henceforth be paid on a semimonthly basis, rather than monthly as at present, and also that they may elect to be paid over either a 10-month period or a 12-month period. Both these changes are in response to requests on the part of many of the teachers.

Title IV of the bill contains two provisions, both of which I strongly support. The first amends the present law regarding administrative leave for teachers. At present, each teacher and attendance officer in the District school system may use as many as 3 days in any school year out of his accumulated sick leave, for any purpose whatever. In 1968, the District of Columbia Teachers Union took advantage of this provision by encouraging a large-scale 1-day walkout by teachers in the city, to demonstrate here at the Capitol in favor of some pending legislation regarding teachers' salaries. This caused the closing of a number of the schools in the city for that day, for lack of teaching personnel. The response of the Congress to this irresponsible and high-handed action was to amend the law so as to restrict the administrative leave privilege to not more than three teachers in any one school on any one day, or 5 percent of the teachers in any school, whichever is the greater number. Since that restriction was imposed, the union has encouraged walkouts to the limit of that restriction, in every school in the city, again to protest or demonstrate in favor of pending legislation.

I am strongly of the opinion that walkouts of this nature are not in keeping with the teachers' professional dignity and responsibility to the pupils, and that they certainly should not be condoned on days for which the teachers are being paid. Therefore, I heartily support the provision in this bill which states that such administrative leave may be granted only for purposes authorized by the Board of Education. I have every confidence that the Board will use this authority properly, in granting such leave in the future.

The other provision of this title will direct the District of Columbia Board of Education to develop policies, procedures, and regulations consistent with the provisions of Executive Order No. 11491, dated October 28, 1969, to govern employee-management relationships between the Board and its employees and organizations regarding such employees. I sponsored this provision in the bill, because of my conviction that the District of Columbia Board of Education desperately needs some instrument by which they may deal with the District of Columbia Teachers Union effectively and in the interests of the District of Columbia public school system.

Executive Order No. 11491 was issued by the President in 1969, establishing a revision of the framework for labor-management relations between the Federal Government agencies and their employees and employee unions. Section 18 of this order spells out standards of conduct for labor organizations, and section 19 delineates a strong line against unfair labor practices with respect to organizations of Government employees.

The District of Columbia government is revising its labor relations program in a manner consistent with the policies spelled out in this Executive order. This program is expected to establish an impartial Board of Labor Relations to arbitrate disputes, and otherwise to create effective machinery for resolving impasses in contract negotiations.

The problem is, however, that the District of Columbia Board of Education will not be included in this program, and thus can look forward to no realistic, useful authority in dealing with the District of Columbia Teachers Union. The events of the past several years, since the teachers union became the officially recognized bargaining agent for the District of Columbia teachers, have clearly indicated the need for such an authority. Only this year, a teacher strike in the Nation's capital was narrowly averted. There is a clause in the District of Columbia teachers' contract forbidding them to strike, but to this union that is only a scrap of paper—and furthermore, the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel advised that the Board could not enforce that provision anyway. In this situation, therefore, in view of the attitudes of the officers of this teachers union, anything might happen.

I have discussed this matter at length with certain key persons in the District of Columbia School Administration, and the language in this provision of H.R. 17138 evolved as a result of those conversations. I am assured that the development of this set of policies and procedures by the District of Columbia Board of Education, invoking as it will particularly sections 18 and 19 of Executive Order No. 11491, will afford the Board the means to orderly and constructive relations with the teachers union. I call attention to the fact that in Boston, where a similar authority prevails, the union officials are being threatened with imprisonment and the union with a heavy fine, in connection with a teachers' strike in that city, by the local courts. This is the sort of authority which I feel the District of Columbia must be able to exert also, against strikes in which the innocent schoolchildren are the real losers.

Title V provides a new and revised personnel income tax schedule for the District of Columbia, to become effective as of January 1, 1970. This schedule, which was requested by the District of Columbia Commissioner, will produce an estimated $25 million of additional revenue to the District of Columbia General Fund per fiscal year.

It has been my intention, at the first opportunity, to sponsor legislation which will permit the payment of District of Columbia personal income tax simply as a fixed percentage of the individual's Federal income tax for that year. Such measures for the simplification of payment of State and local income taxes have been adopted in some States, and are currently being studied in others. I have gone into this matter to some extent, and am convinced that such a formula will be feasible. However, in view of the extremely heavy schedule of major legislation pending before this committee this year, there was not sufficient time and opportunity to give this proposal adequate consideration for inclusion in this bill.

Inasmuch as the total cost of the salary increases provided in H.R. 17138 will be $23.5 million for a full fiscal year, and since the 15 percent of this cost which we are advised can be absorbed by the Police and Fire Departments and the District of Columbia Board of Education reduce this cost to a net figure of $20 million, it is seen that the increase in the income tax will exceed this net cost by some $5 million per year.

As for the net cost of the salary increases for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1970, which amounts to $11.01 million, although the additional $12.5 million of revenues which will accrue from the personal income tax increase for that period cannot actually be collected during that time, we are advised that the District can obtain a short-term advance from the Treasury on the strength of these additional revenues which will eventually accrue to the city. Thus, the salary increases provided in H.R. 17138 are more than fully funded.

Section 502 of this title is designed to correct a misunderstanding in reference to the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969. It was the intent of our Committee that this legislation should raise the sales tax on alcoholic beverages sold and consumed on the premises, as in restaurants, from 4 percent to 5 percent. Through a misunderstanding, however, this increase was made to apply also to alcoholic beverages sold in package stores. Since another provision in this Revenue Act increases the gallonage tax on off-sale alcoholic beverages substantially, this inadvertent error actually imposed an unfair double tax increase on this one segment of the city's economy. The language of this section of H.R. 17138 repeals the unintentional sales tax increase on off-sale beverages, reducing the rate to 4 percent which is the general sales tax rate at present in the District of Columbia.

Title VI of the bill increases the salary of the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard, so as to restore the comparability of this salary to the GS–15 rate for classified Government employees. This was the original intent for this salary when it was first established in 1961, but this comparability has not been maintained since that time. The result is that at present, there are some 28 employees working under the Commanding General at the Armory whose salaries exceed his. This provision in H.R. 17138 will remove this inequity and prevent its recurrence.

I am the sponsor of title VII of this bill, which provides simply that Square 764 in the District of Columbia be excluded from the property which may be acquired by the House Office Building Commission for use by the Congress.

This property, located at 4th and D Streets SE., is the former site of the Providence Hospital. It was purchased in 1962 by a group of local investors known as the Providence Associates of Washington, D.C. At that time, the buildings were leased to the General Services Administration, and it was the plan of the new owners to continue this arrangement. Soon after they purchased the property, however, the Government terminated its lease, and subsequent vandalism of the buildings made it necessary to raze them.

Thus, the purchasers unexpectedly found themselves with a vacant square of land. Surveys, however, showed a need for a modern apartment building and commercial development in that area to serve the needs of Members of Congress and other persons working on Capitol Hill. In response to this showing, the owners of square 764 sought to obtain a rezoning on this property which would make such a project possible. This effort, however, has not been successful.

Meanwhile, the House Office Building Commission has had the acquisition of this property under consideration, as a location for a Capitol Police Academy and possibly other future needs of the Congress. As a matter of fact, the present owners of the property would be quite willing to sell it to the Commission. However, the Commission's request for an appropriation of $1,250,000 for this purpose was denied by the Appropriations Committee in the legislative branch appropriations for 1970. Further, there is no indication whatever that such a request is likely to be granted in the foreseeable future.

Meanwhile, the Architect of the Capitol has successfully opposed the rezoning of the property as requested by the present owners. The Architect of the Capitol is a member of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission and was able to use his influence to keep the property available for future use by the Capitol.

The dilemma of the owners of this property thus is quite obvious. They now own a piece of valuable real estate which they cannot develop for any profitable use, even though the need for such de-

velopment has been established. The Architect of the Capitol cannot obtain the funds to purchase the property, but has been consistently successful in preventing the owners from using it in any practical manner.

I feel that this situation is highly unfair to the owners of this property, who have acted in good faith and now are being denied the rezoning which will enable them to make a reasonable profit on their investment. Even if the use for which the House Office Building Commission and the Architect wish to obtain this property is desirable, the fact is that they cannot acquire the funds for this purpose. Therefore, I feel strongly that they should remove themselves from the picture at this time, in order that the application for rezoning of this property may be considered entirely upon its merits. This, then, is the sole purpose of title VII of H.R. 17138. The Congress, or the agent for the Congress, has caused these property owners to receive several years of unfair and costly treatment, Mr. Speaker. It would actually not be improper to consider an award by the Congress for damages. The least we should do, however, is to insist on prompt and proper zoning, for they have suffered long enough. If the Zoning Commission fails to act in a fair and reasonable manner, then the Congress by legislation should assure that proper zoning is granted.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee and I have spent many hours in hearings and deliberations on this proposed legislation. There is no question whatever that the salary increases for the District of Columbia policemen, firemen, and teachers and other school officers as provided in this bill are reasonable, fair, and well deserved by these loyal and dedicated public servants. The other provisions are also sound, and I commend this legislation to my colleagues as being in the best interests of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I take this 5 minutes to have the opportunity to commend the Metropolitan Police Department and also to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine and wonderful way in which the Metropolitan Police Department handled themselves last Saturday during the antiwar demonstration. I had the opportunity personally to observe how the Police Department handled themselves from about 11 o'clock Saturday morning on through to 4 o'lock on Sunday morning. I might say it seemed to me the Police Department in handling these crowds was well trained in riot control and in handling disturbances of this kind. They restrained themselves in a manner that was almost unbelievable. I saw one police sergeant about 3 o'clock on Saturday afternoon being hit by a soft drink bottle thrown by one of these demonstrators. This police sergeant was with his men in Lafayette Park. He was hit on the head and it was a very serious wound. The policemen handled themselves in a manner of restraint. They did not start firing tear gas. I noticed that the crowd felt no sorrow that this policeman had been hurt. This is a situation that concerns me sometimes, that a law-and-order man can be hurt and it seems to be all right, but protesters, when they get hurt it seems to disturb some people across this country. On 17th and H Streets I saw police in front of the buses receive bottles, trash, and rocks which were thrown at them. They did not fire any tear gas or threaten the crowd but kept them under control.

I will give credit to the rally marshals. They worked real hard. If it had not been for these rally marshals, I believe the city situation possibly could have been in a state of complete chaos by 7 o'clock on Saturday night. However, the marshals, as I mentioned earlier in my 1-minute speech today, were not able to control these rally groups when they broke up into smaller groups and started roaming the city on Saturday night. They blew out the whole front of the National Guard Association Building and burned cars. They started a march led by six Black Panthers on the Francis Junior High School, attempting to burn it down. For what reason I do not know.

They tried to taunt the policemen but still the policemen kept their cool. However, after darkness reached our Capital City the policemen did start moving in with firmness. They arrested over 364 demonstrators. The arrests were in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise mainly, as I said earlier, to commend the Metropolitan Police Force for the outstanding job that they did.

Mr. Speaker, I must also take this opportunity to commend the District of Columbia National Guard. Guardsmen were used as special policemen throughout the Police Department and were ready to support the Metropolitan Police if needed. Ninety-five percent of the available National Guard strength reported for duty Saturday.

I would also like to say that the Capital Park Police handled themselves very well. As you recall, during the moratorium in November around the Washington Monument, the protesters were allowed to run up the Vietcong and North Vietnamese flags on the flagstaffs at the Washington Monument. This did not happen last Saturday. However, when the Capital Park Police tried to run up the American flag at sunup on Saturday morning they had some difficulty with these protesters because they did not want the American flag run up on their regular staffs. All that day the police had to stand by these flags and flagstaffs and protect them and the American flag from any possible abuse.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN. And, is it not true that this is the type of legislation that we are going to have to pass in this Congress if we are to maintain such a group of men in our municipal Police Department just to take care of situations like this at any time?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is certainly correct. This is why I am bringing to the attention of the Members of the Congress the outstanding job performed by the Metropolitan Police Department.

Mr. HAGAN. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi and urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation providing pay increases and changes in pay schedules for our teachers, our policemen, and firemen in the District of Columbia.

I also had the opportunity to visit many parts of the city on Saturday. I visited the command center down at the District of Columbia Building and saw the work of Mayor Washington, Deputy Mayor Watt, and the Director of Civil Defense for Washington, George Rodericks. I also visited parts of the ellipse and the area of 16th and H Streets, north of Lafayette Park.

I deplore the incidents of disorder and disruption by several bands of dissidents on Saturday. From what I saw, however, I believe that most of those who came to Washington came with peace in mind, and that fact stands out. For example, on 16th Street, I saw the parade marshals asking the marchers to walk on up 16th Street and avoid violence. The greater number of the marchers who came along that street did choose to turn up 16th Street to avoid confrontation and violence.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but praise for the public officials, the demonstration marshals, and our brave policemen who all cooperated in preserving order. I believe the pay raise legislation we consider today is essential to assure the continued service of a highly professional police force. It is only through professionalization and good training, as well as good recruiting, that we can attract the kind of men we need to maintain the high standards our police department has set for itself. Once again, I salute Chief Jerry Wilson and the Department. The policemen and firemen of our city certainly deserve this long-overdue pay raise.

The dedicated teachers of the District of Columbia schools deserve a much fairer shake, too. They, too, contribute to public order in its broadest sense, by educating young citizens for the places they will take in the community. I have met this week with many students from my own district, and I know that all our teachers are faced with an alert and often restless group of young people. We need good teachers in the District more than ever, and it is time we approved the salaries to match the difficult and vital job the teachers are doing.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time during the consideration of this bill, after the committee amendments have been discussed, I shall offer an amendment to strike title VII to this bill on the basis that it simply does not belong in the bill. This involves a certain parcel of property which is still under

the jurisdiction of the House Office Building Commission and the Architect of the Capitol.

So I want to let the committee know that I will do that after the committee amendments have been disposed of. As to the other committee amendments, I support very much the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi and the other members of the committee on the necessity of increasing the salaries of policemen and firemen. It is the only way we develop the type of quality police department that is necessary to control an urban city, and in particular this Federal capital city.

I am very pleased that the members of this committee, starting approximately 3 or 4 years ago, began working together to try to bring these salaries up. I think it is vital and I support the increases. However, there is one committee amendment that I will oppose, and that is the committee amendment on pages 14 and 15 that lowers the bill's amount for the teachers' salaries from a starting salary of $8,000 to a starting salary of $7,800. All of the other portions of this bill as amended are the recommendations that were made by the city within its finances for taking care of the program for teachers, policemen and firemen insofar as pay raises are concerned.

In other words, starting January 1, 1970, it starts the police and firemen at the $8,500 figure, but the committee saw fit to cut the teachers' salaries from $8,000 to $7,800. I do not think they should have done this. I am going to ask for a vote on that, and if the vote is "no" on the committee amendment. The salaries would be at the $8,000 level. I would now ask to make a parliamentary inquiry:

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. Speaker, is my understanding correct if the amendment is adopted then the bill would go back to the original language which was in the bill on page 14, and the salary of $8,000 which was in the bill as originally put in would automatically come back into effect?

I ask that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry asked by the gentleman from Washington that if the committee amendment is rejected then the language will revert to that in the bill before the committee amendment, and would prevail.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the Speaker.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman in his intention to strike out title VII of this bill. I lived up on Capitol Hill here for several years, and I became pretty well acquainted with the situation. It looks to me at the moment that to take this old property of the hospital site and rezone it from its present zoning of R–4 to R–5D, which would allow the building of a 90-foot-high building over in this area over here, is something that we do not need on Capitol Hill. I do not think we should have a high-rise building on Capitol Hill competing with our office buildings here, and the dome of the Capitol—but, of course, I realize the dome of the Capitol is higher than 90 feet. But this looks to me like just a piece of special-interest legislation for the benefit of the people who own this property. They can develop that property, as I understand it now, in 40-foot-height buildings. I see no reason to change the height of the zoning around the Capitol Hill to the disparagement of other official buildings that are here such as the Library, the House Office Buildings, the Senate Office Buildings, and the Capitol Building itself. So I shall support the gentleman from Washington on that particular amendment.

I might say that I have no property on Capitol Hill at this time. The Government took my property away from me. I was in that block bounded by Second Street, I believe, on the east, and the street next to the Old House Building and Pennsylvania Avenue and D Street. I had a nice home over there, and the Government came along and took it away from me against my will. So I have no particular interest as a property owner in anything on the Hill, but I do think that the esthetic appearance of the Hill and the prominence that is now given to the official buildings should be maintained.

I seriously doubt that we should take this one little plat of land here and rezone it for the benefit of the private owners and have a commercial type building put up in competition with buildings on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, to include a letter from the Architect of the Capitol which gives the background on this situation and the reasons for the request for the original zoning change and now for this being removed from the House Office Building Commission jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the memorandum I refer to is as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1970.

Memorandum to Honorable John L. McMillan, Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives.

This memorandum is submitted in accord with our conversation last evening and your conversation by telephone last week with the Speaker and myself.

REPEAL PROVISION IN H.R. 16988

As you know, the following provision has been added to H.R. 16988, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes:

TITLE VI—AMENDMENT TO ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ACT OF 1955

SEC. 601. The first sentence of section 1202 (a) of Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41) is amended by inserting after "parts thereof" the following: "but excluding square numbered 764".

EFFECT OF PROVISION

The effect of this provision would be to remove the authority of the House Office Building Commission to direct the Architect of the Capitol to purchase square 764 which is the site of the Old Providence Hospital. The Commission is composed of Honorable John W. McCormack, Chairman, Honorable Emanuel Celler, Member, Honorable William C. Cramer, Member.

AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT TO PURCHASE

The authority given the Commission and the Architect of the Capitol in the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purposes of section 1201 of this chapter or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds."

The Comptroller General of the United States, ruled in August, 1967, that the Architect of the Capitol, with approval of the House Office Building Commission, is vested by the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 with authority to acquire square 764, either as an addition to the Capitol Grounds, of for any of the other purposes specified in the 1955 Act.

OWNERS MAY DEVELOP PROPERTY

You indicated in your conversation with the Speaker and me that your committee had been told that the present owners of the square could not build on the square due to objections of the Commission and/or the Architect. This is not a correct statement. As far as the Architect is concerned and, to the best of my knowledge, as far as the Commission is concerned, the owners could go ahead tomorrow with the development of the square under its current R–4 zoning. According to the records of the Zoning Commission, the property was zoned R–4 when acquired by the owners.

ZONING CHANGE SOUGHT BY OWNERS

It is public knowledge that the owners have on several occasions attempted to have the zoning changed to R–5–D or SP. This is the move which the Architect, upon direction of the Commission, has opposed because this "spot zoning" in a residential neighborhood of R–4 buildings would have undesirable esthetic effect on the area and would result in "high-rise" buildings near the Capitol complex. Several neighborhood groups have also strongly opposed the rezoning. Under R–4 zoning the height is restricted to 40 feet. Under R–5–D the height can go to 90 feet.

In one of the meetings of the House Office Building Commission, when this matter was considered, one of the Commission Members stated his opinion that the Commission should not endorse any request for a change in zoning which would be contrary to existing zoning regulations. He said that the owners of this square were fully aware of the area zoning restrictions at the time they purchased the site and he did not consider it a proper function of the Commission to assist private speculators by recommending departures from present zoning regulations that would inure to their benefits.

PROPOSAL TO PURCHASE PROPERTY

Several years ago the owners expressed interest in selling the property to the Government. The Commission directed the Architect of the Capitol to obtain appraisals of the property. In October, 1968, the appraisals

were presented to the Commission. At that meeting the Architect reported on the basis of the appraisals and on informal evaluation of the appraisals by the Department of Justice staff, it was concluded that $1,250,000 represented a fair amount for the Government to pay for the property, including cost of incidental expenses.

At meeting of October 4, 1968, the Commission agreed unanimously as follows:

(1) to approve the purchase of Square 764.

(2) to authorize the Architect to include in his regular budget for fiscal year 1970 sufficient funds to cover the cost of acquiring the property, and

(3) to request the Architect to advise the owners of the property of the actions of the Commission.

The instructions of the Commission were carried out by the Architect. The amount of $1,250,000 was budgeted for fiscal year 1970 and hearings were held before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, in June, 1969.

The funds were not allowed. The following pertinent statement is quoted from House Report No. 91–487 on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1970:

"The other part of the budget request—$1,250,000 to acquire square 764, the old Providence Hospital site two blocks from the east boundary of the Capitol grounds—is disallowed without prejudice. The committee was told that while it is not contiguous to the present Capitol grounds and if acquired would be expected to be held for future construction purposes, serious consideration would be, or has been, given to its use as a site for a Capitol Police Academy. The committee was not impressed with this thought. Moreover there are, in the committee's judgment, more pressing capital investment projects for the legislative branch than this piece of land."

In letter of September 18, 1969, to Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations (see page 761 of the published Senate hearings on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1970), one of the owners of Square 764 verifies the fact that the property was purchased by his group in November, 1962. It is worth noting that the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 containing the authority of the Architect, with approval of the Commission, to acquire property in this area, was enacted April 22, 1955 or some 7½ years before the November, 1962 purchase date. As the law now exists all property within the areas authorized to be acquired are subject to the same impartial treatment.

The Speaker indicated to you last week that the Commission thought the provision should be deleted from H.R. 16988, pending further consideration by the House Office Building Commission—that the Commission must take into consideration the over-all esthetic values in the area and the over-all effect on other property owners. It obviously would be discriminatory against other property owners in the area to remove this one square from the Commission's authority to purchase. You said that the provision was put in the bill in subcommittee with the understanding that you would discuss the matter with the Commission and the Architect before it was taken up in full committee.

I believe you are aware that the Architect of the Capitol is, by law, one of the five members of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, the other four members being the District Commissioner, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the City Council and the Associate Director of the National Park Service. It is proper and normal, therefore, for the Architect to be involved in zoning matters, particularly those affecting the areas in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds.

I trust that this report will give you at least the highlights on this subject.

PHILIP L. ROOF,
Executive Assistant.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) in his commendation of the local police for their activities in the current situation in Washington.

I do not think any of us need to be reminded that crime and unrest in the streets and in the schools have become an almost daily diet. Some of us can view this in an aloof atmosphere.

But for others, those who live with more than the statistics—our teachers, firemen, and policemen—the situation is direct and personally threatening.

It is the responsibility of Congress to maintain compensation for the teachers, policemen, and firemen in the District in line with their service and dedication.

This bill attempts to do that.

For policemen, firemen and teachers the bill will establish a long-overdue 13-percent across-the-board increase.

In view of the vital areas of public service with which this bill deals, it is vital that competent personnel be encouraged to seek and stay with these positions. We must provide for them a decent living standard.

In the area of education, the proposed pay scales in this bill will better enable the District to compete with other school systems. It is a necessary step toward curing some of the ills of the District schools.

Policemen, firemen and teachers in the city last received a major pay raise on October 1, 1967.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the committee's amendment to make those raises retroactive to January 1, 1970, rather than July 1, 1969, as the bill before us provides.

We are all aware of the fact that during 1969, the rate of inflation of our economy was 6.1 percent. We can all testify to the fact that food, shelter, and clothing, as well as taxes, have all gone up steeply during the past year.

While curbing inflation is one of the primary concerns of Congress and the administration, we see around us other problem areas—law enforcement and education—which are in desperate need of support, particularly in the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, in inflationary times such as these employees of Government and private industry are receiving cost-of-living increases and our policemen and firemen and their families have to strain to meet the family budget.

In view of the vital areas of public service with which we are dealing, it is doubly important that competent personnel be encouraged to seek these positions and to remain in them by providing them a decent living.

The proposed salary schedule for the officer ranks, is realistic as it seeks to provide for the first time a definite mesaure of comparability with the salaries paid under the Classification Act to Government employees with equivalent degrees of responsibility.

Public Law 88–575, effective July 1, 1964, recognized the need to establish parity between the personnel in class 5 through class 11 of the Police and Firemen's Salary Act and the General Services Grade Salary Schedule. Cognizance was taken of the fact that senior classified emploeyes of the District government had recently been given exceptionally large pay raises as a result of the Federal program to achieve comparability between upper level classified employees and upper level private industry employees. The act of 1964 established the Office of Chief of Police at approximately GS grade 17, the executive officer at approximately GS grade 16, Deputy Chief of Police at about GS grade 15, Inspector at about GS grade 14, and so on. (Exhibit A attached.)

Public Law 89–810 of 1966 and Public Law 90–320 of 1968 failed to maintain this correlation between upper level salaries. Both Federal and District employees under the Classification Act have received substantial pay raises, on July 1, 1969, and again in December 1969. These salaries were based on Civil Service and Budget Bureau staff findings derived from the Bureau of Labor Statistics comparing Federal salaries with industrial pay. These increases are supposed to bring Government salaries into parity with industry for the first time.

In order to effectively compete for attraction and retention of top caliber police officials, some comparison must be made with the pay rates for positions of responsibility in a given area. In the city of Detroit, for example, police pay rates are geared to rates paid in the largest local industry; the automotive industry. By the same token, the pay rates of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments should be comparable with those of the largest employer in the area, the Federal Government. Hence, a comparison is drawn between the levels of responsibility for various GS grade levels and similar levels of responsibility in uniformed police positions applying the principle that equal pay should be given for substantially equal work.

EXHIBIT A.—COMPARISON OF SALARIES FOR POLICEMEN AND CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES—YEARS 1964, 1970, AND PROPOSED LEGISLATION

	July 1964	1970 salary [1]	H.R. 17138 proposed starting salary [2]
GS–17	$21,445	$30,714	$30,714
Chief of police	21,000	24,000	28,500
Discrepancy	−445	−6,714	−2,214
GS–16	18,935	26,547	26,547
Executive Officer 1964 (Assistant Chief 1970)	17,500	19,742	23,800
Discrepancy	−1,435	−6,805	−2,747
GS–15	16,460	22,885	22,885
Deputy Chief of Police	16,500	18,671	21,500
Discrepancy	+40	−4,214	−1,385

	July 1964	1970 salary [1]	H.R. 17138 proposed starting salary [2]
GS–14	$14,170	$19,643	$19,643
Inspector	14,000	15,994	18,500
Discrepancy	−170	−3,649	−1,143
GS–13	12,075	16,760	16,760
Captain	12,000	13,852	15,800
Discrepancy	−75	−2,908	−960
GS–12	10,250	14,192	14,192
Lieutenant	10,000	11,710	13,300
Discrepancy	−250	−2,482	−892

[1] This column compares civil service salaries under the recent 6-percent pay increase, GS grades, provided in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–231, approved Apr. 15, 1970), with the salaries currently received by police and firemen in comparable ranks.

[2] The final column is a comparison of 1970 GS grades with those provided in H.R. 17138 as reported herewith, and shows that there is still considerable disparity between them in the comparable grades and ranks.

In summation, this analysis points to two major considerations that should receive high priority in establishing basic pay rates for the Metropolitan Police Department. Comparison with benchmark positions in cities of similar population must include the high cost of living in the Washington area and the unique problems associated with law enforcement in the U.S. Capital. Also, as a matter of principle and sound pay administration, parity should be reestablished between top level supervisory positions in the police department and similar positions in the District and Federal Governments.

It just does not make sense, to point to just one position, that of the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief. As the following schedule shows, there are 38 civilian positions in the District of Columbia government which pay higher salary than received by the Chiefs of Police and Fire Department. These are salaries shown before the last 6-percent pay increase the civilians received in the 1970 Employees Salary Act reflected in exhibit A above:

Salary of District official

Position:	*Annual salary*
1. Director of Highways and Traffic	$33,495
2. Corporation Counsel	33,495
3. Health Office	33,495
4. Director—Department of Human Resources	33,495
5. Director—Finance and Review	32,840
6. Director—Sanitary Engineering	30,908
7. Librarian	30,889
8. Superintendent of Schools	30,000
9. Medical officers	29,942
10. Medical officers	29,942
11. Medical officers	29,942
12. Medical officers	29,942
13. Medical officers	29,942
14. Medical officers	29,942
15. Chief personnel officer	28,394
16. Director of Recreation	28,382
17. Director of Corrections	28,976
18. Associate Director, District Treasury	25,909
19. Deputy Director—Sanitary Engineering	25,879
20. Medical officers	25,879
21. Medical officers	25,879
22. Medical officers	25,879
23. Medical officers	25,879
24. Medical officers	25,879
25. Medical officers	25,879
26. Medical officers	25,879
27. Medical officers	$25,879
28. Medical officers	25,879
29. Medical officers	25,879
30. Medical officers	25,879
31. Medical officers	25,879
32. Medical officers	25,879
33. Medical officers	25,879
34. Executive officer (GS 301–16)	25,044
35. Executive officer (GS 301–16)	25,044
36. Deputy Director—Department of Highways and Traffic	25,044
37. Chief, Bureau of Engineering and Construction	24,469
38. Associate Director Municipal Audits	24,469
39. Chief of Police	24,000

I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand briefly on the fine comments made by the gentleman from Mississippi. There have been two reasons why it has been difficult to recruit policemen in the District of Columbia. One has been the salary schedule; the other has been a community attitude. I think we should note today what is obviously a great improvement in that community attitude. I think the behavior of our local population in the last two big demonstrations we have had in Washington signifies a maturity that has to be commended.

Now we are raising the pay of the police, the firemen, and the teachers. At the same time, while we have tried to get the recruits necessary to fill the authorized strength of the Police Department, we have, in fact, lowered the standards for the police force at a time when every reason dictates that we should be raising those standards.

I would hope that the committee, with the legislative history surrounding the passage of this bill, will give a word to those who are in authority indicating that this body does want standards raised rather than lowered. Otherwise we will soon not be able to say those things which the gentleman from Mississippi said. Indeed, when we have improved community attitudes and when we have raised salaries, we have a right to expect that we will get a higher quality enforcement of the law, that we will be able to expect a higher quality of education.

Unless we achieve a higher quality in both of those fields, we have acted on false premises.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask someone on the committee whether the situation with respect to teachers has improved in the District. The last report we had from the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia indicated that there were 37 to 40 percent of the teachers holding temporary certificates. Can I assume that the holders of temporary certificates are included in this pay bill? Do I correctly understand that there has been little correction of this situation of teachers holding temporary certificates in the District?

Mr. FUQUA. In response to the gentleman's question I might say that we are very much concerned about the high number of temporary certificates held in the past year, but we feel that with this legislation that situation can be corrected so that we will have more permanent teachers employed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Then the salary increases will go to holders of temporary certificates?

Mr. FUQUA. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. If they have been made permanent will they get an increase under this bill?

Mr. FUQUA. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. What percent of the teachers in the District of Columbia will get an increase under this bill.

Mr. FUQUA. All teachers, temporary probationary, and permanent will benefit. Under previous pay legislation holders of temporary certificates are dropped from the rolls after 5 years. This gradually reduces the number of temporary teachers. This is to try to encourage and attract and hold qualified teachers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) just said that the police recruitment program in the District may be getting results in numbers but the quality is down. Does the gentleman from Florida agree with that?

Mr. FUQUA. We hope there will always remain a high quality in the Police Department. I think there may have been cases where in order to recruit people in the District of Columbia, in addition to the higher salaries, there may have been a relaxation of some of the high qualifications for officers, but as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) and others have said, the police have handled themselves in a creditable way in the recent events in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can add into that, in connection with what happened over the weekend, the expenditure of a huge amount of money. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can say who is going to provide the money to pay the bills that have been incurred in order to support the police force? For instance, there were 100 buses that were parked as barricades, and the window glass was broken out of many of them. They were apparently rented at a cost of $10 an hour for some 24 hours. If they were rented for 24 hours at the rate of $10 an hour, that in itself is a cost of a quarter of a million dollars to provide buses to be used only as barricades.

Mr. FUQUA. It is my understanding that is an expense borne by the executive department. I understand most of the area where trash was disposed of, around the Ellipse, will be taken care of by the Park Service. So this also would come out of the executive and not in any way be connected with the expense for the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask another question. Does the gentleman anticipate if this pay increase is approved that the District of Columbia, in the absence of a tax increase, is going to be called upon to pick up the bill for the increase?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on that point. One of the things in this bill the gentleman should know is that the pay increase is going to be paid for by the citizens of the District of Columbia with an increase in their income taxes.

Many of us felt the Federal Government should pay some of this because the District of Columbia is taking care of certain activities involved in demonstrations against war because this is the Federal City, but this pay increase will be paid for by the District of Columbia citizens with an increase in their income tax.

Mr. GROSS. Has the tax been voted?

Mr. ADAMS. The tax increase is in the bill, to increase that. We tried in committee to put in a provision to raise the Federal payment to match that, but that was defeated. I think the Federal Government should pay its share. That is why I offered an amendment in committee to increase the Federal payment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with due credit to the law-enforcement officers of the District of Columbia, a lot of money was spent over this past weekend to aid them in the enforcement of the law. Are we going to increase the taxes upon the District of Columbia to fund these added expenses, or are we going to vote in Congress more Federal funds to the District of Columbia to pay for that?

Mr. ADAMS. I think in this case they were protecting the executive. As the gentleman from Florida has mentioned, the funds for the buses would come out of a different area. In this case, which was a case involving a Federal dispute, I think the Federal Government should share the expenses necessary to control the dispute. The city did not cause it. This was a Federal executive decision which caused the demonstration.

Mr. GROSS. If a demonstration were staged in my hometown, I am certain the Federal Government would not put up the money to police it.

Mr. ADAMS. But the President is not in the gentleman's hometown and did not cause a disruption there.

Mr. GROSS. What specifically does the President have to do with it?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, the decision of the President was made a Federal issue and this was joined in by people who came from all over the country. That is what created the disturbance. I assume that does not happen in the gentleman's hometown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. I assume, if it were not here, it would have been someplace else.

Mr. ADAMS. No. This is the Federal Capital, I might state again, and when a decision is made on a matter which involves all the people of the United States and they want to petition the Federal Government then they have to come to Washington, D.C., because that is where the Government is. This is the problem we constantly face in trying to get a reasonable arrangement as between Federal payments and local payments.

Mr. GROSS. We could argue that all afternoon.

Again I ask who is going to pay the cost for the buses that were parked as barricades at the rate of $10 or more an hour, which have had their windows busted out and tires deflated, and slashed? Who is going to pick up the bills for that?

Mr. ADAMS. Those were parked around the White House. The gentleman will have to ask the President who ordered them. They are not a part of this bill and not a legislative expense, so far as this gentleman knows.

Mr. GROSS. Is this being charged to the Defense Department?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) to the first committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FUQUA. Is this on page 2?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On pages 2 and 3.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 8, line 5, strike out "date of enactment" and insert "effective date".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 9, line 2, strike out "July, 1969" and insert "January 1, 1970".

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. HOGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all of the remaining committee amendments, on pages 9 and 10, to this title, be considered en bloc. They are all the same.

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I agree that they be considered en bloc will I still have the opportunity to oppose the amendments en bloc?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be recognized and his rights will be protected.

Mr. HOGAN. I thank the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendments to title I.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 9, line 9, strike out "July 1, 1969" and insert "January 1, 1970."

On page 10, line 12, strike out "July 1, 1969" and insert "January 1, 1970."

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I will stake my record and my sentiments toward fiscal responsibility against those of anyone in the House, with perhaps a few exceptions.

But in this case I believe equity demands that we do what is right for the policemen and firemen who have not received additional compensation since October 1, 1967.

Employees in the classified service and employees in private industry have received several increases.

I should like to point out that police and firemen are purchasing their groceries in the same stores as their neighbors who work for the Federal Government or for private industry.

Their apartment rent is raised at the same time as their neighbors; their payments on their automobiles are the same as their neighbors. So I think that we, functioning as the City Council for the District of Columbia, have an obligation not to make them the scapegoats for fiscal responsibility. Their pay raise is more than 1 year overdue at this point in time. Recently we gave the Federal employees in the classified service a 6-percent increase, which they deserve, but this has had the effect of putting the local employees that much further behind.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, if we really want to give some substance to the pious phrases we have heard today about how great the police and firemen are and the tremendous problems that they have in curbing unrest in the District of Columbia, I think we ought to be consistent and do what is right by them and make the pay raise retroactive to July 1, 1969, as the bill before us reads, and vote in opposition to the committee amendment, which would bring it back to January 1, 1970.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) in opposing the committee amendment, which makes the pay increase for police and firemen retroactive to January 1, 1970, rather than July 1, 1969, as originally provided for in the bill as reported by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of reluctance, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that I find myself in a position of not supporting the position of the committee. However, the subcommittee that handled the legislation voted to make this pay raise retroactive to July 1, 1969. It was as somewhat of a compromise in the full committee, and by a rather close vote that we agreed to extend the retroactivity only back to January 1, 1970.

As I pointed out in my earlier remarks, and as was further emphasized by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN), a number of years ago we decided that we would make the salaries of various policemen and firemen comparable to those of certain grades in the Class Act schedule. Now, we had a reason for doing this at that time, because the positions involved comparable work and comparable responsibility, but we have been somewhat negligent, Mr. Speaker, because we have fallen behind in keeping the pay scales of the police and firemen on a par with the pay increases that we have awarded in this same Congress to the Class Act employees.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN), we have not acted on a major pay raise increase for the police and firemen since 1967. Since that time, we have enacted several salary raises for the Class Act employees. If we are successful in our opposition, to this amendment, we will make this pay raise retroactive to July 1, 1969, and thereby bring the police and firemen salary scale up to comparability with the Class Act schedule, which certainly should be done at this time. The amendment that is being opposed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) and myself does not take into consideration the 6-percent pay raises that we granted to the Class Act employees retroactive to December 27, 1969. So even by opposing the committee amendment, and making the pay raise retroactive to July 1, 1969, we will find police and firemen still at least 6 percent behind the pay that they should have if we are entirely consistent in our position of keeping these pay schedules on a comparable basis.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House will vote to oppose the committee amendment. As I say, the only effect of it will be to make the pay raise retroactive to July 1, 1969, instead of to January 1, 1970.

As was pointed out in the colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), there is an income tax provision in the bill which will provide approximately $25 million of additional revenue per year. The total cost of the pay increases for the teachers, the policemen, and the firemen will amount to only approximately $20 million per full fiscal year. So, ultimately, there will be a $5 million annual surplus as a result of the enactment of this bill. Thus, there is adequate revenue to cover the increase which is being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Members of the House will join with my colleague from Maryland and myself in opposing the committee amendment.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I support the committee amendments.

The original bill that we considered in the committee provided retroactive pay for the policemen and firemen going back to July 1969 and for the teachers going back to September 1969. The feeling that prevailed in the committee was that if we were going to have retroactive pay increases, the teachers and the policemen deserved equal treatment insofar as the retroactive date was concerned. Also, the revenue provisions in the bill covered the costs of a retroactive pay increase effective January 1970. Therefore, a compromise date of January was accepted by the committee, by a predominant vote.

I may point out that the revenue that is to be accumulated by virtue of the added tax, if this retroactive pay goes back to July 1969, will be insufficient to the extent of $2.8 million to cover the cost. However, under the January 1970 date, we will be in approximately a balanced position. To reiterate, if we go back to July there will be a $2.8 million deficit in the provisions of this bill to cover the costs. Therefore, I feel after the many hours of concerned attention which has been given to this bill, and which has been reported out and now comes to the floor of the House today, the committee amendment is a fair one and the best we could do under the circumstances.

I do not believe there is anyone in the committee who is more concerned about our police and our teachers than am I. I think we all face the realization that at times we are tempted to increase pay scales as a step to meet inflation, but it needs also to be a sound step to meet inflation, one grounded in fiscal responsibility. Therefore, it is my hope in the future that we can make continued adjustments, as needed, but not anticipatory of continued inflation.

May I say in response to what has already been said relative to the police I would also add my commendation. The Police Department in this city has improved materially and I think conditions in our schools have improved materially. I would like to pay my compliments to both of those areas of the city government. I have a great concern for both. But I do hope that the committee amendments will be adopted at this point providing a 13-percent increase in pay for teachers, policemen, and firemen.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I appear in support of the committee amendment and it in no way should reflect dissatisfaction, but only praise for the Metropolitan Police Department and for that matter the Fire Department.

In my opinion this is one of the finest departments that I know of anywhere. We have heard today much praise heaped upon these people for the fine job they have done and for their dedication.

But I might point out one of the problems with which we are faced in this bill. This bill provides for a 13-percent increase across-the-board to all policemen and firemen, and goes into the lower grades such as the privates where the men spend the greatest period of time, where there is a 29-percent increase.

I might further point out that when one compares this with the surrounding jurisdictions—Fairfax County, Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, Arlington, Falls Church—with the $8,000 salary—starting salary—which is prevailing today, there is only one jurisdiction that has a higher starting salary and that is Fairfax County. When you raise it to $8,500, you have a higher figure than you do for any of the surrounding jurisdictions. It places the District of Columbia in the position as being one of the top cities in the United States insofar as pay for policemen and firemen is concerned. Not only that, but it has been very appropriately pointed out by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), that this leaves a $2.8 million deficit in the amount of money that we are proposing to raise as a result of the enactment of this bill.

This is retroactive back to January of 1970, but to make it retroactive again back to July 1, 1969, is going to add another $5 million to this bill. This will leave a debt that is not provided for in the bill of approximately $2.8 million. We find ourselves, even though there is presently a small surplus in the bill—but we do not know what the revenues may be because of various events that are somewhat unpredictable—but the best estimate we can get is that if this amendment is defeated, that this is going to provide a deficit of $2.8 million in what is provided.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), my good friend, has an amendment to increase some of the salaries to the teachers, and if we set this back to July 1, 1969, then are we not rightfully to consider moving starting salaries to the teachers back retroactively to 1969? Here again, however, how far can we go with the revenues we have? We have tried to mold this piece of cloth to fit the revenues that we have provided. Therefore I hope the House will go along in the action of the committee, and make this retroactive back to January 1, 1970, rather than July 1, 1969. I ask the House to vote in favor of the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments being considered en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 11, immediately below line 12 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 204. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe

the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside', approved July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–132a) is amended—

"(A) by inserting immediately after '(a)' the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section,';

"(B) by striking out ', except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section,' in the second sentence;

"(C) by striking out 'twelve' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-five'; and

"(D) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) For the purposes of this Act, the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Chief of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, may in individual cases waive the requirement that an officer or member reside within the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan district.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: The salary schedule on page 12 is amended in group D of class 5 by inserting immediately below "Director, industrial and adult education" the following new item: "Executive assistant to Deputy Superintendent.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On pages 14 and 15, the items relating to class 15 in the salary schedule are amended to read as follows:

"Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,800	$8,115	$8,430	$8,745	$9,060	$9,375	$9,760
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	8,190	8,505	8,820	9,135	9,450	9,765	10,150
Group B, master's degree	8,580	8,965	9,350	9,735	10,120	10,505	10,990
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,970	9,355	9,740	10,125	10,510	10,895	11,380
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	9,360	9,745	10,130	10,515	10,900	11,285	11,770
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.							
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspectors.							
Counselor, placement.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
School psychologist.							

Salary class and group	Service step 8	9	10	11	12	13	Longevity step Y
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$10,145	$10,530	$10,915	$11,300	$11,685	$12,070	$13,000
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	10,535	10,920	11,305	11,690	12,075	12,460	13,800
Group B, master's degree	11,475	11,960	12,445	12,930	13,415	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,865	12,350	12,835	13,320	13,805	14,290	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	12,255	12,740	13,225	13,710	14,195	14,680	16,100
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.							
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspectors.							
Counselor, placement.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
School psychologist."							

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, is this the replacement amendment on pages 14 and 15, or, rather, on page 14, whereby the class A bachelor's degree is dropped from $8,000 to $7,800 in the salary scale?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the gentleman from Washington that these are the replacement amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee at the time they considered this bill and put it together as a new, clean bill, took the recommendations of the District of Columbia government and we spent a great deal of time trying to balance out the bill with the revenues, and in time we agreed upon the salary increases for policemen, firemen, and teachers. But then we came into the full committee and after a great deal of discussion, and at one point where the teacher salaries were dropped down to $7,600 instead of $8,000, which had been recommended by the District of Columbia government, a compromise was reached dropping them down from $8,000 to $7,800.

In my opinion, and I want to be very fair with the committee, you must have—and this is the reason the District of Columbia government recommended the $8,000 figure—you must have a differential between the District of Columbia central city schools and the surrounding area in order to hire teachers.

The figure of $8,000 was reached by the District government and by the subcommittee as being a comparable figure that would accomplish this.

I, therefore, am asking the committee not to lower the teachers' salaries. If there is anything that this committee should be doing, it is the same thing we are doing with the policemen and firemen and that is raising the pay scale for teachers just as we have for them.

In fact, in the opinion of many of us who live in the District and have spent some time in the schools here, the problems of the individual teacher going to the classroom every day and teaching the children, often in highly volatile situations and often with great disciplinary problems, are every bit as great as are involved in the very difficult job done by policemen and firemen.

It is only $200 a year for these people. I would submit that for someone who is trying to raise a family and start a career in teaching school—and we hope that people will do that—the sum of $8,000 to raise a family is not a lot of money. It is not a lot of money at all.

We find also that in trying to get people to come here to this school area and to stay in the schools here and to retain them, it is necessary to have a salary scale that goes up. You will notice that the salary scale across the board by the committee amendment has been dropped in each area.

I think it would be a very bad thing for the House at this time when we are trying to emphasize education, to say that they are going to drop teachers' salaries below the recommendation that was in the original bill.

I think the committee should go along with it, and I am urging the House to do so.

I am very hopeful that when all the Members of the House have a chance to vote that they will say they believe that teachers' salaries should not be lowered. I hope others will join with me in voting for the original bill—and that is voting against the committee amendment. A vote of "no" will restore the original salary of $8,000 to start. This is below what we start policemen and firemen—and I am in agreement with that.

We have only been retroactive back to January 1, because of our revenue limitations. I am in favor of that.

I would just close my remarks by saying that we will not hire teachers until September, other than the very few administrative people who come into school who are qualified for this so the amount of revenue involved in giving $200 to bring some new teachers in September is very small and was originally figured into the District's estimates on revenue. That is the little surplus they were talking about.

If you were to vote "no" on this, the bill will be balanced and I think we should give our teachers a break.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in behalf of the committee amendment, I am not speaking in favor of a reduction in teachers' salaries, but rather in favor of an $800 increase in starting salaries for District of Columbia schoolteachers.

In the committee bill, as amended, we are providing a 13-percent average increase for schoolteachers and school officers, and a 13-percent average increase for policemen and firemen.

Actually, so far as the starting salary is concerned, we provided only a $500 increase for police and firemen—but $800 for schoolteachers.

So we have been somewhat more liberal for the lower levels of schoolteachers than we have with policemen and firemen.

Over the period of years, and using the year 1954 as a base year because since then we have had quite a number of increases for classified employees and for the military, and for policemen, firemen, and schoolteachers, we find that we have increased the salaries of the classified employees, and that would mean the civilian employees of the District of Columbia government, by 64 percent. This does not include the recent 6-percent salary increase for Government employees, retroactive to December 27, 1969.

During this same period of time, we raised the salaries of District of Columbia policemen and firemen by 69.3 percent, and for District of Columbia teachers by some 82.1 percent. So during the past 15 years, the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia have fared substantially better in salary increases than have other employees of the District.

Now, with the 6-percent pay increase that we recently passed retroactive to December 27 for Class Act employees, the total increase since 1964 will amount to 70 percent. With this 13-percent increase proposed for the schoolteachers, their total increase will amount to 95.1 percent. I think that is quite generous; quite liberal. We do not have to sweeten the pot any more. If we compare the salaries of schoolteachers in the District of Columbia with the national average—and again I am talking about comparable cities, with populations of 500,000 to 1 million—we find that the District of Columbia schoolteachers rank No. 1. In no other city of comparable size in the United States will there be teachers receiving more money than what we will be paying our schoolteachers here in the District of Columbia.

There is one thing that really poses quite a problem, even under the present bill as amended by the committee. The salaries for schoolteachers in the suburban areas of the metropolitan area of Washington—and this is with pay increases that have already been initiated, that will go in effect at the beginning of the next school year—the starting salary for a teacher in the suburbs will average from $7,100 a year to $7,250, or roughly $600 a year less than what we will be paying the starting teacher here in the District of Columbia. So that is going to make it extremely difficult for the suburbs to catch up, as they will be obliged to do, and when they do, then another "round robin" will start and we will have to come back again to raise the District schoolteachers' salaries a little higher. This is a never-ending cycle.

I recognize that we have to pay a little more to recruit schoolteachers here in the Nation's Capital. Someone said during committee consideration of this bill that we should label it "jungle pay" or "combat pay." Nevertheless, it will always be more difficult to get teachers to work here in the Nation's Capital than in the suburbs where more attractive conditions prevail. That is the reason we are setting a starting salary some $600 higher. But I see no reason—when we consider comparability with the suburbs, and with other cities, with the police and firemen, and with the Class Act employees—why we have to go more than $600 higher at this time.

If the committee amendment is not adopted, and we have to increase the starting teachers to $8,000, this will cost $1.9 million per year additional. This was a prime consideration in adopting the last committee amendment, which prevented the retroactivity for the policemen and firemen, going back to July 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. As much as it pains me to disagree with my good friend and colleague from Virginia, I must do so, and I shall not belabor the arguments already made by the gentleman from Washington. I think there is a distinct difference between the conditions under which Washington, D.C., teachers are forced to work and those in the surrounding areas and also elsewhere in the country. There are many things wrong with the schools in the District of Columbia which salary increases will not correct. I would hope that the local school board would direct their attention to correcting these problems. But for our part I think we should do what is right by the teachers. I would have preferred that the recommendation of the local government be adhered to in the committee's actions. I regret that it was not.

I, therefore, will vote to oppose the committee action in reducing the salaries to $7,800 rather than the $8,000 in the bill.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland who spoke a moment ago and the gentleman from Washington on their position with reference to these teacher salaries. I have never known just exactly what a fair salary is. It is all a relative matter. It all depends on one's point of view, I suppose, but at least we can make a few comparisons.

It does seem to me that if a schoolteacher in the District of Columbia is willing to endure the hardships and in many instances the unpleasant working conditions that he or she must endure to work in some of the city schools here in the District of Columbia, the teacher is entitled at least to some fraction of what is paid to the secretaries who work on Capitol Hill under rather good conditions and circumstances.

There was an opportunity for this House not too long ago, just a few days ago, to determine whether, after voting a 10-percent pay raise for congressional staff employees only last summer, on top of that—and I say on top of, in addition to an addition of $8,000 to the clerk hire of every Member of Congress—there was an opportunity several days ago to exclude those employees from the overburdened backs of the mailmen in this country, and that opportunity, the RECORD will show, was passed by this House. If the House is determined that these people who work under, I must say, rather pleasant conditions here on Capitol Hill, are entitled to salaries ranging from $8,000 up, surely in the name of logic the schoolteachers, who encounter the kinds of conditions they do particularly in the inner-city schools, are entitled to the original action taken by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked really when the full committee made this reduction in the salaries of the teachers.

In Great Britain, in London, the teachers who teach in the inner-city schools are paid more. There is an incentive paid to them. Why? Because they get paid for the amount of work they have to do, and there is much more difficulty in teaching little children who have not learned to speak the English language well, much more difficulty in teaching those children to read. It is a mammoth job. It is more difficult to teach them good citizenship and emotional self-control and all the rest. It is a mammoth job compared to teaching children who have had the benefit of good education in a so-called good home, a good upbringing.

So under all the circumstances, I commend the gentleman from Maryland for his very sensible statement, and I commend the gentleman from Washington for bringing this matter before the House.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17138 to provide salary increases for District of Columbia teachers, police, and firemen. I had fully intended to support this measure even before the events of this past weekend, but a personal experience in the early morning hours Sunday has served to remind me that these increases are fully justified.

I want to commend the District of Columbia Fire Chief and the District firemen for exemplary action in responding to a fire call on Highland Place in the Cleveland Park section of Washington.

A call was placed to the Fire Department at 4:01 a.m. At 4:03 a.m. firemen arrived to extinguish a blaze which gutted my garage, destroying its contents and my car. Their prompt response prevented the fire from spreading to my home, only a few feet away, or to two neighboring homes. Their action deserves recognition.

I also would like to make special note of the role of William Reedy, son of George Reedy, aide to former President Lyndon Johnson, and several companions who discovered the fire and sounded the alarm. My family and I owe them, and the District Fire Department, a tremendous debt of appreciation for having prevented what might otherwise have been a tragedy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is a rather touchy subject for Members of the House.

If one would just listen to the surface of the speeches which have been made against the committee amendment, one would think that the bill was reducing someone's salary. That is not the case at all.

Actually, this bill gives a minimum raise of 13 percent to every teacher in the District of Columbia. If a person were seeking a place to teach in the District area—that is, in the District of Columbia, or Maryland, or in Virginia—and he decided he was going to teach in the community that paid him the most money, he would wind up in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia now and under this bill will be paying its teachers considerably more than is being paid in Maryland; and I am told they have the highest per capita income in the world over in Montgomery County. They will also be paying their teachers considerably more than is being paid over in Virginia.

As the gentleman from Indiana says, I guess there is no way to arrive at what is a fair pay for a teacher, but certainly we have to have something to go by, and we usually go by what we are capable of paying. That is the only criterion I know of which is really applicable to a situation of this kind. What are we able to pay?

Every teacher, from the very lowest level, will be receiving, as a beginning teacher, a minimum $800 more per year under this bill than he would receive last year. These salaries are not so skimpy. Eventually they can earn up to $15,200 a year. That does not mean in a year or two, of course; it is over a reasonable period of years. That is not bad.

I would hope that the Members would not get the impression that the committee has suggested the reduction of pay of anyone.

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

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

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware that this is for a 10-month period of work?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course.

Mr. FUQUA. Not for a 12-month calendar period of time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course. It is for 10 months.

The committee has not suggested the reduction of the pay of anyone. The committee is suggesting a minimum raise which is not bad. It is 13 percent for the beginning teacher. And that raise will appear all the way across the board from the lowest to the highest.

While I should like to pay $10,000 as a beginning salary, or $20,000, they do not have that kind of money here. We have to do the best we can, and the best we can is better than is being done in Maryland and Virginia.

There were two teachers who called on me when this matter was pending. They were teaching in the District of Columbia. Do you know where they were from? They were from Montgomery County, Md. I do not know why they were teaching over here, unless it was because they could earn more money here. I would assume that the more attractive pay must have had something to do with it.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. I believe what the gentleman says is exactly right, but I do find some problem here. I understand this bill would do this, and it has been this way until now, but how do we justify paying starting policemen $700 more per year than starting teachers?

Mr. ABERNETHY. How does one justify paying a private in the U.S. Army about $150 a month? We cannot justify it.

Mr. MYERS. That is a short period of time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes, but a rather rough and dangerous service, certainly worse than teaching.

Mr. MYERS. It is a contribution to his country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Why could not the District of Columbia, which I am not too familiar with, provide for this problem? My wife does volunteer service 1 day a week, with no pay, to contribute to the education of children in the District of Columbia. She comes back and tells me some of the problems associated with this job, and some of the terrific tasks and responsibilities. She has taught in Indiana and in Illinois, and knows the comparable responsibilities and tasks. She says there is no comparison.

I believe we should pay our policemen as much as we possibly can. I certainly do not mean by my suggestion or argument that we should reduce the pay of policemen.

I do find it difficult to understand how you can start a policeman at $700 more than a teacher who has to go to school for 4 years, at least, in order to become qualified to be a teacher. These people who are going to teach our young people are very necessary to our system.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman makes a very good point. But, after all, it resolves down to the availability of money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments to the salary schedule found on pages 14 and 15 of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is this bill not being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then, we cannot vote on an amendment on a roll-call vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the bill is being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and it is in the House. The gentleman's point of order is in order, and the rollcall will be automatic as soon as the Chair announces it.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 142, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—183

Abbitt	Flowers	Nichols
Abernethy	Flynt	O'Konski
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neal, Ga.
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Patman
Arends	Fuqua	Pelly
Ashbrook	Galifianakis	Pettis
Belcher	Garmatz	Poff
Berry	Gettys	Preyer, N.C.
Bevill	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Blackburn	Goodling	Quie
Blanton	Griffin	Quillen
Boggs	Gross	Railsback
Bow	Grover	Randall
Brinkley	Hagan	Rarick
Brock	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Brotzman	Hall	Reifel
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Rhodes
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Roberts
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Robison
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Roth
Burlison, Mo.	Hosmer	Roudebush
Burton, Utah	Hull	Ruppe
Bush	Hunt	Ruth
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Caffery	Jarman	Satterfield
Camp	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Cederberg	Jonas	Schadeberg
Chamberlain	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Clancy	Jones, Tenn.	Sebelius
Clausen, Don H.	Kazen	Shipley
	Kee	Shriver
Clawson, Del	Keith	Sikes
Cleveland	King	Sisk
Collins	Kleppe	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Kyl	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Landgrebe	Snyder
Coughlin	Landrum	Springer
Cowger	Langen	Stanton
Cunningham	Latta	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Va.	Lennon	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	McClory	Stuckey
Davis, Wis.	McClure	Talcott
de la Garza	McCulloch	Taylor
Dellenback	McDonald, Mich.	Teague, Calif.
Denney	Mahon	Thompson, Ga.
Dennis	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Mann	Waggonner
Devine	Marsh	Wampler
Dorn	Martin	Watts
Downing	Mathias	Whitehurst
Duncan	May	Whitten
Dwyer	Mayne	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Meskill	Williams
Edwards, La.	Michel	Winn
Erlenborn	Mills	Wold
Esch	Mizell	Wyatt
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wylie
Evins, Tenn.	Natcher	Zion
Findley	Nelsen	Zwach
Fish		

NAYS—142

Adams	Gray	Olsen
Addabbo	Gude	O'Neill, Mass.
Albert	Hamilton	Perkins
Alexander	Hanley	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Hanna	Poage
	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Harrington	Price, Ill.
	Hastings	Purcell
Annunzio	Hathaway	Rees
Ashley	Hays	Reuss
Barrett	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Beall, Md.	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Bennett	Helstoski	Roe
Biester	Hicks	Rogers, Colo.
Boland	Hogan	Rogers, Fla.
Bolling	Holifield	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Horton	Rosenthal
Brooks	Howard	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Hungate	Roybal
Burke, Mass.	Jacobs	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Schwengel
Button	Karth	Skubitz
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Smith, Iowa
Casey	Kluczynski	Stafford
Clark	Koch	Staggers
Cohelan	Kyros	Steed
Conte	Leggett	Steiger, Wis.
Corbett	Lowenstein	Sullivan
Corman	Lujan	Symington
Daddario	Lukens	Thompson, N.J.
Daniels, N.J.	McCloskey	Tiernan
Dingell	McFall	Udall
Donohue	Meeds	Ullman
Dulski	Melcher	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Eilberg	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Fascell	Miller, Ohio	Vigorito
Feighan	Minish	Waldie
Flood	Mink	White
Ford, William D.	Minshall	Widnall
	Mize	Wilson, Charles H.
Foreman	Monagan	
Fulton, Pa.	Morgan	Wolff
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Wright
Gaydos	Murphy, N.Y.	Wydler
Giaimo	Myers	Yates
Gibbons	Nedzi	Young
Gilbert	Nix	Zablocki
Gonzalez	O'Hara	

NOT VOTING—104

Anderson, Tenn.	Fallon	Morton
	Farbstein	Mosher
Aspinall	Fisher	Murphy, Ill.
Ayres	Foley	Obey
Baring	Fraser	Ottinger
Bell, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Patten
Betts	Friedel	Pepper
Blaggi	Gallagher	Philbin
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Pickle
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Pirnie
Brademas	Griffiths	Podell
Bray	Gubser	Pollock
Broomfield	Halpern	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Calif.	Hammer-schmidt	Pucinski
Brown, Mich.		Reid, N.Y.
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Cabell	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Ichord	St Germain
Carter	Kirwan	Scheuer
Celler	Kuykendall	Schneebeli
Chisholm	Lloyd	Slack
Clay	Long, La.	Stokes
Collier	Long, Md.	Stratton
Conyers	McCarthy	Stubblefield
Cramer	McDade	Taft
Crane	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Culver	McKneally	Tunney
Dawson	McMillan	Watkins
Delaney	Macdonald, Mass.	Watson
Dent		Weicker
Dickinson	MacGregor	Whalen
Diggs	Madden	Whalley
Dowdy	Matsunaga	Wilson, Bob
Edmondson	Mollohan	Wyman
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Yatron
Evans, Colo.	Morse	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Obey with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Long of Indiana with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Stokes.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Scheuer.

Messrs. POAGE and OLSEN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments as follows:

Page 15, strike out line 17 and all that follows thereafter down through the period in line 1 on page 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The Board of Education may place in a permanent status any fully qualified employee in salary class 15 having three or more years of satisfactory service, including service in an educational system or institution of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia, as determined by the Board, at any time beginning one year after the commencement of the probationary period of such employee."

Page 24, strike out line 25 and all that follows thereafter down through line 7, page 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 402. The Board of Education shall formulate within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, policies, procedures, and rules and regulations governing employee-management relations between the Board of Education and its employees and organizations representing such employees. Such rules and regulations shall include, but shall not be limited to, a clear statement of the rights of employees, procedures with respect to the recognition of labor organizations, determination of appropriate units, consultation and negotiation with labor organizations, approval of agreements, mediation, and impasse resolution, policies and practices regarding consultation with other organizations and associations and individual employees, and standards of conduct for labor organizations. The policies, procedures, and rules and regulations so established by the Board of Education shall be consistent with the provisions of Executive Order 11491, dated October 28, 1969 (relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service); the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; and such other Federal and District of Columbia Government personnel policies as may be required by statute.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAMS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAMS: Page 29, strike out line 17, and all that follows thereafter down through line 22.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out an amendment to the House Office Building Act, which in the opinion of this gentleman simply does not belong in this bill. It is tacked onto the end of the pay bill and in effect provides that the House cannot consider through its House Office Building Commission and through the Architect of the Capitol the possible acquisition of a site of property which is close to the Capitol and on which formerly was built the Providence Hospital. I think this is a piece of special-interest legislation and it is in the wrong committee. The Committee for the House Office Building can consider the matter.

I have indicated to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) who is the sponsor of the act, that it may have merit, but certainly our committee did not know anything about the merits of the matter. We did not know whether or not this matter should proceed at this time. I would hope that we not do it in this fashion and that, if there is to be an additional bill, then we can consider it after some hearings, or perhaps the matter can be handled through the Architect of the Capitol or in some other fashion.

I do not know the proper fair market value of the property. I do not think we should place a dead hand on property. But I have opposed it being zoned for a new-property use and have opposed the fact that it would be treated differently than any other property in the vicinity of the Capitol.

In particular I do not want to see some very high buildings built in the immediate vicinity here, because the whole structure of the area is such as to keep the height of property down. It is in a residential district and between two grammar schools. I would hope the committee would strike title VII, which is all that my amendment does, and this matter can then be considered on its merits at a different time and in the

proper jurisdiction. Then we can move to have the bill before us passed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike title VII to the pending legislation.

I acknowledge that the language of title VII is not language on which the fate of the Nation rests. However, what we hope to do by including title VII in this bill is to correct an inequity, an unfairness, if you please, which now exists.

I should like to point out that the bill pending before us is somewhat of an omnibus bill. It has to do with pay raises for teachers, firemen, and policemen; it has to do with revenue because we increase the income tax for the people of the District of Columbia; it has to do with changing the tax on alcoholic beverages and in some areas of the bill we deal with uniforms for policemen and certain other matters.

I might further point out that the other body seems to be constantly adding nongermane language to bills that we send over to them. So I suggest that it is proper that we deal with this particular subject matter in this omnibus legislation.

This is not a zoning title, as it has been described by some of my colleagues. It has nothing to do with authorizing a 90-story building or a high-rise apartment building.

What we are dealing with here, Mr. Speaker, is one square of land, square No. 764, located at 4th and D Streets, Southeast, which was formerly the old Providence Hospital site. This old Providence Hospital was acquired by a group of individuals in 1962 as an investment.

At that time it was under lease by the General Services Administration. They terminated the lease. The owners attempted to release the property. However, it was vacant; it was subjected to vandalism; and the owners were forced to tear down the building.

Therefore, they had a piece of vacant property on their hands. They attempted to get it rezoned, since the old Providence Hospital was nonconforming, so that they could properly develop the property. But their attempts to rezone it failed because the Architect of the Capitol acted in what he felt, I am sure, was the best interest of the Congress, and opposed any efforts to have this property rezoned for its proper use, because he felt this property could be used to expand the Capitol Hill complex.

I do not disagree with that general objective of the Architect of the Capitol. However, the property owners have been stuck with the property since 1962 and the Congress has still not acquired it. They could not rezone it, they could not sell it or improve it but they had to continue to pay taxes on it.

The House Office Building Commission in 1968 advised these property owners that it would acquire the property—which was perfectly acceptable to the property owners. They did not care whether it was acquired by the Capitol Building Commission or by someone else.

However, in the following year, 1969, the Committee on Appropriations failed to appropriate the necessary funds with which to acquire this property, even though the Speaker himself made a personal request of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate these funds so these property owners could be provided with some measure of relief.

At the same time the appropriations bill was up for consideration I asked one of the members of the committee handling the bill if the committee had any hopes of having any funds appropriated for acquisition of this property.

I received a reply in the negative that indicated to me at that time the best thing to do was to turn the property back to the property owners. So what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat of a dilemma that these property owners have been confronted with for 8 years. As I said before, they cannot develop the property; they cannot sell it, because it is not worth anything under the present stigma; they cannot get the zoning they need to properly use it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as I say, this stigma was placed on this property unintentionally by the Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, all that the language in title VII seeks to do is to release this property from the stigma that has been placed upon it, unintentionally, by the Congress, so that the owners will be permitted to seek the rezoning on its merits. They have suffered 8 years of unfair and costly delay. The proper thing for us to do would be to award these people damages. We should certainly insist that proper zoning be granted. But that is not what we seek to do in this legislation. I would like to suggest that if the proper zoning is not granted we should come back and take a look at it from the legislative standpoint.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make on title VII to section 701 of this bill, which would remove from the House Office Building Commission, of which I am the chairman, the authority to direct the purchase of square 764, the site of the old Providence Hospital. The language of this bill in section 701 excludes square No. 764, and takes it out of the jurisdiction of the House Office Building Commission.

In 1955 the Congress enacted Public Law 24 (69 Stat. 41), which provided for the construction of the third new office building and other facilities for the House, remodeling of the Cannon and Longworth House Office Buildings, and the acquisition of property in the vicinity of these buildings south of Independence Avenue. The provision of this law dealing with the acquisition of the property reads as follows:

> The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purpose of section 1201 of this chapter for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds.

This portion of the law was enacted for the purpose of enabling the House to provide for acquisition of land for new construction, and for additions to the Capitol Grounds in the area and near the office buildings.

Under authority of this law eight squares of property have been acquired—and I will include them in my remarks.

The material referred to follows:

Under authority of this law, eight squares of property have been acquired to date, as follows:

Square 635: Now under western part of Rayburn Building.

Square S. of 635: Outside parking.

Square 637: Underground parking garage and shops with landscaped surface.

Square 691: Underground parking garage with landscaped surface.

Square 692: Outside parking and Congressional Hotel.

Square 639: Outside parking.

Square 732N and Square 732S: Now dedicated by the Congress as the site of the James Madison Memorial Library of Congress Building.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago the owners of square 764 expressed an interest of selling this property to the Congress. In order to be certain of the authority of the Commission and the Architect of the Capitol to acquire the property, the Commission directed the Architect to obtain a ruling from the Comptroller General of the United States.

The Comptroller General ruled in August 1967, that the Architect, with approval of the House Office Building Commission, is vested with authority to acquire square 764, either as an addition to the Capitol Grounds or for any of the other purposes specified in Public Law 24, 84th Congress.

The Commission ordered the Architect to obtain two appraisals on the property. These appraisals were presented to the Commission at meeting of October 4, 1968. The Architect reported, on the basis of the appraisals and on informal evaluation of the appraisals by the Department of Justice staff, it was concluded that $1,250,000 represented a fair amount for the Government to pay for the property, including the cost of incidental expenses.

At that meeting, the Commission agreed unanimously as follows:

First, to approve the purchase of square 764;

Second, to authorize the Architect to include in his regular budget for fiscal year 1970 sufficient funds to cover the cost of acquiring the property; and

Third, to request the Architect to advise the owners of the property of the actions of the Commission.

The instructions of the Commission were carried out by the Architect. The amount of $1,250,000 was budgeted for fiscal year 1970 and hearings were held

before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, in June 1969.

The funds were not allowed. The following pertinent statement is quoted from House Report No. 91–487 on the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1970:

> The other part of the budget request—$1,250,000 to acquire square 764, the old Providence Hospital site two blocks from the east boundary of the Capitol grounds—is disallowed without prejudice. The committee was told that while it is not contiguous to the present Capitol grounds and if acquired would be expected to be held for future construction purposes, serious consideration would be, or has been, given to its use as a site for a Capitol Police Academy. The committee was not impressed with this thought. Moreover there are, in the committee's judgment, more pressing capital investment projects for the legislative branch than this piece of land.

I might say, there was never any policy of the use of a site acquired for a Capitol Police Academy. In an offhanded way someone asked about that and I said, "Well, we have a police force with over 600 at the Capitol here and some day they will have to get a headquarters for themselves." And in some way that was twisted to this, when it was never intended to have application to the site formerly occupied by the Providence Hospital.

There has been indication from some quarters that the Commission and the Architect are preventing the owners from developing this property. This is not correct. As far as the Commission or the Architect is concerned, the owners could proceed at any time with the development of the square under its R–4 zoning which was in effect when the property was purchased and is still in effect.

The owners have said, however, that they cannot construct facilities under this residential zoning, which permits a building of about 40 feet in height, on a profitable basis and they have sought on several occasions a change in zoning which would permit them to construct high-rise apartments and townhouses. It is this zoning change that the Architect, upon the direction of the Commission, has opposed successively.

The Commission felt that it must consider the residential character of that neighborhood and recommend against a "spot zoning" that would change the zoning pattern there, resulting in high-rise buildings so close to the Capitol complex.

CONCLUSIONS

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the House Office Building Commission was not consulted by the District Committee before insertion of section 701 in the pending bill.

I do not make this statement as a criticism, but as a statement of fact.

It would seem to me that, while I am sympathetic to the owners' desire to improve this now vacant land, this is a matter on which the House Office Building Commission should be consulted before proceeding with legislation to exempt this parcel from the purview of the Commission, thereby setting it apart, as an island, from other property in this area.

I still feel that we should purchase this property and hold it as a part of the Capitol Grounds until there is other need for it in the future and I am hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will consider favorably the next request for funds for that purpose.

I thought I should take the floor of the House as chairman of the House Office Building Commission and acquaint my colleagues with the situation and with the facts involved.

I dislike to oppose the action taken by the Committee on the District of Columbia. I can assure my colleagues, as far as the Commission is concerned, that we shall renew our request. I shall call a meeting of the Commission as early as possible. If the House should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, I shall call a meeting of the House Office Building Commission as soon as possible to discuss the question of again authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to renew the request.

Might I again emphasize for the benefit of my friends on the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations that at no time was there any policy about the site being used for a police force academy. It was merely an offhand observation that I made. I shall take the responsibility. It was not a fixed policy, but only an offhand observation that we have a police force of over 600 men at the Capitol, and someday the Congress will have to provide them with some kind of headquarters, never having in mind this particular site.

So the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations can completely disregard that comment in connection with any future consideration of a renewal of the request heretofore made by the House Office Building Commission.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Do I correctly understand that the present owners were satisfied with the figure that was recommended in the fiscal year 1970 appropriation bill for the legislative branch?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not prepared to say that. I do not want to make a statement which would bind them. I never had any discussion with them on that subject. But we did have outside appraisals, and there was some slight difference, not much, and then the Justice Department called it $1,250,000. So it is within range of that figure, I would say. But I do not want to make a statement that would be an expression of my own opinion and that would have any binding effect on the owners of the property. I might say they have been very decent. I realize their situation. I have been trying to help them. I have been anxious to help them.

We will need the property sometime. It is about the only vacant land that is available for any future expansion of the House of Representatives. So I have been trying to help them by having the money appropriated so that the necessary steps could be taken for the purchase of that site by the Government for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker yield for another question and comment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. First, let me say I believe these owners have been trying to find a solution, either certain action in relation to zoning, or certain action involving sale of the property to the Federal Government. From what I understand, they would be satisfied with either one or the other alternative.

Unfortunately, the legislative appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1971 has gone through the House of Representatives. However, there is still the possibility of affirmative action if the Building Commission were to recommend such action on a supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 and if the action is taken today to delete this section, section 7, I would hope that in all fairness and equity in the supplemental appropriation bill some relief will be given.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope so, too. I realize their predicament. I am most tolerant of it. There are one or two alternatives. There is the alternative of rezoning. Then what about the other people who own property in the vicinity?

The gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) made some remarks. What about the effect of a high-rise building on the atmosphere of the Capitol? Those are all things we must consider. I realize their predicament. I am most sympathetic to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

I am only anxious to try to help out in some way, and the Commission has been also. I think the subcommittee got the idea there was going to be a police military academy there. I just want to relieve your minds of that thought. When the matter comes up again, it will be simply a question of the outright purchase for a wise investment—and it would be a wise investment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not find myself in disagreement with anything the distinguished Speaker has said. Actually I apologize for the Office Building Commission not being consulted when this title was put in the bill, but I was under the impression, when the Appropriations Committee turned down the request for funds last year, we had somewhat given up any hope of that property ever being acquired.

I agree there has been no formal or official action which prohibits this property from being used, but the net effect was the same as if there was a legislative restriction, because the owners could not sell their property or finance it, and they

could not build on it because they would have to have some change in zoning to construct appropriate buildings on the property. I appreciate what the Speaker has said on this matter and particularly his assurance that the Commission would again seek appropriations to acquire the property and that the Building Commission still has a keen interest in it. The only interest I have in this subject is to remove it from dead center, so that we purchase the property as quickly as possible or remove this so-called restriction from it. That is what I am interested in. I am not concerning myself with the purchase price. There are adequate and proper means to arrive at the appropriate value. My point is we say once and for all whether we want to buy this property or not.

In view of what the distinguished speaker has said, I as sponsor of title VII of the bill will agree to it being removed from the bill and therefore go along with the amendment of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I assure the gentleman I will call a meeting of the House Office Buildings Commission as soon as possible, and the architect will appear at the proper time before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I hope the statement I made about the police academy will be enlightening to the Members, because in all good faith they must have had a misimpression about the purpose. The purpose was that some time in the future we may need the property and we will regret the day when we lost the opportunity to get that land for the future expansion of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) to strike title VII from the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in connection with the District bills that were passed today.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title:

S.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to further amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 954 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 954

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16595) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 954 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 16595 to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year in the amount of $525,630,000 and $2 million in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States. The $525,630,000 authorization is broken down as follows:

Support of scientific research	$306,000,000
Computing activities in research and education	15,000,000
Institutional support for science	55,500,000
Science education support	110,400,000
Science information activities	13,000,000
International cooperative scientific activities	2,200,000
Planning and policy studies	3,030,000
Program development and management	20,500,000

The proposed $2 million in foreign currencies would permit the Foundation to continue to arrange for collecting, translating, abstracting, and disseminating foreign scientific and technological information, and for promoting and supporting research and other scientific activities which are authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 954 in order that H.R. 16595 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 954 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 16595 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize for fiscal 1971 funds totaling $525,630,000 for the National Science Foundation, together with $2 million in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department designates as in excess of requirements.

Major program authorizations included in this total are:

Scientific research	$306,000,000
Institutional support for science	55,500,000
Program development and management	20,500,000
Science education support	110,400,000
Computing activities and research and education	15,000,000
Scientific information activities	13,000,000

The $2 million in excess foreign currencies will be used by the Foundation to continue to arrange and collect, translate, and disseminate foreign scientific and technological information within the United States. Funds will also be used to promote research activities.

The National Science Foundation requested funding of $500 million. The committee increased this by $27,630,000. Of this, $10 million represents transfers from other agencies of activities the Foundation is undertaking. An additional $9,500,000 is authorized for educational support, an increase of $4 million for both the college science program and the environmental research program. Finally, $130,000 in increased authorizations is provided for the State and local intergovernmental science policy planning program.

There are no minority views or agency reports contained in the bill.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I understand it, this bill is $14.5 million above the budget; is that correct?

Mr. QUILLEN. It was pointed out before the Rules Committee that it was above the President's budget, but it is $27 million plus.

Mr. GROSS. Is it $27 million above the budget?

Mr. QUILLEN. It is $27,630,000 above the budget.

Mr. GROSS. Did anyone appearing in behalf of the bill attempt to justify that?

Mr. QUILLEN. Yes; they pointed out the urgent need for these funds and said that would be explained on the floor of the House when the bill was taken up for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move

that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16595) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16595, with Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 16595, would authorize appropriations of $525,630,000 for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes. In addition, this bill would authorize the National Science Foundation to spend $2 million in excess foreign currencies for translation of scientific documents and for research support.

Therefore, the total amount which would be provided by this bill for the Foundation's activities in fiscal 1971 is $527,630,000. This is $27,630,000 more than the administration requested.

This authorization does not include the national sea-grant program, which is administered by the National Science Foundation but authorized by another committee.

I should like to briefly describe the activities which will be supported by this budget of $527.6 million:

Support of scientific research, $306 million. This provides for research projects in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering at over 400 colleges and universities in the United States. It makes possible national and special research programs, such as the international biological program, the global atmosphere research program, and the U.S. Antarctic research program. These funds purchase specialized research facilities and equipment for the conduct of certain highly specialized scientific research. And national centers, such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado and the National Radio Astronomy Observatory in West Virginia make available to all qualified U.S. scientists unique facilities which are beyond the capabilities of individual institutions.

Computing activities in research and education, $15 million. These advance the state of the art in computer science, help improve instructional uses of computers, and explore new applications and techniques in the utilization of computers for research purposes.

Institutional support for science, $55.5 million. Institutional development grants strengthen existing centers of science education and develop new ones that will contribute to the solution of problems of national importance. Formula grants to over 600 institutions help maintain the quality of academic science and give university and college administrators an essential margin of control over the science programs on their campuses.

Science education support, $110.4 million. This program has two objectives: the production of scientific and technical manpower for the Nation and the improvement of the quality of science education at all levels. It supports activities at the precollege, undergraduate, and graduate levels. It not only provides training opportunities for students and teachers, but it develops improved courses as well as their related textbooks and teaching aids.

Science information activities, $13 million. This program focuses on the improvement of ways for dissemination of information in the basic disciplines for scientists and engineers.

Support of international cooperative scientific activities, $2.2 million. These help insure adequate participation by U.S. scientists in various international scientific programs.

Support of planning and policy studies, $3,030,000. This program helps develop policies for promoting and utilizing science and science education, especially at the State and local levels.

Program development and management, $20.5 million. These are the general administrative costs of the Foundation.

Excess foreign currencies, $2 million. Will support scientific activities related to research support and translation of scientific information.

Mr. Chairman, this budget has been reviewed in considerable detail. Seven open hearings were held on the substantive issues and the bill was marked up during four executive sessions. Last year the administration requested $487 million of our committee, plus $3 million in excess foreign currencies. After a similar thorough examination we recommended net reductions totaling about $9.4 million. The record clearly shows that the committee not only thoroughly scrutinizes all National Science Foundation programs which come before it, but that it approves only those with demonstrated high merit.

This year the situation with regard to the National Science Foundation has radically changed. We have found demands for new programs at the same time scientific research and training are being cut back drastically by the mission agencies.

Today we see a flight of motivated and talented young people from the physical sciences to the life sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Since 1960, the percentage of first-year graduate students enrolled in scientific and engineering fields has declined from 24 percent of the total to 18 percent.

It is important for us to recognize the need, in my opinion, of maintaining this manpower because it is the manpower that is at the base of the development of our knowledge-producing mechanisms on which the strength of the economic welfare and security of this Nation depends.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, I would be willing to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that NIH, the Department of Defense and NASA have dropped a number of these programs and the researchers that go along with them? So, you in this are adding to the cost of this bill so they can walk across the street and pick up another project?

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, if I might respond to the gentleman, I would say that I do not look at it as though it is a simple matter of people being dropped out of one agency and moving to another.

The Bureau of the Budget recognized the fact that mission-oriented agencies were dropping what they called nonrelevant research. We have argued that out on the floor on many occasions and the RECORD will show that I had some question about whether that strengthens this country or not—in short, my feeling is that it does not. However, it is important. The Bureau of the Budget, in recognition of the fact that there would be an estimated $20 million of such research as the gentleman from Iowa refers to dropped out of the various agencies, had increased the request of the National Science Foundation some $10 million in order to take care of that. That $20 million has grown to somewhere in the area of $60 million to $70 million as we can estimate it. Therefore, we have added $10 million more to take care of the additional $40 million. This follows the same line of reasoning and logic of the Bureau of the Budget. I think it is proper. It is our feeling, as we have investigated it, that this is fundamental basic research which needs to be supported. The sum of $20 million will not by any means allow the National Science Foundation to take over all of them, nor should it. But it will give them an opportunity to take the very best of those activities and we believe it to be proper that this item be supported. That is one of the reasons why we have added these funds, because it does follow the formula established by the Bureau of the Budget, but not in the same percentage amounts.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. I certainly do yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Connecticut did not the Foundation have available for operation on January 1 of this year, 1970, $244 million in funds? And did it not

have available total unexpended funds on that day of $573 million?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if I may reply to the gentleman from Iowa, the funds available to the National Science Foundation that the gentleman from Iowa has referred to are funds which have been committed over a period of time. It is our understanding, after we have looked into this, that the funds will have been completely committed for the purposes of last year's authorization by the end of the fiscal year. This falls in line with the problems that the National Science Foundation has in adjusting itself to an academic year which does not coincide with the fiscal year.

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

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

The dream of the United States maintaining its position of world leadership in all the key fields of science and advanced technology is seriously threatened. Just last week Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's science adviser, estimated that U.S. research support has dropped 30 percent in the last 4 years in "real dollars." This means that we have nearly a third less real effort in science than we did a mere 4 years ago. Dr. DuBridge stated:

> There has been an upswing in other countries in certain areas and we are no longer the leader. Maybe we should get used to this idea.

I, for one, am not ready to accept a second-rate position for U.S. science.

Because of this overwhelming evidence of need for more support for scientific research and training, the committee made five specific changes in the proposed budget. Let me now explain them in more detail, and point out why this is the bare minimum amount which should be authorized for the Foundation during fiscal year 1971.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the questions asked by the gentleman from Iowa, I have already touched on $10 million of the $27.63 million additional that we have asked for. Special hearings on March 19 pointed out the drastic cutback in research and training in areas related to environmental problems. It was also noted how modest percentage cutbacks at the research oriented institutions often cause catastrophic reductions at smaller universities.

The $10 million added by the committee to fund transferred research projects will permit the NSF to support approximately one-third of the high quality research already identified as being dropped by other agencies.

The committee added $4 million for environmental research in Federal laboratories. Building new laboratories to solve each major new problem facing our country is not an efficient way of utilizing limited scientific and fiscal resources. These additional funds will permit an existing competence in Federal laboratories to be brought to bear in multidisciplinary approaches to problems in environmental quality.

In the area of Science Education, the committee made two additions: $9.5 million was added for graduate traineeships, restoring the number of new trainees to the fiscal 1970 level. Had this not been done, the NSF first-year traineeships in over 200 universities would have been completely cancelled. This action only partially stems a current trend to drastically cut back production of trained scientific manpower in this country.

A total of $4 million was added to the college science improvement program, which funds science education in our undergraduate colleges. These are the institutions which have historically furnished a disproportionately large number of undergraduate majors who go on for advanced study. Our addition brings the total for this program to $8 million, still less than was obligated in fiscal year 1969.

The fifth program which was increased by the committee was the State and local intergovernmental science policy planning program. This activity supports projects designed to assist State and local governments in planning for better utilization of science and technology. The increase of $130,000 brings this particular program total to $500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier to the fact that demands for new programs have been coupled with cutbacks in science research and training by the mission agencies. Let me give an example of how these two trends are affecting the National Science Foundation. The budget item, support of scientific research, contains $15 million for the international decade of ocean exploration. This program is a completely new one, and was not requested by the National Science Foundation. It was assigned to NSF for administrative convenience by the Budget Bureau, as a result of international agreements made by our Government. However, the mission agencies are cutting back their support by $60 million in areas covered by this same budget item, support of scientific research.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times recognized the magnitude of the problem we face when it commented editorially last week on what it described as the "research emergency." After describing the disastrous decline of Federal support for research it stated:

> The search for peace and knowledge, the rescue of man's environment and the rebirth of the decaying cities are certain to become illusory goals unless they are pursued with as much hardhitting scholarship and scientific purpose as the perfection of missiles or exploration in space.
>
> The Pentagon has never failed to impress the political leaders with its dependency on the creativity of the ablest minds on campus; it would be a devastating commentary on the nation's values if history were to record that the military establishment was the only dependable patron of American research and scholarship, and that when military support was cut off, scientific research withered and died.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The National Science Foundation, when it was established 20 years ago, was given the primary mission of encouraging and fostering fundamental research and education in the sciences. This must remain its primary goal although the requirements of today and the future can be expected to impose new directions.

Our society today faces crises of environmental quality and social unrest. More and more we need to understand why people do what they do, and we need to assess in advance the consequences of massive deployment of new technologies.

These problems all demand certain new knowledge drawn from virtually all disciplines in the sciences. In other words, to solve the problems of the future we need a multidisciplinary approach.

Beginning in 1965, our Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development worked for 3 years on a plan to more efficiently organize the National Science Foundation so that it could more effectively carry out its programs. This resulted in the National Science Foundation Amendments Act of 1968, Public Law 90–407. This reorganization not only specifically pointed out the need for Foundation involvement in applied research and the social sciences, but more importantly it gave the Foundation a new and strengthened administrative structure to permit it to act out fully its new role.

In the fiscal 1971 budget, we see the quantitative implementation of these new directions for NSF. In addition to projects of high quality basic research, we find the Foundation proposing support for projects of more immediate applicability.

The international biological program has pioneered global action with regard to significant studies of interrelating biological systems. For example, the current study of grasslands is collecting data which will permit careful and efficient management of this type of interacting biological system, so that the proper ecological balance is struck in a manner consistent with economic progress.

The interdisciplinary research related to problems of our society is expected to fund $13 million worth of research identified as not only good science but as significant to society as well.

The institutional support programs of the Foundation are reoriented in order to encourage institutions to respond more effectively to problems of society and the environment.

The new Arctic research program is oriented toward scientific problems related to the ecology of the tundra and related aspects of the Far North.

The earthquake engineering program is designed to gain knowledge about construction methods for buildings in earthquake zones.

In the field of education, there is a new emphasis on the development of science curriculums, and instructional materials, which will strengthen the knowledge of science for the average student. This will complement the highly successful programs in the past oriented toward the exceptional or gifted student.

A new program for highly trained technologists will fill in one of the gaps in American industry for skilled scientific support workers.

Mr. Chairman, these new and expanded programs of the Foundation show that basic and applied research in the sciences can be relevant. Through the support of these and related programs, the Federal Government can save many dollars in implementing new programs for each dollar invested in research. These funds are not consumed for immediate use by the Foundation and its grantees. Rather, they are an investment in the future, with a yield much higher than those obtainable in any financial market. It would be foolish for the Congress not to invest an adequate amount in this venture.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to commend the members of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development on both sides of the aisle, for the great amount of work they performed during the course of the hearings and markup on this bill and for the concern they have had for the welfare of scientific research and education in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to include in the RECORD several brief articles which are germane to the issue being discussed here today, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1970]

RESEARCH EMERGENCY

The critical decline of Federal support for research is disastrous on two levels: it undermines the fiscal health of the nation's universities at a time of spiraling costs and dangerous deficits; and it threatens to retard American intellectual, scientific and technological progress for decades to come. When so seasoned an expert as Dr. James R. Killian Jr. can say flatly that the universities' financial outlook has not been so bleak in 30 years, there is urgent need to review basic policies.

Two related factors conspire to turn the situation into a national emergency. What had already been a gradual slowdown in Federal spending turned into fiscal rout last year, with the result that even the Administration's present request for full funding of the National Science Foundation would barely keep pace with inflationary costs. In any event, this sum falls far short of paying for the research eliminated under the new Congressional prohibition against use of Defense Department funds for contracts not directly related to military purposes.

The irony is that although the prohibition was aimed at least in part at preventing military contracts from distorting campus research, it is non-military research that will be the victim. It would indeed be shameful if science and technology, which were lavishly supported so long as they seemed a boon to national defense, were to be put in cold storage just as national priorities demanded that they be harnessed for missions of peace and social progress.

The search for peace and knowledge, the rescue of man's environment and the rebirth of the decaying cities are certain to become illusory goals unless they are pursued with as much hardhitting scholarship and scientific purpose as the perfection of missiles or exploration in space.

The Pentagon has never failed to impress the political leaders with its dependence on the creativity of the ablest minds on campus; it would be a devastating commentary on the nation's values if history were to record that the military establishment was the only dependable patron of American research and scholarship, and that when military support was cut off, scientific research withered and died.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 8, 1970]

SEED-MONEY LACK COULD SLOW ECONOMY

(By William Hines)

"A slowsort of country!" said the Queen. 'Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!' "

The Queen in Lewis Carroll's "Through the Looking Glass" would have felt right at home in the federal capital this past week, curled up with a brown-covered book entitled, "The Budget of the United States Government—Fiscal Year 1971."

From start to finish, but nowhere more clearly than in the parts related to science and technology, the book gave evidence that here, too, is a country where merely running as fast as you can does little good.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, President Nixon's science adviser, faced this fact squarely at a briefing before the budget went to Capitol Hill. Pointing out that in terms of dollars the $17 billion research and development (R&D) program for fiscal '71 is about the same as that for fiscal '68, Du Bridge commented:

"Really, it's maybe a 15 percent decrease in level of effort from 68 because of rising costs. There's no question about it."

Even the fact that basic and applied research (as distinguished from that vastly more costly category, development) received a slight increase in '71 over '70 does not give an accurate picture of what is going on. The 5.5 percent boost in research money was gobbled up by a 6.5 percent rise in prices. Actually, then, there will be less government-sponsored research done in '71 than in the current fiscal year.

This is not solely Richard Nixon's doing because the lean years for R&D began in Lyndon Johnson's time after seven fat years, largely sparked by moon and missile projects. New money for R&D peaked in the period 1964–68, the exact year depending on how one views the budgetary picture.

In terms of dollar outlays authorized, R&D funding reached its apogee in fiscal 1968. But with the dollars adjusted to a constant (1957–59) value to account for inflation, the peak occurred in 1967. And, expressed as a percentage of the total budget, emphasis on R&D as a government activity peaked in 1965.

Basic research—which President Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said "is when you don't know what you're doing"—is still on the way up when reckoned in inflated dollars, but on a constant-dollar basis the summit was reached three years ago.

There is no question that for a while in the mid-sixties R&D was overfed. Witness fiscal 1965, when 12.6 percent of the budget went into this pigeonhole, mostly for hardware development.

The point at which obesity ends and malnutrition sets in is not easy to determine in advance, or even for that matter in a post-mortem examination. But there can be little doubt that, as far as the federal feeding of science is concerned, the hungry years are here. How long they will last probably not even President Nixon knows.

Basic research is the seed money of economic growth, applied research is the fertilizer development activity is the farm machinery, the national economy is the planted acreage—and the gross national product (GNP) is the harvested crop. Any dirt farmer knows that the worst place to economize is on seed.

Yet this is what has been happening for several years now, even as the GNP has continued to grow. In terms of real buying power—constant dollars—the level of federal support for basic research has grown very little in the past five years. The outlay for basic research in fiscal 1967 was the constant-dollar equivalent of 1.9 million. The best estimate of Nixon's basic-research request for fiscal 1971 is $2 million, again in constant dollars.

The GNP harvest has been good up to now, and the fields from which it is gathered are broader than ever. But the money for seed is no more plentiful than four or five years ago, when the acreage was smaller.

This means one of two things: Either the seed's quality will be maintained and it will be sowed more sparsely, or a lower-grade seed will be substituted so as to keep up the quantity sowed on each acre. Either way, there is a very real danger of skimpy GNP harvests in future years because of failure of basic research to keep step with the growth of the national economy.

[From Science Magazine, Apr. 3, 1970]

NSF BUDGET: HOUSE GROUP REACTS TO DATA ON PLIGHT OF SCIENCE

(By Philip M. Boffey)

Complaints that recent budget cuts are inflicting great damage on the American scientific establishment seem to have moved the House Science and Astronautics Committee last week to recommend that the National Science Foundation be allocated $27.6 million *more* for the next fiscal year than the Nixon Administration had requested. The committee approved a budget authorization of $527.6 million for NSF in fiscal 1971 instead of only $500 million as proposed in the President's budget. That authorization would finance all NSF activities except the national sea grant program which is covered by separate legislation. The action, though not unprecedented, was unusual. Congressional committees generally cut the President's budget request—they seldom recommend an increase.

The science committee's recommendation does not ensure that NSF will actually receive an unexpected bundle of money. Three other committees—the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee—must still take action on the NSF budget, and the appropriations committees have generally been rather hard-nosed toward NSF. Last year, for example, NSF ended up getting about $60 million less than the highest figure recommended by one of the committees. Nevertheless, the science committee's action is a significant indication that some congressmen are now convinced that American science is indeed in trouble.

The committee's action was based on recommendations by its Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, headed by Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario (D–Conn.). The Daddario subcommittee, in the course of 7 days of hearings on the NSF budget, developed some of the "hardest" information yet available on the current plight of American science. The subcommittee concluded, for example, that various federal "mission agencies"—primarily the Defense Department, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Institutes of Health—are terminating almost $60 million worth of research projects at the nation's universities either because of budgetary stringencies or because of a new attitude fostered by the so-called Mansfield amendment that basic research must be closely related to an agency's mission. The subcommittee also came up with figures indicating that the number of first-year graduate students receiving federal fellowships and traineeships will drop by a precipitous 50 percent between fiscal year 1970 and fiscal 1971.

SCIENCE ON THE RACK

On the more subjective and emotional side, the subcommittee heard testimony from academic scientists at first- and second-rank institutions who alleged that good students

are being driven away from science and that good facilities are going to waste. "I think we understand the belt tightening but generally a belt is pulled up rather gently rather than rapidly like a medieval rack" complained Thomas F. Jones Jr. president of the University of South Carolina and a member of the National Science Board the policy-making body for NSF.

One great problem in assessing the current budget situation is the dearth of hard quantitative information. As Daddario complained in a recent speech: "No one really knows what is going on right now." Daddario said that various mission agencies have been reducing their support of academic science and basic research in recent years and that this has increased the pressure upon NSF to provide support for the projects that are being cut off by other agencies. Daddario's subcommittee, in pondering the NSF budget request this year, decided to "quantify the problem" by asking the various agencies to indicate what academic science projects they are dropping during fiscal years 1970 and 1971 because of budget restrictions. * * * "But what answer did we receive? Well 1968 data was available and complete. 1969 data was beginning to be available, and some agencies were able to provide it. With regard to 1970 and '71 data we were asked to wait a couple of years."

Nevertheless, the subcommittee, with the help of NSF, pieced together some data that indicates the magnitude of the budgetary problem facing science in general and NSF in particular. The subcommittee came up with what it regards as a "conservative estimate" that mission agencies during fiscal 1970 and 1971 will drop $57.9 million worth of academic research projects which can probably be expected to appeal to NSF for support. The projects are those which had previously been funded by the mission agencies but which the agencies plan to drop or sharply reduce in fiscal 1971 because of budgetary problems. The subcommittee estimates that the Defense Department will drop $23.1 million worth, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will drop $22 million, the Atomic Energy Commission $8.6 million, the National Institutes of Health $3.8 million, and the Office of Saline Water, $400,000.

MYSTERY AT NIH

The subcommittee's estimates are based partly on data received from the agencies through official channels, and partly on information supplied by "reliable sources" familiar with the various agencies. In some cases the estimates are probably low. The NIH, for example, for reasons that are baffling to officials elsewhere in the government, apparently won't tell anyone what it is doing. Thus the $3.8 million estimate for research dropped by NIH is largely based on information about NIH projects that have already approached NSF for support. Subcommittee staff members believe the estimate is conservative and that additional NIH cuts may ultimately come to light.

Only a small part of the decline in mission agency support seems to have been caused directly by the Mansfield amendment, which prohibits the Defense Department from supporting any research that does not have "a direct or apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation." The subcommittee, using figures supplied by DOD, reports that the Mansfield amendment is forcing the military agencies to drop about $8.2 million in basic research at the universities during fiscal year 1971. All the remainder of the $57.9 million in research being dropped consists of projects that are being cut for budgetary reasons or because various agencies have adopted the "philosophy" of the Mansfield amendment even though they are not directly affected by it, subcommittee staff members say.

The subcommittee has also collected estimates which reveal a sharp decline in the number of new traineeships and fellowships awarded to graduate science students by nine major federal agencies. In fiscal year 1969 there were 6515 new awards; in fiscal year 1970 there were 6012; and for fiscal year 1971, the Nixon budget would support only 3069, a drop of almost 50 percent in just one year. The totals do not include Public Health Service training grants, for which no firm figures are available.

Within those total figures, the number of new fellows and trainees supported by NSF will drop by almost two-thirds, from 2772 in fiscal 1970 to 1000 in fiscal 1971; the number supported by the Office of Education will drop by one-half, from 1653 to 825; and the number supported by the National Institutes of Mental Health will drop by two-thirds, from 416 to 133. NASA, which supported 420 individuals in fiscal 1969, will not support a single one in 1971; and the AEC, which supported 233 in fiscal 1969, will support only 160 in 1971. No up-to-date figures are available for NIH, which had already experienced a steep drop from 650 in fiscal 1969 to 100 in fiscal 1970.

ACADEMIC WOES

In an effort to further document the damage being done, the subcommittee held a special day of hearings to take testimony from four academic leaders. The testimony, not surprisingly, was anguished and full of dire predictions about the decline of American scientific eminence.

One theme that dominated the testimony was that budgetary stringencies and other factors are causing some of the very ablest students to abandon or shy away from science. Benjamin Lax, director of the National Magnet Lab at MIT, reported that "one of the most brilliant" graduate students at MIT recently came into his office seeking advice because the student now "wants to leave physics and possibly go into humanities." Lax said the student was responding not only to the financial squeeze but also to the general "disenchantment" with science and the general "misconceptions" about the lack of relevance of scientific studies. "Even talented people like this do not feel in 4 years when they graduate they will have jobs or opportunity to make a significant contribution," Lax said. "It takes 4 or 5 years to get a degree . . . And now what is going to happen is youngsters like this one will change or will not go into the sciences. Five years from now we are going to have a shortage."

Ivan L. Bennett, Jr., director of the New York University Medical Center, told of similar feelings among students at the medical school he heads. Bennett said that NYU had pioneered a program that enables students to receive a combined M.D. and Ph.D. degree, and that the success of this program was reflected in the fact that NYU, over the past decade, has graduated the largest number of students who go on to become full-time faculty members in other medical schools. The program thus enables students to pursue careers in scientific research instead of medical practice. But Bennett said that about 6 months ago the present group of M.D.–Ph.D. candidates asked to meet with him for discussions. "There were several of these very gifted young men who were seriously considering dropping the Ph.D. part of the program," Bennett said. "The reason was not that they felt they could contribute to society by practicing medicine . . . It was simply because they looked about and saw the young members of our faculty finding increasing difficulty in obtaining support for their own scientific work, and wondered whether they were not preparing for careers that really would be obsolete by the time they were prepared to do this. It is a very serious problem.

A second theme of the tesimony was that financial stringencies have largely crippled certain laboratories, including some with outstanding reputations and others of lesser rank. Lax asserted that the National Magnet Lab which he heads at MIT is currently being used at only one-eighth of its potential capability. He said the laboratory was forced to cut its operating time in half because of budget cuts this past year. He also said the laboratory has virtually eliminated its program for visiting scientists (there were 100 visitors in 1969), and has dropped most of its postdoctoral programs. To make matters worse, the Air Force, because of the Mansfield amendment, has decided to terminate its support of the laboratory and has asked NSF to pick up the tab. Lax claimed the U.S. is in danger of losing its leadership in magnetic studies. "Our success at our laboratory has spurred the French, the Dutch, and the Germans to duplicate our facility," he said. "The Russians are proposing an even larger one. The Dutch have requested us to build a magnet which takes advantages of our latest developments. If we do this, this will put them abreast of us or possibly ahead of us. If the National Science Foundation does not take on the responsibility and support of our version of this advanced project, we will definitely relinquish our leadership within 2 or 3 years."

Lax also said the Haystack facility at MIT, which he described as "one of the best radio astronomy tools in the United States and in the world," will be "irretrievably lost" unless new sources of financial support are found to replace support which is being withdrawn by the Air Force. And he said that an interdisciplinary space science center which involves 16 departments at MIT, has had its budget cut in half over the past few years. The center's general research program, which totaled about $1 million a few years ago, will be completely dropped in 1972, leaving only some hardware projects.

LESSER INSTITUTIONS HURT

If the situation, as painted by Lax, seemed dire at a prestigious institution like MIT, it seemed close to catastrophic at an institution of the second rank, such as the University of South Carolina. Thomas Jones, president of the latter university, warned that the budget squeeze will be "especially hurtful to those states most in need of development." When federal agencies terminate their support, Jones said, "a ripple, then a wave, goes down through the pecking order of institutions as they scramble to find new resources of support. The lesser institutions experience an acceleration and disappearance of funds and . . . return to the second-hand spectator-type science that characterized those institutions prior to World War II." Jones said the amount of science support at his own institution in fiscal 1970 would probably be about half that of fiscal 1969.

Although some leaders of the scientific establishment have suggested that, in a time of financial crisis, the top-ranking institutions should be favored and the lesser institutions allowed to wither, Jones took a contrary view. "One might conclude these less than superb institutions are not really important to science in our nation," he said. "But let me say, nothing could be further from the truth. The future economic health of our nation depends on at least one institution that is excellent in science in every state in our nation." Jones said an institution within a state has a more profound influence on the local school systems, local industry, and the setting of goals for its young citizens than does a prestigious out-of-state school.

INFLUX OF FOREIGNERS?

One ironic result of the budget stringencies, according to some witnesses, is that

foreigners are now often in a better position to make use of American facilities than our own citizens are. Charles L. Hosler, dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Pennsylvania State University, testified: "In my own college I find it interesting that the number of postdoctoral fellows we can support from within the United States has diminished and yet we have had a great influx of people from Europe and behind the Iron Curtain." He said the foreigners have come from such countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Japan, Germany, Korea, China, India, Ghana, Liberia, and Nigeria. "Many of these we don't have to provide any support for at all," he said. "They would be willing to come if we give them the physical facilities and the ability to associate with the personnel we have on board." Hosler also said Penn State has "two departments in which we don't have any American graduate students—we have only foreign graduate students."

The academic witnesses appearing before the Daddario subcommittee seemed especially upset at the way in which budget cuts have been made. Jones, the University of South Carolina president, complained that the government's budget-cutting exercise has been "almost impulsive" and has reflected "a considerable degree of arbitrariness." He added: "We are sufficiently near to virtually a catastrophe which will be felt for two decades that we need here and now to make some orderly plan for a transition of funds from mission agencies to an agency or agencies that would look after the health of science, and in particular where there have to be cuts, they should be programmed in such a way that they don't hit all at once, so that your society or people or institutions can program the adjustments."

Similar rhetoric had been heard before, but the significant thing was that the Daddario subcommittee obviously bought it. The subcommittee recommended five specfic increases in the NSF budget, and it particularly emphasized the need to support the education of young scientists and the need to continue projects that are being dropped by the mission agencies.

Specifically, the subcommittee recommended that:

Funds for graduate traineeships, which are awarded to over 200 universities which in turn select the recipients, be increased by $9.5 million. The Nixon Administration planned to eliminate all new NSF traineeships in fiscal 1971, but the committee recommendation would restore the program to the level of the current year.

$10 million be added to support academic science projects being terminated by the mission agencies. The Budget Bureau had earlier allocated $10 million to NSF to support such projects, so the committee's recommendation would give NSF $20 million, or enough to support about one-third of the estimated $60 million in projects that are being terminated.

$4 million be added to the College Science Improvement Program, which seeks to upgrade science instruction at the undergraduate level.

$4 million be added to support environmental research in the federal laboratories.

$130,000 be added to assist state and local governments to plan for better utilization of science and technology.

Despite the committee's recommendations, it seems unlikely, in a year when there is such emphasis on the need to curb expenditures in order to fight inflation, that NSF will actually end up being allowed to spend more than the President requested. But leaders of the scientific community can take some consolation that their cries are being heard, and heeded, in at least some segments of the Congress.

[From Physics Today, May, 1970]

"SECTION 203" COMPOUNDS RESEARCH-FUNDING SQUEEZE

The Mansfield amendment—known for short as "Section 203"—in the 1970 Defense Appropriations Act (PHYSICS TODAY, February, page 63), along with continuing contractions in government research funding, is generating concern and confusion in Congress, in the agencies supporting research (not only in the Defense Department), and among scientists. Section 203 aims at restricting Defense-supported research to projects clearly related to military needs, but its effects appear to be spreading to other agencies.

Recently Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario identified several physics laboratories as particularly hard-hit by the overall financial squeeze, particularly from the effects of Section 203. These are: MIT's Francis Bitter National Magnet Laboratory and its Haystack radar-radio astronomy facility, the Princeton-Pennsylvania Accelerator, the Cambridge Electron Accelerator, and Florida State's Tandem Van de Graaff accelerator. In addition Cornell's Arecibo Ionospheric Observatory has been hard-hit.

Congressional concern with Section 203 has emerged mainly through the work of Daddario and his Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. In fiscal-year 1971 budget authorization hearings for the National Science Foundation, the Daddario subcommittee has examined implications of research funding cuts and the particular effects of Section 203. NSF is centrally involved: It is the one agency clearly chartered to support basic research, and everyone looks to it when cuts occur in Defense and elsewhere.

A 25 February report of the Daddario subcommittee's Research Management Advisory Panel deals with *Mission Agency Support of Basic Research*. The Panel urges the government to consider carefully the potentially disruptive effects of a restrictive interpretation of Section 203. Among its recommendations: The government should administer compliance with Section 203 to allow alternative support for individual scientists and projects. Section 203 should not result in termination of near-complete projects or disruption of competent research teams. When Section 203 unavoidably leads to discontinued support for a project, reasonable advance notice and terminal funding of perhaps one year should be given. The Budget Bureau and the President's Office of Science and Technology should prepare a plan for supporting high-quality research projects in the national interest that are dropped by Defense because of Section 203 (but this should not be done at the expense of present NSF programs).

In a statement on 4 March, Daddario commented on the Research Management Advisory Panel's report. His subcommittee, he said, has "been very concerned about the derailment of basic research support by the mission agencies. We have been acutely conscious of the problem since part of our legislative responsibility is the National Science Foundation, and because the Foundation has been under great pressures to take on many of the good research projects being abandoned by the mission agencies. The Foundation has been able to take up some slack, but relatively little. It doesn't have the budget to handle that need."

Daddario deplored "our myopic preoccupation with budget figures, and the manner in which the mission agencies are beginning to respond to 203." He listed the physics installations noted above, and other research areas and facilities already damaged by fund cuts. On the list: Sharp DOD and NASA cuts in radio astronomy and seismology, NIH cuts in organic chemistry and biology, NASA elimination of its sustaining university program, drastic cuts in federally supported predoctoral training and fellowship programs, and about 25 astronomy programs, dropped by DOD and other agencies, which NSF has adopted (or is expected to take on) since fiscal 1969.

NSF authorization hearings held on 19 March focused on the implications of research fundings cuts and Section 203. The Daddario subcommittee heard statements from: Ivan L. Bennett, Director of New York University's Medical Center; Charles L. Hosler, Dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Pennsylvania State University; Thomas Jones, President of the University of South Carolina; Benjamin Lax, MIT physics professor and director of the Francis Bitter National Magnet Laboratory.

Hosler emphasized the importance of higher education and research in advancing social well-being and economic growth. On the economic issue he suggested, among other things, that over the productive life of an individual, an advanced technical degree would effectively return an additional $100,000 in taxes to governments alone, for an initial investment of perhaps $20,000. Hosler stressed the interdependence of higher education and research, and the impossibility of carrying on these activities on an on-and-off basis. His remarks stimulated questions and discussion at the hearings.

In discussing the situation at the Magnet Lab, Lax noted ironically AFOSR's (Air Force Office of Scientific Research) former enthusiastic support for advancing the state of the art in magnet technology; such work is no longer "relevant" under Section 203. He observed that the French, Dutch and Germans are now building similar magnet laboratories, and the Russians are proposing a larger one. "Unless the National Science Foundation takes on the responsibility for the [Magnet Lab] facility and supports our version of such an advanced project, we will relinquish the leadership we have worked so hard to attain."

To illustrate that "pure" science in an interdisciplinary setting leads to results of practical, social importance, Lax took his Magnet Lab as one example. At MIT, research in magnet technology and in plasma physics is contributing to an AEC-supported controlled-thermonuclear experiment. The search for a magnetic monopole has resulted in techniques for removing pollutants from air and water. The Magnet Lab is working with medical researchers on neurosurgical procedures, magnetoencephalography and magnetocardiography, and cardiac defibrillation.

Lax also noted the impending shutdown of the Haystack facility and the curtailed funding of MIT's Space Science Center. The latter is an interdisciplinary laboratory with participation from sixteen MIT departments. Its general research funds are expected to drop from $1 million to zero in 1972; this will sharply reduce the Center's *scientific* space projects.

AFFECTED LABORATORIES

Lax told Physics Today that, with some small cuts that had been expected, but largely because of Section 203, the Magnet Lab's annual funding from AFOSR dropped at the beginning of this year from $2.4 to $1.8 million. At the later figure the Lab is operating at about one-half shift, almost no money is available for graduate and postdoctoral research support or for visiting researchers, and further staff cuts impend. Lax declared that over the years AFOSR has done a "superb job" in helping the Magnet Lab to become a unique national facility. Now, because of Section 203, AFOSR cannot support the Lab as such a facility. In a letter to NSF Director William McElroy, Air Force Assistant Secretary (for Research and Develop-

ment) Hansen has asked NSF to assume this responsibility.

The MIT Lincoln Laboratory's Haystack radar and radio astronomy facility will have to shut down on 1 July unless new funding sources can be found, reports Lincoln Director Milton Clauser. Haystack, built in the early 1960's for $20 million, has had an operating budget of about $1.5 million, very largely from the Air Force, for the last two years. Primarily as a result of Section 203, this funding must now be cut to zero; whether or to what extent NSF or NASA can keep Haystack operating is so far unclear. Haystack's 250–300 kilowatt at X-band complement Arecibo and Goldstone. Recently, under an NSF grant obtained with the cooperation of the 13-university Northeast Radio Observatory Corporation (NEROC), Haystack has increased its operating schedule from 40 to 120 hours a week. As a national facility, it now serves NEROC and is available to the US astronomy community.

The AEC-supported Princeton-Pennsylvania Accelerator has had its operating budget cut from $4.0 million in fiscal year 1970 to $2.0 million in fiscal 1971 and zero in fiscal 1972 (see page 55). AEC has cut the Cambridge Electron Accelerator budget from $3.5 million to $2.4 million; the present staff of 180 will be cut to 112 in July (see page 55).

At Florida State, after about 10 years of steady support, the Air Force is cutting by about ⅔ its funding of the Tandem Van de Graaff Accelerator Program. Robert H. Davis, the program's Principal Scientist, told Physics Today that, under a planned phasing down begun two years ago, AFOSR support has declined from about $440,000 in fiscal 1968 to $320,000 this year, with $150,000 expected for fiscal 1972. NSF supports nuclear-theory work related to the Accelerator Program, but NSF and AEC have not been able to take up the much larger experimental funding slack as had been expected. The impact of Section 203 remains to be seen. The cuts in research support come at a particularly inopportune time: With an NSF Science Development grant awarded two years ago, Florida State is just now replacing its 10-year-old 6-MeV-terminal Van de Graaff with a new 9-MeV machine, and the Air Force has recently made available to the Program an XDS–9300 computer.

Funds for Cornell University's Arecibo Observatory, in Puerto Rico, are now about 20% below what is needed for full utilization of the world's largest radio-radar telescope. But because of the high fixed operating and maintenance costs, Frank Drake, head of Arecibo's Ithaca group and Associate Director of Cornell's Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, estimates that this funding gap means in fact a 50% loss in scientific output. The Observatory expects about $2 million for 1970, largely from NSF. But the termination, as a result of Section 203, of relatively small AFOSR and ONR contracts will seriously curtail pulsar and quasar research. Present money limits also prevent the introduction of needed low-noise and maser equipment, and other steps to upgrade the overall facility. The Observatory has been in operation since 1964 for work in ionospheric physics, planetary radar and radio astronomy. Most of the money for a recommended resurfacing of the main "dish," firmly estimated at $4.2 million, is included in the fiscal 1971 NSF budget. But Congress specifically rejected this item for fiscal 1970; so far Arecibo's scientists are "hopeful" for 1971.

These several examples are probably representative of the current money problems of many physics research projects. Particularly serious is the fact that cuts in the 10–40% range may very disproportionately hurt "good science," even though there is enough money to keep the project going at some minimal level. This is especially likely for research that depends on expensive equipment, where operating costs—"just keeping the tubes warm"—consume most of the budget.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1970]

DUBRIDGE SAYS U.S. SLIPS IN SCIENCE

(By Richard D. Lyons)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Dr. Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's science adviser, said today that cuts in Federal funds for research might turn the United States into a second-class nation in some scientific fields.

"There has been an upswing in other countries in certain areas and we are no longer the leader," Dr. DuBridge said, adding, "maybe we should get used to this idea."

He cited both radio and optical astronomy as fields in which "we have slipped back." He named West Germany, Japan, Britain and the Netherlands as countries that have been gaining on the United States in some scientific areas.

"This is not the policy of the Administration," he said. "The policy of the Administration is balancing the budget."

Dr. DuBridge spoke at a symposium on "the crisis in the Federal funding of science" during the 107th annual meeting of the National Acadamy of Sciences. He amplified his remarks at a news conference.

The 300 distinguished scientists attending the meeting were not cheered as half a dozen speakers issued gloomy forecasts on the prospects for more Federal money for research in the next few years.

LACK OF SUPPORT CHARGED

As the academy met, the House of Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development issued a 55-page report accusing the Administration of failing to support science.

"U.S. science is faltering at a time when the problems of the environment, national security, population control, urban unrest and worldwide education and development demand new ideas," said Representative Emilio O. Daddario, chairman of the subcommittee.

The Connecticut Democrat added that "we must take steps now to insure the most efficient use of our resources and the most economical utilization of our manpower if this demand is to be met."

The subcommittee's report urged the creation of a unified science agency, to be called the National Institutes of Research and Advanced Studies, that would be a reconstruction of the National Science Foundation with the addition of arms of other departments.

Several speakers at the National Academy of Sciences symposium stressed that the nation's scientific establishment was suffering from a crisis in leadership and purpose, as well as money.

URGES SPENDING PRIORITIES

Patrick E. Haggerty, board chairman of Texas Instruments Inc. of Dallas, aid the nation needed to define scientific priorities and adapt its spending to them. The current system is hit and miss and the results the same, he said.

Mr. Haggerty, who is a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, said the President and Congress would have to take part in the creation of a national science policy.

Discussing reductions in Federal support for research, Mr. Haggerty said the United States was "not going to dominate science in the world the way we used to, and that may be a change for the better."

"We simply can't be first in everything," he said.

Dr. Philip Abelson of the Carnegie Institution said American scientific research efforts had dropped 30 per cent in the last three years because of the attrition in Federal support.

"If we continue to cut down at 10 per cent a year the United States is going to be a second-class nation in scientific enterprise," he said.

Dr. DuBridge said the administration would add more research money in its budget for the fiscal year 1972. But other speakers asserted that the increase, about $116-million, would only offset the inflationary factors of the last year or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 16595.

Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult, indeed, to overstate the importance to our country of H.R. 16595, to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation. Since 1950, the National Science Foundation has grown in scope and has become a key part of our U.S. Government's activities in scientific research. This emphasis on research is the reflection of what is happening in our changing society and what has happened in research programs since 1950 when the Foundation was established. It underscores the fundamental fact that science is the root of the technology upon which our social progress and our basic survival as a people depends today. Scientific research is also the principal sinew of our U.S. strength to maintain its position of leadership in the Western World. The funds in this bill will help to maintain U.S. preeminence in science and technology.

The National Science Foundation requested from this committee the authorization of $500 million for fiscal year 1971 programs, including $2 million in excess foreign currencies. After exhaustive review by the Science and Astronautics Committee, it was determined that there was a need for specific changes in the authorization, resulting in an increase of $27,630,000 over the administration's request. Therefore, the total recommended for authorization for fiscal year 1971 is $527,630,000.

Mr. Chairman, before I describe in detail the reasons for the actions taken by our committee to add $27.6 million to this budget, let me highlight the major items included in the Foundation's proposed fiscal year 1971 program.

SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The major part of the Foundation's program is for support of scientific research, for which the Foundation plans to allocate $306 million in fiscal year 1971.

Today we find that many of the by-products of our technologically based society have polluted our environment. We are beginning to assess the consequences to mankind of the inability of the environment to handle the products of this technology and the world's burgeoning population. The challenge is to find ways to improve environmental quality without making a corresponding reduction in our standard of living.

The administration of funds for the

support of scientific research activity contributes in a number of ways to the broad mission. The first and most obvious of these is through the contribution of new knowledge. To qualify for support from the Foundation, the research undertaking must give promise of adding significantly to our understanding of environmental processes, basic natural phenomena or laws, man, or the societies and institutions created by him. In the long run, many of these research efforts will contribute to the development of new technology and possibly illuminate pathways toward the solution of major problems of our society.

The support of scientific research also serves a second function in that it is only through the performance of meritorious research that the Nation's present population of mature scientists and faculty members can maintain a state of readiness to respond to national needs.

A third and very important way in which the support of scientific research contributes to our broad goals is through the training of advanced young people to the highest educational levels in science. This is done toward the end of their academic careers by involving them directly in the performance of research under the guidance of faculty scientists.

The major part, about 65 percent, or $200 million, of the $306 million requested for the support of scientific research is planned for scientific research project support.

Proposals for scientific research project support submitted in behalf of scientists on faculties of universities and colleges and other appropriate institutions throughout the country suggest ways for advancing the state of our understanding of specific areas of science. The proposals are competitively evaluated by scientists in the particular field or fields concerned and grants are awarded primarily on the basis of the scientific merit of the research proposed.

In fiscal year 1971 funds will go toward the pursuit of research in 10 major areas of science, including the following: atmospheric sciences, earth sciences, oceanography, biological sciences, physics, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics, social sciences, and engineering.

Also included is $10 million for support of scientific research projects that may have to be transferred to the Foundation from mission-oriented agencies, especially the Department of Defense.

Funds amounting to $6.2 million will go to the specialized research facilities and equipment program which has as its purpose the provision of those facilities and equipment which institutions require for the conduct of highly specialized scientific research. Examples of facilities provided are controlled-environment biological laboratories, nuclear accelerating and off-campus research facilities. Equipment support is provided where a special research tool is needed by several investigators at an institution, such as, electron microscopes, mass spectrometers, and cryogenic equipment. The availability of these facilities and equipment items enables research scientists to be more productive as well as making possible the conduct of some scientific investigations which would otherwise not be possible.

In addition, $63 million has been allocated for national and special research programs, which are aimed at specific geographical areas, at projects requiring coordinated planning and funding on a national basis or involving international cooperation, at special problems in one or more fields of science where research results are most likely to have a significant beneficial impact on problems of society, or at research programs that require special logistic support or which have unusual management requirements.

In fiscal year 1971, the Foundation plans to initiate an Arctic research program, an earthquake engineering program, and the international decade of ocean exploration—IDOE—program. The Foundation has been designated as the lead Federal agency for both the Arctic research program and the IDOE. In addition, the Foundation has incorporated the program of interdisciplinary research relevant to problems of our society under this subactivity.

Other major programs in this category include the international biological program—IBP—global atmospheric research program—GARP—weather modification program, ocean sediment coring program, and U.S. Antarctic research program.

The last major program category under support of scientific research is $36.8 million for support for the development and operation of national research centers established to meet national needs for research in specific areas of science requiring facilities, equipment, staffing, and operational support which are beyond the financial capabilities of private or State institutions and which would not appropriately be provided to a single institution to the exclusion of others. Unlike many federally sponsored research laboratories, the NSF-supported national research centers do not perform specific research tasks assigned by or for the direct benefit of the Government. They are established and supported for the purpose of making available, to all qualified U.S. scientists, the facilities, equipment, skilled personnel support, and other resources required for the performance of independent research of their own choosing, in the applicable areas of science.

In recent years, the Foundation has supported three astronomy centers—Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, Kitt Peak National Observatory, and National Radio Astronomy Observatory—and one atmospheric research center—National Center for Atmospheric Research. In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation assumed principal funding responsibility for the Arecibo Ionospheric Observatory, in Puerto Rico, and established it as a fifth NSF-sponsored national research center under the designation of Arecibo Observatory. This Observatory was built with funds provided by the Department of Defense—DOD—and, prior to fiscal year 1970, principal funding support was furnished by DOD.

COMPUTING ACTIVITIES IN RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

The objectives of these programs are to advance the state of the art in computer science; to help improve instructional uses of computers in disciplines most ready for innovation; to promote multi-institutional cooperation in computing activities; to explore new applications, new techniques for training, and imaginative uses of computers; and to evaluate the benefits and potential implications of projects that could affect the continuing evolution of the programs. $15 million is included.

The money requested for special computer services for research and science education will enable the Foundation to encourage multi-institutional sharing of resources to meet growing computing requirements. Remote access to a powerful off-campus computer will provide an alternative to continued expansion of more of their own computing resources to educational objectives.

The research and educational activities program will provide support for research projects designed to advance the state of the art to contribute to fundamental understanding of the potential and the limitations of computers; to help improve instructional uses of computers; to promote experiments in multi-institutional cooperation in computer-oriented educational projects and to explore new applications and new methods of training.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR SCIENCE

Responding to the Foundation's statutory responsibility to strengthen the basic research and science education capabilities of the Nation's institutions of higher education, two programs are directed to support of the educational and research needs of the institution as an entity. Support for this program totals $55.5 million.

One of these programs, science development, has as its primary objectives: First, strengthening the base of science and engineering in the principal institutions and regions of the Nation, with major emphasis on undergraduate and graduate education and research; and, second, strengthening existing centers or areas of science and engineering and, where necessary, developing new ones that will contribute to the solution of problems of national importance.

The second of these programs, institutional grants for science, provides grants for discretionary use by the Nation's institutions of higher education. These grants are intended to help maintain the quality of academic science at institutions that have shown strength in research or research training and, at the same time, to safeguard institutional autonomy through restoring initiative and decisionmaking to the local scene.

SCIENCE EDUCATION SUPPORT

The National Science Foundation's science education support program totals $110.4 million. It has two objectives.

The first objective is the production of scientific and technical manpower to meet the Nation's needs.

The second objective is the improvement of the quality of the science educa-

tion programs for all students at all levels as an aid to strengthening scientific research potential.

Support of these objectives is guided by the concept of using the minimum of Federal funds to gain maximum effects by applying such funds to the types of program activity which hold promise of exerting significant leverage for change in a vast system. This concept is illustrated by the NSF fiscal year 1971 program as compared with the total fiscal year 1971 outlays for education.

Several significant factors, indicative of change in NSF's education activity, were considered in developing the fiscal year 1971 program. Among these are:

The continuing need for scientifically trained personnel in our technically oriented society.

The reduced relative priority of producing researchers but the increased priority of producing skilled technologists to support researchers and the needs of industry.

The increasing importance of affording a good education in the sciences to all students for whatever their eventual role to support a technically oriented society.

The growing importance of developing individuals within educational institutions and systems who are thoroughly knowledgeable about new developments in science education, how to choose among these and put them to work in their own settings, and how to develop improvements in their own institutions.

For fiscal year 1971, the science education support program activities have been grouped into three categories; namely, student development, instructional development, and instructional program development.

SCIENCE INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

The Foundation's science information program has, over the past several years, focused its principal support on the improvement and development of information services to scientists and engineers in the basic disciplines such as chemistry, physics, psychology, mathematics, earth sciences, and others. The success of this development is marked by increased capability of the professional societies that provide these information services to utilize modern computers to expand and improve the efficiency and adequacy of their products. In fiscal year 1970, a number of these services were able to channel their products to users on university campuses and in industry where similar computer facilities are available to exploit this growing information resource in a more responsive and useful fashion.

The science information research and development activities that yielded this improvement will continue to be supported in fiscal year 1971. Greater emphasis should be placed on fostering services tailored to the needs of individual scientists in the university environment, and on developing the potential of the discipline-oriented information systems to aid applied research which focuses on society's problems.

The demands on scientific information services necessitate both an increase in size of operation and a change to more sophisticated processing methods. Scientific information services must cope not only with a rapidly increasing information store, but also with a rapidly increasing and more diversified user community. A total of $13 million is included for this program.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES

The Foundation's international cooperative scientific activities help insure adequate participation of U.S. scientists and scientific organizations in international scientific activities. A total of $2.2 million is included. Activities are conducted through three programs:

First. Cooperative science programs which support exchanges of U.S. and foreign scientists to strengthen U.S. science. These programs also include support for selected research efforts for the benefit of U.S. science.

Second. U.S. participation in planning and developing international scientific programs. This program guarantees support of U.S. scientists and scientific organizations in their efforts to organize, plan, and develop international scientific programs. U.S. participation in international planning and development efforts protects U.S. scientific interests.

Third. International travel programs provide support for U.S. scientists to attend professional meetings, conferences, and seminars outside the United States. The opportunity to present papers, meet fellow scientists, and exchange views and news at international meetings helps foster a world community in science and technology, keeps the U.S. scientific community informed on the latest advances in their specialties, and serves as a useful stimulus to the U.S. scientific effort.

PLANNING AND POLICY STUDIES

The Foundation's planning and policy studies have the objective of development of better policies for the promotion and utilization of science and science education. A total of $3.03 million is included. With the information obtained through these studies and associated activities, it becomes possible to assess alternative courses of action and, frequently, to arrive at the most appropriate policy recommendations bearing on the national science effort and on internal Foundation programs. These activities are focused on studies of policy issues, including the needs of science and science education and their role in society; the development of the basic tools for science planning and policymaking; and the development of national science policy study and planning capabilities. This activity also encompasses the Foundation's unique survey efforts, which produce the bases for many policy decisions.

The planning and policy studies and related activities supported by the Foundation are grouped into five broad areas of program emphasis: First, scientific and technical manpower resources; second, educational and research institutions; third, public and private funding of science and technology; fourth, the interactions of science and technology with society; and, fifth, science policies and programs.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

Management, administration, and direction of the Foundation's scientific research and education programs is financed through the program development and management activity. Programs are developed within the policy guidelines established by the National Science Board and the Director of the National Science Foundation. Program administration is accomplished through an organizational structure of offices and divisions each having responsibility for a specific area of scientific research, science education, or scientific support. These offices and divisions are grouped under four assistant directors; one each for research, education, national and international programs, and institutional programs. Financial, data management, and general administrative support functions are under the direction of the assistant director for administration. The planning director is responsible for planning and policy studies.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES TO BE SUPPORTED WITH EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The proposed budget for payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department has determined to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States would permit the Foundation to continue to arrange for collecting, translating, abstracting and disseminating foreign scientific and technological information, and for promoting and supporting research and other scientific activities which are authorized by section 104(b)(3) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 as amended.

Mr. Chairman, these are the programs of the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1971. The amounts I have cited reflect the additions, totaling $27.63 million, made by our committee.

Let me now turn to them. I would like to explain the specific reasons for this increased authorization. They are in the five following areas:

First, transferred research—$10 million; second, environmental research in Federal labs—$4 million; third, graduate traineeships—$9.5 million; fourth, college science improvement—$4 million; and fifth, planning and policy studies—$130,000.

The field of the National Science Foundation and responsibilities have been enlarged by mission-directed agencies restricting research on programs not closely related to mission results. Specifically, the effect of section 203 of the fiscal year 1970 Military Authorization Act has caused mission agencies to eliminate many scientific projects of basic research, which total in cost at least $57.9 million. This is in addition to the cancellation of $4.2 million in graduate training programs in fiscal year 1971 by NASA, or $5 million in the State technical services program by the Commerce Department. These limitations and eliminations have had their effect in every State of the Union. Section 203, introduced by Senator MANSFIELD, requires that every research program of a scientific nature must have a direct and apparent relationship to the programs conducted by the Department of Defense. We know how difficult this can be with regard to basic research, as the fundamental knowledge developed there-

by is so hard to achieve if research is restricted by mission objectives. The Nation needs the result of such basic research, thus many of the mission agencies' programs have been transferred to the National Science Foundation.

I also wish to point out that an evaluation process is necessary to determine which programs should by definition be supported by the foundation. It is estimated that 80 percent or more of the defense research programs being terminated, for instance, would be competitive for funds. The $10 million added by the committee will permit the foundation to fund approximately one-third of the high-quality terminated projects already identified with other agencies.

One of the most important aspects of this is environmental research. We hear in every quarter the cries of our people and our political leaders that we must do something about pollution of our air, our water, and our earth. The Environmental Quality Council must have much more basic scientific knowledge and technical expertise than it now has in order to solve the tremendously complicated problems before it.

It has been the policy of our committee in its recommendations that the Federal laboratories should be put to work on problems outside the scope of the missions of the agencies in which they reside. It is a fundamental fact that building new laboratories to solve any new problem facing the Nation is a very inefficient way to utilize our enormous—but nevertheless limited—scientific and fiscal resources.

Improvement of our environment through scientific research can be given an enormous boost by utilizing the existing competence that can be found in our Federal laboratories. The National Science Foundation already has the necessary jurisdiction to make use of these laboratories and at the same time has the necessary authorization to provide the highly specialized laboratories where they are required.

Many environmental problems require research and pilot plant capabilities beyond the resources of our individual universities and laboratories. This has been recognized in both Houses of Congress by legislation which proposed the establishment of national environmental laboratories where needed. For these reasons, the committee has added $4 million for this purpose, which will make possible the first steps in creating a fully operational laboratory by 1974.

The Foundation requested $17.7 million for graduate traineeships. The committee increased that amount by $9.5 million, making a total for fiscal year 1971 of $27.2 million. These traineeships are the means by which graduate students can gain support to enable them to continue studies in the sciences. The support is awarded to institutions, which in turn select trainees for their various departments.

This year the National Science Foundation has not requested any funds for first-year trainees but it is proposed to fund previously made commitments so those students already in the program can finish their studies. The traineeships are distributed on a geographic basis to over 200 universities. This geographic distribution has been strongly favored by the committee for many years and has found its expression in the authorizations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Any serious reduction in funding these graduate traineeships would have a heavy impact upon many institutions in every corner of our country which are working mightily to sustain high quality programs in graduate science education.

Another increase by our committee was in the area of the college science improvement program. This increase amounts to $4 million, which added to the NSF request provides a total of $8 million. The purpose of this program, through grants, is to enable colleges and universities and associations of colleges to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in one or more of the sciences.

This $4 million will bring this program up to a level less than was obligated in fiscal year 1969, when the National Science Foundation received proposals totaling $24 million from the Nation's colleges, but this budget level of $8 million will allow the NSF to reasonably support the needs for quality science education at the undergraduate level.

For planning and policy studies, the National Science Foundation requested $370,000. The committee, in its judgment, believed that another $130,000 was needed, which totals $500,000 for this program. One of the purposes of the program is the support of projects to assist State and local governments to plan for better utilization of science and technology. It has been increasingly evident in the past few years that State and local authorities are better equipped organizationally to deal with their particular—and often peculiar—environmental problems. The program has been extremely valuable in this regard. It has provided the means by which local resources can be mobilized by the people themselves to attack their individual problems.

Mr. Chairman, I think the increases recommended by the committee are reasonable and prudent. We must recognize the enlarged burden of support the National Science Foundation must carry for the constant upgrading of our scientific capabilities. If we fail to support the NSF by this authorization, we will pay a heavy penalty in the years ahead in the knowledge we need then to solve our many social, political, economic and environmental problems. That knowledge will not be available, and what there is will be characterized by too little and too late. I might also add—too expensive.

I insert at this point several articles which describe in more detail why it is essential the Foundation's programs receive the strongest possible support:

[From Time magazine, Feb. 16, 1970]

RESEARCH CRISIS: CUTTING OFF THE PLANT AT THE ROOTS

"Scientific activity cannot be turned on and off like a faucet."—Richard M. Nixon.

It was a campaign statement, delivered in a speech on Oct. 5, 1968, and made a point that is no less true today. Yet now, in the near-unanimous opinion of U.S. scientists, President Nixon is ignoring what Candidate Nixon said. At a time when drastic, all-around budget trimming is obviously necessary—confronting the Administration with some painful choices—sensible scientists do not expect research appropriations to keep growing at the beanstalk rate of the early 1960s, but they have hoped to maintain reasonable, normal growth. Instead, they have suffered cutbacks and hold-downs for two years, and now the Administration has submitted a budget that, despite rising costs, will keep the level of federal spending for research virtually unchanged through June 1971. As a result, some important programs will be cut down severely or actually eliminated. The net effect, says Physicist Philip H. Abelson, editor of *Science*, has been harshly called a "mindless dismantling of American science."

According to Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the President's science adviser, the overall effect of the new budget, after allowing for inflation, will be to reduce net buying power for research by almost 3%. Others think the reduction will be much greater—in some cases as much as 20% in areas of fundamental scientific research that offer no immediate, practical payoffs. This is generally called "basic research," a favorable target of administrators and legislators with little patience and less vision. Out of apparently aimless inquiries have come antibiotics and transistors, vaccines and computers, transplants and spaceships. Government budget makers who try to judge a program's worth by the crude criterion "How soon will it pay off?" are bound to be wrong much of the time.

So-called basic research in the U.S. mushroomed after the Soviets' first Sputnik in 1957. From 1958 through 1965, federal expenditures for basic research increased at an annual rate of 19%, climbing from $1 billion to $3 billion. For the next five years, however, the average increase was only 5.5%—boosting the annual sum to its present $4 billion—and that has been barely enough to keep up with inflation. For the coming fiscal year the percentage increase is near zero—hence the net loss after inflation. Some institutions hope to keep their key programs coasting on tighter budgets. Others will simply be shut down.

BREEDER REACTOR

One casualty is the Princeton-Pennsylvania proton synchrotron on the Princeton campus, which is used for basic particle research by 14 universities. From a recent budget of $5,000,000 annually, the synchrotron funds have now been cut to $3.5 million, and will be down to $2,000,000 next year. Beyond that the Atomic Energy Commission is cutting off funds completely—after a total investment of $30 million on a project that, according to Director Milton White, has not yet had a chance to reach its peak efficiency. Another important tool for probing the secrets of the atom, the Cambridge Electron Accelerator at Harvard University, is in jeopardy; its budget has been cut 25%. "This," says M.I.T. Professor Victor Weisskopf, "essentially means that it will go out of business." Budget cuts have already paralyzed a less costly but still formidable piece of hardware: a $35,000 electron microscope given by New York City to New York University's department of medicine. It is lying idle because operating funds expected from the National Institutes of Health will not, after all, be supplied.

At the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, Dr. Herbert Friedman, one of the world's foremost X-ray astronomers, estimates that budget cuts combined with inflation have reduced the effective level of his support by 40% in three years. Able to afford only half as many trainees as he had expected and with no new equipment, Friedman has drastically curtailed his studies of X-ray galaxies. He has also reduced his work on quasars and pulsars, those mysterious

sources of energy in outer space that promise not only a clearer understanding of the nature of the universe and of basic physical laws but also might provide clues for developing new energy sources on earth.

Although scientists complain that the Atomic Energy Commission, along with the Department of Defense and NASA, gets a disproportionate share of federal research funds, the AEC itself has had to shut down its molten-salt breeder reactor at Oak Ridge. The Bureau of the Budget simply did not release $3,000,000 authorized for it by Congress. This was especially dismaying to environmentalists, because the breeder reactor promises, eventually, to be the cleanest and most efficient fuel source for electric power.

BARNACLES AND TEETH

Until recently, the Department of Defense generously funded research projects that had no foreseeable military applications. That will no longer be possible. An amendment attached to a military procurement bill by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield requires that research must be "mission-oriented" if it is to win DOD support. Mansfield learned 1) that researchers were trying to ferret out the magically strong adhesive produced by barnacles, in the hope of using it to secure fillings in teeth, and 2) that the Navy was backing barnacle research. Actually, barnacle-tooth research at the University of Akron has been funded, at a mere $40,000 a year, not by DOD but by the National Institutes of Health. The Navy has spent probably twice as much on its own barnacle research, and with good reason: scraping the adhesive crustaceans from hulls and buoys costs the Navy, Coast Guard and private shipping interests $700 million a year.

Mansfield's action points up the interlocking of many facets of research. Advances in the design of nuclear reactors and of particle accelerators have brought progress in the treatment of cancer. Vitallium alloy, developed in the 1930s for dentures, later proved valuable for its heat resistance in jet engines. Immunology depends ultimately upon the study of reactions among protein molecules. Its applications extend from the obvious field of infectious diseases and vaccination to allergies, auto-immune disorders like some forms of arthritis, to cancer, heart and kidney disease, and most dramatically, to organ transplants.

CUTS AND NIBBLES

Within medicine, research cannot be separated from teaching and treatment. Cuts in federal grants to medical institutions mean not only that research will be slowed down but also that fewer doctors will receive the specialized training that will enable them to give better care in the future. No fewer than 19 clinical research centers affiliated with major universities are due to be shut down. Among them: a small and always overtaxed unit at Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago, for children with severe digestive and metabolic problems; a twelve-bed center for acutely ill patients (including many suffering from burns) at Albert Einstein Medical Center in New York; a research institute at Indiana University, studying and treating patients (including children) with brain tumors and disorders of bone metabolism such as osteoporosis.

Prestige is no protection against the budgeteers' knives. Recent Nobel laureates in medicine, chemistry and physics have had their funds cut. So have most of the nation's great medical centers. Programs at Massachusetts General Hospital are "only being nibbled at" now, admits its tart-tongued director, Dr. John Knowles. "But," he adds, "we'll really feel it in a year if the cutbacks continue, and if they go on too long you are going to wing the country for ten years." One of the affected M.G.H. programs turned out technicians trained to read electroencephalograms (brain-wave recordings). These specialists are in short supply at many hospitals. "When there's a shortage," says Dr. Robert Schwab, who runs M.G.H.'s program, "it doesn't mean that the EEGs are not read. It simply means that they are read by somebody who's no good. This is scandalous and dangerous." Another nibble victim, down the corridor, is Dr. Paul S. Russell, a top surgeon at M.G.H., whose research on antilymphocyte globulin (used to suppress the rejection reaction after heart, kidney and liver transplants) has been curtailed. Under current limitations, his staff can produce only 20% of the ALG it needs.

A lower budget forced Children's Hospital in Los Angeles to reduce the number of research beds from six to three in its genetic-disease unit, setting off a howl of community protests, including a petition to President Nixon with 20,000 signatures. (The cut has not yet been rescinded.) In many cases the drying-up of funds means not only that progress will be slowed but that money already spent will be wasted. M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute in Houston, which lost $1.5 million of its $8 million in federal funds, cannot add a needed and long-planned 350-bed unit. After spending years and $1,752,000 of N.I.H. money raising monkeys in an almost germ-free environment and injecting them with cancer material and virsus, Bionetics Research Labs at Bethesda, Md., expected some to start developing tumors. Then the budget ax fell. At first it was thought that the 320 monkeys would have to be destroyed, because each costs $3 a day in upkeep. Then the monkeys were reprieved and shipped out in batches to other primate centers. Whether the experiment has been ruined because of the changes in the environment is not yet known.

Heart-artery diseases are America's No. 1 killer, and the No. 1 research project on their cause has been the Framingham Study. Since 1947, more than 5,000 residents of the Massachusetts town have been given regular examinations. The results, almost but not yet quite conclusive, indicate that smoking and high blood pressure and cholesterol are the most important factors in increasing the risk of early death from heart disease. The study is to be terminated June 30—to the despair of heart researchers all over the U.S.

RADICAL SURGERY

Manhattan's Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research proclaims in its very name that it meets the Government jargon specification of being "mission-oriented." That has not saved it from radical budget surgery. Five years ago, says Director Frank L. Horsfall Jr., the Government supplied 51% of S.K.I.'s income. In 1968, with a federal cut and inflation, S.K.I. went $1.2 million in the red. Next year the deficit was $1.8 million, and was met by dipping into capital. Faced with still deeper federal cuts and a probable deficit of $2.6 million for 1970, the trustees have set a deficit ceiling of $1.6 million and required expenditures to be cut by $1,000,000. As a result, seven out of 69 laboratories have had to be closed, while nine others have taken cuts of 20% to 30%. Both professional and technical staffs have been reduced and further curtailment next year is inevitable.

In Buffalo, Roswell Park Memorial Institute's director, Dr. James T. Grace, has had to abandon a five-year study designed to show whether adenoviruses are a cause of cancer in man as they can be in animals.

Cancer may eventually be conquered only by a crash program along the lines of the Manhattan Project. It is equally possible that vital cancer clues will come from some seemingly unrelated "basic" research in biology. Yet the likelihood of this discovery is reduced by the decrease in the number of investigators in all the life sciences. That is where the budget cuts are hurting, and inflicting wounds that will not heal for years. The National Institutes of Health are losing valuable experienced investigators, as are the complexes of hospitals, medical schools and research institutes.

By the later 1970s, the effect on medical research could be disastrous. It is the younger men who are being dropped in the economy wave and there are no funds for replacing them next year or the year after. Says Dr. Russel V. Lee, founder of the Palo Alto Clinic: "The principal loss, to my mind, will be the great discouragement in recruitment of young men for medical research. We are cutting off the plant at the roots." Virtually all the men responsible for directing research in both the life sciences and the physical sciences share that view.

Thus there is a crisis in research that today imparts even more urgency to words spoken only 16 months ago: "In the name of economy, the current Administration cut into muscle. The U.S. must end this depreciation of research and development in its order of national priorities." That demand was made by Richard Nixon.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 9, 1970]

SCIENCE UNDER FIRE: BEHIND THE GROWING CONCERN

Scientists, after reaping admiration for the leaps in technology that they have accomplished in recent decades, now find themselves fending off brickbats.

People in growing numbers seem to feel that scientific research is creating more problems than it is solving. Often cited are atomic and hydrogen bombs that can destroy civilization, drugs such as thalidomide that promise to help but end up crippling, pesticides that kill wildlife, detergents that may alter the life cycle of rivers, industrial processes that lead to pollution.

Criticism began to break through the walls of the laboratories last year. Now it has reached a point where many of the nation's leading scientists are profoundly worried. What they fear, if disenchantment with their work increases in the public mind—

The search for revolutionary scientific concepts and technology will be downgraded.

Scientists will be reduced to solving everyday problems.

Government support for research will be cut back even more sharply than in 1969.

Bright students will turn away from science and engineering.

Russia will beat the U.S. in the hunt for breakthrough ideas, materials and technology.

TOO MUCH "ENTHUSIASM"?

Still, skepticism among nonscientists continues to mount. Many now wonder if researchers, in their enthusiastic quest for new things, are aware of the possible harmful side effects of their discoveries.

On January 26, Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, told a joint House-Senate subcommittee meeting to review the Humanities Act of 1965:

"Certainly, many of the most important problems cannot be solved by science, which we have greatly supported and which has made many important contributions to our society.

"Science cannot solve these problems because scientists, alone, cannot decide what to do with the knowledge that is produced."

Dr. Keeney, former president of Brown University, said scientists ought to be "forced to answer" what the effects of their achievements will be on the lives of individuals.

Dr. Keeney's remarks are the latest in a lengthening list of challenges that have plagued scientists recently.

Late in December, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, including most of the leading U.S. scientists and engineers, held its annual meeting in Boston. It was interrupted time after time by angry

students and others shouting such slogans as, "Science is in a sorry state" and "Science for the people, not the Pentagon."

"EDUCATIONAL" PROTESTS

The purpose of the protests, said one student, was to "educate scientists on the political implications of their research."

On January 1, Dr. C. Stark Draper, credited with a major role in landing men on the moon, stepped down as head of the Massachusets Institute of Technology's instrumentation laboratory. He was forced out by professors, as well as students, who criticized him for spending too much time on space and military research and not enough on the problems of daily life on earth.

Dr. Draper's replacement: Dr. Charles L. Miller, chairman of MIT's civil-engineering department and director of the socially oriented Urban Systems Laboratory.

On January 16, Columbia University, reacting to pressure on campus, voted to end all secret research for the Defense Department and industry.

ACTION ON CAMPUSES

In the coming weeks, professors and students will be conducting "environmental teach-ins" on campuses around the country. The purpose: to show scientists how the results of their research is damaging the environment and threatening human life.

Scientists and engineers from universities, research institutes and industry took a hard look at these new problems last autumn at a meeting called "Technology Forecast for 1980," sponsored by the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

Dr. Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics at Harvard University, summed up the issues this way:

"This hostility has spread in our time from a small literary elite to a wide section of the educated public, especially some of our most highly educated youth.

"Not only is less importance attached to material progress as a condition of a viable society, but also there is an almost obsessive preoccupation with the bad side effects of technology while taking its benefits for granted. If we assume even a moderate degree of persistence in this present mood, the outlook for technological change appears rather dim."

POTENTIAL DAMAGE?

Many scientists are convinced that this present hostility toward their work could cause U.S. severe damage.

Dr. Arthur Kantrowitz, vice president of Avco Corporation and director of the company's Everett Research Laboratory, recently said:

"I am convinced that only a few more years of the present vigorous counterattack on technology will result in a technological gap between the U.S. and the Soviet Union which will be reflected in our economic and our strategic posture with catastrophic consequences."

He added: "We must not allow those who would escape this challenge to dominate the thinking of young people."

The Avco scientist does agree that a way must be found to bring the explosion of technology under control so that people benefit from its use. He suggests a system of "scientific judges" might do the trick. Every new development would be brought before one of these judges. He would listen to what is good and bad about the idea. Then he would decide if it should be put to use.

Other scientists believe the problem of deciding what is good or bad for society is not that difficult. Some think such decisions can be made by one of their own inventions—the computer.

Dr. O. Hugo Schuck, chief of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Office of Control Theory and Application, would have opponents feed their arguments into a computer. The machine would decide the winner.

The NASA scientist said, "The promise this holds out for rational behavior is tremendous."

However, there is a growing number of Americans who distrust all forms of science and technology—including the computer. Many of them, Dr. Keeney for one, think that there has been too much emphasis placed on scientific education and, as a result, the aims of America have been distorted.

"The result," Dr. Keeney told Congress, "has been the destruction of our system of values, so that people now have no real guide for their lives."

The former college president says the stress in education should be away from the sciences to such fields as history, philosophy and the other humanities. He thinks a new look must be taken at the way America has developed and what its goals should be. Then science should be made to fit those goals.

Students losing interest. This debate has already been felt in the nation's graduate schools. As the accompanying chart shows, the proportion of graduate students of science is declining.

Experts say that fewer bright high school graduates, normally the group that goes into the sciences and engineering, are now taking such courses.

This does not necessarily mean there will be a shortage of scientists in the next decade. There may even be a surplus, some experts warn.

Dr. Charles E. Falk, planning director of the National Science Foundation, predicts all science graduates with Ph.D.'s 10 years from now will be able to find jobs. But he thinks many will have to pass up research and go into teaching, management or even selling technology.

Signs of this are already appearing. Only about 100 potential employers showed up at the American Physical Society meeting the week of January 26 to interview newly graduated physicists with Ph.D.'s. Last year, 167 employers were on hand, and 272 in 1967.

There is a big demand for teachers in the physical sciences. But one society official said most of the graduates would not make good teachers because they were trained primarily in research.

This is another signal to scientists that their prestige is slipping.

[From Science magazine, Mar. 13, 1970]

MANSFIELD AMENDMENT CURB ON BASIC RESEARCH MAY SPREAD

(By Philip M. Boffey)

Prominent scientists and congressional supporters of science are worried that many federal agencies have decided to abandon support of basic research that is not closely related to their primary missions. These scientists fear that the spirit of the so-called Mansfield amendment, which is intended to restrict the kind of research that the Defense Department can support, is now spreading to many civilian agencies as well. The widespread impact of that amendment, when added to the other budgetary constraints afflicting science, "has turned what was a serious situation into a crisis," according to Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D–Conn.), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development.

The Mansfield amendment, which was adopted as Section 203 of the military procurement and research authorization bill last November, prohibits the Defense Department from financing "any research projects or study unless such project or study has a direct or apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation." As a result of the amendment, Daddario said at a press conference last week, the Defense Department will cancel some $50 million in research support. He said this was far above some original estimates that only $10 to $15 million might be affected.

Some impact on military research has been expected, for that was the intent of the amendment. But Charles A. Mosher, ranking Republican on the science subcommittee, expressed fears that "Section 203 sets an example that is contagious—it's going to spread very quickly to other agencies." He thought this was an unfortunate result for an amendment that sprang from "Mike Mansfield's very special feeling about the military and the Vietnam War."

At an NSF budget authorization hearing before Daddario's subcommittee on 17 February, Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences and chairman of the National Science Board, claimed the Mansfield philosophy "has begun to rub off on other agencies."

Handler particularly singled out the National Institutes of Health (NIH). He said NIH "has quite deliberately narrowed down its own view of what areas of science are appropriate," with the "most dramatic changes" occurring in organic chemistry, a field in which NIH has traditionally been the major support. Handler claimed NIH is currently withdrawing from "any research which happens to have the name of a plant in the title of the application and certainly all research in the field of photosynthesis." Handler acknowledged that perhaps NIH should not be the main support of work on photosynthesis, but he warned that "such action should not be taken unilaterally—there should be a plan whereby some other agency would undertake such programs."

In his press conference last week Daddario listed several other research areas that are being abandoned because of the Mansfield amendment and because of "our myopic preoccupation with budget figures." He said the Defense Department is likely to reduce sharply or terminate the Florida State tandem accelerator, the National Magnet Laboratory at M.I.T., the Haystack radio telescope at M.I.T., and the theoretical research on many-body theory at the University of Illinois. He also said that the Defense Department and NASA have sharply cut research funds for ground-based astronomy, geochemistry, and seismology; the AEC is putting the Cambridge Electron Accelerator at Harvard "on the shelf" and is shutting other facilities; and NIH support for work in plant physiology, biochemistry and genetics, and non-pathogenic bacteria and viruses is "badly impaired." Daddario said that the National Science Foundation, the only agency whose primary mission is to support scientific research, is being pressed to take on more than 50 high-quality biological programs in the coming year that were formerly supported by NIH. He also said NSF has adopted or is expected to take on 25 astronomy programs dropped by other agencies since fiscal 1969.

Another manifestation of the Mansfield contagion, Daddario said, is that the General Accounting Office has recently raised the question of whether federal agencies should restrict the kinds of "independent research and development" that they will support by industrial contractors. Some big agencies have traditionally financed research that is not specifically related to a particular contract on the theory that such research is an acceptable "overhead cost." But the GAO, in a recent report discussing possible changes in the procedures, suggested as one alternative that agencies might restrict their support to "projects that have a direct and apparent relationship to the specific function of the agency."

The potential impact of the Mansfield amendment is causing increasing concern. William D. McElroy, director of NSF, said it would be a "national disaster" if the Defense Department abandoned basic research. And

last week Daddario released a report by scientific advisers to his subcommittee which called for "a reaffirmation of our historic national policy that each mission department and agency which draws upon science in its operation should support its proper share of the country's basic research." The report's signers included, among others, James B. Fisk, president of Bell Labs; James M. Gavin, chairman of Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Samuel Lenher, vice president of DuPont; Jerome B. Wiesner, provost of M.I.T.; and Don Price, dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

What might be done to ease the impact of the Mansfield amendment remains unclear. Congressmen Daddario and Mosher said they had no plans to make a direct attack on the amendment in an effort to get it repealed. They said they hope primarily to ensure that the amendment is implemented cautiously and that a mechanism is set up to make certain that outstanding scientific projects are not junked precipitously. Meanwhile, NSF has budgeted some $10 million to take care of some of the increased proposal pressure expected as other agencies drop research projects. McElroy said NSF has not yet seen "any great influx of applications" but added that it is too early to tell what the real effect of the Mansfield amendment will be. If young investigators start to get squeezed out, he said, NSF will earmark special funds for them.

[From Chemical & Engineering News, Feb. 23, 1970]

FEDERAL R. & D. BUDGET CUTS SQUEEZE CHEMISTS

Throughout several years of crisis over declining federal support to universities and colleges, chemists have remained silent and aloof from politics—certainly more so than physicists and biologists. With a smaller percentage of chemists holding academic posts than physicists or biologists, without shutdowns of big particle accelerators, or cutoff of funds to medical research projects, the impact of the shrinking federal research dollar on chemists has been less dramatic. But the constantly eroding situation has now reached the point where more and more chemists are concerned about the future of basic chemical research in the universities.

The evidence of chemists' plight emerges from many sources. For instance, physical organic chemists, concerned over the National Institutes of Health's reduced funds to organic chemistry and suspended support to physical organic chemistry, are accumulating facts to back a drive to alert Congressmen to the problem of federal support of chemistry (C&EN, Jan. 19, page 11).

Examination of the Nixon Administration's fiscal 1971 budget reveals obvious ax cuts, such as the end of the National Acronautics and Space Administration's sustaining university program, and less apparent incisions that will not be felt until several years from now. Some 290 chemical or chemically related research projects will be snuffed out by the NASA cut.

Other budget items show little added chemical research money from the National Science Foundation, NSF cuts in traineeships that are not balanced by increases in fellowships and similar NIH and Atomic Energy Commission reductions in fellowships and traineeships, no new National Defense Education Act fellowships, and no new money for grants and direct loans for academic facilities (C&EN, Feb. 16, page 32).

Chemistry department chairmen report that department research spending has been stretched out or reduced by 25% or more over the past two years, coupled with varying estimates of 5 to 8% annual increases in the cost of doing research. Grants have not been renewed. It is increasingly difficult for young faculty members to secure grants. A number of chemistry departments plan to level off or reduce the number of new graduate students they enroll over the next few years, and note that there has been no success in finding industrial support for their students.

Documenting the impact on chemistry thus far is difficult, but physical organic chemists seem most hard hit at the moment. Preliminary answers to the physical organic questionnaire sent out by Dr. Kenneth Wilberg, chairman of the Yale chemistry department, and Dr. Jerome A. Berson indicate how hard. A total of $1.3 million in research grant/contract and graduate student support was lost in the past two years by 156 full, associate, and assistant professors responding to the survey. By federal agency source, the total breaks down to $565,300 lost from NIH, $486,000 from Defense Department agencies, and $251,000 from NSF. Fellowships lost from NIH total 63 and from NSF 26.

Top scientists have not been spared from the cuts, either. Responses to the Yale survey are confidential. However, another source indicated that Dr. Orville Chapman, at Iowa State University of Science and Technology and winner of the ACS Award in Pure Chemistry for 1968, was among those cut by NIH. Contacted by C&EN, Dr. Chapman said that one of two NIH grants was terminated; the other was approved, but was not funded because of the vetoed HEW appropriation bill for the fiscal year now nearly three quarters over. Consequently, Dr. Chapman was spending a remaining NSF grant at an "accelerated rate" to support 12 graduate students before industrial funds "bailed" him out.

Dr. Chapman says that NIH grant administrators were "helpful" in his case but are in a quandry over "what the agency's mission is and how much they have to spend." He admits that the National Cancer Institute administrators could not defend his research on the basis of a cancer cure because it is only "peripherally related" to cancer research.

For Dr. Chapman and other organic chemists similarly cut off from NIH funds the outlook is bleak. Under the Mansfield amendment it's highly unlikely that DOD will fund basic chemical research. NASA and AEC R&D budgets are already tight. NSF's budget, despite an increase, provides little opportunity to fund projects dropped by other agencies of the government.

Rep. Charles A. Mosher (R.-Ohio), told a meeting of NSF project directors and science educators 11 days ago that the NSF increase "proves largely illusory, when measured against the new responsibilities NSF is inheriting as castoffs from other agencies. The net result will almost certainly be a decrease next year for overall support of basic research." The Republican member of the House Subcommittee on Science Research and Development added that an NSF increase when other agency budgets are reduced could make an especially vulnerable target for Congress.

Faced with such harsh prospects, Dr. Chapman sees "scientific leadership in organic chemistry passing to the Japanese and Germans." Similar pessimism comes from Dr. Wiberg, who says that "all chemists are in trouble," and that it would be a "damn foolishness to dry up a major source of basic research in the U.S.—the university."

Chemistry department chairmen and spokesman at other schools assess the research and graduate support situation similarly, although perhaps not so pessimistically.

At Harvard, Dr. Konrad Bloch points to the 25% cutback in research efforts over the past two years, and at Cornell University Dr. William D. Gurowitz says the graduate student enrollment has been reduced to two thirds of the previous level, primarily because of federal cutbacks, and he questions what impact the Mansfield amendment will have on a materials science center on campus. Dr. Gurowitz thinks that if the center's funds are cut there could be a "tremendous effect" on solid-state research and graduate student support.

In the Midwest, Dr. Jack Kinsinger at Michigan State University believes that tight federal money will hurt the emerging universities most. At Indiana University, Dr. Riley O. Schaeffer says the school cannot "realistically support the same number of graduate students that it has been supporting," points out that Defense agency grants have expired and have not been renewed, and that, like many other schools, IU postdocs and graduating Ph.D's are having trouble finding the jobs they want. Yet Dr. Schaeffer is frankly "pessimistic" about the success of any appeals to Congressmen for additional support.

California schools face many of the same problems. Within Caltech's division of chemistry and chemical engineering support has dropped off some 20% over the past year with an added 15% of the division's funds in jeopardy by the Mansfield amendment, Dr. George Hammond estimates. He sees the twin difficulties of getting funds for young investigators and older faculty members who want to branch out into new areas "pressuring chemical research into becoming more conservative." Appeals to Congressmen, he believes, are "basically sound, but chemists have to make a persuasive case" and avoid "pleas of anguish."

Dr. Kurt E. Shuler at the University of California, San Diego, says he is "most unhappy" over the lack of industrial support for the department and the number of federal agencies that want to "subcontract research and not support education."

Parallel comments emerge from the responses received thus far to the Yale questionnaire. One sharply worded statement makes the point that considering the draft, the increase in student interest in areas other than organic chemistry, and the difficulty in getting funds at any level, it seems that chemistry per se, not just physical organic, needs to re-evaluate its present position and techniques.

The respondent was not sure that much of the federal support cutback was not justified considering the large amount of effort he believed to be wasted in many areas.

Another critical answer points out that the loss of fellowship support has a greater impact on the so-called prestige schools (Yale, for example) than on other universities. The critic says frankly that he does not think NIH should support physical-organic work, not even much organic synthesis, but he does support a larger role and budget for NSF. He adds that there is much that is artificial and some that is downright dishonest about the present so-called pluralistic scheme.

Many of the NIH cuts in physical organic research have affected young investigtors. One respondent writes that since he is a fairly new faculty member he has not had the opportunity yet to lose support, only the opportunity to not get it. His only source of funds is the Public Health Service and if he loses this support (as he indicated was possible) then he would not be able to support six graduate students nor receive summer support for himself.

Another young respondent had never received federal funds, although he had applied and been turned down numerous times. He charges that the Government is largely unwilling to support anything that a starting chemist wants to do and that he is caught in a vicious circle—no money, no work, no fame, no money.

NIH is not the only federal agency failing to support young researchers. Although one Ph.D. finds life considerably simpler with the department in the second year of an NSF Center of Excellence grant, he expects serious trouble when the department reverts to obtaining support from normal funding agencies. His Office of Naval Research contract has

expired and he sent his application for an NIH grant after the decision was made not to support physical organic research.

Meanwhile, his NSF budget, he says, is frozen at the "beginners" level, an inequity he calls especially galling to young investigators. He argues that young Ph.D.'s need increases in their grant budgets if they are to develop large enough research programs to produce meaningful results. The need is particularly crucial when studying complicated systems with several people concurrently investigating different aspects of a problem. The current pattern of funding, he charges, almost forces young people to work on small problems at a time when science and the world needs the opposite approach in the actual conduct of research and in training Ph.D.'s.

A number of statements, however, support the Yale chemists' appeal to Congress. Typical is one stating that the questionnaire arrived as the chemist made initial efforts toward getting his department to get some Congressmen to visit. He thought chemists should make clear that everything in civilized life derives from past chemical basic research. However, he noted, the lag time is 15 to 20 years.

Dr. Wilberg sums up his own view on appealing to Congress in this way: "Congress thinks that all we do is research where what we really are doing is teaching others to do research. . . . We have to state the relationship between research and teaching, convince Congress that we're useful—otherwise there's no reason why they should provide support."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH).

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I can say that I will offer a motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 16595, and to explain that motion to recommit.

As the very distinguished gentleman from Connecticut has said, the bill provides for $525,630,000. It is somewhat over the President's request, and the Bureau of the Budget request, and my motion to recommit will reduce that amount from the figure I just quoted to $498 million, the amount requested by the President.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my distinguished colleagues that it is necessary for the United States to maintain its world leadership in science and technology.

On the other hand, it is even more important to maintain the fiscal integrity of our Nation's Government.

The question before us, today, as I see it, is not that of choosing leadership or mediocrity in science.

Rather, it is that of supporting sound budget policies.

I am a strong supporter of the Nation's science programs.

I believe this is amply demonstrated by my position during the recent NASA authorization debate.

I feel it imperative that our country maintain its preeminent position in space exploration and manned space flight.

This is a tangible goal toward which we can strive.

And, as a fallout from this program, we find a broad base of NASA support for the basic sciences.

I believe the basic research support resulting from the additional NASA funds which we have just approved will more than take up the slack resulting from cutbacks by other mission agencies.

Let me point out why we must practice fiscal constraint in authorizing the Science Foundation Budget.

The uncontrollable items in our Federal budget, together with the reduced defense request, total approximately 80 Science Foundation budget.

This leaves only $40 billion not already committed to these uncontrollable items, such as interest on the national debt and social security payments, or to national defense.

This is certainly not a small sum.

However, the half billion dollars which we are discussing this afternoon is certainly more than an insignificant portion of it.

Because of the constraints upon us due to the uncontrollable and defense expenditures, we must carefully scrutinize each request which comes before us.

The administration request with respect to the National Science Foundation was a reasonable one.

The administration cut the Foundation back much less than it cut back the requests of other agencies.

The administration is not against science.

But, as pointed out by Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's science adviser, just recently, the administration does have a commitment to a balanced budget.

The science community must make its contribution toward this goal, also.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that the administration request for the fiscal 1971 NSF budget is adequate, even although not as generous as some would like it to be.

I, therefore, ask the support of the house for my motion to recommit with instructions that the committee report back a figure identical to that requested by the administration.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, my dear friend, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, has referred to a statement that Dr. DuBridge, Science Adviser to the President, made in which, as I understand it, he laid emphasis on the need to balance the budget so far as the National Science Foundation is concerned. I would like to comment on the fact that Dr. DuBridge, as I have read his remarks and as I have talked with him over the course of time, is tremendously concerned about what we are doing in this particular area.

May I just quote something that he said that I think is extremely pertinent to the argument the gentleman from Indiana has made. This is a direct quotation from Dr. DuBridge. He said:

> There has been an upswing in other countries in certain areas, and we are no longer the leader. Maybe we should get used to this idea.

I, for one, do not believe that we ought to get used to that idea. I think it is an irresponsible policy not to give support in this particular area, especially in a period of time when we are cutting back in the mission-oriented areas. I think what we need to do is to develop manpower in this area which will give us the ability to handle the problems of the big cities, to handle the problems of transportation, and to handle the problems of health and medical care. Much of which stems from fundamental research, knowledge development, and the building of manpower will provide us with the ability to handle these problems and I urge support for the increases for which we have made recommendations.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. May I respond to the gentleman? I certainly did not mean to imply—and I hope I did not—that Dr. DuBridge was happy about the reduction. I merely pointed out the fact that science had to bear its portion of the reductions. Dr. DuBridge did make that statement. I think I stated almost exactly his language in the quotation I gave.

However, I want to acknowledge his reluctance in doing so.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I merely wish to make one comment very briefly on the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), that we are slipping somewhere along the line in leadership in some respects. I think the gentleman from Indiana will agree with me that we are the undisputed leader of the world in spending money and accumulated debt as a government.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. If the gentleman's question is, "Does our country have a greater debt than all the other nations combined?" the answer is, "Yes."

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is what I am saying. We have undisputed leadership in that field. I am unable to understand why, with $264 million of unobligated funds on January 1 of this year and with $573 million available for expenditure on January 1, we should even need any money for this purpose at this stage. How do you commit? How do you spend $573 million in 6 months on a foundation of this kind? I just do not understand how you can do it reasonably and intelligently.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Yes.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I had already touched on the question the gentleman from Iowa has raised, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I do have the figures. I had said all of these amounts would be committed by the end of the fiscal year. It is my understanding they will all be committed by the 15th of May, but the unobligated balance has been, as of March 31, 1970, $110,789,000. Commitments to it were $49,982,000. The uncommitted, unobligated balance is $60,607,000, and that will be committed by May 15.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not disputing the figure I gave for January 1 of this year, is he?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am just trying to bring it up to date.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to make it clear, because this is the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am not disputing it. I am trying to get the record straight and up to date, so that I can, in fact, answer the figures the gentleman put before the House, which on that date were correct and adjusted to the point I have given in answer to that particular question.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on his fine statement and also on his competence on this subject.

In order that the House will understand the position the gentleman is taking on the motion to recommit and to amend H.R. 16595, I would like to point something out. The gentleman's motion to recommit would strike the amount of $525,630,000 which appears on page 1, line 9 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the amount of $498 million. There is not only $498 million on that particular line, there is also on page 2 of this bill, under section 4, $2 million authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States, to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be in excess of the normal requirements of the United States. The gentleman understands there is then $500 million of authorization for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct in counting the $2 million of the so-called counterpart funds or foreign currencies.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Science, Research, and Development Subcommittee, Mr. DADDARIO, and the distinguished senior minority member, Mr. FULTON. They have worked hard on the bill before us today, and I compliment them and their colleagues on the fine job they have done.

The basic issue before us is that of adequate support for basic research in our country. There are increasing signs that we are losing our preeminence in certain areas of science to other countries. This is already reflected in the necessity for American scientists to buy certain specialized equipment from Japan, Germany, or some other country.

But you may ask, "Why do we need to keep the lead in basic science? Will not Yankee ingenuity keep us paramount in technology even if the ivory tower researchers fall behind?"

In this modern world, the inevitable answer is "No." H. B. G. Casimir, vice president of the Philips Co. of the Netherlands, pointed out before a Commerce Department symposium a few years ago why this is the case. He stated:

> I have heard statements that the role of academic research in innovation is slight. It is about the most blatant piece of nonsense it has been my fortune to stumble upon.
>
> Certainly, one might speculate idly whether transistors might have been discovered by people who had not been trained in and had not contributed to wave mechanics or the theory of electrons in solids. It so happened that inventors of transistors were versed in and contributed to the quantum theory of solids.
>
> One might ask whether basic circuits in computers might have been found by people who wanted to build computers. As it happens, they were discovered in the thirties by physicists dealing with the counting of nuclear particles because they were interested in nuclear physics.
>
> One might ask whether there would be nuclear power because people wanted new power sources or whether the urge to have new power would have led to the discovery of the nucleus. Perhaps—only it didn't happen that way, and there were the Curies and Rutherford and Fermi and a few others.
>
> One might ask whether an electronic industry could exist without the previous discovery of electrons by people like Thomson and H. A. Lorentz. Again, it didn't happen that way.
>
> One might ask even whether induction coils in motor cars might have been made by enterprises which wanted to make motor transport and whether then they would have stumbled on the laws of induction. But the laws of induction had been found by Faraday many decades before that.
>
> Or whether, in an urge to provide better communication, one might have found electromagnetic waves. They weren't found that way. They were found by Hertz who emphasized the beauty of physics and who based his work on the theoretical considerations of Maxwell. I think there is hardly any example of twentieth century innovation which is not indebted in this way to basic scientific thought.

Today, more than ever before, we have problems facing our society. Our environment is deteriorating. We are faced with gigantic difficulties in managing our massive technology. We desperately need those new tools formed by the innovative new ideas which can only come from the basic sciences.

H.R. 16595 will help assure the United States with precisely those tools for the future. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is so knowledgeable in this whole field, I wonder if he can supply me with responses to these questions, which I ask most seriously.

Do we have any statistics which show how the dollars spent on basic research or the man-hours or the number of researchers in the United States, compares with the figures for foreign countries of the world?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not have that. It is produced. I may say to the gentleman, some time ago I had the privilege of going to Europe with a team headed by Dr. Hornig, then the head of OST, to defend American science before an international organization in Europe.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is very difficult to come to a precise answer to the question which has just been asked, but recent figures we have had, taking all the balancing factors into consideration, indicate that, as of now, the Russians are spending, in the area of R. & D., some $19 billion in the area of defense-oriented research, and our figure is somewhat in the area of $14 billion, including research in the space program and atomic energy. For the first time they have surpassed us in this particular area.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will finish the statement I started to make.

When we got there we were criticized for our way of doing science. They said that Americans do not have a goal that they work toward. Mr. Hornig said:

> Thank God we do not have a goal we work toward. We work in the field of science trying to uncover some of nature's secrets to use.

Following through, the man who had been our greatest critic told the press that America was not to be criticized, but perhaps was to be followed.

Throughout the world they are jealous of the strides we have made. It is a question of whether we keep to the fore or whether we rest on our laurels. There is a little fairytale about resting on one's laurels when one is in a race.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell me approximately what percentage of all basic research in the country is done by or through the National Science Foundation?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know that I could give a figure on that. The National Science Foundation picks up and is responsible for a great many activities in the field of science in the Federal Government.

I may say that last year was the first year an authorization bill was established for the National Science Foundation. So we have had about a year's experience with it. However, from the support of universities on down through grants to institutions and to scientific groups it is the one that more or less takes the lead in the physical sciences, just as the National Institutes of Health takes the lead in the biological field.

Mr. DADDARIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DADDARIO. The total figures for fiscal year 1970 insofar as basic research is concerned are $1,148 billion. As to the amount that the National Science Foundation spends on basic research, that is $225 million.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point so I can inquire of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. That is Government-sponsored research. Is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes.

Mr. KYL. Do you have some figures regarding the privately sponsored basic research in the United States?

Mr. DADDARIO. The rough figures would be about half the Government figure.

Mr. KYL. Am I correct in my understanding that the gentleman says the Soviet Union is now spending $32 billion a year on the same kind of basic research as a comparable figure to that?

Mr. DADDARIO. The figure I gave was not $32 billion, but research and development for defense purposes, taking all of the balancing things into account, with their rule against our dollar, with inflation and one thing and another, shows that they are spending $19 billion for research and development as against $14 billion in this country for similarly related research and development.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I might say for the benefit of the gentlemen on the other side that if they need some more time, I will be glad to yield them some of ours.

(Messrs. MOSHER, BELL of California, BUSH, and HOGAN (at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) were allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee, and with the gentleman from Connecticut, chairman of our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

It seems to me of utmost importance that we should today approve in full the recommendations of the committee, authorizing $527,630,000 to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1971.

As these gentlemen have indicated, this committee recommendation includes an increase of $27.6 million over the administration's budget request. I am fully aware of the administration's concern with and efforts to check the inflationary spiral in the economy. That is one crisis. But I also am keenly sensitive to the quieter crisis that exists today in the Nation's scientific community. Therefore, I emphasize that the recommendations made by our committee reflect strong bipartisan support, in both the subcommittee and in the full Science and Astronautics Committee.

We have arrived at this recommendation only after a most detailed examination of the problems and through three executive sessions within our own subcommittee. I submit that the amount requested in this bill is the result of a consensus of deep concern about the presently diminishing strength of our scientific enterprise, and the decreasing production of talented young scientists.

Mr. Chairman, two major functions performed by the National Science Foundation include: First, scientific research; and second, the education and training of future scientists. I want to speak briefly on the critical question of scientific manpower training.

The two objectives of the National Science Foundation science education activity include: First, the production of scientific and technical manpower to meet the nation's needs; and second, the improvement of instructional personnel and programs.

During the past year, our committee has been concerned with recent reports which seemed to indicate that the Nation is producing an excess of scientific manpower at the graduate level. In an effort to determine whether such an excess really exists, we reviewed with various witnesses two recent studies performed by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Foundation. The conclusions reached by these studies are the same; that the supply of science doctorates is now just coming into balance with current demands. Despite the presence of reports to the contrary, the needs for such highly trained personnel are increasing and will continue to increase.

The committee does recognize that changing requirements do exist, such as in the area of environmental science, and these will require different patterns of education and training. Similarly, there is an increasing need for the development of technologist training programs to complement the traditional science education programs. The Foundation plans several new initiatives in these two areas this year.

Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned over the recent cutbacks that have taken place in graduate education in the sciences. I refer to the moratorium that has been placed upon direct Federal support of first-year graduate students in the sciences. This has occurred not only in the National Science Foundation, but in the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, NASA, AEC, and the Department of Defense. Overall fiscal year 1971, direct Federal support for first-year graduate students is projected at only one-half of the fiscal year 1970 level. This decision appears to have been made on the basis of only partial information of future year manpower demands and runs in the face of findings of the two studies I just mentioned.

I submit this represents a most dangerous retreat from the policies of the past. It can result in a very serious crisis for this Nation in a decade from now, when highly trained and competent scientists will be needed to solve the increasingly complex problems facing the Nation.

As Mr. Nixon said less than 2 years ago while campaigning for the Presidency:

> The decline of science education is the most damaging indictment of present administration policy; it threatens to cripple the national effort in science for years to come.

Our committee, in reviewing the National Science Foundation budget for fiscal 1971, has, therefore, restored some traineeship funds in an effort to partially offset the reductions being made in other agencies. This addition of $9.5 million will continue the NSF's traineeship program at its fiscal year 1970 level. It will also permit an orderly review of future scientific manpower requirements during the coming year, so that we will have a firmer base upon which to make Federal policy.

In addition, the committee has also added $4 million to the Foundation's college science improvement program. As the gentleman from Connecticut has pointed out, this program provides grants to colleges or consortiums of colleges for improving the quality of their undergraduate instruction in one or more of the sciences. In order to improve the full range of undergraduate education in the sciences and to expand opportunities for undergraduates to become interested in scientific careers, this program is intended to benefit both teachers and students, subject matters and methods of instruction, facilities, equipment, and teaching materials.

Because our undergraduate colleges have historically furnished a large proportion of students who go on to become scientists, this program has had a most effective influence upon the size and quality of our national scientific and technological manpower resources. The addition of $4 million, therefore, is designed not only to meet the increasing demands, but restore the program to the fiscal 1969 level. It will permit the Foundation to more adequately meet the crucial needs for quality science education which exist in the Nation's undergraduate colleges.

Mr. Chairman, these two additions, totaling $13.5 million represent only the most minimal requirements if the Foundation is to effectively meet the challenges posed by our society and the requirements for highly skilled manpower resources.

I should add, however, that they are no less important than the additions recommended for the program of scientific research support. The inseparable link between science education and scientific research is something that cannot be understated.

Therefore, I enthusiastically urge the fullest possible funding of the Foundation for fiscal year 1971 and join our committee chairman in urging that H.R. 16595 be now approved.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, several of my colleagues have already pointed out to this body the critical state of our national scientific enterprise today. They have touched upon the current funding crisis facing the scientific community, explained the dangerous effects upon our present and future generations of young scientists, and emphasized the need for strong endorsement and support of scientific research through the programs of the National Science Foundation. I, too, share their deep concerns.

However, I should like to focus on still another important facet to this problem; I am referring to the U.S. position vis-a-vis other industrialized nations. For, the hard fact is that U.S. leadership in science and technology is being challenged not only by the Soviet Union but also by Western Europe and Japan. Let me describe this situation by pointing out several interesting sets of statistics.

While Federal support for R. & D. has declined in recent years, these other countries have either expanded or maintained a vigorous level of effort in their own national programs of science and technology. According to recent figures only 2.7 percent of our gross national product—GNP—will go into R. & D. this year. This will mark the third straight year of decline, as compared with 2.8 percent last year and 3 percent in 1968.

It is true that Soviet investment in research and development has closely paralleled our own. However, available statistics now indicate that at official exchange rates the Russian research expenditures exceeded those of the United States for the first time in 1968. Moreover, it has recently been reported that Russian defense-related outlays are also now more than 20 percent greater than our own.

Similarly, if we look to Western Europe, we see reason for deeper concern. While it is true that as early as 1962 the United States was spending about 10 times as much on R. & D. as the Western European countries combined, this is no longer the case. In France, over the last 7 years, support for research has increased by nearly a factor of 4 and the number of researchers by a factor of 3. Indeed, between the years 1958 and 1966 the growth rate in funds for research in France has averaged about 25 percent. In West Germany, planned expenditures for science for the Government's medium term financial plan—1967–71—indicate an overall increase of 81 percent. Specialized areas that have been singled out for increased support from the German Government include atomic energy, data processing, space, and oceanography, while other data indicate that Great Britain is maintaining a steady and strong program of scientific research and development, especially in such areas as polymer science, enzyme chemistry, transport technology, and astronomy.

In Japan, research expenditures, alone, jumped 33 percent in the years 1967 and 1968. And, there is no mistaking the presence of an important relationship between Japan's investment in industrial, scientific, and technological research and its booming economy, which according to current projections, will put Japan in third place as a world economic power in the next decade. These projections hold true not only overall, but also in specialized areas affected by and affecting R. & D., such as atomic energy, computer technology, and medical, space, and ocean sciences.

I cite these figures for a very specific reason. We, in the United States often tend to be too susceptible to complacency. There is, perhaps some reason for this, however. It is instructive to recall that during the first 40 years of Nobel prizes, from 1901 through 1940, the United States received only 10 in the sciences, as against 30 for Germany, 19 for Britain, and 13 for France. Since then, the U.S. Nobel prize total has exceeded the combined total of all of Europe, including the Soviet Union. That, in itself, is another testament to the effectiveness of strong and broad Federal support for its programs of scientific research and development. It also provides a dangerous opportunity to become further complacent.

Today, I feel we are on the dangerous edge of losing that leadership. Already, many of our youngest investigators are turning their sights to Western Europe where facilities and support are becoming more readily available than in their own country. Could it be that we have started the wheels moving toward another reverse brain drain?

The programs of the National Science Foundation for which we are requesting additional authorization totaling $27.6 million will help to not only restore balance to our system of scientific research support, but will provide increased assurance that U.S. leadership in science will remain strong. I, therefore, fully endorse the actions taken by our committee and urge their wholehearted adoption.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the New York Times, which has special relevance to my earlier comments:

THE MONEY DRIES UP AND THE BRAINS DRAIN

WASHINGTON.—In a few weeks, beside the hamlet of Westerbrook in northern Holland, the world's largest radio-telescope will go into operation partially manned by American scientists. "There is almost a brain drain in reverse," the Dutch observatory's director has told visiting Americans.

Space program research and development in the United States is almost moribund so the British scientists and technicians who flocked here when the space boom was on are returning home. Last year 8,000 fewer trained foreign technicians entered the United States to work, a 17 per cent drop in one year.

Jobs here for scientists and technicians are becoming scarcer because Federal funds for R & D (research and development) continue to dwindle. An additional $400-million will be cut in the coming fiscal year, a reduction that has caused extreme anguish in the scientific establishment. Citing the following examples, scientists warn that the United States is losing its first place standing in world-wide R & D.

GOING TO CANADA

Japanese laboratories are beginning to dominate research in the relatively new field of solid state physics, the area from which the transistor grew and the area in which American scientists made the pioneering discoveries.

Basic discoveries in physical and organic chemistry, the touchstones of industrial chemistry, are increasingly coming from French and German laboratories. Continental scientists pioneered in these fields, then ceded their leads to American colleagues. Now the advantage is being handed back.

American scientists in increasing numbers are going to Canada as that government's investment in research grows while that of the United States goes down.

As President Nixon's National Science Board warned him earlier this year, trimming the Federal investment in R & D will lead to "a day of reckoning for United States science and for the national well-being. That day may be very near," the board said, then ticked off half a dozen areas where the United States had lost its scientific pre-eminence.

'WE'RE IN TROUBLE'

Much in the same vein, other reports followed from Congressional committees and the academic community. Four former chief Presidential science advisers joined earlier last month in sharp criticism of present Federal policy in supporting science.

A few days ago several hundred distinguished scientists, their faces as austere as the hard wooden benches on which they sat, gathered as the annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences opened in its Great Hall. As the morning wore on, a dozen speakers rose to repeat what has almost become a litany among researchers in recent years. "The money has dried up—we're in trouble."

Most Americans, as several members of the prestigious academy pointedly told their colleagues, just couldn't care less about the financial dog days of the scientific community. Town and gown protests, the war's expansion, the stock market, inflation and crime have dominated the day-to-day concerns of the electorate. The scientists, however, were concerned about the future.

PRACTICAL RESULTS

The two decades after World War II were the flowering of American science and technology. Dollars and people were pumped into the scientific establishment in ever increasing numbers so that it grew at a rate of 10 to 20 per cent every year. The practical results filled homes with hi-fi sets, frozen foods, lightweight clothing, life-saving drugs and durable plastics.

More dramatically, however, this period also deeply broadened man's knowledge of himself and his world. New radiotelescopes brought glimpses of nether worlds never imagined, while electron microscopes peered into the very heart of matter. What good is basic research: Can it lead to a source of inexhaustible power from controlled thermonuclear reactions? A cure for cancer discovered embedded in a gene?

The point, as scientists have said repeatedly, is that no one knows. The question is answered only as man's knowledge continues to expand and is put to use through increasingly expensive R. & D. Yet it is axiomatic in this technological era that the welfare of a nation depends on its rate of innovation. One economist contends that the taxes paid by the nation's multi-billion dollar computer industry, which did not exist 20 years ago, are enough to underwrite all American electronics research. American computers dominate the world market, and should for years to come, because of the momentum generated by early investment.

ON VALUE RECEIVED

American investment and momentum, however, are waning. In 1965 the Federal Government invested $15.2-billion in basic research, applied research and development, 50 times as much as had been spent a generation before. This year the Administration is considering spending exactly the same amount.

This is a tremendous amount of money, yet one scientific authority told the academy that the value received is going down. Dr. Philip Abelson noted that the effects of inflation and the increasing cost of research have combined to reduce the research effort by one-third, even though the dollar investment is the same.

"If we continue to cut down . . . the United States is going to be a second class nation in scientific enterprise," he said.

The current Presidential science adviser, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, challenged some of Dr. Abelson's statistics but conceded that his analysis of the trend was correct. "There has been an upswing in other countries in certain areas and we are no longer the leader," he said.

"This is not the policy of the Administration," Dr. DuBridge added "The policy of the Administration is balancing the budget."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of the Science

and Astronautics Committee on the fine job they have performed in preparing this legislation—H.R. 16595—particularly the gentleman from Connecticut.

Of particular interest to me is the program for interdisciplinary research relevant to the problems of our society. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, I have become more and more concerned over the problems of our environment and the interrelationships of our depleting resources and increased population. The urgency demanded in finding and executing solutions to these complex problems cannot be underestimated. The activities and attitudes of the American people and the world in recognizing and correcting these problems must be considered the No. 1 objective in this decade of the seventies. Each year of mere rhetoric and inactivity further multiplies the consequences of inaction.

By the end of this month our task force will have completed a full year's study and examination of the problems and directions of our earth resources and population with a full report of our findings to this body. What is very evident to the task force is that we cannot solve today's problems with yesterday's programs. Interdisciplinary research, interdisciplinary planning, and interdisciplinary action on the part of all sectors of our society are urgently needed in order to surmount the problems of our society.

Two major problems confronting us today are the stewardship of our environment and the poor communications existing with our young adults, particularly undergraduate college students.

Last week we witnessed both tragedy and hope resulting from student activities on different university campuses and here in Washington. Frustration and agony abound in the minds of all citizens who desire to protect our free democratic system that encourages the expression of independent thinking, yet necessitates order and responsible actions. It was with this realization in mind that I introduced H.R. 16847 on April 18 with 21 of my colleagues, to establish a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies under the direction of the National Science Foundation.

The programs of the National Science Foundation are predominantly directed toward the development of graduate studies, the propagation of doctoral degrees, and the ensuing research. There is no doubt this should be the primary goal of the Foundation, but I strongly believe that we have shown a lack of creativity in our leadership to provide undergraduate students with a constructive forum for communications. Communications is a two-way proposition. It entails both sending and receiving. There is little question that there has been a great deal of sending on the part of both students and legislators, but very little receiving has been evident—mostly as a result of inadequate organization. These students want to reach us and they want to reach the White House, but lacking a vote they feel compelled to voice their opinions in loud outcries to attract our attention and the attention of the voters—unwittingly driving a bigger wedge into the communications gap. Because such loud cries through demonstrations lack the discipline of order, the constructive and well-intentioned ideas and suggestions get buried in tear gas and bullets—further fanning the flames of their frustrations. I do not condone these demonstrations, but I do recognize the inability over the years of national leadership from every sector of our society to provide creative forums within which these students can exercise their mental competence and receive some fulfillment that they have contributed to the intellectual problems of selecting, defining, and solving national problems.

Yesterday, some many years ago, a college or a university was the forum for this kind of orderly intellectual interchange but recently, over the past decade or so, our population growth has created such tremendous stress on the capabilities of our colleges and universities that the original purpose of these institutions has had to take a back seat to the demands for techniques necessary to provide education to the greatly increased numbers of students attending our colleges and universities. We simply cannot expect yesterday's concept of college programs to answer the problems of students today and, therefore, we need some new and creative alternatives.

The concern of college students over our problems of a quality environment seems to me an excellent principle on which we can focus our attention as national leaders and create an intellectual forum for constructive interchange of thinking on the part of qualified undergraduate students. This would offer these students an opportunity to communicate their thoughts and ideas relative to the problems of our environment that would be received by our Nation's leadership.

As constructed in my bill, a National College on Ecological and Environmental Studies would not be a brick and mortar job but the creation of seminars, think-tank sessions, and other such forums that would bring together outstanding undergraduate students of all sciences and engineering disciplines from all over the country to wrestle with the complexities inherent in sustaining our society while protecting and restoring our environment. This program would necessitate the involvement of the commercial and private sectors of our society because the obligations of the Federal Government would not exceed $100,000 a year or one-third the cost of this program, whichever is less.

I seriously considered offering this legislation in the form of an amendment to the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1971 but now feel it is important that the Committee on Science and Astronautics has an opportunity to hold hearings on this bill in hopes that some more creative thinking on the value of this legislation might produce some solid recommendations which the Director of the Foundation, Dr. McElroy, could implement once this program is underway.

We all care about our environment and I know we all desire to seek solutions. This national college is a positive program in this direction. It is an inexpensive program from a taxpayer's point of view. It is a creative program that deals with problems of vital concern to our young people. Earth Day could not have produced more evidence of this. It is important that we listen to what our young people have to say on this issue for it will be their demands for goods and services in the not-too-distant future that will influence changes in industry, education, and our society as a whole. If we are to be smart managers, we must have the vision necessary to comprehend the true purpose of these teach-ins—a need to communicate.

The establishment of this National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies is certainly an interdisciplinary program relevant to the problems of our society, and I certainly hope that committee hearings will be held and this legislation brought to the floor during this session. There is an urgency that must not be underestimated.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given us, if we need more time. I am not quite sure of that as yet.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Science, Research, and Development Subcommittee and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, as well as those of the distinguished minority members.

I, too, am gravely concerned about the future of scientific research and education in this country. The point has already been made that a reduction in real scientific effort in this country has occurred. The proportion of students going into science and engineering is steadily diminishing, and scientific leadership is beginning to pass to other countries in certain disciplines.

This trend is fraught with danger for the future of our country. The threat this poses to our national security and to the prestige we enjoy among the other nations of the world is at once apparent to anyone who takes a moment to reflect upon the fundamental and overwhelming impact science and technology have had upon military strength from earliest times to the present day.

Propulsion of ships and trains by steam, communication by telephone, followed by "wireless" communication, the invention of dynamite, the gasoline engine, and the airplane are but a few milestones that have affected first the military posture of every nation on earth and second the means toward helping humankind in its unceasing quest to conquer its environment.

To permit a diminution in the funding of our national scientific endeavor would be to indulge in folly of the worst kind. Let us look for a moment at an area of research which is supported by funds from the bill which is before us today.

The study of astronomy does not immediately impress the average as being an area which is entitled to any special priority, and yet without it the development of the hydrogen bomb would probably never have taken place. An understanding of the tremendous energy output of the sun and the stars was of key significance in developing nuclear energy.

The possibility of changing, by human agency, one atom into another in order to harvest the energy difference equal to the mass which was destroyed was made plausible and credible because it was so clear that such a process was indeed taking place in the stars. The discovery of pulsars and quasars has opened up areas and given new insights into the nature of matter and energy generation not even dreamed of a few scant years ago.

Our position of leadership in science and technology can be lost at any time, unless we exert the utmost vigilance to protect it.

The National Science Foundation is the principal Federal agency for the support of ground-based astronomy through the support of individual research projects, special research equipment, and astronomy research centers. The foundation provides about one-half of the total Federal investment in this field. Other Federal agencies are decreasing their support significantly, even for research projects of proven quality.

Research in astronomy logically falls into two categories, optical astronomy and radio astronomy. If we look at the record of Federal funding, we find that total support of radio astronomy has declined since fiscal year 1967 and total support of optical astronomy has declined since fiscal year 1968. There are no encouraging signs of a reversal in this trend.

Just this week I read an Associated Press story in the Washington Post describing a new Dutch radio telescope facility. It stated:

> The world's newest and biggest radio telescope, probing eight billion light years into space, is calling U.S. scientists to Euprope.
>
> "There is almost a brain drain in reverse," said Dr. Ernst Raimond, superintendent of the observatory to be opened here June 24.
>
> "Many U.S. scientists want to come to Europe," Raimond said, 'because Europe has a more ambitious radio astronomy outlook than the United States.
>
> "Even if they (The U.S.) started right away it would mean that they would not have comparable potential before the end of the 1970's," he observed.

How are we reacting to this and other challenges to U.S. science?

We are reducing direct support for new graduate students in the sciences by half in just 1 year.

We are closing highly productive particle accelerators.

We are shutting down one of our best and most versatile radar and radio telescopes, the Haystack facility in Massachusetts.

We seem to be drifting toward an attitude that science is not relevant, at a time when scientific and technological strides have never been so long and so rapid.

The voices of our scientists are united in pointing out the grave danger to our country of neglecting our scientific endeavors, and the further fact that any lessening of effort on our part will be keenly felt for years to come.

This bill deserves the wholehearted support of every member of this committee and of the House, and I hope its adoption.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has been a great leader on our committee and very generous to all the members and to me particularly and personally upon many occasions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state that as a freshman Congressman and serving for the first time, naturally, on a committee, that I cannot imagine how any committee could be better managed or organized than this Subcommittee on Research and Development under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO).

We heard many witnesses on this question of the budget. My remarks generally are a condensation of the argumentation that is made in the report of the committee, particularly as it affects science education, but I have heard one or two things this afternoon that cause me to disgress slightly from my text.

For one thing, gentlemen, it is not only the witnesses before our committee who told us of the decline in interest in science in this country and perhaps we could attribute that to self-interest on their own part to increase the funds with which they want to work—but many of the young people with whom I have talked over the past year, and in larger numbers in recent months and weeks, have indicated that they feel that the cause of science and technology is not for them; that somehow science and technology have let the Nation down rather than performing useful work for it.

Many of them want somehow to go back to Thoreau's Walden Pond and live in a simpler time. If there is anything that a reading of the hearings will indicate clearly, it is that you cannot go back to Walden Pond; you have to go forward to find it again, and we have to find it through the use of technology as developed by the world of science.

We were given many striking comparisons. For example, had Henry Ford known in his day that the application of the internal combustion engine burning fossil fuel would some day possibly poison his grandchildren, he might have sought an alternative mode of propulsion. He did not know that.

Today we do not have the same leadtime between a possible error of a scientific character and the realization of that error given the explosion of knowledge and pace of technology year to year. What does this mean? It means that we must graduate scientists and technologists who are in fact aware of the secondary consequences of major breakthroughs in their respective skills and disciplines.

Scientists testified before our committee, asking us not to distrust technology, but merely the questions we put to it. We were told technology is neutral. But it answers the questions we ask. We have heard this afternoon the suggestion that the addition of $25 million more or less to a $500 million budget is somehow a threat to the economy of our country.

But we must recognize that there are men in technological positions today who must help us decide, for example, whether we need or ought to have a supersonic transport at a cost of many hundreds of millions of dollars.

And as one witness told us, if we ask the scientists and technologists for a supersonic transport, we will get it. But if we were instead, for example, to ask for a very fast plane that will carry quite a few people but in no way disturb the quality of life, either through emissions in the biosphere or noise pollution here on earth, we would get a different answer.

Now, somebody who has been to school is going to help decide that, and we want a lot of youngsters in school today who might help us decide even tougher questions in the future. And when we think that $100 million a day is being spent to meet our military commitments all over the world, many of them resting on a technological basis, surely one-fourth of that sum, $25 million, cannot be considered an outrageously high annual sum to encourage if not guarantee competent technological judgment.

Yes, half a billion dollars for the National Science Foundation is a lot of money. It is about the cost of 2 weeks or less of war, and it is roughly 5 days of all of our U.S. military commitments around the world.

I certainly do not think the lower figure reflects in any way on the Bureau of the Budget which recommended it because I do not think even when they came forward with it that they realized the extent to which America's young had turned away from science and technology.

Now what does this NSF bill provide as an inducement to our young people to continue in this field?

The science education support of the National Science Foundation is divided into three separate programs which they call student development, instructional personnel development, and instructional program development. That is their terminology. I would have said, "students, teachers, and courses."

The student development program, I think, is one which perhaps tells us most vividly what is happening with this kind of appropriation. What is it we are trying to accomplish?

This bill covers hgh school and undergraduate students, as well as the most talented individuals involved in graduate study.

For example, the science training program for high ability secondary school students provides opportunities for advanced scientific study or research participation under the direct guidance of university scientists.

This would not have been possible were it not for the funds allocated for that purpose.

Think what it means to the youngsters, for example, in a secondary school to be able to spend the summer with a university scientist and really get hooked in some area that is vital not only to our security but to our well-being. Think what it could mean to the country.

Over the years the record shows that virtually 100 percent of the participants enroll in college—perhaps that is no surprise; 85 percent major in science, and two-thirds enter graduate school.

This is pretty good ratio of success in keeping interest alive in youngsters who want to find a career in science and technology.

This year about 6,000 students will participate in the program during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, the instructional personnel development program, that is for teachers, is directed toward improving the skills of teachers in science and mathematics from precollege through the graduate level.

This program has been in operation some 15 years, and concentrates on the supplementary training of teachers in their major subjects.

About 40 percent of our present secondary school science and mathematics teachers have participated in one or more of these institutes.

The new emphasis being taken by the foundation, perhaps partly for this reason, with respect to this program, will emphasize leadership training and courses which include both subject matter training and pedagogical skills.

Beforehand, they were directed largely to courses themselves but not to how they are taught.

Let me say, a lot of us can remember a great deal of what we got out of high school was in the how and not just in the what.

A significant reduction in the level of support for these institutes has been proposed by the NSF and approved by the committee, but only on a tentative basis.

The committee will watch closely during the coming year to determine the effectiveneses of new programs for precollege instructional personnel, and will demand strict assurance that these new programs are, in fact, superior to the existing institutes.

At the undergraduate level NSF programs aim to keep teachers apprised of new discoveries and develop workable ways of getting new concepts across to their students.

At the graduate level NSF supports science faculty fellowships and short-term instructional projects for leading professors who participate in research at the frontiers of knowledge.

I wish that it would have been possible for all of us to be at those hearings and to hear the testimony from witnesses from all across the country concerning the needs of the scientific world which are essential to get its job done and to make its contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I think the scientific world is already "sharing" to a great extent in cutbacks on national funding. I think it would be an error for us to require it to cut back further at this time. I believe that would be false economy.

We want the young men and women in the pipeline of capability to serve this country in that area. We do not want to become merely a nation of poets. We have a lot of young folks who can tell us what they would like out of the world, but not many to tell us how to get there, and it will really require capability in the field of science and technology to do so.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman has been talking about all these scientific projects, perhaps he can tell me what the study of penguins is all about. I refer to embryology, incubation, and behavior of the Adelaide, or whatever it is—the print is not very good—the incubation and behavior of the Adelaide and related penguin species. This grant happens to go to an Iowa college. Could the gentleman inform me as to just what they are doing when they are studying this variety of penguin?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The gentleman has managed to surface a specific grant of which I have no immediate knowledge. As it is to an Iowa college, I must assume it is a meritorious grant. But as I was an English major, I shall defer to the scientist on our committee, our chairman.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not a scientist, but last year, along with several others, I had the privilege of going to Antarctica, where most of this work is being done. There are many people, teams down there, working with penguins. I do not know just what the words to which the gentleman referred mean. They are as strange to me as they are to you. But I do know that we talked with three people from one of the universities who had discovered a new nematode. I had thought that nematodes came only in potatoes. But they brought these out of the penguins.

They put them under a microscope for us, and they looked like three or four little pieces of thread about a third of an inch long. Under the microscope they looked like three little snakes wiggling.

Mr. GROSS. Were those Irish potatoes?

Mr. MILLER of California. No, that is just what they get into.

Mr. GROSS. I thought they were some of the snakes we have heard about in Ireland.

Mr. MILLER of California. Maybe that is where they went, into the potatoes. I have no idea. But you have asked the question, and I can only tell you of my experience. These people were very much excited about the discovery. They were going back for more study, for they felt that if they could be found there, they could be found some place else.

I do not know the relationship of nematodes to the human body. I do not know if they exist in our bodies or whether they can exist. But perhaps if they do get into the human body, they might do the same damage to us that they do to Irish potatoes, and I know the gentleman would not like that.

Mr. GROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from California for his interesting discourse. It did not add anything in answer to the question about penguins. Perhaps the gentleman cannot answer it. I know he was walking along on good, solid ice down there in the Antarctic.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, 2 miles of it, as a matter of fact, straight down. I am not a biologist, so I cannot tell the gentleman all the details of the study. All I can tell you is that they were excited.

Mr. GROSS. The penguins or the scientists?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on his excellent statement and also for his competence on our committee. As a new member, the gentleman from Missouri has shown unusual interest and knowledge that has added to our work.

I must say the remarks of our chairman certainly show that when anything comes up, from penguins to science, he has been right there. So I think the gentleman from Iowa got an answer from the correct person when the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee can report that he had personal experience both with the penguins and with the nematodes during the past year.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, so I may ask the gentleman from Iowa a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, how many penguins does the gentleman from Iowa have out there?

Mr. GROSS. In Iowa? I do not know that we have any.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1971, I think it is very appropriate to discuss the establishment of a program to encourage students to pursue careers in the fields of ecology and environment.

The committee report on the National Science Foundation Act states that one of the challenges of our Nation "is to find ways to improve environmental quality without making a corresponding reduction in our standard of living such as would result, for example, if we elected to retreat to 19th century technology and population density."

I fully concur, and I think one of the best ways to meet this challenge is to stimulate young people and direct their energies toward solving environmental problems.

For this reason, I cosponsored H.R. 16847 with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) to establish a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies under the direction of the National Science Foundation.

This college would serve undergraduate students, recognized for their scholarship and potential. Its purpose would be to encourage them to pursue careers in environment and ecology.

Young men and women across the Nation offer a tremendous untapped res-

ervoir of ideas and energies. We need a massive effort at every level of society to prevent further environmental deterioration. It would be foolish to disregard the potential of youth.

Through my bill, seminars and conferences would provide a forum for outstanding undergraduates to direct their energies toward restoration of our environment.

Members of the college would be selected by a board of directors chosen by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

This legislation would also pull the private and commercial sectors into the fight against pollution. Two thirds of the program would be financed by them.

The Federal Government would provide seed money, $100,000 a year for 5 years, but would not inhibit the growth or content of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the task force on earth resources and population. In addition, I have been studying environmental and pollution problems for almost 8 years—long before the problems came to the attention of the general public or ignited much interest.

Therefore, I know the situation we face. And I know that young people want to be heard on the problems ahead of them. I can fully understand this. It is their future at stake. I feel that my bill gives them one logical channel to funnel their energies toward the betterment of their futures.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider the merits of this proposal, and then to fully support efforts to bring H.R. 16847 to the floor of the House during this session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $525,630,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed $2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed $2,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c). If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

(c) The programs referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are as follows:

(1) The programs authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and

(2) The programs authorized under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to establishing the Science Information Service.

(d)(1) Nothing in this Act, or any Act amended by this Act, shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an indeepndent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1971".

Mr. DADDARIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much that anything I may say will change those in the House who are determined to approve the biggest possible spending bill for the National Science Foundation. I am laboring under no illusions about what probably will happen, despite the fact that the House Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this particular subject has already cut the amount to $495 million from its present figure here of more than $525 million.

We have been handed another bone to pick if the move to reduce it is only by $27 million. The price of this bill has been inflated to $525,630,000, plus $2 million in foreign currencies or a total of more than $527 million.

As usual, the asking price is high in the expectation that a move would be made to lop off a few million as a gesture toward economy.

How this National Science Foundation reasonably and decently can expend $573,000,000 of the taxpayers' money between January 1 of this year and June 30 of this year is beyond me. Yet that is what the House Appropriations Committee says it is doing.

But this is not our personal money that is being tossed around. This is the taxpayers' money. So the motto as usual is spend it if it is somebody else's money.

Mr. Chairman, no case has been made for the authorization of this amount of money. In view of the financial crisis confronting the Nation, this bill ought to be cut by 50 percent. I doubt that even a token cut will be approved and so with or without it I will vote against the bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been said, I think it would be helpful to refer to some things the President of the United States has said. I do not think we ought to close this argument by looking at the activities of the National Science Foundation as being inefficient or for purposes which are not beneficial to the welfare and security of this Nation of ours. I will quote from the President of the United States, who recently said this:

> Scientific activity cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. The withdrawal of support disperses highly trained research teams, closes vital facilities, loses spin-off benefits and disrupts development momentum.

What we have tried to show here today is that, cognizant of such views, aware and sensitive of the adjustments which are taking place, we must look to the National Science Foundation to take over a greater responsibility. It is now in a better position, partly because of the action of this committee to do these things, to make sure that disruption will not occur.

I should like to refer also to the statement made by the President in 1968, when he said:

> But there is another, quieter crisis at hand. It may seem less urgent and it gets fewer headlines, but it poses unparalleled dangers and opportunities.
>
> I refer to the crisis in American science and technology.
>
> The American scientific and technological community plays a key role in maintaining our well-being and our national security. Science and technology compose a new At-

las that upholds our economic growth, our military defense, our educational system, and our bright hopes for the future of man. The role of science and technology is so large, so complex, and so pervasive, that we sometimes merely take it for granted. At other times, we fear it unreasonably, resent its power, ignore its role and deny its great promise for the future.

Science has served mankind faithfully and well. It has dramatically extended the average lifetime, shortened geographical distances, increased industrial productivity, reduced poverty, and in the long trial of war, contributed significantly to the cause of freedom.

Let us recognize what we are asking for here today is really not a swollen budget. It is a request that takes into consideration the withdrawal from the various mission agencies of research. Unless we are to say the military, for example, is the only agency of Government where research is to be supported, and that we are only interested in research in that particular area, as regards weapons systems, not what else new can be done, I believe it would be a sad commentary if we were not able to support the kind of research necessary to keep this country economically strong and socially aware.

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

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

Mr. FUQUA. I want to thank the gentleman for the time he has taken on this bill and for his dedication to it.

The point he has been making is the fact that even with the money we have in this bill, we are not taking up all of the slack which came about as a result of the so-called Mansfield amendment of last year, where the Department of Defense had to pull out a lot of its basic research activity. We are taking up a part of the slack, but still are leaving a void area. In many areas of the country research is going to come down because of the action of the Senate, later approved by the Congress, in the so-called Mansfield amendment. We are not taking up all that slack.

I thank the gentleman for what he has done in trying to bridge this gap. Still we are not closing it.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman from Florida makes a significant point. He has been one who has watched carefully the effect of amendment No. 203 in this regard, and given his support so that we might develop the science, manpower, and knowledge which this country needs for its welfare.

I do believe it is important to recognize that the figure of $60 million, which I referred to during the general debate, being transferred or brought out of other agencies, will most likely be swollen to a considerable degree in the time ahead, possibly to get into the order of $125 million—toward which we are only asking $20 million in compensation.

The best figure I can get, as we look at that swollen figure, is that about 85 percent of it will be competitive with the other work that is going on in the National Science Foundation.

I believe they should get this kind of support.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. I certainly do yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have read in the House Appropriations Committee hearings that the National Science Foundation is now going to make a study of inflation. Its so-called experts will not have far to go. It can do it right at home and on the basis of this bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Chairman, that is a matter of point of view. I just disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16595) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 954, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ROUDEBUSH

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROUDEBUSH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 16595 to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 1 line 9, strike the amount "$525,630,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$498,000,000".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 137, nays 188, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—137

Abbitt	Findley	Mizell
Abernethy	Flowers	Montgomery
Adair	Flynt	Myers
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Natcher
Andrews, Ala.	Foreman	Nelsen
Arends	Fountain	Nichols
Ashbrook	Frey	O'Konski
Baring	Goldwater	Pettis
Belcher	Goodling	Poage
Berry	Griffin	Poff
Betts	Gross	Purcell
Bevill	Grover	Quillen
Blackburn	Hagan	Randall
Bow	Haley	Rarick
Brinkley	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Reifel
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Rhodes
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Roberts
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Roudebush
Burleson, Tex.	Hunt	Ruth
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Satterfield
Bush	Johnson, Pa.	Schadeberg
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Scherle
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Cederberg	King	Scott
Chamberlain	Kleppe	Sebelius
Clancy	Landgrebe	Shriver
Clausen, Don H.	Langen	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Collins	Lennon	Snyder
Colmer	Lloyd	Springer
Cowger	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	Lukens	Sullivan
Cunningham	McCloskey	Talcott
Daniel, Va.	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Thompson, Ga.
Dellenback	McDonald, Mich.	Thomson, Wis.
Denney	Marsh	Wampler
Dennis	Martin	Watts
Derwinski	May	Widnall
Devine	Mayne	Wiggins
Duncan	Michel	Wold
Edwards, Ala.	Mills	Wylie
Erlenborn	Minshall	Zion
Eshleman	Mize	

NAYS—188

Adams	Feighan	Mahon
Addabbo	Fish	Mailliard
Albert	Flood	Mann
Alexander	Foley	Mathias
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, William D.	Meeds
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fulton, Pa.	Melcher
Annunzio	Fulton, Tenn.	Meskill
Ashley	Fuqua	Mikva
Barrett	Galifianakis	Miller, Calif.
Bennett	Gaydos	Miller, Ohio
Biester	Gettys	Minish
Blanton	Giaimo	Mink
Boggs	Gibbons	Monagan
Boland	Gilbert	Morgan
Bolling	Gonzalez	Moss
Brasco	Gude	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Hamilton	Nedzi
Brotzman	Hanley	Nix
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Olsen
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Neal, Ga.
Burton, Calif.	Harrington	O'Neill, Mass.
Button	Hastings	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Hathaway	Patman
Caffery	Hays	Pelly
Casey	Hébert	Perkins
Celler	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Pirnie
Clark	Helstoski	Podell
Cleveland	Hicks	Powell
Conable	Horton	Preyer, N.C.
Conte	Hosmer	Price, Ill.
Corbett	Howard	Price, Tex.
Corman	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Quie
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Tenn.	Railsback
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Rees
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Dingell	Kazen	Riegle
Donohue	Kee	Robison
Dorn	Keith	Rodino
Downing	Kluczynski	Roe
Dulski	Koch	Rogers, Colo.
Dwyer	Kyl	Rogers, Fla.
Eckhardt	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, La.	Leggett	Rosenthal
Eilberg	Lowenstein	Rostenkowski
Esch	McClory	Roth
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Roybal
Fascell	Madden	Ruppe
		Ryan
		Shipley

Sikes	Teague, Tex.	Whitehurst
Sisk	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson,
Smith, Iowa	Tiernan	Charles H.
Smith, N.Y.	Udall	Winn
Stafford	Ullman	Wolff
Staggers	Van Deerlin	Wright
Stanton	Vander Jagt	Wyatt
Steed	Vanik	Wydler
Steiger, Wis.	Vigorito	Yates
Stephens	Waggonner	Young
Symington	Waldie	Zablocki
Taylor	White	Zwach

NOT VOTING—104

Anderson, Tenn.	Fisher	Morton
Aspinall	Fraser	Mosher
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.
Beall, Md.	Friedel	Obey
Bell, Calif.	Gallagher	O'Hara
Biaggi	Garmatz	Ottinger
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Patten
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Brademas	Griffiths	Philbin
Bray	Gubser	Pickle
Brock	Halpern	Pollock
Broomfield	Hammer-schmidt	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Buchanan	Harvey	Rooney, N.Y.
Cabell	Hawkins	St Germain
Carey	Holifield	Saylor
Carter	Ichord	Scheuer
Chisholm	Jacobs	Schneebeli
Clay	Kirwan	Slack
Cohelan	Kuykendall	Stokes
Collier	Landrum	Stratton
Conyers	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Cramer	Long, Md.	Stuckey
Culver	McCarthy	Taft
Dawson	McDade	Tunney
Delaney	McEwen	Watkins
Dent	McKneally	Watson
Dickinson	McMillan	Weicker
Diggs	Macdonald, Mass.	Whalen
Dowdy	MacGregor	Whalley
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Whitten
Edwards, Calif.	Mollohan	Wilson, Bob
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead	Wyman
Fallon	Morse	Yatron
Farbstein		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Moose.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Taft.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Scheuer with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Stratton.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Bingham.

Mr. KEITH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 6, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—312

Abbitt	Cunningham	Heckler, Mass.
Abernethy	Daddario	Helstoski
Adair	Daniel, Va.	Henderson
Adams	Daniels, N.J.	Hicks
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Hogan
Albert	Davis, Wis.	Horton
Alexander	de la Garza	Hosmer
Anderson, Calif.	Dellenback	Howard
Anderson, Ill.	Denney	Hull
Andrews, Ala.	Dennis	Hungate
Andrews, N. Dak.	Derwinski	Hunt
Annunzio	Devine	Hutchinson
Arends	Dingell	Ichord
Ashley	Donohue	Jarman
Baring	Dorn	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Belcher	Duncan	Jonas
Bennett	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Berry	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Betts	Edwards, La.	Jones, Tenn.
Bevill	Eilberg	Kastenmeier
Biester	Erlenborn	Kazen
Blackburn	Esch	Kee
Blanton	Eshleman	Keith
Boggs	Evins, Tenn.	Kleppe
Boland	Fascell	Kluczynski
Bolling	Feighan	Koch
Bow	Findley	Kyl
Brasco	Fish	Kyros
Brinkley	Flood	Landgrebe
Brooks	Flowers	Langen
Brotzman	Flynt	Latta
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Leggett
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Lennon
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, William D.	Lloyd
Broyhill, Va.	Foreman	Lowenstein
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Lujan
Burke, Mass.	Frey	Lukens
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton, Pa.	McClory
Burlison, Mo.	Fulton, Tenn.	McCloskey
Burton, Calif.	Fuqua	McClure
Burton, Utah	Galifianakis	McCulloch
Bush	Gaydos	McDonald, Mich.
Button	Gettys	McFall
Byrne, Pa.	Giaimo	Madden
Byrnes, Wis.	Gibbons	Mahon
Caffery	Gilbert	Mailliard
Casey	Goldwater	Mann
Cederberg	Gonzalez	Marsh
Celler	Goodling	Martin
Chamberlain	Gray	Mathias
Chappell	Griffin	May
Clancy	Grover	Mayne
Clark	Gude	Meeds
Clausen, Don H.	Hagan	Melcher
Clawson, Del	Haley	Meskill
Cleveland	Hamilton	Michel
Collins	Hanley	Mikva
Colmer	Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Calif.
Conable	Harrington	Miller, Ohio
Conte	Harsha	Mills
Corbett	Hastings	Minish
Corman	Hathaway	Mink
Coughlin	Hays	Minshall
Cowger	Hébert	Mize
	Hechler, W. Va.	Mizell
		Monagan
		Montgomery
		Morgan
		Moss
		Murphy, N.Y.
		Myers
		Natcher
		Nedzi
		Nelsen
		Nichols
		Nix
		O'Konski
		Olsen
		O'Neal, Ga.
		O'Neill, Mass.
		Passman
		Patman
		Pelly
		Perkins
		Pettis
		Pike
		Pirnie
		Poage
		Podell
		Poff
		Powell
		Preyer, N.C.
		Price, Ill.
		Price, Tex.
		Pryor, Ark.
		Purcell
		Quillen
		Railsback
		Randall
		Rarick
		Rees
		Reid, Ill.
		Reifel
		Reuss
		Rhodes
		Riegle
		Roberts
		Robison
		Rodino
		Roe
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roth
		Roybal
		Ruppe
		Ruth
		Ryan
		Sandman
		Satterfield
		Schadeberg
		Scherle
		Schwengel
		Scott
		Sebelius
		Shipley
		Shriver
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Smith, Calif.
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Snyder
		Springer
		Stafford
		Staggers
		Stanton
		Steed
		Steiger, Ariz.
		Stephens
		Sullivan
		Symington
		Talcott
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Thompson, Ga.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Tiernan
		Udall
		Ullman
		Vander Jagt
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Waldie
		Wampler
		Watts
		White
		Whitehurst
		Widnall
		Wiggins
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Winn
		Wold
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Yates
		Young
		Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—6

Ashbrook	Crane	Hall
Camp	Gross	Roudebush

NOT VOTING—111

Anderson, Tenn.	Fraser	Mosher
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.
Ayres	Friedel	Obey
Beall, Md.	Gallagher	O'Hara
Bell, Calif.	Garmatz	Ottinger
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	Patten
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Blatnik	Griffiths	Philbin
Brademas	Gubser	Pickle
Bray	Halpern	Pollock
Brock	Hammer-schmidt	Pucinski
Broomfield	Hanna	Quie
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Buchanan	Harvey	Rivers
Cabell	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Holifield	St Germain
Carter	Jacobs	Saylor
Chisholm	Karth	Scheuer
Clay	King	Schneebeli
Cohelan	Kirwan	Skubitz
Collier	Kuykendall	Slack
Conyers	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Cramer	Long, La.	Stokes
Culver	Long, Md.	Stratton
Dawson	McCarthy	Stubblefield
Delaney	McDade	Stuckey
Dent	McEwen	Taft
Dickinson	McKneally	Tunney
Diggs	McMillan	Van Deerlin
Dowdy	Macdonald, Mass.	Watkins
Eckhardt	MacGregor	Watson
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Weicker
Edwards, Calif.	Mollohan	Whalen
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead	Whalley
Fallon	Morse	Whitten
Farbstein	Morton	Williams
Fisher		Wilson, Bob
		Yatron

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Weicker.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Taft.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. King.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Scheuer with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Stratton.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Long of Maryland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed, H.R. 16595.

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

There was no objection.

SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS, POLICEMEN, AND FIREMEN

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from further consideration of S. 2694, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, a Senate bill similar to that passed by the House, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I.—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rate of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service steps						Longevity steps		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a)	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Fire private.									
Police private.									
Subclass (b)	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,853
Private assigned as:									
Technician.									
Plainclothesman.									
Station clerk.									
Motorcycle officer.									
Class 2:									
Subclass (a)	9,775	10,340	10,905	11,470			12,035	12,600	13,165
Fire inspector.									
Subclass (b)	10,370	10,935	11,500	12,065			12,630	13,195	13,760
Fire inspector assigned as technician.									
Class 3	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Assistant marine engineer.									
Assistant pilot.									
Detective.									
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,050	11,600	12,150	12,700			13,250	13,800	14,350
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	11,645	12,195	12,745	13,295			13,845	14,395	14,945
Police sergeant assigned as motorcycle officer.									
Class 5	12,750	13,390	14,030	14,670			15,310	15,950	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	13,815	14,505	15,195	15,885			16,575	17,265	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	14,875	15,620	16,365	17,110			17,855	18,600	
Fire captain.									
Police captain.									
Class 8	17,000	17,850	18,700	19,550			20,400	21,250	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	19,550	20,530	21,510	22,490			23,470	24,450	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									
Class 10	21,500	22,500	23,500	24,500			25,500	26,500	
Assistant fire chief.									
Assistant chief of police.									
Commanding officer of White House Police.									
Commandef officer of the U.S. Park Police.									
Class 11	27,000	28,000	29,000	30,000					
Fire chief.									
Chief of police.									

SEC. 102. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendments made by section 101 of this title apply shall be adjusted as follows:

Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a salary class or subclass in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding schedule service or longevity rate in effect on and after the effective date of this title, except that:

(a) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was assigned as technician I or plainclothes-

man in subclass (b) of class 1 or as technician II, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (c) of class I shall, on the effective date of this title be assigned as and receive basic compensation as technician, plainclothesman, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (b) of class 1 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(b) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving as a fire inspector assigned as technician I or technician II in subclass (b) or (c) of class 2 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed and receive basic compensation as fire inspector assigned as technician in subclass (b) of class 2 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(c) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving in subclass (b) of class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title be placed in and receive basic compensation in class 10 at the service step or longevity step corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(d) The Fire Chief or Chief of Police who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving in class 10 shall on the effective date of this title be placed in and receive basic compensation in class 11 at the service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(e) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force who is performing the duty of a dog handler on or after the effective date of this title shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $595 per annum except that if a police private is classed as technician in subclass (b) of class 1 in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as dog handler such police private shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 103. Section 303(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 as amended (D.C. Code sec. 4–829(c)) is amended by deleting "(b), or (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (b)".

SEC. 104. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 401(a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–832(a)) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than three successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 1 through 4, nor more than two successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 5 through 10.

"(3) In the case of the officers or members serving in salary classes other than class 1, each longevity step increase shall be equal to one step increase of the salary class or subclass of a salary class in which the officer or member is serving."

SEC. 105. (a) Section 105 of Public Law 88–575, approved September 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 882; D.C. Code, sec. 4–832(c)), is repealed, effective on the date of enactment of this title.

(b) Notwithstanding this section, the rate of basic, gross, or total annual pay received by an officer or member immediately before the effective date of this title shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 106. Except for section 105, this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1969.

SEC. 107. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1969".

TITLE II—SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501) is amended by striking the salary schedules contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PROPOSED TEACHERS' SALARY ACT AMENDMENTS

	"Service Steps								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1:									
A Superintendent of schools	$38,500								
B Vice superintendent	35,000								
Class 2:									
A Deputy superintendent	31,000								
B Associate superintendent	29,000								
lass 3:									
Asistant superintendent	22,190	$22,720	$23,250	$23,780	$24,310	$24,840	$25,370	$25,900	$26,430
Class 4	19,480	19,940	20,400	20,860	21,320	21,780	22,240	22,700	23,160
Director, curriculum.									
Director, staff development.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	17,600	18,040	18,480	18,920	19,360	19,800	20,240	20,680	21,120
Group B, master's degree	18,380	18,820	19,260	19,700	20,140	20,580	21,020	21,460	21,900
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,770	19,210	19,650	20,000	20,530	20,970	21,410	21,850	22,290
Group D, doctor's degree	19,160	19,600	20,040	20,480	20,920	21,360	21,800	22,240	22,680
Chief examiner.									
Executive assistants to vice and Associate superintendents.									
Director of food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level IV, principal	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level III, principal	17,345	17,770	18,195	18,620	19,045	19,470	19,895	20,320	20,745
Level II, principal	16,830	17,255	17,680	18,105	18,530	18,955	19,380	19,805	20,230
Level I, principal	16,315	16,740	17,165	17,590	18,015	18,440	18,865	19,290	19,715
Group C, M.A. plus 30	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level IV, principal	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level III, principal	17,735	18,160	18,585	19,010	19,435	19,860	20,285	20,710	21,135
Level II, principal	17,220	17,645	18,070	18,495	18,920	19,345	19,770	20,195	20,625
Level I, principal	16,705	17,130	17,555	17,980	18,405	18,830	19,255	19,680	20,100
Group D, doctor's degree	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level IV, principal	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level III, principal	18,125	18,550	18,975	19,400	19,825	20,250	20,675	21,100	21,525
Level II, principal	17,610	18,035	18,460	18,885	19,310	19,735	20,160	20,585	21,010
Level I, principal	17,095	17,520	17,945	18,370	18,795	19,220	19,645	20,070	20,495
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent of pupil personnel services.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, evening and summary school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capital Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									

	"Service Steps								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	$16,205	$16,595	$16,985	$17,375	$17,765	$18,155	$18,545	$18,935	$19,325
Group C master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,595	16,985	17,735	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715
Group D, doctor's degree	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	19,935	19,325	19,715	20,105
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	14,685	14,985	15,385	15,785	16,185	16,585	16,985	17,485	17,985
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,005	15,305	15,705	16,105	16,505	16,905	17,305	17,805	18,305
Group D, doctor's degree	15,325	15,625	16,025	16,425	16,825	17,225	16,625	18,125	18,625
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal , health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,880	14,240	14,600	19,960	15,320	15,680	16,040	16,400	16,760
Group B, master's degree	14,660	15,020	15,380	15,740	16,100	16,460	16,820	17,180	17,540
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,050	15,410	15,770	16,130	16,490	16,850	17,210	17,570	17,930
Group D, doctor's degree	15,440	15,800	16,160	16,520	16,880	17,240	17,600	17,960	18,320
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	14,095	14,445	14,795	15,145	15,495	15,845	16,195	16,545	16,895
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,485	14,835	15,815	15,535	15,885	16,235	16,585	16,935	17,285
Group D, doctor's degree	14,875	15,225	15,575	15,925	16,275	16,625	16,975	17,325	17,675
Assistant director audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	13,670	14,005	14,340	14,675	15,010	15,345	15,680	16,015	16,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,060	14,395	14,730	15,065	15,400	15,735	16,070	16,405	16,740
Group D, doctor's degree	14,450	14,785	15,120	15,455	15,790	16,125	16,460	16,795	17,130
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	13,200	13,525	13,850	14,175	14,500	14,825	15,150	15,475	15,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,590	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190
Group D, doctor's degree	13,980	14,305	14,630	14,955	15,280	15,605	15,930	16,255	16,580
Cheif attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									

	"Service steps												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Class 13:													
Group B, master's degree	$12,080	$12,465	$12,850	$13,235	$13,620	$14,005	$14,390	$14,775	$15,160				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,470	12,855	13,240	13,625	14,010	14,395	14,780	15,165	15,550				
Group D, doctor's degree	12,860	13,245	13,630	14,015	14,400	14,785	15,170	15,555	15,940				
Assistant professor, laboratory school.													
Psychiatric social worker.													
Class 14:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	9,250	9,660	10,070	10,480	10,890	11,300	11,710	12,120	12,530	$12,940	$13,350	$13,760	$14,170
Group B, master's degree	10,030	10,440	10,850	11,260	11,670	12,080	12,490	12,900	13,310	13,720	14,130	14,540	14,950
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,420	10,830	11,240	11,650	12,060	12,470	12,880	13,290	13,700	14,110	14,520	14,930	15,340
Group D, doctor's degree	10,810	11,220	11,630	12,040	12,450	12,860	13,270	13,860	14,090	14,500	14,910	15,370	15,730
Coordinator of practical nursing.													
Census supervisor.													

"CLASS 15

	"Service steps													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Y
Group A, bachelor's degree	$8,000	$8,320	$8,640	$8,960	$9,280	$9,600	$9,950	$10,300	$10,650	$10,600	$11,350	$11,700	$12,050	$13,000
Group A-1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	8,400	8,720	9,040	9,360	9,680	10,000	10,360	10,720	11,080	11,440	11,800	12,160	12,520	13,800
Group B, master's degree	8,800	9,175	9,550	9,925	10,450	11,000	11,500	11,900	12,300	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,200	9,575	9,950	10,325	10,850	11,400	11,900	12,300	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	14,300	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours	9,600	9,975	10,350	10,725	11,250	11,800	12,300	12,700	13,100	13,500	13,900	14,300	14,700	16,100."
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.														
Attendance officer.														
Child labor inspectors.														
Counselor, placement.														
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.														
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.														
Research assistant.														
School social worker.														
Speech correctionist.														
School psychologist.														

(2) Section 2(c)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1511(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'plus fifteen credit hours' and 'plus thirty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than fifteen graduate semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree or thirty graduate semester hours beyond the master's degree as the case may be in academic, vocational, or professional courses, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the fifteen or thirty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such thirty credit hours. The term 'plus sixty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than sixty graduate semester hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop

teacher in the vocational education program the sixty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such sixty credit hours."

(3) Section 3 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1512) is amended by adding the words "or salary class" immediately after the word "position" each time it appears in the section.

(4) Section 4 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1521) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Board of Education in group A of salary class 15 who possesses a bachelor's degree plus fifteen credit hours shall be transferred in accordance with section 10 (a) and (b) to group IA of salary class 15."

(5) Section 5 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522) is amended by adding a subsection (f), reading as follows:

"(f) Whenever a teacher or school officer is changed to a lower salary class or to a lower level in the same salary class as in the case of school principals in the public school system, the Superintendent of Schools is authorized to fix the rate of compensation at a rate provided for in the salary class or level to which the employee is changed which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation, except that if his existing rate falls between two service steps provided in such lower salary class or level, he shall receive the higher of such rates; if he is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower class or level in which he is to be placed, he will retain his existing rate of compensation and receive one-half of any future increases granted his new salary class or level: *Provided,* That such reduction to a lower salary class or level is for reasons other than (a) for personal cause; (b) at his own request; (c) as a condition of a previous temporary promotion to a higher grade; or, (d) because of a reduction in force brought about by lack of funds or curtailment of work."

(6) Section 6(a)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On July 1, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969 each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is on service step 13 and completes 15 years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. Each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is on longevity step X, on such effective date, shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service in salary classes 3 through 15 for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5."

(7) Section 6(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531 (b)) is amended by striking everything in the paragraph after the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Beginning July 1 following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969, each permanent employee who has not reached the highest service step for his salary class, or class and group, under this Act shall advance one such step each year until he reaches the highest step for his class, or class and group, except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step Y on July 1, following the completion of fifteen years of creditable service: *Provided,* That the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(8) Section 10, subsections (a) and (b) (D.C. Code sec. 31–1535 (a) and (b)) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969, each promotion to group B, group C, or group D, within a salary class or group IA within salary class 15, shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular Board meeting of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree or fifteen credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree in salary class 15, as the case may be, whichever is later.

"(b) Any employee in a position in a salary class in the salary schedules in section 1 of this Act who is promoted to group B, group C, or group D of such salary class or group IA in the case of salary class 15, shall be placed in the same numerical service step in his new group which he would have occupied in the group from which promoted."

(9) Section 13(a) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended school year programs, adult education programs, and Americanization schools under and within appropriations made by Congress. The pay for teachers, officers, and other education employees in the summer school programs, adult education programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist	$6.86	$7.61	$8.42
Psychiatric social worker	8.02	8.92	9.86
Clinical psychologist	8.35	9.29	10.28
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary school	9.69	10.77	11.92
Supervising director	10.02	11.15	12.33
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	10.69	11.89	13.15
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	6.86	7.61	8.42
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	7.54	8.38	9.27
Assistant principal	10.66	11.85	13.11
Principal	11.76	13.07	14.46."

(10) Section 13(d)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Board is authorized to pay an employee in salary class 15 who performs an extra-duty activity the additional compensation prescribed for such extra-duty activity by the Commissioner in accordance with this subsection: *Provided,* That (1) the activity involves the supervision and direction of students who select such activity voluntarily and (2) that the activity is performed on a continuing basis in addition to the standards teaching load of a regular duty school teacher or work load assigned to other employees in salary class 15."

(11) Section 13(d)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(2)) is amended by adding the words "or other employees" after "classroom teachers" each time it appears in the subsection, and by striking out "monthly" and inserting in lieu thereof "semimonthly".

(12) Section 14 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1543) is amended to read as follows: "On July 1, 1970, each employee assigned to salary class 15 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in semimonthy installments in accordance with existing law. All other employees covered by the provisions of this Act shall have their annual salaries paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments in accordance with existing law. Annual salaries for employees paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments means calendar year for purposes of this section."

SEC. 203. The increase provided in this title for the position of Superintendent of Schools under class IA shall be effective only with respect to an individual who is appointed to that position subsequent to the date of the enactment of this title.

SEC. 204. The Act approved May 26, 1908, entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine, and for other purposes" is amended as follows:

(1) The final proviso under PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS (D.C. Code, sec. 31–609), is amended to read as follows: "That, effective July 1, 1970, the salaries of employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969, whose services commence with the opening of school and who shall perform their duties, shall begin on the 1st day of September and shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments. The first payment shall be made on the 1st day of October, or as near that date as practicable; and the second payment shall be made fifteen days thereafter or as near that date as practicable. Subsequent payments shall be on the first and sixteenth days of the month or as near those dates as practicable: *Provided,* That the salaries of other employees in salary class 15 shall begin when they enter upon their duties."

(2) The final paragraph under PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS (D.C. Code, sec. 31–630), is amended to read as follows:

'Effective July 1, 1970, the following rules for division of time and computation of pay for services rendered are hereby established: Compensations of all employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1969 shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments. In making payments for a fractional part of a month, one-fifteenth of an installment shall be the daily rate of pay. For the purpose of computing such compensation and for computing time for services rendered during a fractional part of a semimonthly period in connection with the compensation of such employees, each and every semimonthly period shall be held to consist of fifteen days, without regard to the actual number of days in any semimonthly period thus excluding the thirty-first day of any calendar month from the computation and treating February as if it actually had thirty days. Any person entering the service of the schools during a thirty-one day month and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to pay for that month from the date of entry to the thirtieth day of said month, both days inclusive; and any person entering said service during the month of February and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to one month's pay, less as many days thereof as there were days elapsed prior to the date of entry: *Provided,* That for one day's unauthorized absence on the thirty-first day of any calendar month one day's pay shall be forfeited."

SEC. 205. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay

period which begins on or after September 1, 1969.

TITLE III—FUNDS

SEC. 301. (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the District of Columbia, in addition to any other amounts authorized under this or any other Act to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for such fiscal year, the amount of $5,200,000 for use in payment of increases in salaries of police, firemen, teachers, and school officers authorized by this Act for the period commencing January 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1970.

(b) (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the District of Columbia, in addition to any other amounts authorized under this or any other Act to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for such fiscal year, the amount of $5,600,000 for use in payment of increase in salaries of police, firemen, teachers, and school officers authorized by this Act for the period commencing January 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1970.

(2) In the event that the tax revenues of the District of Columbia are increased during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, by reason of legislation enacted by the Congress subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act, the District of Columbia, with respect to any amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the amount of such increase in tax revenues received by the District of Columbia during such fiscal year, or such amount so appropriated, whichever is the lesser.

SEC. 302. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the District of Columbia, in addition to any other amounts authorized under this or any other Act to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for such fiscal year, the amount of $10,746,000 for use in payment of increases in salaries of police, firemen, teachers, and school officers authorized by this Act for the period commencing July 1, 1969, and ending December 31, 1969.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2694 and insert in lieu thereof the language of H.R. 17138, as passed, as follows:

TITLE I—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

SEC. 101. This title, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 102. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rate of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

SALARY SCHEDULE

Salary class and title	Service step						Longevity step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a)	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Fire private.									
Police private.									
Subclass (b)	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,835
Private assigned as:									
Technician.									
Plainclothesman.									
Station clerk.									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horsemounted officer.									
Class 2:									
Subclass (a)	9,775	10,340	10,905	11,470			12,035	12,600	13,165
Fire inspector.									
Subclass (b)	10,370	10,935	11,500	12,065			12,630	13,195	13,760
Fire inspector assigned as: Technician.									
Class 3	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Assistant marine engineer.									
Assistant pilot.									
Detective.									
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,900	12,495	13,090	13,685			14,280	14,875	15,470
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	12,070	12,645	13,220	13,795			14,370	14,945	15,520
Police sergeant assigned as—									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horse mounted officer.									
Class 5	13,300	13,965	14,630	15,295			15,960	16,625	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	14,550	15,280	16,010	16,740			17,470	18,200	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	15,800	16,590	17,380	18,170			18,960	19,750	
Captain.									
Class 8	18,500	19,425	20,350	21,275			22,200	23,125	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	21,500	22,575	23,650	24,725			25,800	26,875	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									
Class 10	23,800	24,990	26,180	27,370					
Assistant chief of police.									
Assistant fire chief.									
Commanding officer of the White House Police.									
Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.									
Class 11	28,500	29,925	31,350	32,775					
Fire chief.									
Chief of police.									

SEC. 103. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendments made by section 102 of this title apply shall be adjusted as follows: Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a salary class or subclass in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity step in effect on and after the effective date of this title, except that:

(1) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was assigned as technician I or plainclothesman in subclass (b) of salary class 1 or as technican II, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (c) of salary class 1 shall, on the effective date of this title, be assigned as and receive basic compensation as technician, plainclothesman, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (b) of salary class 1 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(2) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving as a fire inspector assigned as technician I or technician II in subclass (b) or (c) of salary class 2 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed and receive basic compensation as fire inspector assigned as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 2 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(3) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title

was serving in subclass (b) of salary class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 10 at the service step or longevity step corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(4) The Fire Chief and Chief of Police who immediately prior to the effective date of this title were serving in salary class 10 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 11 and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(5) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force and United States Park Police force who is performing the duty of a dog handler on or after the effective date of this title shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $595 per annum, except that if a police private is classed as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Fireman's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as dog handler, such police private shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 104. Section 303(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829(c)) is amended by deleting ", (b), or (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (b)".

SEC. 105. The first sentence of section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–830) is amended to read as follows: "Any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class or subclass of a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher salary class or subclass which exceeds his existing rate of compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class or subclass from which he is promoted or transferred."

SEC. 106. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 401(a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–832(a)) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than three successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 1 through 4, and not more than two successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 5 through 9.

"(3) In the case of the officers or members serving in salary classes other than salary class 1, each longevity step increase shall be equal to one step increase of the salary class or subclass of a salary class in which the officer or member is serving."

SEC. 107. (a) Each officer and member in active service on the effective date of this title to whom section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title apply, who is receiving basic compensation at one of the scheduled service or longevity steps of a salary class or subclass other than subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1, and whose latest promotion has been subsequent to January 5, 1963, and prior to effective date of this title shall (1) be placed in the service or longevity step of his salary class or subclass which provides a salary not less than the amount he would have received as a result of sections 102, 103, and 105 of this title had such promotion occurred on or after the effective date of this title, and (2) receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the salary class or subclass in which he is serving.

(b) The rate of basic compensation received by any officer or member under the provisions of section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this section

(c) Any officer or member who receives additional compensation as a result of the enactment of this section shall be credited with any active service he has rendered in the service or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829, sec. 4–832).

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the effective date of this title and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the provisions of section 12 of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 108. All retired officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who at any time prior to October 1, 1956, held the rank of Assistant Superintendent shall be held and considered for the purpose of computing retirement benefits payable on and after the effective date of this title to have retired in the rank of Assistant Chief.

SEC. 109. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title or services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, services in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 110. (a) Paragraph 3 of section 102 of the Act of November 13, 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823d–1(3)), is amended by inserting after "5" the following: ", 6, or".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the effective date of this title.

SEC. 111. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to Government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 112. This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1970.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN POLICE MATTERS

SEC. 201 Paragraph (5) of section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–122), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The trial board shall be the exclusive body to receive, hear, and determine complaints against officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force."

SEC. 202. (a) The uniform of officers and members of the United States Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch showing the flag of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police Board in the case of the Capitol Police, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia in the case of the Metropolitan Police force shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(c) This section shall take effect one hundred and eight days after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 203. All laws of the United States in force on the date of enactment of this title in which reference is made to the White House Police force are amended by substituting "Executive Protective Service" for each such reference.

SEC. 204. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside", approved July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–132a) is amended—

(A) by inserting immediately after "(a)" the following: "except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section,";

(B) by striking out ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section," in the second sentence;

(C) by striking out "twelve" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five"; and

(D) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of this Act, the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Chief of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, may in individual cases waive the requirement that an officer or member reside within the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan district."

TITLE III—SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 302. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501) is amended by striking the salary schedules contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1:									
Superintendent of schools	$35,000								
Class 2:									
Group A, Deputy superintendent	31,200								
Group B, Associate superintendent	29,000								
Class 3:									
Assistant superintendent	22,190	$22,720	$23,250	$23,780	$24,310	$24,840	$25,370	$25,900	$26,430
Class 4	19,480	19,940	20,400	20,860	21,320	21,780	22,240	22,700	23,160
Director, curriculum.									
Director, staff development.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	17,600	18,040	18,480	18,920	19,360	19,800	20,240	20,680	21,120
Group B, master's degree	18,380	18,820	19,260	19,700	20,140	20,580	21,020	21,460	21,900
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,770	19,210	19,650	20,090	20,530	20,970	21,410	21,850	22,290
Group D, doctor's degree	19,160	19,600	20,040	20,480	20,920	21,360	21,800	22,240	22,680
Chief examiner.									
Executive assistants to associate superintendents.									
Director of food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to Deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level IV, principal	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level III, principal	17,345	17,770	18,195	18,620	19,045	19,470	19,895	20,320	20,745
Level II, principal	16,830	17,255	17,680	18,105	18,530	18,955	19,380	19,805	20,230
Level I, principal	16,315	16,740	17,165	17,590	18,015	18,440	18,865	19,290	19,715
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level IV, principal	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level III, principal	17,735	18,160	18,585	19,010	19,435	19,860	20,285	20,710	21,135
Level II, principal	17,220	17,645	18,070	18,495	18,920	19,345	19,770	20,195	20,620
Level I, principal	16,705	17,130	17,555	17,980	18,405	18,830	19,255	19,680	20,105
Group D, doctor's degree	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level IV principal	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level III, principal	18,125	18,550	18,975	19,400	19,825	20,250	20,675	21,100	21,525
Level II, principal	17,610	18,035	18,460	18,885	19,310	19,735	20,160	20,585	21,010
Level I, principal	17,095	17,520	17,945	18,370	18,795	19,220	19,645	20,070	20,495
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent of pupil personnel services.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	16,205	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715
Group D, doctor's degree	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715	20,105
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	14,800	15,175	15,550	15,925	16,300	16,675	17,050	17,425	17,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,190	15,565	15,940	16,315	16,690	17,065	17,440	17,815	18,190
Group D, doctor's degree	15,580	15,955	16,330	16,705	17,080	17,455	17,830	18,205	18,580
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,880	14,240	14,600	14,960	15,320	15,680	16,040	16,400	16,760
Group B, master's degree	14,660	15,020	15,380	15,740	16,100	16,460	16,820	17,180	17,540
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,050	15,410	15,770	16,130	16,490	16,850	17,210	17,570	17,930
Group D, doctor's degree	15,440	15,800	16,160	16,520	16,880	17,240	17,600	17,960	18,320
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	14,095	14,445	14,795	15,145	15,495	15,845	16,195	16,545	16,895
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,485	14,835	15,185	15,535	15,885	16,235	16,585	16,935	17,285
Group D, doctor's degree	14,875	15,225	15,575	15,925	16,275	16,625	16,975	17,325	17,675
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	13,670	14,005	14,340	14,675	15,010	15,345	15,680	16,015	16,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,060	14,395	14,730	15,065	15,400	15,735	16,070	16,405	16,740
Group D, doctor's degree	14,450	14,785	15,120	15,455	15,790	16,125	16,460	16,795	17,130
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	13,200	13,525	13,850	14,175	14,500	14,825	15,150	15,475	15,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,590	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190
Group D, doctor's degree	13,980	14,305	14,630	14,955	15,280	15,605	15,930	16,255	16,580
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	$12,080	$12,456	$12,850	$13,235	$13,620	$14,005	$14,390	$14,775	$15,160
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,470	12,855	13,240	13,625	14,010	14,395	14,780	15,165	15,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,860	13,245	13,630	14,015	14,400	14,785	15,170	15,555	15,940
Psychiatric social worker.									

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Longevity step Y
Class 14:														
Group A, bachelor's degree	$9,250	$9,660	$10,070	$10,480	$10,890	$11,300	$11,710	$12,120	$12,530	$12,940	$13,350	$13,760	$14,170	----------
Group B, master's degree	10,030	10,440	10,850	11,260	11,670	12,080	12,490	12,900	13,310	13,720	14,130	14,540	14,950	----------
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,420	10,830	11,240	11,650	12,060	12,470	12,880	13,290	13,700	14,110	14,520	14,930	15,340	----------
Group D, doctor's degree	10,810	11,120	11,630	12,040	12,450	12,860	13,270	13,680	14,090	14,500	14,910	15,320	15,730	----------
Coordinator of practical nursing.														
Census supervisor.														
Class 15:														
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,800	8,115	8,430	8,745	9,060	9,375	9,760	10,145	10,530	10,915	11,300	11,685	12,070	$13,000
Group A-1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	8,190	8,505	8,820	9,135	9,450	9,765	10,150	10,535	10,920	11,305	11,690	12 075	12,460	13,800
Group B, master's degree	8,580	8,965	9,350	9,735	10,120	10,505	10,990	11,475	11,960	12,445	12,930	13,415	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,970	9,355	9,740	10,125	10,510	10,895	11,380	11,865	12,350	12,835	13,320	13,805	14,290	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	9,360	9,745	10,130	10,515	10,900	11,285	11,770	12,255	12,740	13,225	13,710	14,195	14,680	16,100
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.														
Attendance officer.														
Child labor inspectors.														
Counselor, placement.														
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.														
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.														
Research assistant.														
School social worker.														
Speech correctionist.														
School psychologist.														

(2) Section 2(c)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1511(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'plus fifteen credit hours' and 'plus thirty credit hours' mean the equivalent of not less than fifteen graduate semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree or thirty graduate semester hours beyond the master's degree as the case may be in academic, vocational, or professional courses, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the fifteen or thirty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such thirty credit hours. The term 'plus sixty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than sixty graduate semester hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the sixty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such sixty credit hours."

(3) Section 3 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1512) is amended by—

(A) striking out "For" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), for";

(B) inserting immediately after "position" each time it appears "or salary class"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Board of Education may place in a permanent status any fully qualified employee in salary class 15 having three or more years of satisfactory service, including service in an educational system or institution of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia, as determined by the Board, at any time beginning one year after the commencement of the probationary period of such employee. Any employee appointed to permanent status under this subsection shall be considered an employee of the Board on permanent tenure."

(4) Section 4 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1521) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Board of Education in group A of salary class 15 who possesses a bachelor's degree plus fifteen credit hours shall be transferred in accordance with section 10 (a) and (b) to group A–1 of salary class 15."

(5) Section 5 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Whenever a teacher or school officer is changed to a lower salary class or to a lower level in the same salary class as in the case of school principals in the public school system, the Superintendent of Schools is authorized to fix the rate of compensation at a rate provided for in the salary class or level to which the employee is changed which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation, except that if his existing rate falls between two service steps provided in such lower salary class or level, he shall receive the higher of such rates; if he is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level in which he is to be placed, he will retain his existing rate of compensation and receive one-half of any future increases granted his new salary class or level until such time as his rate of basic compensation is no longer in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level. This subsection shall not apply if such reduction to a lower salary class or level is (1) for personal cause, (2) at the request of such teacher or school officer, (3) as a condition of a previous temporary promotion to a higher grade, or (4) because of a reduction in force brought about by the lack of funds or curtailment of work."

(6) Section 6(a)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is on service step 13 and has completed 15 years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. Each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is in longevity step X, on such effective date, shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service in salary classes 3 through 15 for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section."

(7) Section 6(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(b)) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee who has not reached the highest service step for his group, or, if his salary class has no group, the highest service step for such salary class, shall advance one such service step until he reaches the highest service step for such group or salary class. However, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement following any school year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(8) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1535 (a) and (b)) respectively, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each promotion to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D within a salary class shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular Board meeting of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree or on the completion of fifteen credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree, as the case may be,

whichever is later.

"(b) Any employee in a position in a salary class in the salary schedules in section 1 of this Act who is promoted to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D of such salary class shall be placed in the same numerical service step in his new group which he would have occupied in the group from which he was promoted."

(9) Section 13(a) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended

school year programs, adult education programs, and Americanization schools. The pay for teachers, officers, and other education employees in the summer school programs, adult education school programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Per period Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist	$6.86	$7.61	$8.42
Psychiatric social worker	8.02	8.92	9.86
Clinical psychologist	8.35	9.29	10.28
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary school	9.69	10.77	11.92
Supervising director	10.02	11.15	12.33
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	10.69	11.89	13.15
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	6.86	7.61	8.42
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	7.54	8.38	9.27
Assistant principal	10.66	11.85	13.11
Principal	11.76	13.07	14.46."

(10) Section 13(d)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(2)) is amended by striking out "monthly" and inserting in lieu thereof "semimonthly".

(11) Section 14 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1543) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. On July 1, 1970, each employee assigned to salary class 15 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in twenty or twenty-four semimonthly installments, at the discretion of such employee, in accordance with existing law. All other employees covered by the provisions of this Act shall have their annual salaries paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments in accordance with existing law. Annual salaries for employees paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments means calendar year for purposes of this section."

SEC. 303. The increase provided in this title for the position of Superintendent of Schools under salary class 1 of the salary schedule shall be effective only with respect to individuals employed in that position on or after the date of the enactment of this title.

SEC. 304. (a) The third paragraph under the paragraph beginning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" in the first section of the Act of May 26, 1908, entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine, and for other purposes" (D.C. Code, sec. 31–609) is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That the salaries of other teachers shall begin when they enter upon their duties." and inserting in lieu thereof ". However, effective July 1, 1970, the salaries of employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, whose services commence with the opening of school and who shall perform their duties, shall begin on the first day of September and shall be paid in twenty semimonthy installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. The first payment shall be made on the first day of October, or as near that date as practicable; and the second payment shall be made fifteen days thereafter or as near that date as practicable. Subsequent payments shall be on the first and sixteenth days of the month or as near those dates as practicable. The salaries of other employees in salary class 15 shall begin when they enter upon their duties."

(b) The fourth paragraph under the paragraph beginning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" under the center heading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." in the first section of such Act of May 26, 1908 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–630), is amended to read as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1970, the following rules for division of time and computation of pay for services rendered are established: Compensations of all employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act amendments of 1970 shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. In making payments for a fractional part of a month, one-fifteenth of an installment shall be the daily rate of pay. For the purpose of computing such compensation and for computing time for services rendered during a fractional part of a semimonthly period in connection with the compensation of such employees, each and every semimonthly period shall be held to consist of fifteen days, without regard to the actual number of days in any semimonthly period thus excluding the 31st day of any calendar months from the computation and treating February as if it actually had thirty days. Any person entering the service of the schools during a thirty-one-day month and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to pay for that month from the date of entry to the 30th day of such month, both days inclusive; and any person entering such service during the month of February and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to one month's pay, less as many days thereof as there were days elapsed prior to the date of entry. For one day's unauthorized absence on the 31st day of any calendar month one day's pay shall be forfeited."

SEC. 305. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shell be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance and the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1970.

TITLE IV—CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

SEC. 401. The first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–691) is amended by inserting after "for any purpose" the following: "authorized by the Board of Education."

SEC. 402. The Board of Education shall formulate within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, policies, procedures, and rules and regulations governing employee-management relations between the Board of Education and its employees and organizations representing such employees. Such rules and regulations shall include, but shall not be limited to, a clear statement of the rights of employees, procedures with respect to the recognition of labor organizations, determination of appropriate units, consultation and negotiation with labor organizations, approval of agreements, mediation, and impasse resolution, policies and practices regarding consultation with other organizations and associations and individual employees, and standards of conduct for labor organizations. The policies, procedures, and rules and regulations so established by the Board of Education shall be consistent with the provisions of Executive Order 11491, dated October 28, 1969 (relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service); the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; and such other Federal and District of Columbia Government personnel policies as may be required by statute.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE LAWS

SEC. 501. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every resident a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	2% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$20, plus 3% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$50, plus 4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $5,000	$90, plus 5% of excess over $3,000.
Over $5,000 but not over $8,000	$190, plus 6% of excess over $5,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$370, plus 7% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $17,000	$650, plus 8% of excess over $12,000.
Over $17,000 but not over $25,000	$1,050, plus 9% of excess over $17,000.
Over $25,000	$1,770, plus 10% of excess over $25,000."

SEC. 502. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) and paragraph (3) of section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2702) are each amended by inserting after "wines" the following: "for human consumption other than off the premises where such liquors, beer, or wines are sold".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—PAY RATE FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

SEC. 601. (a) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1889 (D.C. Code, sec. 39–201), is amended (1) by

inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 7.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any person serving as the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall be paid at a rate equal to the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 55 of such title.

"(c) Any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States who, while serving on active duty, is detailed to serve as commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall, while so detailed, be entitled to receive only the pay to which he is entitled as an officer of the Armed Forces."

(b) The paragraph under the center heading "NATIONAL GUARD" in the first section of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961 (74 Stat. 25), is amended by striking out "at not to exceed $13,300 per annum".

(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 17138) was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT MAY 14 TO FILE REPORT ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Thursday, May 14, 1970, to file a report on H.R. 17550, Social Security Amendments of 1970.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 112 just concluded, I was unavoidably detained with a group of college students in my office. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

RICHARD DUDMAN AND TWO OTHER REPORTERS MISSING IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed to read in today's Washington Post of the reported capture by the Vietcong of my long time friend Richard Dudman, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post Dispatch.

Dick Dudman has the reputation of being a resourceful reporter. Hopefully, his resourcefulness and experience as a veteran overseas reporter will stand him, and the two other American reporters thought captured with him, in good stead. I hope and pray that their whereabouts and condition can be established quickly and that their safe returns are without delay.

I include with my remarks the news account which appeared in this morning's Post:

THREE U.S. REPORTERS LOST IN CAMBODIA

Three American reporters, including Richard Dudman, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, are missing in Cambodia and are believed captured by the Vietcong.

The others are Elizabeth Pond of the Christian Science Monitor and Michael Morrow of Dispatch News Service International.

The three left Saigon in a car Thursday morning and were expected back Friday. They failed to return and inquiries showed that they apparently drove west on Rte. 1, which runs 135 miles from Saigon to Phnom Penh, capital of Cambodia.

They apparently crossed the border into Cambodia and may have reached Svay Rieng, 35 miles inside Cambodia in the Parrot's Beak area.

They are known to have been stopped on Rte. 1 at a checkpoint manned by the Cambodian army. Last Thursday and Friday, Cambodian units were in command of Rte. 1 about 2½ miles west of Svay Rieng.

Later, at a time not yet determined, their empty car was found on a secondary road 2½ miles from Svay Rieng. It is believed that they left Rte. 1, in order to circumvent the Cambodian army roadblock.

In Saigon, two Japanese correspondents who had been in the area said they had heard local reports that three American correspondents had been captured by the Vietcong. Sources within the Army of South Vietnam, which is fighting in the Parrot's Beak, said they had heard similar reports from persons in the same region.

Dudman, 52, is a veteran of many overseas assignments and had been in Southeast Asia at least seven times before. Marquis Childs, contributing editor to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and senior correspondent in its Washington bureau, said that Dudman arrived in Bangkok on April 27 after a two-week vacation in Europe with his family. The Dudmans live at 3409 Newark St. NW.

Miss Pond who is about 35, has been a Monitor for many years, mostly working in Boston. Two years ago she became its correspondent in Czechoslovakia, and a year ago in Saigon.

She took a year's leave of absence last July when she was appointed an Alicia Patterson Foundation fellow. She chose to do research work in Saigon and had been scheduled to return to active reporting in Vietnam on July 1.

Morrow, 24, left Dartmouth to go to Taiwan and Saigon. In Saigon he married a Vietnamese, the former Christina Vinh. He formed Dispatch News Service, Inc., from which Dispatch News was formed. The two now have no connection.

Dispatch News' Seymour Hersh recently won the Pulitzer Prize for reporting the Mylai incident.

Seven other newsmen—two of them Americans—vanished in Cambodia early in April and are believed to have been taken prisoner by the Vietcong.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY DOES THE EEOC HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS?

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, commonly known as the EEOC, has scheduled public hearings to begin on June 1, 1970, at Houston, Tex. I am also advised that invitations have been mailed to approximately 30 employers and several trade and labor unions. Such invitations are in the form of a letter directed to the various employers and unions asking their participation at the scheduled hearings and stipulating that the hearings would be open to the public, but that no testimony or comments would be permitted from the floor. Although the letter is in the nature of a request to appear, its general tenor indicates that the employers are expected to appear, that they are expected to appear through their chief executive officers, and that they are to bring with them certain data and other information.

I have three questions that the people of this country and especially this Congress are entitled to have answers to. They are as follows:

First. By what authority does the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have to call these hearings?

Second. By what right and under what authority does the EEOC act in requiring employers to appear at a public hearing and present information and testimony which the law specifically designates as being confidential in nature?

Third. By what right or authority does the Chairman authorize or permit the expenditure of public tax funds for the payment of Federal employees and for the procurement of services and the payment of associated expenses in the conduct of public hearings which are not authorized by law?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that EEOC officials are prepared to give specific answers to these questions and to cite the specific law under which such action is purported to be authorized. Unless such authority can be documented in the law, it is my opinion that the commission would be well advised to reconsider what could be an ultra vires act, and report to the Congress why he feels that he is authorized to assume nonexistent powers and undertake to subject the people of this Nation to his commands and desires.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the EEOC was specifically created under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as the regulatory body charged with the administration and enforcement of the fair employment practices of the act. It would appear that in keeping with such charges, the explicit authority granted is set out in section 710, 42 U.S.C. 2000e, which reads as follows:

For purposes of any investigation of a charge filed under the authority contained in section 706, the Commission shall have authority to examine witnesses under oath and to require the production of documentary evidence relevant or material to the charge under investigation.

It is to be noted that the authority granted is specifically limited to the investigation of a charge filed under the authority contained in section 706. Hence, the investigative power is limited to the examination by way of physical inspec-

tion of information relevant to the charge under investigation and to the use of a Federal Court order to produce information "relevant to the charge under investigation." In this connection it should be noted that investigations of unlawful employment practices may be initiated either by a complaining employee or by a written charge of an EEOC member. In the case of the proposed Houston hearings, and the letters of invitation sent out by the chairman, it is my understanding that no complaint has been filed either by an employee or by written charge of an EEOC member. If such complaints are in existence, the employers were not so advised in the letters of invitation and to my knowledge have not received copies of any such complaints, if any there are. Since it would appear that the existence of a complaint is a condition precedent to the exercise of the investigative powers of the EEOC, I am interested to know how the commissioner determined that it has the omnipotent powers to call a public hearing and virtually require the attendance of those employers he picked out.

I would also point out that it appears that EEOC hearings are intended to be conducted according to procedural rules promulgated in keeping with the restrictive legislative powers granted and in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. If this is so, it would further appear that the act and the EEOC regulations demand strict maintenance of confidentiality of any charge, information obtained through hearing investigations, employer reports, any other company records or disclosure of efforts of conciliation prior to the initiation of any court proceeding. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask how Chairman Brown expects to comply with the requirements that such information be on a confidential basis, and yet require that such information be divulged at a public hearing.

It is my understanding that it was the intent of Congress that the enforcement of the policies of the Civil Rights Act as applicable to fair employment practices, should not be along the traditional adjudicatory processes of other Federal agencies. But, on the other hand, should be in the nature of a confidential hearing which would not conclude with the issuance of an affirmative order. It appears to me that the act directs the EEOC to seek an elimination of the illegal practice by voluntary compliance. In other words, the EEOC's explicit regulatory powers are informal conference and persuasion aimed at conciliation. Should the EEOC fail to secure the voluntary compliance, its office would then be to notify the person aggrieved and advise such person that a civil action may be initiated by him, or her, as the case may be; or, on the other hand, if the charge was brought by an EEOC member, then the civil action could be brought by any person affected by such illegal practice. Hence, the end result would be that a guilty employer would be confronted with a private civil action rather than the administrative act of a Federal agency.

I would also call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the acts of the chairman of EEOC with regard to the Houston, Tex., hearings appear to be in the nature of an attempt on the part of the chairman to harass or intimidate a cross section of industry and several labor unions. In short, a broad attack against a geographical region or area to try to establish a general pattern on the part of industry in that geographical region. Nowhere in the act can I find any expressed or implied authority for any such action on the part of the EEOC. It would appear that if the chairman or the commission desire to make a broad attack concerning a segment of industry or a group of industries or a sectional area, the proper course would be to recommend a civil action by the Attorney General, as provided in section 707(a) of the act. However, even under this procedure, the civil action by the Attorney General must be directed at the employment records of the individual company.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman is engaged in an aggressive attempt to try to embarrass or harass a section of this country and the industry located therein, with a total disregard of the express provisions of the law and the intentions of the Congress of the United States. In fact, it appears that he is undertaking to exercise powers of his own creation which have been denied to him by the duly constituted legislative authority of this Nation.

I think it should also be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that such hearings could be interpreted and construed as a deliberate attempt to flout the expressed will of Congress and to circumvent the written law of this land. In support of this contention I would point out that the said chairman, on the 18th of February 1970, in a speech before the National Energy Policy Conference in Washington, D.C., made the following statement:

> I think FPC (Federal Power Commission) would seriously question whether a utility company with employment figures such as those cited today, or with a slew of unconciliated "cause findings" is truly operating in the "public interest."

In my opinion this statement could be construed as a veiled threat against the utility industry that unless they shaped up to the "yardstick" of Chairman Brown, they might find themselves in trouble in obtaining an application for a certificate of convenience and necessity—a practice or procedure not authorized in any degree by the law of this land, either statutory or case.

It is my feeling that the EEOC and every other agency, department, division, bureau, commission, and so forth, of the Federal Government, should be required to track the laws as written by the Congress and should not be allowed to subject the people of this Nation to requirements, procedures, practices, harassment, or intimidation without the express authorization of a statute duly passed in accordance with the Constitution and laws of this Nation. Certainly, such divisions of this Government should not be allowed to expend tax moneys in the exercise of powers which they do not have. What frightens me in this regard, Mr. Speaker, is the thought that if this is going on in the EEOC, how many other departments of the Federal Government are engaging in such surreptitious practices in violation of the law? The cost could be staggering.

I would hope to have an early answer to the questions I have posed and a complete explanation of why this practice was attempted to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no contact with any of those requested to attend the commission's hearings in Houston beginning June 1. None have asked my advice and I am not giving any. I submit however, that the best way to stop these illegal proceedings would be to ignore the invitation.

There is too much legal encroachment by the Federal Government without adding that not authorized. This appears to be a method at attempts to make out a case of some sort against business and labor, based possibly on their own statements.

DON'T FIND SST GUILTY BEFORE EVIDENCE IS IN

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the misconceptions being spread concerning the supersonic transport program in which the United States presently is engaged continue to gain momentum. I totally repudiate the argument that the SST is not compatible with the environment, because there is no evidence of this. Mr. Speaker, those who make such charges are finding the airplane guilty before the evidence is in.

I point especially to the remarks attributed to Elwood R. Quesada, who a decade ago was the Federal Aviation Administration Chief. He spoke last week before the Joint Economic Subcommittee on Economy in Government. Mr. Quesada's remarks, of course, will be given great play by opponents of the program. They will point out that he is chairman of the board of American Airlines.

However, there is a marked inconsistency in this case. While the chairman of the board, Mr. Quesada, is quoted as saying the Federal Government should never have gotten into the financing of a supersonic transport, the President of that same airline has stated that in his judgment:

> The technical and development work thus far accomplished on the U.S. supersonic transport makes it desirable to fund the prototype phase.

It has been said American Airlines has no real interest in the plane because they basically are a domestic air carrier. This is no longer true. Not only did President Nixon choose American Airlines for South Pacific routes, but the airline has ordered six U.S.-built SST's.

The most alarming of the remarks attributed to Mr. Quesada was the statement:

> Europe has bought our airplanes for decades. I can see nothing wrong with our buying a Concorde.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are not speaking of a Concorde. World airlines have ordered 74 Concordes; seven of these airlines are from the United States

and nine of them are from foreign countries. What is even more important is that 26 airlines have ordered 122 American SST's. These sales could go to the British-French, and could account for nearly $5 billion in the U.S. economy.

One last point, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Quesada said he doubts the Russian SST could be given away, much less sold. He should talk to his colleagues in the corporate structure of other airlines. The president of Pan American World Airways has commented favorably on the Russian SST, as have the leaders of numerous foreign airlines.

On this question of Federal funding of the prototype phase of the SST, it is not a one-way avenue, as some are suggesting. The U.S. airlines have put up $56 million in risk capital to aid this program; $6 million of which came from American Airlines.

This is no time to turn our back on the American technology and the American laborer which will construct the finest, most advanced aircraft the world has ever known, the American supersonic transport.

SUCCESS IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the success of the military attack on the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia is bound to shorten the war in Vietnam and bring American soldiers home more quickly.

Already the enemy has sustained what must be unacceptable losses in both men and equipment.

If it is true that they had between 30,000 and 40,000 men in these sanctuaries, they have literally been decimated. Latest figures are showing nearly 4,500 enemy killed in action and over 1,300 prisoners of war.

This does not include wounded enemy who have been carried away by their fellows and who pose an additional logistical burden on them.

Enemy material and equipment losses are staggering. These include:

Small arms ammunition, over 8,300,000 rounds.
Machine gun ammunition, over 6,600,000 rounds.
Antiaircraft ammunition, over 3,000 rounds.
Large rocket rounds, over 800.
Small rocket rounds, 9,000.
Bunkers destroyed, 2,700.
Individual weapons, over 6,000.

There is no question in my mind that these operations, which will be completed within the next 6 to 8 weeks, will measurably shorten American participation in the war by allowing the program of Vietnamization to proceed on schedule.

TESTIMONY ON ELECTRIC RELIABILITY

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, since the northeast blackout of 1965, America has witnessed 37 substantial blackouts and innumerable lesser power shutdowns, known as brownouts. Yet, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission came before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power last week and testified against a number of bills designed to provide reliable electric service in America. The Chairman of the FPC made some very valid points, but what he failed to do was to offer constructive plans to help prevent future power failures. Like so many other regulatory actions, the FPC is dragging its feet. The FPC Chairman spoke of legislation that is being proposed to meet these needs. The trouble is that this legislation is coming too late. The hearings are being held now. The problem is immediate. Platitudes from the FPC will do little to help the consumer who finds himself compelled to turn off air conditioners and sit in the dark because the power source is inadequate.

The FPC Chairman says he thinks that the industry will voluntarily provide reliable sources of electricity and that this legislation is not needed. The record of the industry does not bear this out. The industry and the FPC have both been derelict in protecting the people. The fact is that New York City and many other parts of the Nation have inadequate resources to protect against power failures this very summer.

On April 19, Dr. Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's science and technology adviser, pointed out there is danger of blackouts in various parts of the country—we have a critical power situation in this country—the whole east coast is troubled by the shortage of power.

The FPC and the electric industry agree in this assessment; yet they have not taken the steps needed to solve these problems.

I would like to see the industry act without a legislative prod—but when they do not, it is up to us in Congress to take the necessary steps. Legislation is needed. No bill is no answer to the problems at hand. Unless the FPC moves to protect the electricity consumer and unless it quickly provides legislation which it can support, then it will be doing a great disservice to the Nation and to its own mandate.

I am tired of having regulatory agencies defending industry at the expense of consumer protection. Something must be done and it must be done now to convince the Nixon administration that the time has passed for stalling and temporizing.

Action is needed and if the FPC fails, then we in Congress must act.

TINDERBOX TENSION IN MIDDLE EAST HEIGHTENED BY U.S. VACILLATION

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a grave danger to world peace is the tinderbox tension in the Middle East. Vacillation by the United States in support of Israel heightens that danger.

Unless there remains a balance of weaponry and strength, the Russian-supplied forces alined against Israel will be tempted again to try to overrun the tiny nation that has displayed to the world a love of freedom that has lifted hearts everywhere.

President Nixon has said that the United States is prepared to supply military equipment necessary to the efforts of Israel to defend the safety of her people. Nevertheless, he has failed to date to sell Israel the aircraft it requested for its defense, saying that the balance of forces was sufficient in her favor to prevent an attack.

This latest news, of Russian fliers piloting Russian-supplied planes, adds a new dimension to the threat against Israel. The balance of power, so important as a deterrent to a full-scale war, may be tipping in favor of the forces who seek to overrun Israel. We cannot permit that imbalance. For the safety of the world, and for the safety of the free people of Israel, as well as our own national interest, we cannot permit a full-scale conflict to erupt.

Five successive Presidents have affirmed the policy that there is a relationship between Israel's integrity and survival and U.S. national interests.

Any failure on our part to make clear to the entire world our resolve to maintain a balance in the Mideast, any failure on our part to make clear our respect for Israel, any failure on our part to make clear our willingness to stand by Israel will signal to the world that we have failed in our moral obligations to the only democracy in the Middle East. The principles of justice, freedom, and human dignity, which we have in common with the people of Israel, demand that we stand with them in their hour of danger. The interests of the United States demand the same stand.

Israel has not requested a gift of U.S. military assistance, or U.S. troops, or even U.S. advisers. She only wants to purchase the aircraft necessary for her defense against openly belligerent neighbors.

I urge the President, who has promised to review his earlier decision not to ship jet aircraft to Israel if the danger is increased, to do just that—review his decision. Such a review, I am confident, will reach the conclusion that I have reached, that the United States has a strong obligation to begin immediately the sales of aircraft requested by the Israelis for their defense.

ISRAEL-ARAB DISPUTE

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time, as the people of Israel celebrate their 22d Independence anniversary, new and unprecedented dangers are emerging that could threaten their very survival. I refer to the intrusion into the Israel-Arab dispute of military units of the Soviet armed forces. This is a major escalation of the Israel-Arab dispute and portends no good for the future.

For these past 22 years the people of Israel have been going about their task of nation building with incredible energy and success. They are a small and democratic nation with a long and tortured history of inequality, persecution and outright slaughter. After 20 centuries of homelessness they have returned with the sanction and blessing of the international community to the land where their history began and from which they have never been entirely severed. They have reclaimed the desert, built cities in the sand, and rehabilitated hundreds of thousands of their refugee brethren, many of them refugees from Arab countries.

Time and again they have appealed to their neighbors to conclude with them an honorable and lasting peace, only to be rebuffed, attacked, and threatened with destruction. Now the Soviet Union has squarely allied itself against the State of Israel. For years Moscow has been pouring in billions of dollars worth of the most sophisticated weapons into the Arab arsenals. It has sent its advisers, its experts and its generals to teach the Arabs how to prepare for war against Israel. Not very long ago they dispatched the most sophisticated SA–III missile system together with thousands of military personnel to deploy and man them. And since mid-April, Soviet combat pilots flying Mig–21's from Egyptian airfields are patrolling Egyptian skies.

I say this is wanton aggression against the State of Israel. It is aggression because it is in support of Egypt's hostile policy. It is aggression because it is designed to release the best of the Egyptian forces to resume their war of attrition against Israel. It is aggression because it is calculated to protect the Egyptian rear against the prospect of Israeli counter-response.

By its act the Soviets have drastically shifted the balance of power against Israel. The qualitative advantage Israel once enjoyed has been erased by the presence of the Soviet military alongside the Arab military. The United States must move swiftly to correct this imbalance, otherwise Israel will be left exposed to the prospect of massive assault. A weak Israel is a sure invitation to Arab-Soviet aggression. That aggression will be deterred only if Israel preserves its credibility in the eyes of those who seek her harm.

Israel's strength is America's strength in the Middle East. Their battle for survival and peace is our battle. They are the one true friend and stable ally we have in the whole area. It is our duty to provide Israel with the weapons it needs to protect itself, and the time for that is now. That small country on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean asks no one to fight its battles. Its people have shown time and again that they have the courage, the will, the readiness, and the capability of carrying their own burden of defense by themselves. We must provide them with the tools to do the job, and at the same time we must make it clear to the Soviet Union that we are going to stand by Israel, period.

Time is of the essence if Soviet aggression and penetration are to be discouraged and curtailed. It is up to the Government from the President downward to make its voice heard in this matter, not only in words but in deeds as well.

ISRAEL NEEDS HELP

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 22d anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel. I wish her many more birthdays. And I join in saluting the rare accomplishments, the energy, and the indomitable courage of this tiny nation which has greatly enriched the concept of what it means to be a practicing democracy.

But I think we must fear for her future, now more than any time in the past dozen years.

Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban termed the use of Soviet pilots in Egypt "an almost revolutionary change" in the military situation and called for prompt international assistance to Israel to compensate for it.

I think that a shift in the balance against Israel—the condition the United States set for supplying more aircraft—now very clearly exists.

We should not be deluded into thinking that the only crucial issue at the moment is the confirmed fact that the Soviet Union has sent several squadrons of fighter pilots to Egypt and that these pilots are now flying protective cover over cities and military installations in central Egypt. We cannot overlook the recent installation of SAM III ground-to-air missile sites, manned by an estimated 1,500 Soviet technicians, around cities like Cairo and Alexandria, and at the Aswan Dam.

The enormity of Soviet intervention should be obvious in the fact that not only are Egyptian troops armed with the latest Soviet equipment and backed by Soviet technicians, but the Soviets have also stationed a major fleet in the Mediterranean. It is reported that they have virtually converted Alexandria into a Soviet naval base. They are seeking bases in Libya.

The absence of firm support for Israel, can easily be interpreted by the Soviet as weakness in U.S. policy and its direction—a miscalculation which may be directly responsible for the current Soviet buildup in Egypt and which can trigger the mistakes which could begin a third world war.

Mr. Speaker, the presence of Soviet pilots in combat operations over Egypt presents the terrifying possibility that the death of even one Soviet pilot could bring about massive Soviet retaliation.

I believe that the United States must signal a caution light to the Soviet Union. I believe this can best be accomplished when the balance in the Middle East is restored and assured by our providing Israel with the aircraft strength she needs. I believe that restoring the balance represents an effective deterrent—so that the Soviet will not dare risk a step where the consequences would become international in their gravity.

I want peace in the Middle East. I believe that Israel desperately wants peace, and that her only concern is her self-defense.

I have no doubt of Israel's integrity. I plead for immediate action by the President to assist Israel in her time of very gravest peril.

DISCLOSURE OF EXPENSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with previously adopted policy of disclosure, I am at this time making public a statement of receipts and expenditures of the supplementary expense fund raised for newsletter, unreimbursed travel, and office expenses.

As I stated in previous disclosures, there is no provision under the law for any reporting, but I feel it is best to do so.

The disclosure follows:

Statement for fiscal year 1969

Balance, beginning Jan. 1, 1969	$6,182.66
Total contributions, 1969	6,996.50
Subtotal	13,179.16
Expenditures, 1969	12,681.52
Ending balance, Dec. 31, 1969	497.64
Itemized expenses:	
Newsletter	2,308.65
TV, radio, and press reports to district	1,308.21
Unreimbursed travel expense, member and staff	2,343.22
Rental and maintenance, office equipment	3,523.64
Telephone and telegraph	1,508.61
Newspaper and periodical subscriptions	251.70
Constituents luncheons and receptions	1,437.49
Total	12,681.52

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments, and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States is the largest producer of lubricating oil in the world. In 1966 the United States produced 9,119,000 metric tons of lubricating oil. Japan was second with 1,178,000 metric tons.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the House joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology, I welcome the prompt action being taken today on this legislation. Its passage will mean that Congress has recognized the serious environmental problems that exist and wants to deal

with them effectively. While there has been a steady expansion of independent committee interest in specific environmental problems, Congress so far has not evaluated this field in its entirety with a view toward evolving a coherent and unified policy for national environmental management. There currently exists a veritable jungle of governmental groups dealing with the problems of the environment: 11 Federal departments, 18 independent agencies, 13 congressional committees, 90 Federal programs, 28 quasi-governmental bodies, and 14 interagency committees. In this situation, a joint committee could help to maintain oversight on environmental policy.

The National Environmental Policy Act, signed by the President on the first of this year, declared that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and has a responsibility to contribute to a better environment. This is a fine, upstanding statement, but it needs to be reinforced by substantive proposals offering constructive solutions. Senator JACKSON has correctly noted that:

> It needs to be recognized that the declaration of a national environmental policy will not alone necessarily better or enhance the total man-environment relationship. The present problem is not simply the lack of a policy. It also involves the need to rationalize and coordinate existing policies and to provide a means by which they may be continuously reviewed to determine whether they meet the national goal of a quality life in a quality environment for all Americans.

The joint committee to be established under this resolution is to provide just such a coordination and review function. Its creation will help Congress to grasp the dimensions of the task and to appreciate the complexities of cleaning up the environment. Our approach to environmental protection must be as interrelated as the environment itself is.

One prime responsibility the joint committee is to have, among others, is that of consideration of the annual environmental quality report coming from the President's Council on Environmental Quality. In so doing, it will perform a valuable function similar to that performed by the Joint Economic Committee with respect to the Economic Report of the President. Though a nonlegislative committee, it will be creating the basis for action by the legislative committees.

Environmental problems cut across many existing operational organizations, and coordination in both the executive and legislative branches urgently needs improvement. The Executive's Council on Environmental Quality should be complemented by a corresponding joint congressional committee for purposes of continued and efficient interaction. The Joint Committee on Environment and Technology can provide the needed complement. Its formation will signify a shift on the part of Congress from a scattergun approach to environmental problems to a comprehensive and unified approach.

It has been recognized that, with respect to ecological destruction, "we have met the enemy and they are us." Having realized our own culpability, we need to take steps such as the creation of a joint congressional committee in order to minimize future aspects of our heavy-handed treatment of the world in which we live.

FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCY PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege today to introduce, along with 42 cosponsors, the Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependency Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. To date, 24 Senators have sponsored S. 3562, the bill to which the measure my colleagues and I introduce today is the companion piece.

I have been extremely concerned about the drug abuse epidemic that has existed in the United States for some time. Drug abuse and drug dependence are increasing at an astonishing rate throughout the country. It is apparent that existing laws have not been effective to prevent drug abuse and dependence or to provide adequate education, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons.

Mr. Speaker, to borrow the vernacular of the young, we are "up against it" as far as this grotesque situation is concerned. There is every reason to believe that we will either act now or brace ourselves for a final scene of widespread addiction and ruin as the drug net descends over more and more of our people, young and old, rich and poor, black and white, urban and suburban. I know it pleases no one to find that the drug problem has suddenly mushroomed and worsened nearly beyond belief, but we must deal with reality as we find it, not fantasy as we wish it and this means tackling the drug menace forcefully now.

As far back as 1963, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse found that public and professional education in the field was hopelessly inadequate. Unfortunately, misinformation about drugs and their effects is still prevalent and the measures taken by the Federal Government are still limited, fragmented, and sporadic.

Part of the problem in the past has been an overreliance on law enforcement as a panacea. Clearly, this aspect of the antidrug effort is a vital one but it is a part, not the whole. The skyrocketing drug abuse and narcotic addiction statistics make it painfully obvious that drug laws by themselves will not solve the problem. While new laws may bring about increased arrests they can also disrupt the lives of many innocent people and will do nothing to get down to the root causes of the drug rampage. What we need here is the skill of a surgeon, not the brute force of a butcher.

Drugs involve their victims socially, psychologically and medically, not merely legally or illegally. Desperately needed is an attack on the root causes of this menace to replace the bankrupt policy of continuing to pay the gargantuan costs of drug-induced crime and counterproductive imprisonment which has given us no return on our investment except more costs. We have reacted to this spreading sickness by punishing it rather than curing it. For too long we have spent too much for too little. It is high time to pursue the avenue of developing programs which use our resources to combat the causes instead of the effects.

I was heartened last year when the Members of this body unanimously passed the landmark Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, of which I was a sponsor. This act constitutes a limited but significant step toward the ultimate goal of reversing the rising tide of drug abuse among our extraordinarily vulnerable young people. Believing as I do that drug abuse is an indisputably serious threat to our society, however, I have introduced a number of other drug measures which go considerably further toward dealing with the entire spectrum of this crisis. Education, in my judgment, can and will play a major role in the effort to bring the problem under control but, as with law enforcement, it will be a part, not the whole.

The bipartisan and geographically as well as politically broad based support for the Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependency, Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 is indicative of both the widespread concern of Members of Congress in this area as well as of the merits of the proposed legislation itself.

This legislation would establish the administrative structure and authorization for an unprecedented, massive, across-the-board Federal attack on the drug epidemic in this country, from a prevention, treatment and rehabilitation point of view. The legislation:

First, it would establish within the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration, which would have a completely comprehensive range of responsibilities with respect to the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug dependents and drug abusers. Those responsibilities include administrative, planning, coordination, statistical, research, training, education, classification, and reporting functions, all of which are set out in detail. These powers would be utilized and directed in accordance with a specific and comprehensive drug abuse and drug dependence control plan which would be drawn up and carried out by the newly created Administration and would be submitted annually to Congress for review;

Second, it would replace present legislation governing treatment and rehabilitation services available to drug dependent persons charged with or convicted of violating Federal criminal laws with updated and stronger legislation, which, while continuing the same basic policy of treatment and rehabilitation, would greatly expand the number of persons eligible for such treatment and rehabilitation and would make more definite the Federal Government's obligations to carry out that policy;

Third, it would require the establishment of programs of prevention and the recognition and encouragement of treatment and rehabilitation programs for all Federal employees, and members of the armed services. It would also require the establishment of treatment and rehabilitation programs for veterans and the inclusion of drug abuse and drug dependence in group health and disability insurance policies made available to Federal employees;

Fourth, it would require the recognition of drug abuse and drug dependence as a significant health problem in a broad range of programs affecting health matters, including vocational rehabilitation programs, the Economic Opportunity Act programs, welfare programs, highway safety planning programs, medicare, medicaid, and social security;

Fifth, it would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to and enter into contracts with State and local organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals to carry out a comprehensive range of activities in the drug education, prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation areas. This would include but would not be limited to development of model curricula, curricular materials, and curricular dissemination programs; training and education programs for medical schools, outreach workers, and other professional and nonprofessional persons; support of community planning and educational programs; organization of community personnel; support of services to juveniles and young adults; and services in correctional institutions;

Sixth, it would establish an independent Secretary's Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise and consult with the newly created Administration and to assist it to carry out the purposes of this act; and would establish an Intergovernmental Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence to assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate all Federal prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts dealing with problems of drug dependence and drug abuse.

The following Representatives join me in introducing this legislation:

GLENN ANDERSON of California.
JONATHAN BINGHAM of New York.
GEORGE BROWN of California.
DANIEL BUTTON of New York.
HUGH CAREY of New York.
JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania.
EDWARD DERWINSKI of Illinois.
DON EDWARDS of California.
DANIEL FLOOD of Pennsylvania.
ROBERT GIAIMO of Connecticut.
JACOB GILBERT of New York.
SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York.
RICHARD HANNA of California.
AUGUSTUS HAWKINS of California.
KEN HECHLER of West Virginia.
ROBERT KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin.
EDWARD KOCH of New York.
ROBERT LEGGETT of California.
RICHARD MCCARTHY of New York.
SPARK MATSUNAGA of Hawaii.
THOMAS MESKILL of Connecticut.
JOSEPH MINISH of New Jersey.
WILLIAM MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.
JOHN MOSS of California.
LUCIEN NEDZI of Michigan.
RICHARD OTTINGER of New York.
EDWARD PATTEN of New Jersey.
HOWARD POLLOCK of Alaska.
THOMAS REES of California.
OGDEN REID of New York.
BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL of New York.
EDWARD ROYBAL of California.
PHILIP RUPPE of Michigan.
FERNAND ST GERMAIN of Rhode Island.
JAMES SCHEUER of New York.
GEORGE SHIPLEY of Illinois.
LOUIS STOKES of Ohio.
ROBERT TIERNAN of Rhode Island.
JOHN TUNNEY of California.
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN of California.
JIM WRIGHT of Texas.
JOHN WYDLER of New York.

In addition, two Members have informed me that they intend to introduce this act on their own and to work for its enactment as well.

For my colleagues' information, the following Senators have joined HAROLD HUGHES as supporters of this legislative proposal:

ALAN BIBLE of Nevada.
HOWARD CANNON of Nevada.
ALAN CRANSTON of California.
THOMAS EAGLETON of Missouri.
PHILIP HART of Michigan.
ERNEST HOLLINGS of South Carolina.
DANIEL INOUYE of Hawaii.
JACOB JAVITS of New York.
EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota.
MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana.
LEE METCALF of Montana.
WALTER MONDALE of Minnesota.
FRANK MOSS of Utah.
EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine.
GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin.
CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia.
RICHARD SCHWEIKER of Pennsylvania.
JOSEPH TYDINGS of Maryland.
HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey.
RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas.
STEPHEN YOUNG of Ohio.

Those of us associated with this proposal realize that it is far from perfect and does not present the answer to the problem. But we feel it is a comprehensive and carefully thought-out approach that once promulgated and put into effect will go a long way in combating the drug epidemic that has infected this Nation.

For my colleagues' additional information, I have requested permission to include the full text of the Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependency Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Within the next 2 weeks I intend to reintroduce the bill and will be soliciting additional cosponsors for it. I hope that many of you will see fit to join us in supporting this most worthwhile proposal. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 16386

A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970".

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that—

(a) Drug abuse and drug dependence are rapidly increasing throughout the country. Drug abuse can seriously impair health, and can lead to drug dependence. Drug dependence is an illness or disease that requires treatment through health and rehabilitation services.

(b) Existing laws have not been effective to prevent drug abuse and drug dependence or to provide adequate education, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons. Increasing education, treatment, and rehabilitation services offer the best possibility of reducing drug abuse and drug dependence. A major commitment of health resources and Government funds is required to institute an adequate and effective Federal program for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

(c) Drug dependent persons commit a high percentage of the serious crime in many cities in order to secure funds with which to satisfy their habit. Criminal incarceration without appropriate treatment has proved ineffective to deter drug related crime. Effective treatment services and successful rehabilitation offer the best possibility of avoiding a high rate of recidivism.

(d) Present Federal programs for drug abuse and drug dependence are relegated to a low level of priority and remain uncoordinated within the Government. Federal officials have failed to handle effectively drug abuse and drug dependence among those for whom the Government has special responsibilities—civilian employees, military personnel, and veterans. Existing Federal research, health, and rehabilitation laws have not properly been used to attack the problems of drug abuse and drug dependence. Lack of Federal leadership and funding has also contributed to the failure of State and local governmental agencies and public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to recognize their responsibilities for meeting these problems.

SEC. 102. The Congress declares that—

(a) There shall be established and maintained a Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to coordinate all Federal health and rehabilitation programs related to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

(b) Major Federal action and Federal assistance to State and local programs shall be undertaken to engage in and encourage planning, coordination, statistics, research, training, education, reporting, and classification with respect to drug abuse and drug dependence, and to provide equal access to humane care, effective treatment, and rehabilitation for all drug abusers and drug dependent persons regardless of their circumstances.

(c) In addition to the provisions of this Act, all other Federal legislation providing for Federal or federally assisted State research, prevention, treatment, or rehabilitation programs in the fields of health, education, welfare, and rehabilitation shall be utilized to reduce drug abuse, drug dependence, and drug related crime.

TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. The definitions in the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 shall also apply for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 202. As used in this Act:

(a) "Administration" means the Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by this Act.

(b) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration appointed pursuant to this Act.

(c) "Courts" includes all Federal courts, including any United States magistrate.

(d) "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) "Drug abuser" means any person who uses any controlled dangerous substance under circumstances that constitute a violation of law.

(f) "Drug dependent person" means a person who is using a controlled dangerous substance and who is in a state of psychic or physical dependence, or both, arising from administration of that controlled dangerous substance on a continuing basis. Drug dependence is characterized by behavorial and other responses which include a strong compulsion to take the substance on a continuous basis in order to experience its psychic effects, or to avoid the discomfort of its absence.

(g) "Drug related offense" means any Federal criminal offense committed by a drug dependent person (1) to satisfy his drug dependence or to obtain funds to satisfy his drug dependence or (2) while under and as a result of the influence of a controlled dangerous substance.

(h) "Emergency medical services" includes all appropriate short-term services for the acute effects of drug abuse and drug dependence, which (1) are available twenty-four hours a day, (2) are community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients, (3) are affiliated with, and constitute an integral (but not necessarily physical) part of, the general medical services of a general hospital, and (4) provide drug withdrawal and other appropriate medical care and treatment, professional examination, diagnosis, and classification with respect to possible drug dependence, and referral for other treatment and rehabilitation.

(i) "Government attorney" means an attorney authorized to represent the United States with respect to this Act.

(j) "Inpatient services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abuse and drug dependence provided for a resident patient while he spends full time in a treatment institution.

(k) "Intermediate care services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abuse and drug dependence provided for a resident patient while he spends part time in a treatment institution (including but not limited to a halfway house, hostel, or foster home) which is community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients.

(l) "Outpatient services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services (including but not limited to clinics, social centers, vocational rehabilitation services, welfare centers, and job referral services) for drug abuse and drug dependence provided while the patient is not a resident of a treatment institution, which are community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients.

(m) "Prevention and treatment" includes all appropriate forms of educational programs and services (including but not limited to radio, television, films, books, pamphlets, lectures, adult education, and school courses); planning, coordinating, statistical, research, training, evaluation, reporting, classification, and other administrative, scientific, or technical programs or services; and screening, diagnosis, treatment (emergency medical care, inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient), vocational rehabilitation, job training and referral, and other rehabilitation programs or services.

(n) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(o) "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

TITLE III—DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established within the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration. The Administration shall develop and conduct a comprehensive health, education, and rehabilitation program for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

(b)(1) The Administration shall be under the direction of a Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(2) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, relating to positions at level V of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"(130) Commissioner, Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(c) The Administration and its programs and services shall be staffed with an adequate number of personnel, who shall possess appropriate qualifications and competence, and some of whom may formerly have been drug abusers or drug dependent persons. Prior criminal arrests or convictions shall not be a bar to such employment.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 302. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its administrative functions to—

(a) administer any service or program relating to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence pursuant to a request in accordance with section 304 (a) of this Act;

(b) administer the program for treatment and rehabilitation of Federal offenders established under title IV of this Act;

(c) review and provide in writing an evaluation of the adequacy and appropriateness of the provisions relating to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence of all comprehensive State health, welfare, and rehabilitation plans submitted to the Federal Government pursuant to Federal law, including but not limited to those submitted pursuant to section 35(a)(15) of title 29 and sections 246(a)(2)(L), 291c(a)(4), 1396a(a)(31), and 2684(11) of title 42 of the United States Code;

(d) administer the grants and contracts authorized under title VII of this Act; and

(e) administer any other service or program, or take any other action, consistent with the intent and objectives of this Act.

PLANNING FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 303. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its planning functions to—

(a) develop a detailed and comprehensive Federal drug abuse and drug dependence control plan to implement the objectives and policies of this Act. The plan shall be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the enactment date of this Act. It shall be reviewed annually and submitted to Congress with any appropriate revisions as part of the Administration's annual report. The Commissioner shall, in developing the comprehensive Federal plan, consult and collaborate with all appropriate Federal, State, and public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations. The plan shall specify how all available health, welfare, educational, and rehabilitation resources, and how funds, programs, services, and facilities authorized under existing Federal legislation, are to be utilized;

(b) develop model drug abuse and drug dependence control plans for State and local governments, utilizing the concepts incorporated in the comprehensive Federal plan. The model plans shall be reviewed on a periodic basis and revised to keep them current. They shall specify how all types of community resources and existing Federal legislation may be utilized; and

(c) provide assistance and consultation to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals with respect to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

COORDINATION FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 304. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its coordinating functions to—

(a) assist the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies in the development and maintenance of appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services for drug abuse and drug dependence pursuant to title V of this Act. Upon request, the Administration shall undertake the direct administration of any such program or service;

(b) serve in a consulting capacity to all Federal courts, departments, and agencies, including those responsible for programs affected by title VI of this Act, and to be responsible for assisting in the development and coordination of a full range of programs, facilities, and services available to them for education, diagnosis, counseling, and treatment with respect to the drug abuse and drug dependence problems they encounter;

(c) coordinate all Federal health and rehabilitation efforts to deal with the problem of drug abuse and drug dependence, including but not limited to those relating to vocational rehabilitation, manpower development and training, older Americans, law enforcement assistance, health research facilities, mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers, juvenile delinquency, health professions educational assistance, hospital and medical facilities, social security, community health services, education professions development, higher education, Federal employees health benefits, economic opportunity, comprehensive health planning, elementary and secondary education, highway safety, the civil service laws, and laws providing for the treatment and discharge of the members of the Armed Forces and the support and treatment of veterans of the Armed Forces;

(d) encourage and assist State and local government programs and services, and programs and services of public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(e) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(f) cooperate with the Federal Intergovernment Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence, the Civil Service Commission, and other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, to develop a policy consistent with this Act with regard to Federal employees who are drug abusers or drug dependent persons, involving appropriate programs and services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among such employees;

(g) assist State and local governments in coordinating programs among themselves for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence; and

(h) cooperate with organized medicine to disseminate medical guidelines for the use

of controlled dangerous substances in medical practice. A practitioner may prescribe, administer, or dispense a controlled dangerous substance in the course of his professional practice (1) in good faith within the scope of the patient relationship, and (2) in accordance with principles of medical care and treatment accepted by a responsible segment of the medical profession.

STATISTICAL FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 305. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its statistical functions to—

(a) gather and publish statistics pertaining to drug abuse, drug dependence, and drug related problems; and

(b) promulgate regulations, with the approval of the Secretary, specifying uniform statistics to be obtained, records to be maintained, and reports to be submitted, by public and private departments, agencies organizations, practitioners, and other persons with respect to drug abuse, drug dependence, and drug related problems. Such statistics and reports shall not reveal the identity of any patient or drug dependent person or other confidential information.

RESEARCH FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 306. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its research functions to—

(a) conduct and encourage all forms of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, epidemiology, sociological aspects, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(b) conduct, and encourage and assist others to conduct, all forms of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the toxicology, pharmacology, chemistry, effects on the health of drug abusers, and danger to the public health, of controlled dangerous substances. Investigation of the use of any controlled dangerous substance for therapeutic, research, experimental, or other investigational purposes pursuant to this section shall be by a practitioner or other qualified investigator, and in compliance with the requirements of section 355(i) and 360b(j) of title 21 of the United States Code and any applicable registration provisions of Federal law. Any such investigation may be prohibited, delayed or terminated only on the grounds that the investigator has materially falsified any application required to be filed prior to the investigation, or has been convicted of a felony under any law relating to controlled dangerous substances, or has had his Federal registration suspended or revoked and is no longer authorized by Federal law to engage in the dispensing, or administration of controlled dangerous substances, or fails to establish adequate procedures to account for controlled dangerous substances or to safeguard adequately his supply of such drugs against diversion from legitimate investigational use;

(c) Coordinate research conducted by the Administration with research conducted by other Federal and State agencies, public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals. To facilitate this activity, the Administration shall establish and maintain a complete and current register of all practitioners and other qualified investigators engaged in any form of or research on controlled dangerous substances. Placement on such register shall be pursuant to an application to the Secretary which shall state (1) the name, address, and qualifications of the applicant, (2) the procedures used to account for dangerous controlled substances and to safeguard such substances adequately against diversion from legitimate investigational use, and (3) an outline of the investigation. An application filed pursuant to sections 355(i) or 360b(j) of title 21 of the United States Code shall also constitute an application for purposes of this subsection. Placement on such register may be denied only on a ground specified in subsection 306 (b) of this Act, and shall constitute registration for purposes of the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969, but shall not authorize the dispensing or administration of controlled dangerous substances to human beings except by persons licensed or otherwise permitted to dispense or administer such substances under applicable State laws;

(d) make available research facilities and resources of the Administration to appropriate authorities, health officials, and individuals engaged in investigations or research related to the purposes of this Act. Such resources shall include the maintenance of an adequate supply of controlled dangerous substances for investigational and research purposes, and the establishment of criteria pursuant to which any registered investigator is to be authorized to manufacture or otherwise acquire sufficient controlled dangerous substances for his legitimate investigational and research needs;

(e) make grants to, and contracts with, universities, hospitals, laboratories, and public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals for such research;

(f) establish an information center on such research, which will gather and contain all available published and unpublished data and information. All Federal departments and agencies shall send to the Administration any unpublished data and information pertinent to the cause, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, and the toxicology, pharmacology, effects on the health of drug abusers, and danger to the public health of controlled dangerous substances, and the Administration shall make such data and information widely available;

(g) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Administration and elsewhere, and provide for such fellowships through grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations;

(h) investigate methods for the more precise detection and determination of narcotic drugs in urine and blood samples, and by other means, and publish on a current basis uniform methodology for such detections and determinations; and

(i) evaluate existing and proposed new programs and services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

(j) Any information obtained through investigation or research conducted pursuant to this section shall be used in ways so that no name or identifying characteristics of any person shall be divulged without the approval of the Secretary and the consent of the person concerned. Persons engaged in research pursuant to this section shall protect the privacy of individuals who are the subject of such research by withholding from all persons not connected with the conduct of such research the names or other identifying characteristics of such individuals. Persons engaged in such research shall protect the privacy of such individuals and may not be compelled in any Federal, State, civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify such individuals.

TRAINING FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 307. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its training functions to—

(a) establish training programs for professional and nonprofessional personnel with respect to drug abuse and drug dependence;

(b) encourage the establishment of training courses for professional and nonprofessional personnel by State and local governments with respect to drug abuse and drug dependence; and

(c) establish and maintain training fellowships in the Administration and elsewhere, and provide for such fellowships through grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations.

EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 308. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its educational functions to—

(a) develop a model curriculum, including the provision of relevant data and other information, for utilization by elementary and secondary schools for instructing children about drug abuse and drug dependence;

(b) develop a model curriculum, including the provision of relevant data and other information, for utilization by parent-teachers associations, adult education centers, private citizen groups, or other State or local sources, for instructing parents and other adults about drug abuse and drug dependence;

(c) prepare a broad variety of educational material for use in all media and to reach all segments of the population, that can be utilized by public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations in educational programs with respect to drug abuse and drug dependence;

(d) establish educational courses, including the provision of relevant data and other information, on the causes and effects of, and treatment for, drug abuse and drug dependence, for Federal law enforcement officials (including prosecuting attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officers, and other law enforcement personnel), Federal welfare, vocational rehabilitation, military, and veterans personnel, and other Federal officials who come in contact with drug abuse and drug dependence problems;

(e) develop educational courses, including the provision of relevant data and other information, on the causes and effects of, and treatment for, drug abuse and drug dependence for use by appropriate State and local government and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for State and local law enforcement officials (including prosecuting attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officials, and other law enforcement personnel), State and local welfare, vocational rehabilitation, and veterans personnel, and other State and local officials and community leaders;

(f) serve as a clearinghouse for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of all information relating to drug abuse and drug dependence, including State and local drug abuse and drug dependence treatment plans, availability of treatment resources, training and educational programs, statistics, research, and other pertinent data and information;

(g) recruit, train, organize, and employ professional and other persons, including former drug abusers and drug dependent persons, to organize and participate in programs of public education in relation to drug abuse;

(h) coordinate activities carried on by all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with respect to health education aspects of drug abuse; and

(i) undertake such other activities as the Secretary may consider important to a national program of education relating to drug-abuse and drug dependence.

CLASSIFICATION FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 309. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its classification functions to classify, by regulations promulgated pursuant to subchapter II of Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of its administrative, planning, coordination, statistical, research, training, education, reporting, treatment, and other functions,

every controlled dangerous substance within one of the following three classes:

(a) CLASS A CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES.—This class shall include those controlled dangerous substances that have the most harmful effects on the health of drug abusers or that most significantly contribute to crimes of violence against persons or to other grave felonious conduct.

(b) CLASS B CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES.—This class shall include those controlled dangerous substances that have intermediate harmful effects on the health of drug abusers or that make an intermediate contribution to crimes of violence against persons or to other grave felonious conduct.

(c) CLASS C CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES.—This class shall include those controlled dangerous substances that have the least harmful effects on the health of drug abusers, or that least significantly contribute to crimes of violence against persons or to other grave felonious conduct. The Administration shall consult with the Department of Justice in proposing these regulations or any changes thereto.

REPORTING FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 310. It shall be the duty of the Administration with respect to its reporting functions to—

(a) submit an annual report to Congress, which shall specify the actions taken and services provided and funds expended under each provision of this Act and an evaluation of their effectiveness, and which shall contain the current Federal drug abuse and drug dependence control plan;

(b) submit such additional reports as may be requested by the Secretary or by Congress; and

(c) submit to the Secretary and to Congress such recommendations as will further the prevention, treatment, and control of drug abuse and drug dependence.

TITLE IV—TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF FEDERAL OFFENDERS

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary shall provide at least the following treatment and rehabilitation services for male and female juveniles and adults who are charged with, convicted of, or serving a criminal sentence for, any criminal offense under Federal law and are eligible for treatment under this Act:

(1) Emergency medical services.

(2) Inpatient services, which shall not be a part of or at the same location as a correctional institution.

(3) Intermediate care and outpatient services. (A) The Secretary shall give priority to developing these community based treatment services. (B) Reasonable surveillance techniques such as urine analysis may be used for treatment purposes but the results thereof shall remain confidential and may not be used against any patient in any criminal proceeding. Because of the nature and seriousness of the disease a drug dependent person can be expected to relapse into drug abuse one or more times after the onset of therapy. The decision whether to continue or to modify or to discontinue intermediate care or outpatient treatment after one or more such relapses shall be made on the basis of sound clinical judgment. All reasonable methods of treatment shall be used to prevent their recurrence. (C) Supportive medical care, services, and residential facilities shall be provided for drug dependent persons for whom treatment has repeatedly failed and recovery is unlikely so that they may live in a decent and productive manner.

(b) The treatment and rehabilitation services authorized by this Act may be provided at any available facility, including but not limited to Public Health Service hospitals, Veterans' Administration hospitals, public and private general hospitals, community mental health centers, and public and private drug dependence and drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation centers. Care and treatment for veterans shall be provided where possible in Veterans' Administration hospitals. The Secretary may contract with any appropriate public or private agency, organization, or institution that has proper and adequate facilities and personnel in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) There shall be in each city or region a central office open twenty-four hours a day to coordinate and provide information concerning the availability of all such services. The Secretary may determine, in his discretion, the area to be served by any such office.

(d) Any person assisted under this Act may be required to contribute toward the cost of his subsistence, care, or treatment, to the extent that he is financially able to do so, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such regulations shall specify how funds available to any person as a result of his drug abuse or drug dependence under Federal or State government programs such as social security, welfare, medicare, medicaid, veterans benefits, and employee health insurance plans and policies, shall be used to contribute to the costs of such treatment so far as practicable without imposing undue hardship on him or his family. No person may be discriminated against on the basis of indigence.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

SEC. 402. (a)(1) Any person charged with a misdemeanor under Federal law and who appears to be a drug abuser, or who is taken into custody for what appears to be a drug related misdemeanor under Federal law, shall, after preliminary police processing and an opportunity to consult with counsel, promptly be taken for emergency medical services, where he shall either be admitted as a patient or transported to another appropriate health facility for treatment and diagnosis. Upon admission as a patient, such person shall immediately be examined to determine whether (A) it is probable that he is not a drug abuser and has not committed a drug related misdemeanor, or (B) it is probable that he is not in need of emergency medical services although he may be a drug abuser, or (C) it is probable that he is a drug abuser or a drug dependent person who is in need of emergency medical services. Such screening shall be completed within twenty-four hours of such person's admission to emergency medical services. Any person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(a)(1)(C) shall be detained there as long as is necessary to complete emergency medical treatment, to conduct a diagnosis for possible drug dependence, and to institute any civil commitment proceeding pursuant to section 403 or 405, but in no event longer than five days after his admission.

(2) Any person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(a)(1)(A) or 402(a)(1)(B) shall be released from emergency medical services immediately upon completion of the initial screening process, and in no event shall he be detained there longer than twenty-four hours. Upon his release from emergency medical services, he shall be handled as in any other criminal case.

(3) If a person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(a)(1)(C) is diagnosed as not a drug dependent person and prior to trial on the offense he requests voluntary treatment in lieu of criminal prosecution, the medical officer shall, after a review of the patient's record, advise the Government attorney in writing whether for the treatment and rehabilitation of the person it would be preferable for the criminal charges to be held in abeyance or withdrawn in order to institute voluntary treatment for his drug abuse, or for the criminal charges to be prosecuted. The Government attorney shall exercise his discretion whether to accept the medical officer's advice, but in the event that he does not accept the medical officer's advice he shall state in writing the reasons for his decision.

(4) If a person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(a)(1)(C) is diagnosed as a drug dependent person and prior to trial on the offense he requests voluntary treatment or civil commitment for treatment in lieu of criminal prosecution, the medical officer shall, after a review of his record, advise the Government attorney and the court in writing whether for the treatment and rehabilitation of the person it would be preferable for the criminal charges to be held in abeyance or withdrawn in order to institute either voluntary treatment for his drug dependence or treatment for his drug dependence under civil commitment, or for the criminal charges to be prosecuted. The Government attorney shall exercise his discretion whether to accept the medical officer's advice, but in the event that he does not accept the medical officer's advice he shall state in writing the reasons for his decision.

(5) If the criminal charges are prosecuted and such person is convicted, and at the time of conviction he requests probation with treatment or civil commitment for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment, the medical officer shall advise the court in writing whether for the treatment and rehabilitation of the person it would be preferable for him to receive a suspended sentence and probation on the condition that he undergo education and treatment for drug abuse and drug dependence, or to be civilly committed pursuant to section 405 for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment, or to receive criminal incarceration. The court shall exercise its discretion whether to accept the medical officer's advice.

(6) Any person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(a)(1)(C) shall immediately be informed of his right to request any of the procedures for treatment in lieu of criminal prosecution or punishment which are available to him under subsection 402(a)(3), 402(a)(4), or 402(a)(5) as a result of his diagnosis. If such person is, as a result of his drug abuse or drug dependence, unable at the time of diagnosis either to understand or to make a rational decision concerning his right to request treatment under such subsections, he shall again be informed of such right as soon as he is able to understand the choices available to him and to make a rational decision concerning them.

(7) A criminal charge may be held in abeyance pursuant to subsection (a) (3) or (4) for no longer than one year, after which it is automatically dismissed. A person civilly committed pursuant to section 405 may be returned to stand trial pursuant to section 405(e)(3) within that year.

(b)(1) Any person charged with a felony under Federal law and who appears to be a drug abuser, or who is taken into custody for what appears to be a drug related felony under Federal law, shall, after preliminary police processing and an opportunity to consult with counsel, promptly be taken for emergency medical care services, where he shall either be admitted as a patient or transported to another appropriate health facility for treatment and diagnosis. Upon admission as a patient, such person shall immediately be examined to determine whether (A) it is probable that he is not a drug abuser and has not committed a drug related felony, or (B) it is probable that he is not in need of emergency medical services although he may be a drug abuser, or (C) it is probable that he is a drug abuser or a drug dependent person who is in need of emergency medical services. Such screening shall be completed within twenty-four hours of such person's admission to emergency medical services. Any person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(b)(1)(C) shall be detained there as long

as is necessary to complete emergency medical treatment, to conduct a diagnosis for possible drug dependence, and to institute any civil commitment proceeding pursuant to section 403, 404, or 405, but in no event longer than ten days after his admission.

(2) Any person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(b)(1)(A) or 402(b)(1)(B) shall be released from emergency medical services immediately upon completion of the initial screening process, and in no event shall he be detained there longer than twenty-four hours. Upon his release from emergency medical services, he shall be handled as in any other criminal case.

(3) If a person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(b)(1)(C) is diagnosed as not a drug dependent person, he shall be handled as in any other criminal case.

(4) If a person determined to fall within subparagraph 402(b)(1)(C) is diagnosed as a drug dependent person and he pleads nolo contendere or guilty, or he is found guilty after trial, and at that time he requests probation with treatment or civil commitment for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment, the medical officer shall advise the court in writing whether it would be preferable for the treatment and rehabilitation of the person for him to receive a suspended sentence and probation on the condition that he undergo education and treatment for drug abuse and drug dependence, or to be civilly committed pursuant to section 405 for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment, or to receive criminal incarceration. The court shall exercise its discretion whether to accept the medical officer's advice.

(5) Any person diagnosed as a drug dependent person pursuant to subsection 402(b)(4) shall immediately be informed of his right to request probation with treatment or civil commitment for treatment in lieu of criminal punishment. If such person is, as a result of his drug dependence, unable at the time of diagnosis either to understand or to make a rational decision concerning his right to make such a request, he shall again be informed of such right as soon as he is able to understand the choices available to him and to make a rational decision concerning them.

(c) Whenever the medical officer in charge believes that any patient requires additional short term involuntary emergency medical treatment and care, and that the findings required by section 403(a) can be substantiated, he shall recommend in writing to the Government attorney that a civil commitment proceeding be instituted pursuant to section 403. The Government attorney shall institute such a proceeding unless he believes that the findings required by section 403(a) cannot be substantiated or that there is other good cause for denying the recommendation.

(d) Whenever the medical officer in charge believes that any patient taken into custody for or charged with any violation of the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 is a drug dependent person who is charged with a drug related offense, he shall recommend in writing that a civil commitment proceeding be instituted pursuant to section 405.

(1) The Government attorney shall institute such a proceeding unless he believes that the violation was not a drug related offense or that the findings required by section 405 cannot be substantiated. If the medical officer and the Government attorney disagree on the applicability of this subsection, the Government attorney may proceed with a criminal prosecution and shall state in writing the reasons for his decision. If the criminal charges are prosecuted under these circumstances against the recommendation of the medical officer, the medical officer shall make a report in writing to the court setting out his conclusions and recommendations, and the court shall take any appropriate action.

(2) If criminal charges are prosecuted and the court finds that the person is a drug dependent person and that the violation was a drug related offense, he shall be handled only pursuant to section 402, 403, and 405 of this Act. In any trial, the burden of showing the applicability of this subsection shall be on the defendant.

(3) This subsection shall be inapplicable to any drug dependent person who is charged with distribution of a large quantity of a controlled dangerous substance or distribution of any controlled dangerous substance as part of a continuing criminal enterprise. The Secretary may issue regulations defining, for any controlled dangerous substance, the quantity that constitutes a large quantity of that substance for purposes of this provision.

(e) Whenever the medical officer in charge believes that any patient taken into custody for or charged with a felony under Federal law other than a violation of the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 is a drug dependent person who is charged with a drug related felony, he shall recommend in writing to the Government attorney that a civil commitment proceeding be instituted pursuant to section 404 of this Act. The Government attorney shall institute such a proceeding unless he believes that the findings required by section 404 cannot be substantiated or that there is other good cause for denying the recommendation, but in the event that he does not accept the medical officer's advice he shall state in writing the reasons for his decision.

(f) Any Federal officer, Government attorney, court, or Federal probation or parole officer shall refer any person to the Secretary for handling pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) whenever it appears that such person is a drug abuser or that an offense with which he is charged may be drug related.

(g) The medical officer shall be given all pertinent records and information with respect to any person handled pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) by any Federal department, agency, officer, Government attorney, court, or Federal probation or parole officer who has such records or information.

SHORT TERM CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENT

SEC. 403. (a) A court may, on a petition of a Government attorney filed before the period of detention for emergency medical treatment and diagnosis expires, and after a hearing without a jury, order any person receiving emergency medical services pursuant to section 402 to be temporarily committed to the Secretary for emergency medical treatment and care for a period not to exceed thirty days from the date of commitment if he determines that the person is a drug dependent person, and as a result of his drug dependence (1) is in imminent danger of sustaining substantial physical harm unless he receives medical treatment for a period longer than permitted by section 402, and (2) is unable to make a rational decision about accepting assistance. The Court shall make any determination pursuant to this subsection, and shall impose any order of commitment, within five days after the filing of the petition, and the person who is the subject of the petition may be detained during that five-day period regardless of any time limit for detention imposed by section 402(a)(1) or 402(b)(1).

(b) The hearing shall be conducted according to the provisions of subsections 404(c) through (f) of this Act.

(c) As soon as a patient so committed is once again able to make a rational decision about accepting assistance, he shall be civilly committed for treatment pursuant to section 405, or detained for pretrial treatment pursuant to section 404, or be handled as in any other criminal case.

PRETRIAL DETENTION FOR TREATMENT

SEC. 404. (a) A court shall hold a civil hearing without a jury to consider the commitment of a person for treatment prior to trial upon a petition filed by a Government attorney alleging that the person—

(1) has been diagnosed as a drug dependent person, and

(2) is charged with a felony under Federal law that is (A) a drug related felony, and (B) not an offense under the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969.

(b) The court may order commitment of the person to the Secretary for treatment and care for drug dependence for a period not to exceed sixty days if it determines that—

(1) there is clear and convincing evidence that the person is a drug dependent person and that the offense charged is a drug related felony, and

(2) appropriate treatment for drug dependence is available for him.

(c) Such hearing shall be held within four days after the filing of the petition, unless the person or his attorney requests a delay of the hearing. The court shall notify the person and his attorney of the time and place of the hearing. If the person is without funds to provide for the assistance of counsel for the hearing, the court shall appoint counsel to represent the person at the expense of the Government.

(d) In conducting a hearing under this section, the court shall receive and consider all relevant evidence and testimony which may be offered. The person shall have the right to present evidence, and to present and cross-examine witnesses. The testimony of the person at this hearing may not be used against him in any other judicial proceeding, nor shall the person waive his privilege against self-incrimination in any future judicial proceeding by testifying at this hearing. The court shall make any determination pursuant to this subsection, and shall impose any order of commitment, within forty-eight hours after the conclusion of the hearing.

(e) Any person committed shall have the right to appeal: *Provided*, That any appeal arising pursuant to this subsection shall be disposed of within ten days of the entry of the order appealed from.

(f) Any court which conducts the hearing provided for in this section, or which reviews the outcome of said hearing, shall not sit in any trial of the person for an offense which was the basis for or pending at the time of said hearing, or any related appeal.

(g) Any person committed shall have his case placed on an expedited trial calendar, and the handling of motions and other preliminary matters pertaining to the case shall also be expedited. Continuances shall be granted only upon a showing of compelling circumstances. A continuance granted upon motion of the defense shall extend commitment to custody ordered pursuant to this section for the additional period of such continuance. If the trial of the person has begun but not been completed before the expiration, after the order of commitment to custody, of sixty days plus the period of any such continuance, the person shall remain subject to the commitment order until the conclusion of the trial.

(h) Any hearing under the provisions of this section shall be taken down by a court reporter or recorded by suitable sound recording equipment. A transcript of the record of such hearing shall be made available, at the expense of the Government, to a person who was the subject of the hearing and who makes affidavit that he is unable to pay or give security therefor.

(i) No person committed shall be denied the right to communicate with counsel or any other person at any reasonable time. Upon the application of counsel on behalf of any such person in custody, a court shall

order for a strictly limited and necessary period of time, the release of such person in the custody of and at all times to be accompanied by a designated Federal officer, if the court determines that, notwithstanding the rights secured by this section, the person cannot otherwise prepare his defense.

(j) Any person committed pursuant to this section shall initially be placed in inpatient treatment unless the court orders otherwise. The Secretary may transfer a committed person between inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient services without court permission on the basis of sound clinical judgment, except that a court order must be obtained for the transfer from inpatient status. A committed person has a right to intermediate care and outpatient status as quickly as is consistent with sound clinical judgment and with the safety of other persons and property.

CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR TREATMENT OF DRUG DEPENDENCE

SEC. 405. (a)(1) The courts may commit to the Secretary for treatment and care for drug dependence in lieu of criminal prosecution or punishment for up to a specified period of time a drug dependent person who—

(A) is charged with a misdemeanor and who, prior to trial on the offense, requests such treatment in lieu of criminal prosecution; or

(B) is charged with a misdemeanor or felony and who, after having pled nolo contendere or guilty to, or having been found guilty of, the offense charged, at the time sentence is imposed requests such treatment in lieu of serving the sentence imposed; or

(C) is serving a criminal sentence and petitions the court for such treatment in lieu of serving the remainder of his sentence.

(2) No term of commitment shall be ordered for a period longer than the maximum sentence that could have been imposed for the offense with which the person was charged with respect to subsection (a)(1)(A), or for a period longer than the sentence actually imposed with respect to subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(1)(C), unless he is found at the end of that time to constitute an immediate and continuing danger to the safety of another person or of property pursuant to subsection (c)(2). A patient may voluntarily remain in treatment for as long as the medical officer believes warranted.

(b)(1) The courts may commit to the Secretary for treatment and care for drug dependence for up to a specified period of time a drug dependent person who—

(A) is charged with a drug related offense and is acquitted on the ground of drug dependence; or

(B) is charged with an offense under the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 and is found, before or after trial, to fall within the provisions of section 402(d).

(2) No term of commitment shall be ordered for a period longer than the maximum sentence that could have been imposed for the offense of which he was acquitted with respect to subsection (b)(1)(A), or for a period longer than the maximum sentence that could have been imposed for the offense for which he was taken into custody or charged with respect to subsection (b)(1)(B), unless he is found at the end of that time to constitute an immediate and continuing danger to the safety of another person or of property pursuant to subsection (c)(2). A patient may voluntarily remain in treatment for as long as the medical officer believes warranted.

(c)(1) Prior to the commitment of any person pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) the court shall hold a civil hearing without a jury and must find that (A) he is a drug dependent person; and (B) appropriate treatment is available for him.

(2) To support a finding that a person constitutes an immediate and continuing danger to the safety of another person or of property, a court must conclude from clear and convincing factual evidence, based upon recent behavior during intermediate care or outpatient treatment, that as a result of his drug dependence he will engage in illegal distribution of any controlled drug or will commit grave felonious conduct that is drug related.

(d) Pending the court's decision on civil commitment, the person shall be detained for appropriate care and treatment pursuant to sections 402 and 403: *Provided,* That such commitment cases shall be expedited and that such interim detention shall not exceed ten days from the date the proceeding is instituted. The order of the court shall prevail unless and until overturned on appeal: *Provided,* That any appeal shall also be expedited.

(e) The Secretary shall immediately inform the court whenever in his opinion any one of the findings made pursuant to subsection (c) is no longer applicable, or for any reason the person should be unconditionally released.

(1) The Secretary shall, after a review of the patient's record, recommend to the court whether the commitment order should be continued, or whether the patient should be unconditionally released, or whether the patient should be returned to stand trial if he was committed under subsection (a)(1)(A) or to serve the remainder of his sentence if he was committed under subsection (a)(1)(B) or (a)(1)(C) or whether some other appropriate action should be taken. The court shall hold a civil hearing and shall enter an appropriate order.

(2) Time spent under civil commitment shall be counted toward any sentence for a person returned to stand trial or to serve the remainder of his sentence.

(3) A person committed under this section may be returned to stand trial or to serve the remainder of his sentence if he does not cooperate with an appropriate treatment or care program, or if appropriate treatment or care is ineffective: *Provided,* That the decision whether to return the person to stand trial or to serve the remainder of his sentence after failure to conform to a schedule for rehabilitation shall be made on the basis of what is most consistent with the rehabilitation of the individual and the safety of the community.

(4) Except as provided in subsection 405(h), no person shall remain committed for treatment or care pursuant to this section after a court determines that any one of the findings made under subsection 405(c) is no longer applicable.

(f) A committed person may, upon the expiration of six months following the commitment order, and not more frequently than every six months thereafter, request the Secretary in writing to conduct a review of the current applicability of the required findings, and if the request is timely it shall be granted. The patient may, at his own expense, have one or more qualified physicians participate in the review or conduct an independent review. The Secretary shall, upon the written request of an indigent patient, assist him in obtaining a qualified physician to participate in the review, and such a physician shall be compensated for his services by the Secretary in an amount determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable. The Secretary shall report the result of the review to the patient. If the patient is not released as a result of this review he may petition the court for an order directing his release. The court may hold a hearing and shall consider all pertinent evidence and enter an appropriate order. The burden of proof in such a proceeding shall remain on the Secretary.

(g) In addition to the right of review upon a patient's written request, the Secretary shall as often as practicable, but not less often than every six months, review a patient's status under the required findings. Any right available to him for obtaining release from confinement, including the right to petition for a writ of habeas corpus, shall also be retained, and the burden of proof in such a proceeding of the continuing existence of the findings upon which the commitment is based shall remain on the Secretary.

(h) If the Secretary continues to make a good faith attempt to provide appropriate treatment pursuant to subsection (c)(1), a drug dependent person who has been adjudged an immediate and continuing danger to the safety of other persons or of property pursuant to subsection (c)(2) shall not fail to be committed pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), or be released from commitment under subsection (e), (f), or (g), until the finding under subsection (c)(2) is no longer applicable.

(i) A committed person or a person detained for treatment may initially be placed in inpatient, intermediate care, or outpatient treatment, on the basis of sound clinical judgment, except that a person charged with or subject to a prison sentence for a felony shall initially be placed in inpatient treatment unless the court orders otherwise. The Secretary may transfer a committed person or a person detained for treatment between inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient services without court permission on the basis of sound clinical judgment, except that a court order must be obtained for the transfer from inpatient status of any person charged with or subject to a prison sentence for a felony. No committed person may be unconditionally released without a court order. A committed or detained person has a right to intermediate care and outpatient status, and to unconditional release, as quickly as is consistent with sound clinical judgment and with the safety of other persons and of property.

(j) If the respondent in any proceeding under this Act does not have an attorney and cannot afford one, the court shall appoint one to represent him. Counsel so appointed shall be compensated for his services by the Secretary in an amount determined by the court to be fair and reasonable.

(k) Neither mail nor other communications to or from a person committed pursuant to this section may be read by others or censored except when ordered by a physician for treatment reasons: *Provided,* That reasonable regulations regarding visiting hours and the use of telephone and telegraph facilities may be adopted, and reasonable precautions may be used to prevent persons from illegally obtaining controlled dangerous substances.

(l) Upon the institution of proceedings for the commitment of a person pursuant to section 403, 404, or 405, the Secretary shall give such person and his nearest known adult relative a written statement and explanation outlining in simple nontechnical language the procedures and rights set out in this section. If such person is committed, the Secretary shall give him and his nearest known adult relative a further written statement and explanation outlining all release procedures and other rights provided by this section, as well as by other statutes and general legal principles.

(m) A specific treatment plan, adapted to each individual, shall be prepared and maintained by the Secretary on a current basis for every patient committed pursuant to section 404 or 405. It shall show the treatment planned, and the treatment provided, in sufficient detail to permit an evaluation of the adequacy of the program for that individual. The plan shall be reviewed by the court in considering the findings required by subsections 404(b)(2) and 405 (c)(1) and (c)(2).

(n) Each individual treatment plan prepared pursuant to subsection 405(m) may

utilize inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient services, in accordance with principles of medical care and treatment accepted by a responsible segment of the medical profession. All public and private community efforts, including but not limited to welfare services, vocational rehabilitation, and job replacement, shall be utilized as part of outpatient treatment programs to integrate drug dependent persons back into society as productive citizens.

(o) Any hearing held pursuant to subsections 405 (c), (e), or (f) shall be conducted according to the provisions of subsections 404 (c) through (f) and (h) of this Act.

FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT

SEC. 406. Any person committed to or eligible for commitment to the custody of the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act (chapter 402 of title 18 of the United States Code) who is eligible for civil commitment under this title shall be handled pursuant to this title: *Provided,* That any person who was a youthful offender within the meaning of section 5006 of title 18 of the United States Code or who was eligible for sentencing under the Federal Youth Corrections Act pursuant to section 4209 of title 18 of the United States Code at the time of his commitment hearing under this title shall remain eligible for sentencing under the Federal Youth Corrections Act (1) if he should fail to be committed for treatment under this title or (2) if, having been committed, he is at any time returned to stand trial or to serve the remainder of his sentence under section 405(e)(3).

DRUG ABUSE SERVICES IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND ON PROBATION AND PAROLE

SEC. 407. (a) The services established by this Act shall be used by the Bureau of Prisons and the Board of Parole for drug abuser or drug dependent offenders (including persons sentenced under the Federal Youth Corrections Act, chapter 402 of title 18 of the United States Code) placed on work release, probation, parole, or other conditional release. The Secretary and the Bureau of Prisons shall cooperate in establishing and encouraging the establishment of community based drug abuse treatment services and of drug abuse treatment services in Federal correction institutions.

(b) The conditional release of any drug abuser or drug dependent person convicted of any Federal offense may be conditioned on the person's agreement to periodic urine analyses or other means of detecting narcotic drugs within the body.

(c) The Bureau of Prisons and the Board of Parole may transfer an offender placed on conditional release from one treatment service to another depending upon his response to treatment. The decision whether to retain or to restrict or to revoke probation or parole or other conditional release after failure to conform to a schedule for rehabilitation shall be made on the basis of what is most consistent with both the rehabilitation of the individual and the safety of the community. All reasonable methods of treatment shall be used to prevent relapses and to promote rehabilitation. The Secretary shall provide periodic reports and recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons and the Board of Parole on persons being treated pursuant to this section.

AVAILABILITY OF CRIMINAL RECORDS

SEC. 408. (a) In order to facilitate the treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons, any arrest for a criminal offense under the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 or under the provisions of Federal law previously governing narcotics and dangerous drugs shall no longer be available as part of the person's public arrest and other public criminal records when the charges are withdrawn or dismissed or the person is acquitted of the charges.

(b) Any arrest or trial or conviction for a criminal offense under the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 or under the provisions of Federal law previously governing narcotics and dangerous drugs may be made unavailable as part of a person's public criminal records by a court upon the filing of a petition supported by substantial evidence of good conduct since the petitioner's conviction. Copies of the petition shall be served on the United States attorney, who shall be responsible for consulting other appropriate public agencies and departments. If a Government attorney files a motion to dismiss the petition within sixty days, the court, without a jury, shall hold a hearing before ruling on the issue. The petitioner shall have the right to cross-examine any adverse witness or rebut any adverse evidence. The proceeding shall be closed to the public. The petition shall be granted if supported by substantial evidence of good conduct since the petitioner's conviction unless the court finds, on the basis of evidence of record, good cause not to accept the petitioner's allegations of good conduct. The petition may be filed and heard only after the following time lapses:

(1) For a Federal conviction involving any class A controlled drug, or any Federal offense under prior law involving any class A controlled drug, after five years from the date of conditional or unconditional release from a penal institution or from the date of conviction if not sent to a penal institution.

(2) For a Federal conviction involving any class B controlled drug, or any Federal offense under prior law involving any class B controlled drug, after three years from the date of conditional or unconditional release from a penal institution or from the date of conviction if not sent to a penal institution.

(3) For a Federal conviction involving any class C controlled drug, or any offense under prior law involving any class C controlled drug, after two years from the date of conditional or unconditional release from a penal institution.

(4) For a conviction for any Federal offense under prior law governing narcotics and dangerous drugs that would not now come within any of these provisions, after three years from the date of conditional or unconditional release from a penal institution or from the date of conviction if not sent to a penal institution.

(c) An arrest or trial or conviction that has been made unavailable to the public pursuant to this section shall not thereafter be regarded as an arrest or trial or conviction for the purpose of any statute or regulation or license or questionnaire or any other public or private purpose: *Provided,* That such a conviction shall continue to constitute an offense for purposes of any criminal statute under which the existence of a prior conviction is relevant to the penalty to be imposed. No Government employee shall divulge, nor shall any Government record available to the public reflect such arrest or trial or conviction, or a proceeding conducted pursuant to this section: *Provided,* That the judiciary, court personnel, and Government attorneys may be informed of such arrest or trial or conviction, and of such proceeding, where it becomes relevant to a penalty to be imposed in a subsequent case. Any Government employee who divulges such information in violation of this subsection shall be punished by a prison sentence of not more than ninety days, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

RETENTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

SEC. 409. A person receiving care or treatment under the provisions of this Act shall retain his civil rights and liberties except as herein otherwise explicitly provided.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

SEC. 410. (a) A complete medical, social, occupational, and family history shall be obtained as part of the diagnosis, classification, and treatment of a patient pursuant to this title. Copies of all pertinent records from other agencies, practitioners, institutions, and medical facilities shall be obtained in order to develop a complete and permanent confidential personal history for purposes of the patient's treatment.

(b) All patient records (including all records relating to any commitment proceeding) prepared or obtained pursuant to this Act, and all information contained therein, shall remain confidential, and may be disclosed with the patient's consent only to medical personnel and only for purpose of diagnosis and treatment of the patient or to Government or other officials for the purpose of obtaining benefits due the patient as a result of his drug abuse or drug dependence. Disclosure may be made for purposes unrelated to such treatment or benefits upon an order of a court after application showing good cause therefor. In determniing whether there is good cause for disclosure, the court shall weigh the need for the information sought to be disclosed against the possible harm of disclosure to the person to whom such information pertains, to the physician-patient relationship, and to the treatment services, and may condition disclosure of the information upon any appropriate safeguards. No such records or information may be used to initiate or substantiate charges against a patient under any circumstances.

(c) All patient records and all information contained therein relating to drug abuse or drug dependence prepared or obtained by a private practitioner shall remain confidential, and may be disclosesd only with the patient's consent and only to medical personnel for purposes of diagnosis and treatment of the patient or to Government or other officials for the purpose of obtaining benefits due to the patient as a result of his drug abuse or drug dependence.

TITLE V—PREVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AND VETERANS

DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE AMONG FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 501. (a) The Civil Service Commission shall be responsible for developing and maintaining, in cooperation with the Administration and other Federal agencies and departments, appropriate policies and services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among Federal employees, consistent with the purposes and intent of this Act. Government employees who are drug abusers or who are drug dependent shall retain the same employment and other benefits as other persons afflicted with serious health problems and illnesses, and shall not lose pension, retirement, medical, or other rights. A good faith attempt shall be made to find appropriate nonsensitive work within the Government during the employee's rehabilitative treatment, rather than placing him on sick leave: *Provided,* That acceptance of appropriate treatment shall be required as a condition of continued work.

(b) The Administration shall be responsible for fostering similar drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services in State and local governments and in private industry.

(c) No person may be denied or deprived of Federal employment or a Federal professional or other license or right solely on the ground of prior drug abuse or prior drug dependence, except with regard to extremely sensitive positions specified in regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

HEALTH AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PLANS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 502. All health and disability insurance policies and plans for Federal employees shall cover drug abuse and drug dependence in the same way as other health problems, illnesses, and diseases that are not self-inflicted.

DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 503. (a) For purposes of chapter 61 of title 10 of the United States Code, drug dependence shall be regarded as a physical disability and shall not be regarded as the result of intentional misconduct or willful neglect. A drug dependent person shall retain the same rights and benefits as any other person afflicted with serious illnesses, and shall not lose pension, retirement, medical, or other rights because of drug dependence. This subsection shall be retroactive.

(b) The medical care provided to military personnel and their dependents pursuant to chapter 55 title 10 of the United States Code shall include appropriate treatment services for drug abuse and drug dependence.

(c) Any penalty or penalties imposed upon military personnel pursuant to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, for an offense that would otherwise fall within the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969, shall be no greater than or different from the penalty or penalties provided under the Federal Controlled Dangerous Substance Act of 1969.

DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE AMONG VETERANS

SEC. 504. (a) Appropriate treatment facilities and services for drug abuse and drug dependence shall be made available within Veterans' Administration hospitals as a matter of high priority.

(b) For purposes of chapters 11 and 17 of title 38 of the United States Code, drug dependence during military service shall be regarded as a service-connected disability, and shall not be regarded as due to willful misconduct.

(c) Section 602 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended to add "or drug dependence" in the title and in the body of the section after the word "psychosis."

(d) A dishonorable discharge prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be a bar to treatment for drug abuse or drug dependence if the discharge was the result of drug abuse or drug dependence.

TITLE VI—PREVENTION AND TREATMENT UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH, WELFARE, AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

SEC. 601. (a) A drug abuser or drug dependent person shall be regarded as a sick or disabled person eligible for treatment under medicare and medicaid (the Social Security Amendments of 1965, as amended).

(b) Section 1396a of title 42 of the United States Code is amended to add: "(a)(31) include provision for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence."

SOCIAL SECURITY

SEC. 602. A drug abuser or drug dependent person shall be regarded as eligible for disability benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended, and benefits shall not be barred on the ground that drug abuse or drug dependence is a self-inflicted disability.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 603. Drug abuse and drug dependence shall be a matter of high priority for programs undertaken under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

SEC. 604. (a) A drug abuser or drug dependent person, or a facility or program or service for the prevention or treatment of drug abuse or drug dependence, shall be eligible for funds made a available pursuant to chapter 4 of title 29 of the United States Code.

(b) Section 35(a) of title 29 of the United States Code is amended to add:

"(15) provide for the use of vocational rehabilitation in the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence."

WELFARE

SEC. 605. Drug abuse and drug dependence shall, for the purposes of all Federal welfare programs and all State welfare programs that receive Federal participation, be regarded as a major health and economic problem.

(a) State and Federal agencies charged with administering such welfare programs shall take action to reduce the incidence of financial indigency and family disintegration caused by drug abuse and drug dependence, and shall provide for treatment and rehabilitation services for those persons enrolled in welfare programs whose financial eligibility for such assistance results, in part or in whole, from drug abuse or drug dependence.

(b) Drug abuse and drug dependence prevention and treatment programs and services for persons enrolled in such welfare programs whose financial eligibility for such assistance results, in whole or in part, from drug abuse or drug dependence, shall, if approved by the Secretary under the same procedure and criteria used for approving programs under title VII of this Act, be eligible for 75 per centum Federal funding participation. Application for funds under this subsection shall be made by the State agency charged with administering the aid program, which may conduct the program or may contract with any other appropriate State agency or private organization for the provision of any of the designated services.

(c) Persons otherwise eligible for such welfare assistance shall not be ineligible for such assistance because of drug abuse or drug dependence. Any person whose financial eligibility for assistance results, in whole or in part, from drug abuse or drug dependence shall be provided the services of appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services upon a certification by a responsible medical officer that (1) the services will more likely than not be appropriate for the recipient, and (2) the services can accommodate the recipient. After such certification, participation by the recipient in the program shall be a requirement for continuing eligibility for such assistance, in the absence of good cause for nonparticipation. A certification by the director of the facility that the recipient is no longer amenable to treatment shall constitute such good cause.

(d) Any drug abuse or drug dependence treatment facility shall qualify as a medical institution within the meaning of section 306(a) of title 42 of the United States Code. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations specifying how such welfare benefits shall be used to contribute to the costs of treatment and rehabilitation of a drug abuser or drug dependent person receiving welfare assistance so far as practicable without imposing undue hardship on him or his family.

(e) Any recipient of welfare assistance whose inability to work or to participate in a work training program is the result of drug abuse or drug dependence shall be excused from such participation only on condition that he accept appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services made available to him.

(f) The Secretary shall promulgate appropriate regulations and offer technical assistance to States in providing, as part of the services rendered under section 705 of title 42 of the United States Code, programs of education about drug abuse and drug dependence for children of school age and adults responsible for them, and appropriate treatment for children physically or mentally damaged or otherwise affected as a result of drug abuse or drug dependence on the part of such children and other children or adults with whom they have significant contact.

SEC. 606. (a) Each State highway safety program approved pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966 shall include provisions for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among licensed drivers. Highway safety research conducted pursuant to that Act shall include research with respect to the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among licensed drivers.

(b) Any Federal funds used to assist State and local governments in the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among licensed drivers shall be expended for the purpose of education, treatment, and rehabilitation and not for the purpose of punishment. Such funds shall be expended for programs and services that are coordinated with and integrated into comprehensive community health and rehabilitation programs and services.

GENERAL

SEC. 607. Drug abuse or drug dependence shall be regarded as a health problem, sickness, illness, disease, disability, or other similar term, for purposes of all Federal legislation relating to health, welfare, and rehabilitation programs, services, funds and other benefits. Any Federal legislation providing for medical assistance, medical care, treatment, rehabilitation, or other similar services, shall be regarded as including programs and services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence.

TITLE VII—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANS

SEC. 701. Section 246(a)(2) of title 42 of the United States Code is amended to add:

"(L) provide for services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, commensurate with the extent of the problem, such plan to (i) estimate the number of drug abusers and drug dependent persons within the various areas within the State and the extent of the health problem caused, (ii) establish priorities for the improvement of the capabilities of State and local governments and public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations with respect to prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, and (iii) specify how all available community health, welfare, educational, and rehabilitation resources, and how funds, programs, services, and facilities authorized under existing Federal and State legislation, are to be used for these purposes."

STATE HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION PLANS

SEC. 702. (a) Section 291c(a) of title 42 of the United States Code is amended to add:

"(4) to projects for construction and modernization of facilities for prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;".

(b) Section 291d(a)(4) of title 42 of the United States Code is amended to add:

"(F) the facilities needed to provide adequate services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;".

STATE MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS PLANS

SEC. 703. (a) Section 2684 of title 42 of the United States Code is amended to add:

"(11) provide for services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, commensurate with the extent of the problem."

(b) Section 2691(c) of title 42 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "mental illness," the following: "drug abuse or drug dependence," and by inserting after "mentally ill patients," the following: "drug abusers or drug dependent persons,".

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE

SEC. 704. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and enter into contracts for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence to assist State and local governments and public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to—

(1) meet the costs of constructing, equipping, and operating treatment and rehabilitation facilities, including but not limited to emergency medical inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient facilities for drug abusers and drug dependent persons, and to assist them to meet, for the temporary periods specified in subsection (b) of this section, a portion of the costs of compensation of personnel for the initial operation of such facilities, and of new services in existing facilities for drug abusers and drug dependent persons;

(2) conduct research, demonstration, and evaluation projects, including surveys and field trials, looking toward the development of improved, expanded, and more effective methods of prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(3) provide education and training for professional personnel, including medical, psychiatric, vocational rehabilitation, and social welfare personnel, in academic and professional institutions and in postgraduate courses, about the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, and provide training for such personnel in the administration, operation, and supervision of programs and services for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(4) recruit, educate, train, organize, and employ community drug abuse and drug dependence prevention and treatment personnel to serve with and under the direction of professional medical, psychiatric, vocational rehabilitation, and social welfare personnel in drug abuse and drug dependence prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs. Prior drug abuse or drug dependence and prior criminal arrests or convictions shall not be a bar to such employment;

(5) provide services in correctional and penal institutions for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(6) provide services, in cooperation with schools, law enforcement agencies, courts, and other public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence among juveniles and young adults. These services, where feasible, shall include curricula for drug abuse education in elementary and secondary schools, and among parents and other adults;

(7) provide programs and services, in cooperation with local law enforcement agencies, the courts, and other public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, for the instruction of law enforcement officers, prosecuting-attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officials and legal aid, public defender, and neighborhood legal services attorneys with respect to the causes, effects, prevention, and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence. Such programs and services shall include, where possible, a full range of services available to State and local courts for diagnosis, counseling, and treatment for drug abuse and drug dependence for persons coming before the courts;

(8) provide services for outpatient counseling of drug abusers and drug dependent persons to include employment, welfare, legal, education, and other assistance, in cooperation and coordination with welfare and rehabilitation personnel;

(9) develop or evaluate curriculums on drug abuse prevention and treatment, including the preparation of new and improved curricular materials for use in elementary, secondary, college, and adult education programs;

(10) develop or evaluate a program of dissemination of curricular material;

(11) provide training programs on drug abuse and drug dependence (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, films, workshops, and conferences) for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel;

(12) provide community education programs on drug abuse (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, films, workshops, and conferences) especially for parents and other adults in the community;

(13) enable a State government agency to assist local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs; and

(14) develop educational material and programs about the prevention and treatment of, and problems arising from, drug abuse and drug dependence, for use or distribution by any form of mass media.

(b) The amount of any Federal grant made under subsection (a) of this section, except with regard to certain grants made under paragraph (1) of subsection (a), shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant. The amount of any Federal grant made under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section to meet costs of compensation of personnel may be made only for the period beginning with the first day for which such a grant is made and ending with the close of five years after such first day. Such grants may not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for the period ending with the close of the twenty-fourth month following such first day, 80 per centum of such costs for the first year thereafter, 70 per centum of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 60 per centum of such costs for the third year thereafter.

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 705. (a) In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall require coordination of all applications for programs in a State and, in view of the local nature of the drug abuse problem, shall not give precedence to public agencies over private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, or to State agencies over local agencies.

(b) All applications from within a State shall first be submitted by the applicant for review by the State agency responsible for administering the State comprehensive plan for treatment and prevention of drug abuse, if such an agency exists. This agency shall be responsible for encouraging, coordinating, and initially reviewing appropriate applications for all localities within the State. All applications initially approved by such State agency shall promptly be forwarded to the Secretary.

(c) Approval of any application by the Secretary, including the earmarking of financial assistance for a program or project, may be granted only if the application substantially meets a set of criteria established by the Secretary that—

(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be substantially administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such programs or projects;

(3) set forth policies and procedures which adequately provide that Federal funds made available for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant; and

(4) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant.

(d) If a State drug abuse prevention and treatment agency finds an application to lack sufficient merit to warrant forwarding to the Secretary, it shall inform the applicant and shall give the applicant the reasons for disapproval in writing within thirty days after receiving the application. At such time the agency shall also inform the applicant in writing that if the applicant disagrees with this preliminary finding the application shall be forwarded to the Secretary with the State agency's recommendation of disapproval and the applicant's statement of disagreement.

(e) Upon notification by a State drug abuse prevention and treatment agency that an application has not been approved for forwarding to the Secretary, or upon notification by the Secretary that the application has been disapproved, the applicant may amend and resubmit it to the State drug abuse prevention and treatment agency, or to the Secretary if no such agency exists, for reconsideration. Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 706. The recipient of any grant or contract under this title shall make an annual report and such other reports to the Secretary in such form and containing such information as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to permit the verification and assure the correctness of such reports.

SEC. 707. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 708. No funds shall be available under this title to any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, if the amount of funds committed by such agency, institution, or organization at the time of the effective date of this Act to programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence is thereafter reduced.

SEC. 709. (a) Whenever the Secretary finds a failure to comply with the terms of a grant or contract made or entered into under this title, he shall, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, terminate payments until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply.

(b) The exclusive remedy of anyone adversely affected by a final action of the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section is to appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which it is located by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file with the court the record of the proceeding on which he based is action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. Until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judg-

ment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

ADMISSION OF DRUG ABUSERS AND DRUG DEPENDENT PERSONS TO PRIVATE AND PUBLIC HOSPITALS

SEC. 710. (a) Drug abusers and drug dependent persons shall be admitted to and treated in private and public hospitals on the basis of medical need and shall not be discriminated against because of their drug abuse or drug dependence. No hospital that violates this section shall receive Federal financial assistance under the provisions of this Act or any other Federal law administered by the Secretary. No such action shall be taken until the Secretary has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with this section, and provided an opportunity for correction or a hearing.

(b) Any action taken by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be subject to such judicial review as is provided by section 709(b) of this title.

TITLE VIII—THE SECRETARY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE

SEC. 801. (a) The Secretary shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence, to consist of nine qualified persons who have knowledge of and an interest in the subject, who represent different geographical regions and occupations, and some of whom must formerly have been drug abusers or drug dependent persons, to advise and consult with the Secretary and the Administration and to assist them in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The members of the Committee shall elect a Chairman, who shall serve a one-year term but may be reelected. The members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, except for expenses, for terms of three years, staggered so that three vacancies occur every year. A member may be reappointed immediately after serving less than a full term, and may be reappointed, after a three-year hiatus after serving a full term.

(c) The Committee shall meet at least once every two months, and may meet more often. It shall consult at regular intervals with representatives of the Administration, the judiciary, corrections, probation, vocational rehabilitation, public welfare, parole, and such other agencies as may become involved in a total treatment and rehabilitation effort to control drug abuse and drug dependence.

SEC. 802. The Committee may appoint one or more technical consultants from experts throughout the country to assist in evaluating the progress of the Administration so that it will have the best possible prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for drug abuse and drug dependence.

SEC. 803. The Committee shall employ a full-time executive director with a secretary, who shall not be employees of the Administration, to assist the Committee and coordinate its activities.

TITLE IX—INTERGOVERNMENT COORDINATING COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE

SEC. 901. (a) For the purpose of coordinating all Federal Government prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts with respect to drug abuse and drug dependence of coordinating such Federal efforts with State and local government efforts, and of developing an enlightened policy and appropriate programs for Federal employees for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and the rehabilitation of drug dependent persons, there is hereby established an Intergovernmental Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Control consisting of the Commissioner who shall serve as Chairman, the executive director of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence, four representatives of Federal departments or agencies, and five representatives of State and local government departments or agencies.

(b) The President shall designate the four representatives of Federal departments or agencies who shall serve on the Coordinating Council, and shall appoint the five representatives of State and local government departments or agencies. The State and local government representatives shall serve for terms of five years, staggered so that one vacancy occurs each year. A State or local government representative may be reappointed immediately after serving less than a full term, and may be reappointed after a five-year hiatus after serving a full term.

(c) The Coordinating Council may appoint such technical consultants as are deemed appropriate for advising the Council in carrying out its functions.

SEC. 902. The Coordinating Council is authorized and directed to—

(a) assist the Secretary and the Administration in carrying out its function of coordinating all Federal prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts to deal with the problems of drug abuse and drug dependence;

(b) assist the Administration in carrying out its function of coordinating such Federal efforts with State and local governments;

(c) engage in educational programs among Federal employees, and in other appropriate activities, designed to prevent drug abuse and drug dependence;

(d) implement programs for the rehabilitation of Federal employees who are drug dependent persons; and

(e) develop and maintain any other appropriate activities consistent with the purposes of this Act

TITLE X—GENERAL

SEC. 1001. The Secretary may promulgate regulations pursuant to subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code to implement this Act.

SEC. 1002. If any section, provision, or term of this Act is adjudged invalid for any reason, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate any other section, provision, or term of this Act, and the remaining sections, provisions, and terms shall be and remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 1003. (a) (1) Chapter 175 of title 28, United States Code, chapter 314 of title 18, United States Code, and title III of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1438), are repealed.

(2) In any case involving an individual committed pursuant to such chapter 175, chapter 314, or title III, on or before the date immediately preceding the effective date of the repeal of such chapters and title, such individual shall continue to be subject to the provisions thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as if they had not been repealed.

(b) Sections 341, 342, 343, 344, and 345 of the Public Health Service Act, and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes", approved November 8, 1966 (80 Stat. 1438), other than title V thereof, are repealed.

SEC. 1004. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Any appropriated funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 1005. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and eighty days following the date of its enactment.

THE FARM MINORITY

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, there is a minority in this country that is being overlooked, abused, and taken for granted. This minority is now suffering an economic crisis. The minority of which I speak are this Nation's farmers.

All of my colleagues know these people. Those of us who represent nonurban districts in this country know them and the problems they face as they try to work and live in a changing, unpredictable, alien, and inflationary economy. My urban colleagues have met many of these people who have already been forced off their farms and into the cities. They know them because they have compounded the complex problems of urban America through a constant migration from the farm to the city.

The farmers of this country do not deserve the reputation or the treatment they are receiving, Mr. Speaker. They are a people whose only vice has been efficiency of production that the country could not support. Their primary problem has been a misunderstanding on the part of the consumers of the farmer's role in the production of the food and fiber that we eat and use daily.

While income has been going up for the vast majority of citizens in this country during the past two decades, the farmer benefited little from this active economy. And yet, he was having to pay more for labor, for supplies, for equipment, and for the other necessities of life. Then, as our economy began to move from active to inflationary, the farmer again was forced to lead the fight against inflation, receiving little more for his products while seeing his expenses mushroom.

There are several myths currently held in this country which need to be clarified.

In the first place, contrary to public belief, the American consumer is, and has been, receiving favorable treatment on his food purchases. A recent article in Top Op, a monthly magazine, puts this situation into proper perspective:

WHO MAKES THE MONEY ON THE FOOD YOU RAISE?

Don't you ever let anyone tell you that farmers are gouging consumers. As far as your share of the consumer's food dollar is concerned, you stand exactly where you did 12 years ago. USDA experts are now predicting that the farmer's share of each $1 spent by the typical urban worker for the "market basket of farm food" will be around 40¢ in the first half of 1970—the same as 1958, but 10¢ *less* than in 1947–49. The 1% boost to 41¢ last year was just a flash in the pan the way it looks now.

If you're a beef man, you got the same 62¢ out of the housewife's dollar spent for beef when USDA Choice cost $1.01 a pound last summer as you got back in the 1957–59, when the average retail price was only 78¢. If you're a wheat farmer, you get exactly the same 3.3¢ from a pound of bread costing 22½ cents at retail as you got from a pound of bread that cost 13½ cents twenty years ago.

You're getting more total dollars now, of course, because food sales volume is up to a record $95.9 billion estimated for 1969, and population is growing. But the main people in the food picture who are really *gaining* on the consumer—getting a bigger and bigger share of her food dollar—are wage and salaries workers and service people involved in handling, processing and marketing farm foods from the time they leave your farm until they hit the supermarket or restaurant.

Labor costs amounted to only 43% of the $39.5 billion marketing bill in 1958. In 1968, it was up to 45% of the $60.6 billion bill. And it's likely to claim an even higher share of the $63.7 billion bill estimated for 1969. In total dollars, labor in marketing in 1970 will likely cost almost as much as the raw material that's shipped from your farm.

Employees in food marketing got a 6% raise from August 1968 to August 1969, to $2.82 an hour, compared with the 10-year average annual increase of 3.9%. In contrast, food manufacturers last summer were making only 2.4% profit on sales compared with 2.3% in 1959; retail chains were making less—1.1% compared with 1.3% ten years ago. Freight charges have also fallen behind.

You can't expect housewives to ask their wage-earning husbands why food prices keep going up. But these are the guys to ask—not farmers.

Americans spend less of their per capita income on food than almost any of the leading nations of the world. This is a break for the consumer, but it has added up to bad news for the farmer. The farmer is subsidizing the consumer.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are at least two realities that we in the Congress, and the consumers of this Nation, must realize. The first is that it costs money to produce food and fiber and, if the farmer is to survive, someone is going to have to pay the bill. The second is that the farmers of this Nation would prefer to stay on the farm, and that it is in the national interest to keep them there.

Now, let me go back to the first point. Of the $95.9 billion spent on food last year, only about one-third, $32.2 billion, was received by the farmers of this Nation. The other two-thirds was the marketing bill. The average net income per farm was only $5,024 in 1966. That figures out to about $1,730 per farm person in disposable personal income and about $1.60 per hour for farmwork. It must also be kept in mind that those figures are averages. On the lower end of the scale, the smaller farmers of this country are virtually donating their services to the Nation's consumers.

So, the first reality that we must face is that the production costs of our farmers must be paid, and they must be paid better than they have been in the past. It seems to me that there are only two alternatives. We can either come up with a realistic farm program by which the Federal Government pays the additional costs on a subsidized basis, or the additional costs can be passed on to the consumers.

The second reality that we must face is that it will cost this Nation much less to keep our farmers down on the farm than it will to keep them up in the city. It is a well-known and documented fact that our cities are in trouble. A major portion of that problem has been created by our unwillingness to develop realistic, workable, and effective legislation to keep rural Americans in rural America. Unable to make a decent living on the farm, these citizens have looked to the greener pastures of industrialized, urban America. All too often, however, that green pasture has turned out to be a barren wasteland, and the farmer, who had previously been a self-supporting, taxpaying citizen, became a burden on society. Neither rural nor urban America wants this. It is an unproductive, wasteful, and shortsighted policy that forces farmers off their land.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that we must develop legislation that deals effectively with the cost-price squeeze facing today's farmers. It is clear that we should make it a conscious policy of our Government to help this Nation's farmers stay on the farm. It is clear to me that our farmers are going to have to be properly and adequately rewarded for their efforts, whether it be by the consumers directly or by the taxpayers through the Federal Government.

At the present time, our farmers face one more crisis. At the end of this year, our present farm legislation expires. It would be most unwise for us to legislate by default, to create farm policy through inaction and the failure to pass legislation. But time is of the essence, the hour is late, and we must move now.

There is one further point that I would like to make, and I address these remarks to the farmers of this Nation. Having grown up on a farm in northeast Arkansas, I am fully aware that farmers are fiercely independent and self-sufficient. This is a virtue that has inured to their benefit as they have fought for their very existence in the past.

There are times, however, when an ounce of cooperation can be worth a pound of independence. In my opinion, this is one of those times. The farm community of this Nation must get together in their own best interests and come to an agreement on a program that will serve all of the farmers of this Nation, large and small, East and West, North and South, food and fiber. No one will win a checkmate, and a standoff will benefit no one.

It is time in this country, Mr. Speaker, for us to take a realistic look at the farm minority in this Nation and for us to try to serve their best interests as well as the Nation's by taking congressional action on this legislation at the earliest possible time.

ISRAEL'S 22D ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the observance of the 22d anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel. Israel has survived and prospered in spite of adversity. Her lands have been made fertile. Modern industry manufactures products for her people, and for export. Democratic institutions nurture the precious freedoms which Americans themselves so greatly cherish.

In working these virtual miracles, Israel is an example for all of us—idealism, commitment, and hard work do achieve their just rewards. And more than being just an example, Israel has extended her hand directly to help other struggling young nations. Her foreign aid program, short on money but long on people-to-people contact, is at work to help other countries to help themselves.

For example, in Laos, there is an Israeli team showing Laotian rice farmers how to irrigate and to rotate crops so that the rice crop will double. In the Central African Republic, there are six farms established on the Israeli model, but with the distinctive African flavor, which are conquering lands that were considered unusable. A one-man Israeli project in Kenya is introducing grapes to that country, a new product which can be profitable for the farmers of Kenya.

In all, over 10,000 Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans have trained in Israel. And more thousands have worked with the 3,000 Israeli field representatives, who have been sent to over 70 nations around the globe.

I would rather just speak of Israel's successes, and of her role as an object lesson to other developing countries. But the events of world politics all too forcefully compel us to recognize that the adversity which Israel has overcome stems not only from a barren land and an inhospitable climate. Since her creation, and even before that, Israel has faced the unremitting hostility of her neighbors. She has had to fight three wars, when she only seeks peace. She has suffered the closing of her waterways, the shelling of her kibbutzes, terrorism in her cities.

And now, despite three wars, in each one of which she emerged victorious, Israel is the object of a war of attrition. Her neighbors, whose resources and talents could so well be spent on bettering the lot of their peoples, are pledged to Israel's destruction. Their ally in this war of attrition is the Soviet Union, which has poured billions of dollars worth of armaments into Egypt alone, as well as thousands of advisers. Now Soviet pilots are flying jets over Egypt.

Israel's past has been a bittersweet one. She has paid a high price for the right to survive. She can continue to do so, if she must. But for her sake and that of the peoples of the Arab States which surround her, it would be so much better if peace were achieved. The problems of human development are far too demanding to allow human destruction to continue.

Let us then on the 22d anniversary of Israel's creation urge her neighbors to join in recognizing this anniversary as a chance for the betterment of all peoples of the Middle East—a chance to work together.

Direct negotiations between the parties are a necessary step toward achieving stability in the Middle East. If the parties to the conflict sit down and iron out their problems, it must necessarily follow that the sources of that conflict will be resolved. This is essential.

But, being less sanguine, we must recognize that so long as the Arab nations maintain their posture of intransigence and hostility, the United States must stand firmly beside Israel. The commit-

ment of the United States is one affirmed, by deed as well as word, by four Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. The ambivalence of the present administration must cease. A strong and secure Israel is in the interest of the United States, and the administration should provide Israel with the jet airplanes she urgently needs to defend herself.

As we congratulate the people of Israel on this anniversary, it should be understood by all nations that we intend to hail Israel's 23d anniversary next year and every successive anniversary thereafter.

THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, May 14 is a day of great significance for the Jewish people because it was on this day 22 years ago that the independent sovereign Republic of Israel was proclaimed.

Over the turbulent centuries the Jewish people have borne persecution, separation from their homeland, tragic assaults against their ethnic heritage, and indeed, even attempted genocide. The 22d anniversary of the Republic of Israel, which we commemorate today, therefore, stands as a monument to the patience, courage, and perseverance of a valiant people who finally have had their sovereignty restored to them.

Since its birth in 1948, Israel has grown and prospered in a most remarkable manner. Israel's gross national product has multiplied untold times from its initial tiny base, and from 1950–65 it averaged an 11-percent annual increase. Jewish immigrants have returned to Israel to establish cooperative and collective farming projects, and with agricultural production expanding at the rate of about 10 percent per year, the need for food imports will soon be eliminated. Already, three-fourths of the nation's food is homegrown, irrigated land has quadrupled, and cultivated land has doubled in the past two decades, and the value of agricultural production has increased immensely.

The economy has expanded rapidly, the immigrants have been absorbed, the desert has been irrigated, and a parliamentary democracy has been assured. The countless accomplishments of Israel in achieving a viable, thriving economy and a true democracy deserve our praise and admiration.

As former legislative and educational director in Chicago for the Steelworkers of America, and one who has always been keenly interested in the labor movement, I am pleased to note that Histadrut is the largest labor union in Israel, with a membership of over 1 million people. Just as with our own labor unions—health, welfare, education, athletic, insurance, and other programs make the Histadrut a vital segment of Israeli life.

The educational and cultural life of Israel has advanced just as rapidly as its agricultural, political, and economic life. Israel has a fine symphony orchestra, has produced internationally known artists and sculptors, and Nobel prize-winning authors. There are more than 1,000 libraries and 5,000 schools in Israel today. and there are seven major universities and 52 colleges, and many museums and institutes which specialize in studies ranging from archeology to atomic energy.

Israel stands today as a tribute to the courage, strength, ingenuity, and perseverance of her people. On the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the independence of Israel, I congratulate the Jewish people in Israel and all over the world. I want to wish for the people of Israel peace and prosperity in their homeland, and I extend my greetings to our friends in Israel as well as Americans of Jewish descent throughout our Nation who are joining in this celebration.

SALUTE TO THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in saluting the Rumanian people on the occasion of their glorious 10th of May celebration—Americans of Rumanian descent as well as those of your people living in the Rumanian homeland.

It is an honor for me to join in this celebration because I recognize that Americans of Rumanian ancestry are among our finest U.S. citizens. I am very much aware, too, that for Rumanians the 10th of May is what the 4th of July is to patriotic Americans.

I feel a great friendliness toward the Rumanian people. I recall, for instance, that the Rumanians fought on the side of the United States during World War I and again in the latter days of World War II.

Americans were most happy, too, to see the genuine joy with which the Rumanian people greeted President Nixon during his visit to their country last year.

Having witnessed the growing independence of the Russian people in recent years, I feel that the time may well come when Rumanians will break the bonds that tie them to the Soviet Union and enjoy the freedom they nurture in their hearts.

The tradition of the 10th of May lives on in the spirit of the Rumanian people today—the spirit that won independence for Rumania on the battlefields south of the Danube in 1877 and flourished after the crowning of Charles I in 1881.

It is my hope that May the 10th will again signal glorious events in the history of Rumania and continue forever as the symbol of a great people.

PUBLICATION OF GEORGE MASON PAPERS

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 23 portraits and medallions around the galleries of the House of Representatives serve to honor great lawgivers down through the ages. We honor two Americans among the 23—Thomas Jefferson and George Mason.

George Mason is termed a "reluctant statesman" in the title of his biography, written in 1963 by Robert A. Rutland. His fame does not begin to approach that of Thomas Jefferson, yet as drafter of the Bill of Rights he justifiably takes his place among the great lawgivers who advanced man's march to freedom.

On May 15, a ceremony at Gunston Hall, Lorton, Va., will mark the official publication date for the George Mason papers. I am honored to report that Mrs. Richard VanZandt of Huntington, W. Va., the West Virginia regent on the board of regents of Gunston Hall, has been prominently associated with this venture and will attend the ceremonies.

In connection with this historic event, I was very pleased to see the following article in the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser of May 10:

CEREMONIES WILL MARK PUBLICATION OF HISTORIC GEORGE MASON PAPERS

(By Bob Withers)

A long standing project of the Cabell County Committee of The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America will come to fruition Friday in Washington, D.C., with the formal publication and presentation of the papers of Eighteenth-Century Patriot George Mason.

Mr. Mason, compatriot of George Washington and author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights and the Virginia Constitution, has been featured in only one definitive work by Mrs. Kate Mason Rowland, published in 1892.

Mrs. Richard VanZandt, West Virginia regent on the Board of Regents of Gunston Hall, Mr. Mason's Virginia plantation, and a member of the Cabell County Committee of the Colonial Dames, will attend the publication ceremonies at the home, near Washington at Lorton, Va., at 2:30 p.m. Friday.

President Nixon was invited to attend the ceremony and receive the first of the three volume sets of papers, published by the University of North Carolina Press and the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va. So far he has not declined.

Mrs. VanZandt will bring back to Huntington 12 sets of the papers, which the Cabell County Committee will present to various libraries and historical societies. Those to receive copies in this area include the Huntington Public Library, the Marshall University Library, the Beverly Hills Public Library, the library of the Huntington Publishing Co., the Cabell-Wayne Historical Society and the library of First Presbyterian Church.

The group will also present copies to West Virginia University, Bethany College, the Manassas, Va., Library, Rio Grande College, the Valdosta, Ga. Public Library and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

From the Stamp Act of 1765 to the Virginia Ratification Convention of 1788, Mr. Mason was at the center of the forces forming the American republic. Because of his anti-federalist position, he was much neglected in the nineteenth century.

Of all the Virginia leaders of the day he was the most stubbornly rooted in his native state—the farthest he ever traveled from his Fairfax County home was to go to Philadelphia for the Constitutional Convention in 1788, and he declined a number of high offices to attend to his acres and cherish his family at Gunston Hall.

The May 15 publication date is of unusual significance in that on that day the Virginia

Convention drafted a resolution which asked Congress to "declare the United Colonies free and independent states" and a sister resolution calling for a committee to "prepare a declaration of rights and a plan of government."

Although committees were formed, both the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of the State of Virginia were almost solely the work of George Mason.

Work toward publishing the Mason papers has been underway since 1954, when Dr. Philip Hamer listed them among those that would be desirable to edit in his director's report to the National Historical Publications Commission. His successor, Dr. Oliver W. Holmes, arranged with the Colonial Dames and the Gunston Hall board to give financial support for the collecting and editing of the papers.

In June, 1963, Robert A. Rutland, then a member of the faculty of the University of California in Los Angeles, who had written in 1961 a short biography of Mr. Mason, "George Mason, Reluctant Statesman," became the editor of the collected works.

The work was completed with the help of a loan of material collected by R. Carter Pittman of Dalton, Ga.

The board of which Mrs. VanZandt is a member is a subsidiary of The National Society and governs the affairs of Gunston Hall. It is comprised of 50 regents, including one from each of 38 states having Colonial Dames committees, and regents-at-large from New York City and Washington, D.C. The Commonwealth of Virginia owns the property.

Mrs. VanZandt is assisted in her work by chairmen of Gunston Hall Committees in each of the six local committees in the state, which include in addition to Cabell County, Fairmont, Charleston, Parkersburg, Wheeling and Bluefield. Mrs. Hilda Long is chairman of the Cabell County Gunston Hall Committee.

In bringing 12 sets of the Mason papers back to the Tri-State Area, the 25-member Cabell County Committee made the largest purchase in the state.

CONGRESSMAN NIX OPPOSED TO ESCALATION OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on my return to the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, I had occasion to visit and confer with several hundred of my constitutents—some of whom have been laboring under the misapprehension that I favor the incursion into Cambodia.

This mistake arose as a result of inept reporting by one of the news people of my district. I made no statement to any news media in reference to my position on the Cambodia question. On the contrary, I filed in the House of Representatives a petition, and I quote the contents herein.

After the speech of the President of the United States to the Nation on April 30, I joined with others in the House of Representatives in condemnation of the Cambodia venture.

I want it to be known to my constituents, to the Members of the House, and to the President of the United States that I am irrevocably opposed to any escalation of the present conflict. I take the position that our troops should be withdrawn from Southeast Asia. I voted against the legislation allocating funds for the war in Vietnam and shall continue to oppose any funds for the purpose of conducting, extending, or aiding the war effort. The only expenditures that I will agree to are those necessary to return our soldiers to their homes in the United States of America.

The petition referred to follows:

We, registered voters of the 2nd Congressional District Pennsylvania, petition Congressman Robert N. C. Nix to:

(1) Withdraw his support for President Nixon's invasion of Cambodia, and

(2) Vote against any direct or indirect military appropriations for U.S. operations in Southeast Asia, except to cover costs of promptly withdrawing all American Armed Forces from Indo-China.

Charles M. Allen, Barbara W. Allen, Jean T. Sharpless, F. Parvin Harper, John P. K. Wood, Gail N. Abram, Betty Y. Shecher, Michael T. Sheek, Violet J. Gardiner, Peter M. Reiner, Robert W. Stuble.

A. Craig Sibelter, Robert B. Mozinter, Nancy F. Renner, Frank G. Malley, Rose Malley, Joyce Mozenten, Ann Stanley, Barbara Ann Zemsky, The Rev. and Mrs. Robert Gregg, Robert Patenostin.

ON THE PRESENT SITUATION

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy that took us into Vietnam, the management of our program and war in Vietnam in previous administrations, has been questioned and challenged. Since the new administration founded its new program of Vietnamization and troop withdrawal, the country seemed quite satisfied to let President Nixon proceed in his own way. Then it seemed necessary for him to take another bold action, that was to send troops into Cambodia. For this reason, he sent troops to find and destroy the sources, capture troops, and war supplies. This he believed, and many of his supporters believed, would shorten the war and hasten the day when our boys would be completely removed from Vietnam.

What has happened since then is well known and appears to be a tragedy. Rebellion is in the air. Again the centers of knowledge and learning are resorting to force, to violence, to destruction of property, to bombings and burnings, to get at what they believe is the establishment. One is moved to say that something seems to be very wrong in America and one is moved to ask, "What has happened to the rule of law?" It seems that all willingness to debate, discuss, and patience are gone and how to recover these virtues and desires for discussion are gone.

John A. Gardner, in his new book "The Recovery of Confidence," in his chapter on "The Politics of Provocation" says:

For the person who concludes that the system is wholly evil and must be destroyed, the end justifies the means; he opposes measures that would diminish suffering now because they blunt the revolutionary mood. The majority must be manipulated for its own good (as he defines it). He has no interest in rational examination of issues; indeed, he will deliberately confuse issues or block communication in an effort to prevent such examination—for example, by preventing opponents from being heard. He will devise traps to demean those in authority, destroying their dignity where possible. He will exploit the mass media, feeding their hunger for excitement and conflict.

He will plan deliberately provocative confrontations designed to lead officials to "overreact", knowing that if they do it will bring to his side naive sympathizers who hate to see officials act repressively. And if officials "underreact" or seem to doubt their own legitimacy, that too favors the revolutionary. If those in authority were perfectly wise, such tactics would never work. But officials are human, subject to fatigue and not immune to error. If the provacateurs are persistent enough and ingenious enough, they can sooner or later trap any official into unwise action.

Whether of the left wing or the right, the stock in trade of the extremist is rage and hatred—and there's always a market for what he has to sell. It's fun to get mad and it's fun to hate. Simpleminded people indulge such emotions without dissembling, and are duly criticized. More guileful people discovered long ago that the big psychic payoff comes in finding an apparently noble cause in which to indulge one's rage and hatred. Then one can draw dividends from both sides of the transaction, satisfying both the new morality and the old Adam.

It would be comforting to believe that only extremists traffic in the destructive emotions, but one can identify a fair number of "respectable" leaders who make a regular practice of exploiting fear and prejudice and anger.

It seems that in the college arenas at least extremists are bound to take over and my response is that extremism in pursuit of what people believe is right only brings confrontation and makes the ultimate solution difficult. It is worthwhile to remind ourselves that the student who now seems inclined to violent action and the policeman with a taste for brutality will meet. From wiser heads and from experience we must learn again that anyone who unleashes man's destructive impulses had better stand back where he will not be hurt for we know that violence begets violence. Hatred feeds on hatred. Even if the confusion finally stabilizes, and I hope it does very soon, it will leave deep and permanent lines of division. This division can pave the way for the anarchists. We must learn that "either we will have a civil order in which discipline is internalized in the breast of each free and responsible citizen or we will see repressive measures designed to re-establish order. Everyone who cares about freedom will pray for the former and avoid courses of action that lead to the latter," so says John Gardner.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my constituency know that I am tremendously encouraged by President Nixon's statements made last Friday night on Vietnam and the troop withdrawals from Cambodia. President Nixon stated the case very well. It is my sincere hope and belief that the action he has now taken in Cambodia will lead to even faster troop withdrawals in Vietnam.

I believe that the people protesting the war and our actions in Cambodia should take the President at his word and be grateful for the assurance that all American troops will be out of Cambodia by June 30. There is no defense for the violence that broke out on college campuses last week. While peaceful and lawful dis-

sent and protest are part of our American tradition, the burning of campus buildings, the destruction of classrooms, and the illegal mob action of last week cannot be tolerated in a society built on law.

I urge college administrators to be fair, but unyieldingly firm in dealing with campus protestors who violate the law or college regulations.

I have confidence in President Nixon's Vietnamization policy and I support it. The President's goals are the goals of the protestors; peace in Southeast Asia, the withdrawal of American troops from that part of the world, a volunteer Army, and a more equitable Selective Service law. It is time for us to unite to accomplish these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, now a word to my college student friends. I want to say that I can understand their concern and their reasons for losing faith in the system, but I remind them that there are right and wrong ways to do right things. I plead with them to have better second thoughts.

The facts are that many things with reference to the war have recently changed for the better. A few reminders will show this. The new Nixon Asian policy, the call for Vietnam to carry a larger share of their load in war and in rebuilding South Vietnam, the destruction of all capabilities for germ warfare are a moving away from chemical warfare, the pledge to bring out and actually to bring out troops from Vietnam, the pledge for continued withdrawal of at least 150,000 troops next year, the provisions for an all-volunteer Army, the reduction in the amount of at least $10 billion in the Pentagon budget, and all the evidence of a shifting of interest to the spending of more money for people who have genuine needs in America.

Finally, let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith, let us all dare to do what we believe would be right under law with justice and equal opportunity for all.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES PROVE COUNTRY IS EXPERIENCING RECESSION

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Government figures released Friday indicating that unemployment sharply escalated from 3.5 percent in December 1969 to 4.8 percent in April are conclusive proof that this country is experiencing a deepening recession. If unemployment continues to leap upward at the rate which we have experienced during the past 4 months, this country by autumn will see unemployment reach the 7.6-percent level attained during the depths of the 1957–58 recession, the worst of the three Republican recessions inflicted on the Nation during the 1950's.

When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, unemployment stood at 3 percent. During the first Republican recession year, 1954, unemployment rose to 5.5 percent. During the second Republican recession in 1958 unemployment reached 7.6 percent in August of that year. A third Republican recession commencing in 1960 resulted in unemployment reaching 6.7 percent in January 1961. Unemployment during the next 4 years declined and by November 1964, long before the commitment of a large amount of American manpower to Vietnam, had reached 4.9 percent. These figures obviously speak for themselves. Unemployment increases under the Republicans. Unemployment decreases under the Democrats.

President Nixon's economic policies have at one and the same time produced the worst inflationary binge which we have experienced in 20 years and plunged the Nation into its first recession since Republicans left office in 1961. The immediate reversal of those economic policies is mandatory if we are to curb inflation and put people back to work.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK W. TOMASELLO, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPERIOR COURT, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

(Mr. McCORMACK, at the request of Mr. ALBERT, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Boys' Clubs of America is a great organization of the youth of America under the leadership on the national and local levels of hundreds of dedicated persons.

On April 20, 1970, this splendid and constructive organization held its national convention in Boston, Mass. The address on that occasion was delivered by the Honorable Frank W. Tomasello, Associate Justice of the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who made a splendid, eloquent, and inspiring address which, with pleasure, I include in my remarks:

THE ESTABLISHMENT, OLD AND NEW

We gather upon this day when in Massachusetts we commemorate the memory of those Patriots of Concord and Lexington, who, as simple farmers and with muskets hardly capable of firing, set out to defend their homes against despotism. This encounter has oft been referred to as the Revolution against foreign oppression.

Today we have those who seek within our shores to establish a Revolution against this great nation for which these founding fathers and those in subsequent wars in our defense fought and died. Theirs is the desire to seize the minds of our youth and to turn them against our country. They wish to fulfill the words of Khrushchev, who once said, "Give me the youth of your country and I will have conquered it without firing one shot."

These same individuals who classify themselves as intellectuals set in motion the "New Establishment" claiming that the "Old Establishment" was too old-fashioned. And what did this New Establishment accomplish? Let us review some of their achievements:

1. They introduced immorality into our midst, in the schools, the movies and on television, where overindulgence in sex was advanced as the steppingstone to success.

2. They introduced the system of pillaging and placing humanity in fear to the point where one would dread to peacefully walk the streets at dusk.

3. They introduced the medium of strikes and riots, and taught the young to absent themselves from schools and classes.

4. They caused dedicated presidents of every major institution and college to withdraw.

5. They taught the young in a time of distress to turn against their country and to engage in unpatriotic activities, even to the point of desecrating our flag and of honoring the symbols of our enemies.

6. They introduced the art of administering drugs to the flower of our youth, causing the destruction of their physical, moral and mental being.

7. They taught the young a disrespect for legally constituted authority and a disregard for the laws of our nation.

8. Though being much concerned about their own extermination by pollution, they sought the destruction of other human beings in the womb of the mother.

9. Yet more shocking, they have advocated the placing of God in the background of our daily lives.

These are but a few of the many accomplishments in a few short years of this so-called New Establishment.

What they forgot was that out of the mouths of the elderly come words of wisdom and between false teeth comes the truth.

So, as I look upon the panorama of the present day, I view a picture of spiritual decline and moral decay and I find that the works and endeavors of the New Establishment have filtered down and into our youthful minds. As a result, crime among the juvenile segment of our population has increased at an alarming pace. Disrespect for parental guidance and admonitions has prevailed in the many homes in America. In no small measure the blame for this dilemma can be placed upon the shoulders of these parents. The father who returns from a day's work and boasts, in the presence of his child, of the manner in which he "told the boss off today" adds little to the character building of the child in a respect for authority. The mother who is too busy watching a soap opera program on television to cook and sit down at a meal with the child, but rather to direct the child to the refrigerator to serve himself, cannot expect maternal affection.

The parents who some few years ago felt they were unable to cope with their infant child and hustled him or her to a pediatrician who advocated the allowance of free expression to the infant, have now seen the folly of this free expression being reversed upon the parents. The elders who, having had little by way of educational backgrounds but who knew that one and one made two, feeling that their child was a superior intellect because of advanced education in mathematics and other kin subjects and allowed them to take over the reasoning in the household and to give the commands, have in great part been responsible for their misgivings.

In great measure our educational system has failed to reach the soul of the child in their effort to create mental giants. In recent years we receded from the established system where in the elementary grades one teacher conducted the class in a variety of subjects, thus becoming an alter-mother or father and a guiding influence to the child because of the closeness of their purpose. Today in the lower grades, the teacher has assumed the distant role of specialist and the child is encountered with a variety of teachers in a variety of subjects, thus drawing the character builder away from the child. Too, the child at school is prohibited from calling upon Divine Guidance for assistance upon the basis of violating the Constitution, whose creators and promulgators of several faiths called upon this same Divinity for guidance in its formation.

To better express this latter concept, the trend in these trying times has been to turn away from the Spiritual and to base our national concepts upon that which gives us material comfort. Too, the home, which was the citadel of the greater sense of values, has become secondary in the development of the mind and character of the child.

To many, marriage by trial has replaced marriage with devotion, leaving the offspring of separations and divorce to be scattered around the globe without parental affection and guidance. In such a state of being ignored and unwanted, they have been expected to survive and withstand the onslaught of evil that presently pervades the highways and byways of our very existence.

In our community more interest is being resolved in the development of sciences rather than the character of man. There was a time when it was believed that the atom bomb was the acme of achievement of science. Today, scientists are multiplying in their desire to surpass the machinations of Frankenstein in seeking to destroy humanity, unmindful of the admonition expressed by General Omar Bradley some years ago at a commencement at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "What the world needs is fewer men of science and more men of God."

Today, we likewise find those who look upon the Ten Commandments as just simple oddities, and thus they seek to make laws unto themselves. These same individuals neither render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, nor to God the things that are God's. To them, loyalty to Country is the promotion of crime, lawlessness, organized protest against the authority of the law and against educational institutions and their administrators.

To the young who are being misled by these evil influences, marijuana, speed and pot have become their God. Strange to say, these individuals have a mistaken notion that they are attaining their goal, and in their quest upon the road to materialism, dismayed as they are, they have turned away from the things in life that have true meaning. They have failed to realize that with God everything is possible; without God nothing is possible. They have likewise failed to recall the lives of those elders who had little of worldly goods yet expected no miracles in accomplishing their task. They had an amazing sense of values, and to them obedience to law and authority came natural, thus giving stability to this democracy.

It is reasonable then to state that if we are to extricate ourselves from the present dismal existence, we must turn away from those false prophets who tell us that life can be achieved without sorrow, disappointment or work. We must be realistic and know that without sorrow there can be no joy, without disappointment, no achievement, and without work, no manly dignity. Only in this reasoning may we know that by adhering to these moral concepts may the goal of man be within the reach of the poor as well as the rich.

So let us return the old-fashioned virtues to the attitudes of modern youth. Let us resurrect a certain brotherhood amongst the young with unselfish compassion for the welfare of others. The young must be made to recognize the environment in which they have been reared and to overcome the hardships that exist so that in their struggles fruition results in ultimate honorable manhood. Thus will they become, to the betterment of mankind, dedicated citizens.

In these struggles we need not leave them to their own destiny, but let us raise up the weak and the fallen, the tear of anguish brush away, and with helping hands bent in one another's welfare may we weave a crown of immortality.

In this age when the tendency is to act as though God does not belong, let us teach the young once more to pray, for prayer dispels fear and brings peace to the troubled heart.

Many today have an attitude of letting a sleeping dog lie, little realizing that when the dog awakens and finds no food, he may become a ravishing and vicious animal. We must accept the concept that the way to man's heart is through his stomach and set in motion mediums for providing sustenance to the hungry, the needy and the poor.

In a desire to remedy the advancing sea of juvenile disorder, our courts have sought to lend its efforts. In this respect, specialized courts handling juvenile matters owe their origin to the humanitarian impulse and initiative of many lawyers, social workers, clergy and others who had become increasingly troubled by the treatment of children under the criminal law and whose efforts to correct this condition resulted in the establishment of the world's first juvenile court in 1899.

The essential philosophy of juvenile courts and other specialized courts handling children's cases has been referred to as "individualized justice," which in essence means that the individuality of the child being recognized, the tribunal adapts its orders accordingly, in a spirit of adjusting law and science, especially the science of medicine and those sciences which deal with human behavior, such as biology, sociology and psychology, to the purpose of rendering youthful conduct remedial and to a degree preventive rather than punitive.

Individualized justice is not, however, easy to achieve and, in the treatment of juvenile delinquency, of paramount importance is the safety, protection and welfare of the community as well as the welfare of the individual child concerned, and neither should be lost sight of nor subordinated in the desire to serve the other. The protecting of the child is not to be construed as shielding him from responsibility for the consequences of his acts.

In seeking the welfare of the child, we must direct our work to securing all services available to achieve the healthy development of the child and the greatest opportunity for his becoming a good citizen in the community. One cannot and should not seek to separate the welfare of the community and the welfare of the child or assume that one must be of primary and one of secondary importance. Each must go hand in hand in accomplishing the aims and purposes of rehabilitating the juvenile delinquent.

In recent years a great deal of time, skill and money have been directed by local, state and federal agencies to the problem of juvenile delinquency. The experience and knowledge gained from these efforts are valuable contributions to our understanding of and approach to children involved in law-violating behavior and the enormity of the problem of juvenile correction.

Many have been the contributions by local police and court officials in developing their own cooperative procedures in a desire to formulate arrangements for increasing the effectiveness in the handling of the juvenile problem. In respect to developing guidelines for law enforcement with its many variations in practices and procedures, the result has been difficult and frustrating. Yet the accomplishments in seeking a solution to the problem of juveniles can be credited to the ideas and suggestions of many persons.

In spite of these meritorious efforts, we have witnessed a consistent and shocking increase in juvenile delinquency cases on the state and national level. Statistics, if you are interested, indicate that an approximate one million juvenile delinquency cases were handled by juvenile courts in the United States during the past year. It is agreed then that new thinking must be stimulated, new ideas and methods must be developed and new programs and services established. Also, it does not take much convincing to realize that existing programs and services can and must be more efficient in order to potentially increase their effectiveness through strengthening individual programs, promoting understanding and acceptance between programs and improving and expanding collaborative work procedures, and the objective in a common purpose is to handle juvenile problems as a cooperative, integrated process in order to attain optimum efficiency. In the accomplishment of this mission we must not leave the effort to restore youth to society and the community entirely to the already overburdened juvenile enforcement officials.

It is then evident that we have a duty to assist in the instruction of children in those morals and principles which are necessary to a well-ordered society.

The development of an outstanding basketball player, though meritorious, should not be the only scope of the endeavors of Boys' Club but, rather, their mission is to seek out the underprivileged and deserted boy and to bring him close to the realities of that which is good and wholesome in our society.

Many of the difficulties of conducting Boys' Club activities have been brought about by urban renewals in various areas, resulting in the type of youngster relied upon for the furtherance of the objectives of Boys' Clubs being scattered about the populace and distant to their centers. It is then necessary to follow the migration and to settle where the greatest good may result for the greatest number.

In conclusion, we must fashion our work upon the concept of making a home for the juvenile who needs assistance. A motto that might well fit such endeavors should be, "A Boys' Club is a Home Away From Home."

MESSAGE TO STUDENT BODY FROM PRESIDENT HINSON OF DE KALB COLLEGE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been devoted in recent days to the activities of college students who have turned from their studies toward direct political activities. I am proud that all college presidents have not permitted a small minority of their student body to dictate school policy and bring about the cessation of normal teaching activities. I am particularly proud of the forthright and courageous stand taken by President James Hinson at De Kalb College, which is located in my district.

President Hinson issued a statement, following discussion with faculty and students, which I think should be called to the attention of college administrators around the Nation. I submit the statement of President Hinson, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO THE STUDENT BODY FROM PRESIDENT HINSON

DeKalb College will hold classes as scheduled. No strike has been sanctioned by the college. The college is open because of the great confidence I have in the ability of De Kalb students to exercise mature judgment and to analyze issues on their merits. The Student Senate did vote to promote a strike, but in a later meeting convened to reconsider this action overturned the strike proposal by a 6–1 majority.

Please understand that both the college and a majority of the Student Senate now stand against the strike as a means of registering concern.

It is just as important to understand that the college shares the concerns of the many students who abhor violence as a means of resolving issues whether it be on a campus or in Cambodia.

The college stands ready and willing to work with responsible and reasonable students in positive ways to express sympathy to the victims of violence, to assist in plans to establish scholarship funds, and to engage in scholarly dialogue on important issues. This has been proven on many occasions such as the memorial service following the death of Martin Luther King and the massive involvement of students, faculty, and administration in the Vietnam and Environmental Control societal issues.

I met with various student groups yesterday. The vast majority of these students were opposed to the proposed strike. Regardless of viewpoint, most students were understanding and respectful of the responsibility that the college has in meeting its educational commitments.

All public colleges operated by the Georgia Board of Regents have been officially closed today and Saturday in view of the volatile situation. DeKalb College has determined to hold regular classes but to suspend other activities until further notice, including campus assemblies. Every student of DeKalb College is requested to honor this approach.

No assemblies have been officially requested or approved and no outside speakers have been scheduled or approved for presentations on the campus. Under the policies of the college such events frequently have been authorized, but all students are asked to recognize (as has the Board of Regents) that a delay is now both necessary and wise in order to insure orderly processes.

It is a basic and fundamental repsonsibility of a college to maintain order through reasonable policies and procedures. I trust at this crucial time that policies and procedures relative to unauthorized assemblies and speakers will be honored by everyone and that it will be possible for our program of concern and commitment to move forward without disruption in the days immediately ahead.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY AND THE STOCK MARKET

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have often pointed out the need to stabilize our economy and the need for a change in the economic policy of the present administration.

On April 9, in a statement to the House, I pointed out the inflationary effects on the cost of living resulting from present economic policies. An article in the Philadelphia Bulletin of May 4, by the eminent economist, J. A. Livingston indicates the present state of the stock market and likens it to 1929. I believe Mr. Livingston's comments to be most timely and include them at this point in the RECORD:

NIXON SAYS ALL IS FINE, JUST LIKE HOOVER IN 1929

(By J. A. Livingston)

Hey diddle diddle,
The bull's in a twiddle,
The President promised the moon.
The economist laughed
To hear such chaff
And the bear danced a bear's rigadoon.

On Friday, October 24, 1929, the day a consortium of New York bankers rallied a panicky Wall Street by buying stocks, President Herbert Hoover made that year's Bear Market official. He declared:

"The fundamental business of the country—that is the production and distribution of commodities—is on a sound and prosperous basis."

And now President Richard M. Nixon has made the 1969–70 Bear Market official. He urged a group of businessmen at the White House not to lose faith. He said:

"You will begin to see, in the third quarter of the year, the economy leveling off . . . in the fourth quarter you will begin to see more encouraging signs of an upturn. Frankly, if I had any money, I'd be buying stocks right now."

How reminiscent! Four days after President Hoover's declaration, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., generous with dimes but parsimonious with public pronouncements, issued this statement:

"Believing that fundamental conditions of the country are sound and that there is nothing in the business situation to warrant the weak market, my son and I have for some days been purchasing sound common stocks."

What are bull markets made of?
What are bull markets made of?
Dividends high
To cause men to buy,
That's what bull markets are made of.

What are bear markets made of?
What are bear markets made of?
Hemlines that fall,
No profits at all,
That's what bear markets are made of.

Unlike President Nixon, John D., Sr., was rolling in cash. His assurance sent stocks up—but only for an interval. A fortnight later stocks were down 14%, to the 1929 low. And they were to go even lower in 1930, 1931 and 1932.

Words are cheap on Wall Street even when backed by money and Presidential hortatory. Only facts count. Facts condition minds—give men hope or fear.

J. P. Morgan,
Have you any news?
Yes sir, yes sir,
More than you can use.
Never mind the rumors
When you speculate
Just remember simply
Stocks will fluctuate.

When stocks break to new lows as they did last week, the line of least resistance is presumed to be down. Theory: Wall Street "smells" bad news. What will it be—who knows? When will it go away? Again, who knows?

Wall Street is now in the process of deflating these overblown expectations:

1. That inflation is a necessary corollary of high employment. Therefore, the dollar will continually depreciate and interest rates on bonds will constantly rise. Who wants fixed income which buys less and less?

2. That growth is forever. Corporations will always enjoy increased profits. Stocks have no way to go, except for intermediate hesitation, but up.

3. That capital appreciation is the new form of income. As the economy grows, stock prices will increase; capital gains are more important than dividends.

4. That recessions are accidents of the past. No political leader can permit one. As President Johnson promised, America has entered an era of recessionless prosperity.

Words, words go away,
Don't come back till that fine day
When Presidents can surely say
Stocks are going up, up, hooray!

CAMPUS TENSIONS: ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS TENSIONS—SOL LINOWITZ, CHAIRMAN

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when tensions and troubles on our college campuses are mounting, I believe that Members of Congress will read with keen interest a report issued a few days ago by the special committee on campus tensions which was established last year by the board of directors of the American Council on Education.

The distinguished chairman of this committee was the former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States and Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, the Honorable Sol M. Linowitz.

Mr. Linowitz and the other members of this committee are outstanding Americans of various backgrounds of experience and concern with higher education.

As the committee members say in the preface to their study, their report "is intended, first, to help bring about—both on and off college campuses—better understanding of the sources of discontent and conflict in American higher education. Second, the report is meant to provide college and university leaders with suggestions for fostering reconciliation, trust, and the conditions favorable to constructive change on the campus."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the report of the Linowitz committee is a most valuable document, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

CAMPUS TENSIONS: ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, April 26, 1970)

(NOTE.—The views expressed in this Report are those of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, which bears sole responsibility for its contents. The Report was made possible by a grant from the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation of Winston-Salem, North Carolina.)

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS TENSIONS

Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman, Washington, D.C.

Morris B. Abram, Esquire, New York, New York.

Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Professor of Law, Yale University, President, American Association of University Professors.

George Bunn, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin.

Robben W. Fleming, President, University of Michigan.

William T. Gossett, Esquire, Last Retiring President, American Bar Association, Detroit, Michigan.

Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

Vivian W. Henderson, President, Clark College.

Mrs. Richard Inskeep, Trustee, Indiana University.

Bill D. Moyers, Publisher, *Newsday*, Garden City, New York.

Charles Palmer, President, U.S. National Student Association.

Joseph Rhodes, Junior Fellow, Harvard University.

John Searle, Professor of Philosophy, University of California, Berkeley.

Patrick Shea, President, Associated Students, Stanford University.

M. Brewster Smith, Professor of Psychology, University of Chicago.

Richard L. von Ende, Graduate Fellow, Vice-Chairman, University Executive Committee, University of Kansas.

Charles E. Young, Chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles.

Whitney Young, Executive Director, National Urban League.

David C. Nichols, Staff Director, Assistant to the President, American Council on Education.

PREFACE

"If colleges and universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others."

This elemental truth was stated with urgency in April 1969, by the American Council on Education in *A Declaration on Campus Unrest*. Widespread disruption on the nation's campuses had angered the American public. As dissatisfaction grew, so did the specter of punitive measures: reduced financial support, restrictive legislation and harsh laws for handling even peaceful demonstrators, and political intervention in the affairs of educational institutions.

Convinced that the higher education community had to solve its own problems, the Board of Directors of the American Council on Education approved the establishment of a Special Committee on Campus Tensions in June 1969. The Committee, composed of lay leaders and spokesmen from the main segments of the higher education community, operating independently of the Council's regular organization, undertook to study campus tensions and to assist institutions in finding remedies.

The Committee sought out the widest feasible range of views about campus tensions and how conflicting points of view might be reconciled. To this end it did the following:

Participated in a series of meetings with representatives of some fifteen associations in the field of higher education to elicit information and ideas for Committee consideration.

Commissioned more than twenty-five background papers by knowledgeable people in higher education, seeking especially their recommendations for reconciling campus conflicts.[1]

Sponsored a three-day workshop, organized and led by students, to discuss campus tensions as perceived by student leaders from colleges and universities around the country.

Commissioned special reports from three student organizations—the National Student Association, the National Association of Black Students, and the Association of Student Governments—and from individual students representing a wide range of opinion.

Undertook case studies of several institutions that have either experienced disruption and successfully coped with it or have, in other cases, instituted wide-ranging reforms without having experienced serious disruption.

Utilized the extensive research on campus unrest published by the American Council on Education and professional journals.

Consulted with presidents, trustees, and faculties at various institutions of higher education.

To all who have generously lent the benefit of their ideas and information, to all who have contributed their time to participate in Committee deliberations and the preparation of this report, the Special Committee on Campus Tensions is grateful. The Committee is, of course, solely responsible for the content of this report.

Members of the Committee come from many different sectors within and without the academic community and hold widely varying views on many subjects. In a report as long as this, about a subject as complex as this, not all members will agree with every statement made. Nonetheless, all are joined in general support of this report's conclusions and recommendations. Kingman Brewster, Jr., President of Yale University, originally served on the Committee but was unable to participate in drafting the report.

The Committee gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the staff of the American Council on Education. We are especially indebted to Council President Logan Wilson, Vice-President Kenneth D. Roose, and David C. Nichols, assistant to the president, who served the Committee as staff director. Richard E. Peterson of Educational Testing Service helped to organize the work of the Committee. Alexander W. Astin, John Caffrey, W. Todd Furniss, and Richard A. Humphrey, all of the Council staff, made substantial contributions. Paul Tamminen helped to conduct liaison with student organizations. Elizabeth vanDuinen served efficiently as research assistant and Patricia A. Tatum capably tended to the secretarial details associated with the entire project. Special thanks are owed to Anthony E. Neville, of Baltimore, and Olive Mills, of the Council's staff, for editing the various manuscripts.

A grant by the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation supported the work of the Committee; we are grateful to Dr. William C. Archie, executive director, for making it possible.

This report is published at a time of great uncertainty about the future state of harmony or tension on the nation's campuses. The first half of the 1969–70 academic year was marked by apparent calm, and yet the arrival of spring signaled disruption that may, in total, surpass that of the record year, 1968–69.

Some observers have expressed the view to the Committee that the worst of the disruption lies behind us, or is a seasonal phenomenon. Others have warned that we are passing through the eye of the storm and that a more severe period of unrest lies ahead. While the Committee took no poll, most persons interviewed were uneasy about what the future might hold.

Violence and disruption have occurred on a minority of campuses. In the particularly turbulent year 1968–69, an estimated 145, or 6.2 percent, of the nation's 2,300 colleges and universities experienced incidents of violent protest; an additional estimated 379, or 16.2 percent, experienced nonviolent but disruptive protest.[2] Still, the majority of American college campuses have experienced at least one incident of protest, peaceful or otherwise.

While the statistics are cause for grave concern, we need to bear in mind that at most times and on most campuses disruption is not occurring. The news media, not surprisingly, focus upon incidents of disorder and ignore the campuses during times of tranquility.

Where disruption has occurred, it has generally been short-lived. When the demonstrators have gone home and the students have cleared out of the buildings, a few administrative positions may change, institutional policies may be altered, a few faculty members may leave, but on the whole universities retain their essential character. Classes are held, examinations are given, degrees are awarded, research grants are obtained, faculties meet and argue. Certainly the problem in the United States is far less severe than in some countries where universities are continually being disrupted.

Yet statistics about class hours interrupted or buildings occupied do not reveal the deeper crisis: confusion and uncertainty about the proper direction of change in higher education. There is abroad a feeling of the tide turning, a sense that a period is coming to an end and that a distinctively different one may be emerging. There is considerable doubt whether the future will be better than the past or, if better, how thoroughly we must discard old assumptions and verities to make it better. At the root of the crisis is the challenge to complacency and to the sanctity of tradition, and—now that the dissonant voices have been heard—the absence of accord among students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and the public generally, about where we go from here.

This report addresses itself to that crisis, though the purposes to be served are modest. The report is intended, first, to help bring about—both on and off college campuses—better understanding of the sources of discontent and conflict in American higher education. Second, the report is meant to provide college and university leaders with suggestions for fostering reconciliation, trust, and the conditions favorable to constructive change on the campus.

I. THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

In the fall of 1969, almost seven million students were attending about 2,300 colleges and universities in the United States. More than two-thirds of those students were in publicly supported two- and four-year, or graduate level institutions. The rest were in private colleges and universities—some church related, others independent. The campuses they attended ranged in enrollment from fewer than 100 to more than forty thousand. The institutions varied in quality, in affluence, in faculty competence, in the academic aptitude of students. They varied in programs and purposes, as they varied also in the kinds of values, beliefs, and personal commitments characterizing their students and faculty.

There are two reasons for drawing attention to this diversity among the nation's colleges. First, the crisis in higher education is by no means uniform across the range of colleges and universities. Because only a minority of colleges have been scarred by disruptive incidents, the crisis may seem to have very little pertinence, at least at present, for a majority of institutions and their students. There is widespread sympathy, nonetheless, among students for the aims of protestors, even though no more than 15 percent have been active in particular incidents.

Second, it should be understood that any analysis of campus unrest must necessarily be sketched in broad strokes—so broad that it cannot possibly be consistently cogent across the national spectrum of colleges and universities. Indeed, the combination of circumstances underlying a given confrontation on a given campus may be unique. The ideas to be put forth here for resolving potentially disruptive conflict, because of the differences in spirit and method of campus governance from one college to another, cannot be expected to apply to all institutions.

The first point is borne out by a closer look at the estimated 524 institutions that experienced at least one incident of violent or disruptive protest during 1968–69. From this, some generalizations can be drawn about the kinds of institutions in which disruption is most likely to occur.

Major protest incidents are about twice as likely to occur at private universities as at public universities. More than one in three of the private *universities* experienced violent protest during the 1968–69 academic year, while one in eight public universities experienced incidents of comparable severity. Approximately 70 percent of the private and 43 percent of the public universities experienced protest that was either violent or disruptive.

In general, the larger the institution, the more likely it will experience violent or disruptive protest. Very few institutions with enrollments under 1,000 had any incidents of violent protest in 1968–69. Among institutions of intermediate size (enrollment be-

Footnotes at end of article.

tween 1,000 and 5,000 students), 4 percent of the two-year colleges, 5 percent of the four-year colleges, and 14 percent of the universities experienced violent protests. Of the large institutions (enrollment over 5,000), 16 percent of junior colleges, 14 percent of the senior colleges, and 22 percent of the universities experienced violent protests. There are also correlations with size when nonviolent disruptive incidents are considered.

The more selective a university, the more likely it will experience violent or disruptive protest. About 85 percent of the most selective universities (those enrolling students of the highest academic ability) had disruptive incidents, of which 40 percent were violent and 45 percent nonviolent. Those in the lowest category of selectivity experienced no such incidents. The association of selectivity with protest incidents was weaker among four-year colleges and was absent among two-year colleges.

A close look at the colleges and universities that experienced violence or disruption during 1968–69 also reveals the kinds of issues that give rise to protest, how institutions typically respond to violence or disruption, and the consequences of violence or disruption upon the participants and the institutions.

Major protest incidents covered a wide range of student concerns. In 1968–69, student power was an issue in roughly three-quarters of the institutions experiencing violence or disruption. The most prevalent of the specific issues on campuses that had *violent* protest involved (1) instituting special educational programs for disadvantaged or minority groups, (2) allowing greater student participation on committees, (3) changing institutional disciplinary practices, (4) challenging apparent administrative indifference or inaction to grievances, and (5)—an off-campus issue—challenging alleged administrative indifference to local community problems. (We do not know, of course, the extent to which stated issues were truly the important issues or had wide student support.)

Among off-campus issues, leading to protest, those related to war have been prevalent. U.S. military policy—for example, in Vietnam, in regard to chemical-biological warfare, in deploying ABM's—was a reported issue in 38 percent of the institutions experiencing violence or disruption. Other military issues, such as ROTC programs and military research on campus, brought the total of war-related issues to roughly half the campuses that experienced violence or disruption.

Institutions have, in general, responded firmly to violence. Fifty-five percent of the institutions that experienced violence during 1968–69 had occasion to call in off-campus police. Roughly the same percentage of institutions report that some demonstrators were arrested. Some major civil or institutional action (arrest, indictment, dismissal, or suspension) was taken against individual students at three-fourths of the institutions where there were violent protests. (Similarly punitive measures were taken by 22 percent of the institutions that had nonviolent disruptive protests.) Sixty-two percent of the institutions report that administration or faculty negotiated issues with demonstrators when the protest was violent, but 83 percent negotiated when the protest was nonviolent.

Although unrest and change are positively associated, colleges and universities also have been instituting changes without confrontation and crisis. Most institutions reporting, including those where no major protest incidents occurred, made major changes in institutional policy and practices during 1968–69. Institutional changes were made as a direct result of protest activities at 72 percent of the campuses where protest was violent and at 54 percent of those where it was nonviolent but disruptive.

Campus tensions, with or without disruption, obviously have stimulated the processes of change. Changes not directly credited to protest incidents but possibly spurred by them were made at 80 percent of those institutions with violent protest, at 89 percent with nonviolent disruptive protests, and at 62 percent that experienced no major incidents. Changes were usually in the direction of increasing participation of students in institutional decision making, forming new committees or study groups, and making changes in curriculum.

To acknowledge, however reluctantly, that violence and disruption have sometimes been effective goads to institutional change is not to explain the current tide of violence and disruption on the nation's campuses. The colleges and universities, traditional bastions of rationality and civility, do not erupt in violence at the mere wave of a baton. Nor can student unrest be explained away as the modern-day equivalent of goldfish swallowing and the panty raid. Obviously something deeper and more disturbing is at work.

Serious and thoughtful explanations of current student unrest abound. To arrive at a better understanding about what the future may hold for colleges and universities, it will be helpful to review some of the major accounts of the underlying causes of student unrest. While there is considerable overlap among them, the theories can be conveniently divided into five general categories.

Generational Conflict

In a historical study of student radicalism, *The Conflict of Generations*, Lewis S. Feuer makes Oedipal rebellion the basis for his explanation of student radicalism.[3] A generation gap exists, according to this hypothesis, in which youth rebel against the values and beliefs of their fathers and act out their disaffection by assaulting tradition and institutions, including universities.

Though popular, the generational conflict or Oedipal thesis has come under attack in recent research. Rather than being in revolt against parental beliefs, evidence shows, student activists are likely to share those beliefs and to enjoy close relationships with their parents. These findings, in turn, lead some to view student activism as an outgrowth of parental permissiveness in the upbringing of their children. But other studies show that student activists tend to come, not from permissive households, but from a highly principled family culture that emphasizes reasoning and persuasion as well as independence in thought and action. At present there is too little evidence to settle the issue.

Social "Irrelevance" of Youth

Many observers of the campus crisis have noted that, while American students are primarily rebelling against an unpopular war and social injustice for blacks, their counterparts in other countries are also in rebellion where there are no war or racial issues to stir up discontent. Searching for a common denominator of worldwide student revolt, some have speculated that youth in affluent societies are socially obsolescent, that they are kept too long in a state of dependence when what they most need is opportunity to feel socially and personally useful and "relevant." Bruno Bettelheim argues that adolescence is now prolonged beyond all reasonable limits. Too many "unwilling" youth, he says, are pushed into attending college by family aspiration and by social coercion to achieve white-collar status. This sense of irrelevance among youth is heightened, according to Bettelheim, by modern technology, which makes individual man and his work obsolete in the scheme of things. "Deep down, what youth is fighting against is not so much the war in Vietnam or the global balance, but an America whose technology seems to have robbed them of any place in the real work of the world."[4]

A related thesis is that attending college is, for many youth, an unsought experience. A distinguished university president, for instance, maintains that the crisis on the campus will not be relieved so long as students feel compelled to attend college for essentially nonintellectual reasons, such as satisfying parental longings, acquiring the credentials for "correct" careers, or avoiding the draft. Many believe that, somehow, attractive options to attend college must be developed so that most of these who do become college students will do so for intellectual reasons.

Obsolete Educational Practices

Any number of critics of higher education emphasize traditional educational practices as a contributing cause of campus unrest. The most radical of these critics argue that colleges and universities are structurally incapable of providing effective education in the modern age. These institutions, they say, have become socially dysfunctional—creating more problems than they solve. The admissions process, for example, which is inherently exclusive and tends to screen out blacks and other minorities, they cite as an elitist and therefore undemocratic tradition. Or, they sometimes argue, faculty members, by and large, are harmful to student learning because their world is detached from reality: what faculty know is largely irrelevant and how they teach it is generally obsolete. In a background paper prepared for the Committee, one adherent of this view argues that since most colleges maintain walls between themselves and their environment, they are by definition socially irrelevant. Another calls the university a social parasite—a place where privileged people are maintained and perpetuate their own kind at the expense of the public purse. Still another, a faculty member, believes that soon professors, in the traditional mold, will become unnecessary to the educational process—except as counselors for students who will be teaching one another and learning experientially in the community. He concludes that, for most professors, the best they can hope for is to be phased out, mercifully.

More temperate critics of educational practices seek a middle ground between the status quo and radical redefinition of the college, largely through increased provision for independent learning, more student initiative in curriculum design, experiential education, and a reduction of formal course requirements for degrees. One consultant to the Committee, noting that "the structure of special departments leaves too little room in the curriculum for the study of critical general problems such as racial injustice, urban chaos and war, or perennial personal problems of sex, politics, and religion," urges the development of "relevant" liberal arts to prepare students as thoughtful citizens. He warns, however, that liberal education is no remedy for discontent but, instead, increases it. "For the liberal education of any person inherently creates something of a crisis of discontent, within himself if not within his family or community."

A Breakdown of Legitimate Authority

There are some who believe that the crisis on the campus is best described as a crisis of legitimacy. Authority, as it has been traditionally held and exercised, no longer commands respect. A generation of students and young faculty has arisen that sees fit to take little for granted. Boards of trustees, because of their remoteness from the campus, are frequently viewed by students as not competent. Presidential and administrative authority and faculty hegemony in academic affairs are being attacked by dissatisfied students as self-serving and unresponsive to

---

Footnoes at end of article.

higher education's real needs. Thus, traditional mechanisms of campus governance are no longer appreciated, and many campus activists instead want direct participation or legitimate representation and truly responsive government.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the outcome of learning and intellectuality. One consultant to the Committee expressed this with hyperbole: "It wasn't the Mississippi tenant farmer who ordered the troops to Vietnam. More likely, and more specifically, it was the Harvard Junior Fellows—those who had maximum chance to develop intellectually." He and others see a casual relationship between the higher learning, as currently purveyed, and dubious ends.

Much is also made of the experiential mode of learning rather than the traditional lectures and books. If the streets are better teachers than the classrooms, then why the classrooms? Why, indeed, a university? Both as to substance and process, the university has come to be viewed in some quarters as an expensive anachronism.

Social Malaise Thesis

Perhaps the most popular thesis of all about the causes of tension on the campus is the one that closely links the university's troubles to the troubles of the society at large. Some students have perceived the university to be the handmaiden of a militarist and racist society. They see university complicity with the latter in selective admissions policies and inattention to "black studies" in the curriculum. They accuse the university of collusion with the military establishment in sponsoring ROTC programs, in classified war-related research, and in recruitment activities for the armed forces and corporations with military contracts.

In its extreme form, this view holds that America is a sick and unrescuable society, and all of its institutions—including colleges and universities—must be torn down. Other student activists see the campus as a base and starting point for nursing the society back to health. As the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has noted, "They see the university, guardian of man's knowledge and source of his new ideas, as an engine for powering the reform of the larger society, and as the first institution they are in a position to reform."[5]

Whatever one's view of the sources of campus unrest, unarguably the phenomenon cannot be ignored. Clark Kerr has compared campuses with the canaries that miners used to take down in the mines with them. Being somewhat more sensitive to bad air than the miner, the canary would keel over first, warning the miner he was in trouble. Whatever the toxins affecting the atmosphere of the nation's colleges and universities, they will ultimately affect the larger society as well.

It is important, therefore, to listen to the voices of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees on what has gone wrong in the colleges and universities.

II. THE COLLEGIATE CONSTITUENTS: WHAT'S ON THEIR MINDS

Most American college students view most of their collegiate experiences favorably. They find new interests in libraries, galleries, and laboratories, a range of intellectual and social models in the faculty and their fellow students, new ways to develop and test their academic and social skills, and greater freedom from conventional restraints than they have ever experienced. In a world of options, the satisfied student believes that the choices he has made were, on the whole, better than alternatives he might have chosen. The results of research indicate that, on balance, most students find the college years rewarding.

Similarly, most faculty members seem to enjoy teaching or immersing themselves in research. Professors derive satisfaction from the successes of their best former students and are generally persuaded that their research results are important contributions to man's expanding body of knowledge. Though they have heard the assumptions of their worth challenged by student activists, most do not feel personally threatened, even when the din can be heard from the laboratory window.

Likewise, most college presidents and administrators seem to enjoy the challenges of their assignments. Even on the more placid campuses, of course, they face problems, even very pressing ones. But men and women do not enter positions of administrative responsibility blindly. Presidents of colleges and universities tend to be people of dedication and stamina who thrive on problems demanding solution. Even where the threat of violence or disruption is acknowledged, the Committee found, it is apparently not the problem foremost in the mind of the president.

Then there are the trustees. For them college and university problems tend to be a part-time, although very important, responsibility. Most trustees and regents believe in the worth of their involvement. They share with their presidents worries about the future of the institutions they serve. But as the Committee also found, campus unrest is not foremost among their worries.

Nonetheless there is unrest, and it affects each of these four constituents. The academic community, the "community of scholars," today is a community divided. One of the most demoralizing aspects of the present divisions is an increase in the climate of fear on the campuses. Not only are campus communities often fearful of external pressures, but on many campuses radical groups have created an atmosphere where students are fearful of exercising independent judgment or defending points of view that are not fashionable. Furthermore, the students, the faculty, the administrators, the trustees each have their deep discontents about the current functioning of colleges and universities. As often as not, these discontents have to do with the behavior and attitudes—or perceived behavior and attitudes—of one or more of the other constituents.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the concerns of some members of these groups about campus developments and tension as they see them. (The Committee's reaction to these concerns will be voiced in the chapter on recommendations for resolving some of the problems.) Contradictory interests and points of view are evident in what follows. The objective of the next four sections, however, is not to pass judgment on allegations but to air the grievances of each party. It is the actions and reactions that follow from these discontents, after all, that constitute campus unrest.

A. What's troubling the students

Though a majority of American students are satisfied with most of their collegiate experience, there is in this observation no ground for complacency. Whatever the size of the discontented minority—its members are, as empirical studies have shown, among the brightest, most experienced, widely read, and articulate young Americans.

They are discontented, not only with colleges and universities, but also with American society, and they see a connection of basic failings between the two. For the most part, the dissatisfied young come from affluent homes; they are the "children of the American Dream," as one of their spokesmen says, and they are disenchanted with the Dream. They are joined in their expressions of discontent by the small but growing minority of college students who are black and are decidedly not the beneficiaries of the American Dream.

As the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence noted:

"Today's intelligent, idealistic students see a nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so. They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. They see a world of nation-states with the technical brilliance to harness the ultimate energy but without the common sense to agree on methods of preventing mutual destruction."[6]

At the same time that students are eager to attack these problems, the Commission also noted, they face the prospect of being compelled to fight a war many of them believe is unjustified.

In their view, the failings of American society are its propensity to violence, its exploitation of the weak, its indifference to human values, its hypocrisy, its corruption. Colleges and universities, say the discontented students, contribute to the corruption of the society by perpetuating and instilling in so-called leaders the values by which those leaders initiate (and gain from) external wars and internal repression, by which those leaders benefit from the status quo. Complicity with the corrupt order is seen in the sponsorship of military research and ROTC programs, in admissions policies that appear to be elitist and racist, in the choice of Establishment figures as trustees and college presidents.

This interconnection of discontents about the collegiate and society may not be as neat as it appears. It is conceivable, for example, that many students dissatisfied with the society find the college a pleasant refuge from family antagonisms, community racism, police intimidation, or the intellectual sterility of their accustomed environments. Also, there are discontents about the college experience that do not translate, automatically, into discontents about the society.

It is axiomatic that the colleges and universities cannot cure all the ills that affect American society. They must, however, come to grips with the discontents of students, including those that have to do with institutional participation (or lack of it) in the pressing social issues. It is therefore necessary to explore the discontents that arise from direct student experience in the college and university.

Indifference and Neglect

A number of students have reported to the Committee their personal experience of indifference or neglect on the part of college and university faculties, administrators, and employees. Requests for information, they say, go unanswered; students wait endlessly to see officials; procedures are maintained for the convenience of the bureaucracy; appointments are not kept; class meetings are canceled at the whim of the instructor. Students can assume the existence of justifiable reasons for a few instances of this sort, but repeated failures to be noticed lead to resentment.

Stereotypes and Labels

Particularly on the larger campuses, students report that they are often treated as stereotypes rather than as individuals. Students complain that they are treated as immature, unskilled, incapable of exercising sound judgment even on matters most directly affecting their personal welfare. Inroads are being made against the old parietal rules governing social behavior, but on many campuses not fast enough to suit the students. Hair style and dress, for example, produce responses unrelated to the reasons students give for adopting a particular style: comfort, economy, association with a social group, or simply experiment. Student behavior that challenges old norms is casti-

Footnotes at end of article.

gated in state legislatures and newspaper editorials as "immature," "irresponsible," or often more opprobriously.

Political Impotence

A consequence of faculty and administrative attitudes that students are immature and irresponsible, say the students, is that they are denied their fair share in institutional governance. Proposals for representation on committees too often meet a reflexive "no" from administrators and faculty groups who have held the effective power. A common criticism of conventional student governments is that they concern themselves with trivia and that when they do attempt to deal with vital institutional issues, they encounter resistance.

Lack of Information

Decisions depend upon information; good ones on accurate information. Students decide about academic programs and personal matters on the basis of college catalogs, other official printed sources, and information supplied orally by officials. Some students report to the Committee that they have been given inaccurate or incomplete information that adversely affects their college careers. Some contend that they were deliberately, rather than inadvertently, misinformed. In some cases, students told the Committee, information has been denied on the grounds that it is confidential or none of their business.

Availability of Student Records

At the same time that some students have challenged the right of institutions to keep information confidential, others have complained that their institutions have too widely distributed information about them. The supplying of grades and class standings to draft boards has been a bone of contention. Some students, especially radical leaders, say their actions and affiliations have been investigated by civil authorities with complete, enthusiastic cooperation from university officials.

Disciplinary Action

Although the right of colleges to impose disciplinary penalties for academic transgressions and failures is not often challenged, in some circumstances particular punishments have become a source of discontent. Expulsion, which exposes the student to the draft, seems to many students a double penalty. In recent years, disruptive or destructive actions have seemed to students to bring excessive penalties; amnesty has often been one of their first demands in negotiating a truce.

Police Action

Apart from civil or academic penalties that may be imposed, many students report that the actions of local police or institutional security forces have been provocative. Two types of action are deeply resented. The more obvious is what they see as excessive force in restoring order. The other is harassment, which ranges from demanding identity cards from black but not white students, to continuing investigations, including wire tapping and surveillance, of some activist student leaders. Tense situations are sometimes aggravated by demeaning or illegal treatment of those arrested or detained.

Discrimination

Although most colleges and universities, by policy and regulation, prohibit discrimination based upon race, sex, economic standing, and religion, some students assert that they are victims of both institutional and individual discrimination. Evidences cited of institutional discrimination are *de facto* policies of social organization (e.g., fraternities) permitted on campus, insufficient representation of minority groups on the faculty and the governing board, demonstrably lower average salaries for women employees, and the orientation of courses and texts to neglect minorities. On an individual basis, cases are cited of professors, administrators, students, and employees who express racial or other forms of prejudice openly. Women students complain that some professors treat them as if they were not suited for scholarly or professional roles.

Bad Teaching

Complaints about teaching focus on both what is taught and how it is taught. The material taught, say students, is frequently out-of-date or simply wrong. Some instructors present the material, grade papers, and treat students in ways that are seen to be incompetent, offensive, or unfair. At particular issue is the absence of courses relating to the major social issues of our time.

Intimidation

Some students see in the rewards and penalties attached to virtually all college regulations a basic system of threats. Violations of rules of conduct and failure to meet competitive standards may have severe consequences, the worst of which is expulsion. Thus, they feel, the basis of the institution's legitimacy is fear; and they resent having to work within the atmosphere they perceive.

Fair Play and Due Process

On campuses where the absolute authority of faculty and administration over student academic and social life has been a long-standing tradition, students maintain that the procedures for instituting change and for settling student grievances do not even respect the rights guaranteed in civil courts. Although customs and procedures are now being rapidly revised, the Committee has had reports of discontent arising out of flagrant denials of due process or refusal to consider the legitimate views of students on changes affecting their welfare.

Involuntary Attendance

A generalized discontent often accompanies students who are in college chiefly because of family pressures, or because they need to acquire a particular credential in order to enter the occupational field of their choice. Avoidance of the military draft all too often is a factor in a student's decision to attend or to remain in college.

Even among those who are voluntarily in college, a number report that they attend chiefly because it is the only place in our society that provides a social milieu in which they can be at all comfortable. Employers don't want them, they have no real responsibilities to family or local community, and only in colleges can they find a community of their peers. Academic programs and college-sponsored noncurricular activities hold no attraction: in order to join the community, however, they will play at book-learning. For them, the future seems to offer little hope of improvement.

The Dry Run

It has been a tenet of many colleges that the institution offers the student an opportunity to experiment in many fields and make mistakes without suffering the consequences he would face outside college. A corollary is that the rewards of such a program are as insubstantial as the penalties. A number of students are discontented because the academic program denies them real rewards. They want to use their talents and energies on something that really counts: a beneficial change in the curriculum, improved living conditions, actual assistance to people in the local community, and the like.

Institutional Rigidity

Students frequently complain that whenever they air any of the above-mentioned grievances or propose reforms, the institutional machinery is unresponsive. Administrators, they say, are rigid in their policies, guarded and deceitful in their discussions with students, and "gutless" when confronted with major issues. Problems that are referred to faculty committees sink from view and are never resolved. When faculty committees do issue pronouncements, students contend, they usually defend the status quo. And in those instances when changes are recommended, it takes an inordinate amount of time to institute them. One student told the Committee that on his campus it takes two years to get a course removed from the curriculum, even when the main parties are agreed to such action.

Student proposals for changing colleges and universities cover a wide range. For some, the chief issue is the replacement of parietal rules by freedom to live and love where and with whom they wish. Others demand the reduction of formal academic requirements and the establishment of independent study. But there are also those, often highlighted by the communications media, who advocate the destruction of the university.

In governance, most proposals envision a reduction in the authority of administrators and trustees, and a corresponding increase in student power (and sometimes faculty power) through joint committees that would have control over most of the institution's functions. Some of these proposals include financial independence as a prerequisite to effective control, whether of a student organization or of an academic department.

Many suggestions deal with the establishment of detailed policies and procedures designed to ensure the student a fair ("constitutional") hearing in any disciplinary procedure.

Some, stressing the importance of reliable information to sound decisions, insist that all information about the institution be readily available to any student who requests it. On campuses where student participation in governance is not the issue, the lack of openness of faculty and trustee meetings frequently is an important issue.

Suggested modifications of academic programs ordinarily include less reliance on grades and testing, more freedom to choose courses that seem relevant to the students' interests, more freedom to create experimental courses, credit for work in a local community, and provision for closer association with faculty members than has been customary.

Suggestions for breaking ties with the evil in society are both negative and positive. Negatively, they urge that cooperation between the university and the military in war-related research and training be abolished; investments in enterprises identified with social repression be disposed of; practices which limit the advancement of ethnic minorities and women in universities and colleges be eliminated. On the positive side, students say that universities should actively seek to bring about desirable social change, not only in the field of civil rights and world peace, but also, more recently, in restoration and preservation of a decent physical environment. Students want the faculty and administrators to speak out as individuals on important public issues.

And finally, there are groups—small but articulate—who would require the university to lead a complete social revolution to destroy capitalism and existing institutions and replace them with a full egalitarian and more humane society. The university is chosen for this movement because it has by definition that part of the population most receptive to learning new ideologies. Such groups are now being challenged by more conservative students, not always of the far right. There is some statistical evidence that students are becoming more polarized in their opinions.

Almost everywhere, but especially on the larger campuses, students are asking that

university officials, and particularly the faculty, show personal concern about them as individuals, rather than treating them as clients, customers, or nuisances.

B. What's troubling the faculty

The concerns troubling the faculty community are, similarly, many and various; they differ according to the kind of faculty, the kind of institution, and the ascendant issues of the moment. It is not surprising that the more conservative responses to university problems tend to come from the senior faculty, who obviously have a greater vested interest in current practice and are especially critical of the trend toward more permissive curricula. Besides the senior faculty, there are the department chairmen with their special role, and then the junior faculty and teaching assistants. It is from the latter two groups that the most outspoken criticisms of the university has come. Significantly the data from one American Council on Education study indicate that faculty were involved in the planning of more than half of the recent protest.[7]

The more prestigious and elite universities, generally having the largest representation of outspoken faculty and students, experience the most campus unrest. Although most of the unrest has been associated with the multi-function universities, the four-year state colleges and four-year private liberal arts colleges, too, are coming in for their share of dissatisfactions. Faculty tensions are evident in the four-year state colleges for a variety of reasons, among them pressure to become universities with prestigious graduate programs and the desire of faculty to broaden their participation in governance. Faculty in the four-year private liberal arts colleges also face a series of pressures: anxiety over their lack of status as compared to faculty in a university and, for many, a fear for the survival of their college. Faculty in community and junior colleges face the enormous pressures of growth and changing status, but these institutions traditionally have had much less faculty-student involvement in the decision-making process.

Recognizing, then, that distinctions must be drawn among the kinds of faculty and the kinds of institutions, it is still possible to identify major problems and issues creating faculty tensions and dissatisfactions. These include the governance and administration of institutions, the functioning of departments, certain basic academic questions, relationships with students, and finally, the goals and objectives of the university.

Governance and Administration of the Institution

Faculty are exerting pressure for more involvement in determining the broader purposes of the institution and more control over the conditions affecting their work. Paralleling student demands, faculty activists want a more important role or association with governing bodies, including the trustees. There is an accelerating move toward organization for collective bargaining, especially in two-year institutions, but to an extent in four year-institutions as well. The general dissatisfaction of faculty with the effectiveness of the administrative process grows during periods of tension. For instance, it has been observed that as an aftermath of major confrontations, faculty frequently blame the administrators for the conduct of the negotiations and the handling of the disputes; a consequence is sometimes the departure of the administrative officers involved.

The Functioning of Departments

Under fire, especially from younger faculty, are procedures and standards for determining tenure, promotion, salaries, teaching assignments, and departmental growth. Younger faculty are demanding a greater part in these decisions than the present concept of seniority allows. Some are disturbed by what they consider to be the excessive emphasis upon research and publications, at the expense of teaching. The university, they charge, is hypocritical when it insists that teaching is the first priority but then rewards the researcher, the administrator, and the publishing scholar with markedly higher salaries than the dedicated and skillful teaching faculty member. Some believe that all professors at the same grade and with the same number of years of service should receive the same salary. One consultant to the Committee argued that professors of law and medicine should receive the same pay as professors of English; persons teaching the history of nineteenth-century France should be rewarded as well as those teaching biochemistry.

Some senior scholars, on the other hand, are forecasting the withdrawal of major research efforts from large universities and the establishment of outside research institutions or agencies so that scholars can be sheltered from the counterproductive interruptions of students and younger faculty.

Academic Questions

Younger faculty members have joined students in demanding more interdisciplinary work, new ethnic study programs, and broader representation on the faculty, particularly of blacks and women. Present standards for faculty and academic programs, they assert, are antiquated and cannot meet the needs of present-day students. With respect to interdisciplinary work, many younger faculty strongly resent departmental rigidity and the resistance to providing adequate support for the broader areas of educational concern. Faculty members disagree on the structure of ethnic study programs—some give strong support to student demands for control of content and appointment of personnel; others resist just as strongly in the interest of academic standards and academic freedom.

Questions of external threats to academic freedom also loom very important in the anxieties of the faculty, both senior and junior. This anxiety is prevalent among faculty members in institutions that are under vigorous attack from the legislature, the public, and even their own boards of control. These faculty members are alarmed at the intervention of public authorities and politics into university administration and feel the need for more effective rebuttal of unsupported charges.

Relations With Students.

Students who demand more contact with their instructors and more of a role in determining the character of their own academic programs have begun to wear out their welcome. Faculty members complain that today's students are exceedingly demanding of their time, and that student-faculty committee deliberations tend to go on endlessly. Faculty serving jointly with students on committees, having devoted countless hours to debate and to the preparation of reports, finally assert that they are weary—they have had it and want to get back to their own research and educational interests. Yet the agreements reached with a given group of students often may not be satisfactory to the next student class, so that the process of give-and-take with students must be carried out over and over again. Some faculty are beginning to refuse to pay the personal price being exacted by the system of participatory democracy.

Other faculty members are seeking ways of avoiding student debate, less because of the protracted character of the discussion than because of the lack of civility and the intemperateness of the encounter. As one faculty member puts it: "The withdrawal thus far is largely due to changes in the style of debate, and to a distaste for threats and personal abuse in the gutter language sometimes employed by radical students to whom civility and rational discourse are contemptible middle-class evasions." [8]

Still other faculty are resentful of student attempts to determine the content of curricula and academic programs, on the ground that students are a transitory element in the university. Some would concede an advisory role to students, but scarcely more than that. Faculty, they say, have the competency to make curricular judgments; they also provide continuity in the university.

Goals and Objectives of the University

Great and growing discontent is being expressed by segments of the faculty over the priorities of the university as they affect current commitments, new fields, and new approaches to education. Faced with genuine uncertainty about the goals and objectives of the university, often lacking educational leadership from administrative quarters, the faculty find themselves caught in the crossfire between the conservative public and student activists.

The prevailing inability of the faculty to speak with a united voice betrays the sharp divisions within their ranks. The young faculty accuse their elders of opting for the status quo to preserve their power and position, yet it is probably closer to the truth to say that the paralysis of the faculty in some institutions reflects organizational inflexibility; in others it stems from genuine ideological disagreements within the faculty membership. Although college faculties are more liberal politically than the general public, the generalization disguises the spectrum of opinion likely to be represented on a faculty. Once these differences were aired in polite conversation at the faculty club; nowadays, as students and faculty activists stage confrontations and demand institutional commitments on social issues, individual faculty members tend to identify themselves with one camp or another. Moreover, younger faculty members are rankled by the seemingly fogyism of their elders, at the same time that senior faculty are genuinely shocked by the disrespect for "objective scholarship," the indifference to scholarly detachment, and the incivility being manifested within their own ranks.

The cleavage between the faculty members of the left and the right helps explain the intensity of faculty disputes over many of the issues discussed here but is not completely adequate for all. For example, conservative faculty more often than not can be found supporting student charges that the teaching function has been downgraded in favor of research and publication. Care must be taken, therefore, not to place exclusive emphasis on differences in political and social opinion on the campuses as the explanation for faculty discontent.

C. What's troubling the administrators

In 1949 the president of the University of Wyoming defined the essential qualifications for his job:

"A college or university president is expected to be an educator, a scholar, an administrator, a business man, a public speaker, a writer, a politician, a giver of dinners, a charmer at receptions, a moral force in the community, a commentator on national and international affairs, and popular with students, faculty and alumni." [9]

If that was a prescription for a superhuman being twenty years ago, consider the expectations that are piled upon the college president today. Faculty members expect him to raise their salaries, provide more facilities for research, and give them a stronger

Footnotes at end of article.

Footnotes at end of article.

voice in making policy. The students hold the president responsible for instituting reforms and increasing student freedom. Trustees and state legislators press him to economize. The alumni expect him to field winning athletic teams and to preserve the values they remember from their days as students.

The president is generally held responsible for dissatisfactions and for whatever can go wrong, and when mistakes are made he may be the first casualty. If he fails to keep costs down, to control unruly student rebels, or to keep the faculty happy, he becomes the scapegoat and may be summarily sacrificed.

Increasingly, presidents point out that their capacity to do anything that "makes a difference" is seriously impaired by the complexity and tortoise-like pace of consensual processes. On the other hand, if a president acts too swiftly or does not consult enough people, he will find himself cut off from his potential support.

Also, administrators in increasing numbers are called upon to negotiate issues, and to negotiate in a style that is new to the college campus. Impossible demands are labeled "non-negotiable" at the outset. Parties to the dispute do not play by the old rules or by any rules at all, and this anomaly of governance is especially disconcerting to a man trained to reason and to accord respect to his adversary. Moreover, men who over the years have learned how to solve most familiar problems now find themselves forced to share their authority, their political views (and sometimes their offices) with students and other juniors who might have been expelled or dismissed in an earlier decade.

For all these hardships, in times of turmoil, the president is likely to be alone. One executive, who became the target of disrupters, observed angrily, "No one was in sight when it came time for support. Everyone faded away into the background. It was like a gigantic live replay of the movie 'High Noon.' All the so-called friends had reason to be absent on the day of the showdown."

This is the position in which a great many presidents and administrators find themselves. What are the particular issues that bother them? The Committee asked some sixty top officers of American colleges and universities to state the "worst one or two persistent problems which create or increase tension on their campus."

The sixty administrators represent a sample of large and small, public and private, old and new colleges and universities. From these responses the most obvious conclusion is that there is no simple consensus. Sources of irritation and tension on the campus reflect the whole domain of the president's ultimate responsibilities.

Faculty

Leading the tallies is the faculty: many respondents mention this constituent as one or another source of difficulties. Even here, however, there is no ready consensus (perhaps a reflection of the differences among institutions). One president complains of the "unwillingness or inability of the faculty to adjust to change," another of "suffocating academic arrogance." While a number of presidents see the faculty as the entrenched voice of conservatism on the campus, others are disturbed by the active role of faculty in promoting dissent and divisiveness. One is vexed by "faculty members who encourage students, by positive efforts or lack of enough guts to oppose, in their efforts to politicize the university." Another notes that tenured faculty are participating in "whispered harrassment of the president and his office (or other administrative offices) by SDS-type student groups."

Financial Difficulties

Since institutional change almost invariably translates into new expenditures of funds, it is not surprising that money is a frequently cited worry among college presidents. "The financial crunch," adds one president, is "pervasive and real, but few are ready to believe that. So innovations except those which cost enormous amounts of new money are not yet the fashion."

Communication

Mentioned as frequently as financial difficulties are problems of communication. Within the academic community, failures of communication are manifested both in misunderstandings and in lack of understanding of why things are as they are. One president complains about "having to decide so many things repeatedly—always taken up *de novo*—as though the issue had no history and had not been considered or decided before."

Among the agents of misinformation noted by administrators are the campus newspaper and the public media—newspapers and television. The effect of misinformation, one respondent notes, is that "we are constantly having to reassure people that we are not planning to do things we have never dreamed of doing, in the face of supposedly informed rumors to the contrary."

Commenting at length on communication problems, another expressed the view that not all failures are inadvertent:

"Administrative and trustee statements are very frequently misinterpreted, as the result of really . . . paranoid efforts on the part of students and faculty to discover a plot where there is none. Students distrust trustees and administrators and faculty; faculty distrust students, administrators and trustees; trustees distrust faculty and students, and so on. All this happens despite the fact that there is an abundance of information, which all too many people either choose to ignore entirely or twist to fit their preconceived notions."

Governance

A good many replies could be tallied under this loose heading, but to lump them together as defining a single problem would be misleading. The targets of criticism, for example, varied. Faculty were criticized for their "persistent unwillingness . . . to involve students in some of their hallowed preserves." Students were criticized for their "unilateral demands" and their "constant pressure to erode one rule and regulation and policy after another." One respondent was especially critical of the board of trustees:

"Either they cause problems by an excessive concern about events on the campus or they limit our options in advance, or they second guess our decisions in such a way as to limit our options in the future. Most of the problems we have had would have been less aggravated and others would not have arisen had it not been for the board."

Another criticized those of his fellow administrators who cling to an "authoritative style of management." Administrators were also criticized for their willingness to see "faults and shortcomings of colleagues but not their own."

Most college presidents would probably agree with the observation that there is a "confusion of roles in the performance of responsibilities." While some complained of important decisions being made without presidential consultation, another noted that "consultation is grinding us to a halt." The worst problem, according to one respondent, "is the increasing authority of faculty and students with no increase in responsibility, and at the same time, lessening of the authority of the president with no change in his responsibility."

There was a time, a president noted, when a consensus about goals allowed institutions to operate under a set of informal understandings, with little need to spell out formal authority.

Now we are in a day when this consensus no longer exists and in which institutions are thus going to have to spell out their governmental arrangements in some detail and to provide for the contingency that they may have to exercise formal authority and even to impose sanctions.

Institutional Goals

Although the connection with immediate tensions was not always made clear, there were many expressions of concern about disagreements or vagueness in defining institutional goals and standards. "The major and very pervasive problem," one respondent summed up, "is the lack of agreement as to the nature of the university and its role in the area of social and political change." While one president saw the essential division of agreement on goals as lying between faculty and students, another pointed to the "erosion in the cohesiveness of the faculty in its attitude toward institutional goals and appropriate means of achieving them."

Student Unrest

A surprisingly small number of respondents mentioned what is so often thought of in connection with campus tensions, namely, violence and disorder. Most concerns were practical: how to deal with threats of disruptive protests, how to improve relations between students and local civil authorities, how to cope with "student arrogance, upstartism, and bad manners."

Some expressed specific concern about the tensions generated by the presence of minority-group students and the need to develop effective educational opportunities for these students. Among those who spoke of these problems, most recognize the need to take steps to increase educational opportunities for minority groups. Still, said one, there is the possibility of "unforeseen incidents triggering a protest by black students." One respondent described the basic problem this way: "The need for both blacks and whites is to forget that the black man is 'black'."

The remainder of the problems and tension-generators scattered over a wide field. Among those mentioned by respondents were the Vietnam war, intercollegiate athletics, predictions of student enrollments, the threat of a student rent strike, "two or three busybody alumni."

The prevailing impression these responses leave is one of recognition of the enormous tasks of great scope and complexity facing administrators at the same time that resources are inadequate and the academic community seems unwilling to pull together toward common goals. Countering this tone, however, is the tone of resolution of men who believe affirmatively in the contributions their institutions can make to the larger society.

Though presidents may seem to scatter the fire of their complaints and criticisms in all directions in return for the pressures which seem to come to them from all directions, few of them abandon hope in the ultimate victory of reason, of compromise and consensus. Many feel that the troubles of recent years will ultimately produce change in desirable directions.

D. What's troubling the trustees

Trustees, who presumably represent the public interest and embody "lay control" of the institution, soon discover—if they did not already know it—that, especially in time of crisis, an academic community is not a readily coordinated interprise. Many competing interests clamor for recognition and a share of scarce resources; the trustees have the ultimate responsibility for determining (broadly or in detail, depending on the institution) which interests coincide with the institution's best interest and can be served with available funds.

Conserving and increasing the material assets of an educational institution, overseeing the improvement of its programs, maintaining its coherence and integrity, and

protecting it against destructive forces are tasks that try the mettle of trustees almost everywhere. Today, as never before, they are called upon to represent the public's interest to institutions, and the interests of institutions to the public.

To find out the concerns now uppermost in the minds of trustees, a query was addressed to broad chairmen of a variety of institutions across the country. More than fifty replied, and some did so at length. (Though a representative sampling was sought, the replies do not, of course, speak for all trustees.)

If the replies are a reliable guide, trustees are aware that in some quarters the legitimacy of their authority is being attacked, their qualifications and organizational composition questioned, their performance criticized, and the importance of their function denigrated. In a paper prepared for the Committee, one trustee began by showing sensitivity to the range of attitudes about trustees, as illustrated by his selection of quotations.

"A board of regents, representative of the university constituency, is more important now than at any time in the history of higher education." (*A business executive*).

"Boards of trustees and regents are an anachronism, and should be abolished, if not immediately, certainly over the next five years!" (*A graduate student from a West Coast university*)

"It's about time regents helped constituencies understand the revolutionary changes taking place in academic life and not simply interpret what they think are our wishes to the academic community." (*An attorney*)

"Trustees are old, rich, totally out of touch with today's academic world and useless except for fund raising." (*An undergraduate student leader in a private Midwestern college*)

"Students and faculties are now so irresponsible and militant that trustees have an obligation to demonstrate who holds the actual power. *We* hold it, not the faculty, not the president, not the students, and it is time we started making that clear!" (*Trustee of an Eastern college*)

Although there is manifest disagreement about whether trustees are really needed and, if needed, about their duties and how they should be executed, it is nonetheless evident that leaders among them are deeply concerned with a wide range of critical problems in American higher education. According to the recent inquiry, the six most common concerns of trustees (in descending order of frequency) are: (1) finances, including optimum use of funds and facilities, and threatened loss of support as a result of public backlash; (2) governance, including communication; (3) faculty, teaching, and innovative educational programs; (4) student unrest; (5) definition of institutional goals and higher education's relations to society; (6) institutional leadership.

Finances

Since the public interest in higher education bears very directly on financial support, trustees, as representatives of that interest, are necessarily concerned with money matters.

The most prevalent single worry of trustees and regents today is over the growing public disenchantment with higher education, and the prospective leveling-off or even decline in financial support as a result of reaction to campus disorders. Many of the proposed reforms that come before them call for added expenditures in a period of financial stringency; seldom do student or faculty recommendations for change suggest what their proponents would be willing to forgo in order to acquire the often expensive new "goodies." Moreover, urgings that academic institutions develop action programs to help solve problems of environmental pollution, poverty, slums, the culturally deprived, and so on, come at a time when these very problems compete with educational needs for financial support.

Trustees of independent colleges and universities are bothered about the future of private higher education. Board members in both the private and public sectors report being plagued by the consequences of inflation, loss of federal grants, student aid difficulties, soaring construction costs, and continued pressures to broaden services without regard to the limited means available. Trustees also worry (more than other members of the academic community tend to do) about wasteful duplication of facilities and programs.

Governance

While in general trustees oppose the inclusion of faculty and students in their membership because of possible conflicts of interest and the inherent cleavages in special pleading, many acknowledged need for better bases of board selection and diversity among members.

Insofar as relations between the board and the faculty are concerned, a trustee of a major university asserted that the rhetoric of faculty governance betrays a cultural lag. Intricate structures maintain a pretense of self-governing "community of scholars," where there is no real community. Except in crisis, he contended, most professors do not want to be bothered by problems of academic government. They rise in protest and then lapse back into their own affairs, leaving day-to-day government to a small minority—mostly the bureaucrats and politicians in their midst. By implication, in large and complex institutions where the concept of "community" has lapsed, responsibility has to be assumed somewhere—not just for parking, money raising, and public relations, but for the "deeper requirements of any organization for central direction." Most trustees argue that they and their chief executive officer, the president, often have no option but carry out this responsibility.

The Faculty and Teaching

Trustees are concerned not only about faculty derelictions in self-governance but also by the high proportion of campus disruptions in which members of the teaching staff (mostly the younger and lower-ranked members) take part. Trustees are also prone to interpret the first loyalty of many academicians to their discipline or field as a sign of disloyalty to the institution.

As one survey shows, more than nine out of ten trustees believe that the teaching function is more important than research. Many of them worry about the priority given to research and publication as a basis for professional recognition, and want to strengthen the significance of effective teaching in the institution's reward scheme. Likewise, they have increasing doubts about tenure, viewing it as a shield for neglect and incompetence, rather than simply a protection of academic freedom. Some share with student dissidents a feeling that many faculty are opposed to innovation and change in their own areas, are not really zealous about the improvement of teaching and learning, and are reluctant to have their real productivity evaluated.

Since they believe that everything else in an institution is subsidiary to the educational program, trustees view the ultimate responsibility of a board as necessarily implying a deep concern for basic academic functions.

Thus they complain about having programs reported to them only in financial terms and about receiving information on educational developments that have already taken place. Even board members who wish to effect what they regard as constructive changes are uncertain how to proceed in the face of faculty indifference or opposition to lay interference.

Student Unrest

It will perhaps surprise some to learn that concern with student unrest ranked only fourth as a current worry among the trustees queried.

In one highly selective private institution, an uppermost concern pertained to pressures pushing that institution more and more toward serving "the alienated affluent and the alienated impoverished." Several trustees expressed puzzlement over dual admissions standards to enroll disadvantaged students, and also doubted whether most institutions would or could provide the added funds, facilities, staff, and special programs to meet their needs. One commentator, speaking broadly, observed that the large majority of institutions are designed to serve only one of three types of students—the 70 percent who adjust to the curriculum and instruction without being very creative or imaginative. The ill-served groups (approximating the remaining 30 percent—are the underendowed or disadvantaged and, at the other extreme, the highly intelligent and creative.

Other trustees voiced astonishment and dismay about students' motives and philosophies, and a concern, already indicated, about whether adverse public reaction will be reflected in greatly curtailed financial support of both public and private institutions.

Institutional Goals and Societal Relations

Most trustees appear to be well aware of their obligation to help relate institutional objectives to the needs and aspirations of the supporting society. They reject the idea that the college or university is an organization intended solely to meet the needs of individual students as defined by the students themselves. They also resist the syndicalist view of some professors that the academic profession should control virtually all of the educational aspects of institutions of higher learning. Some trustees regard presidents and other officers of top administration as being primarily executives of broad policies formulated by trustees.

Despite this desired primacy, trustees are more often validators than formulators of policy. "In fact," one observer has noted, "it can be said that most institutions operate by habits, by assumptions, by accumulated decisions—all acquiring in the course of time the force of common law. But the vulnerability of institutions to attacks by radical minorities has been dramatized by the revelation that boards have not adequately devoted themselves to the review and refinement of policies and to the effective communication of policy."

Trustee comments repeatedly show a felt need to clarify the objectives of American higher education as a whole and the role of each institution within the system. Many realize that traditional programs do not always fit current needs, and that better institutional guidelines should stem from long-range planning and the establishment of campus priorities. They sense that the heightened importance of higher education and the prospect of its becoming universal will thrust most colleges and universities into a closer relationship with the surrounding society. They have a growing awareness that in many places compromises will have to be worked out between competing conceptions of the college or university as a community of scholars, a community of students, a corporate enterprise, an agency or arm of the state, a public service agency, and so on. Charged with maintaining the solvency and protecting the integrity of their institutions, they also worry about upholding these responsibilities while simultaneously responding to an increased variety of internal pressures and being party to the allocation of scarce resources to social problems of the larger society.

Institutional Leadership

By and large, trustees are of the opinion that individual leaders are no less essential than individual institutions to the welfare of American higher education. Trustees of public institutions, in particular, view with some alarm the tendency of politicians and bureaucrats in the national capitol and in state capitols to bypass and undermine the traditional powers of trusteeship and to erode the leadership responsibilities of the executive officers the boards have chosen. Trustees see the main responsibilities falling upon themselves and the presidents—to provide creative leadership and not just mediation, moderation, or conciliation.

Some board members concede that a re-examination of trustee functions is overdue. They acknowledge their shortcomings in dealing with many of the complexities of institutional governance, and believe, further, that better liaison is required with faculty, students, and administrators. They also acknowledge the need for improved methods of selecting board members, better devices for effecting change as well as continuity in their membership, more effective ways of perceiving the right questions and getting the right answers about the institutions they oversee. Even though they grant that their changing assignments may call for more diversity of talent and experience, they oppose the idea that a governing board should be a collection of special representatives.

As one prominent board member has put it, "Trustees should not run the institution, but should see that it is well run." Most trustees realize the need to delegate many of their powers to the president, and to hold him responsible for the execution of basic policies. In this same vein, nine out of ten trustees view the president as a leader rather than mere mediator. Although they sometimes feel that presidents and other administrative officers are not sufficiently firm-handed in what they regard—in corporate terminology—as "management," many are aware that the central direction of academic enterprise must depend more upon persuasion than dictation in situations where shared power, consultation, and the development of consensus are the most effective means to institutional ends.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The higher education community cannot realistically hope to solve all the problems that create campus tensions. It cannot alone stop war, eliminate poverty, rebuild cities, or expunge racism. It cannot afford to be indifferent to these problems, however, if only because campus turmoil is not likely to cease unless genuine progress is made toward curing the glaring social ills. The war in Vietnam and the draft system, in concert, contribute heavily to campus unrest. Until the nation ceases to force young men to fight in a war they believe unjust, a major source of campus tensions will remain. For the campus to be a haven for those who wish to avoid military service is an inequity of the draft system and a perversion of educational purpose.

Through educating decision makers, conducting research, diffusing knowledge, and proposing solutions to social problems, our colleges and universities can have a considerable, if not decisive, influence on the decisions that affect the nation's quality of life. In each of these roles, colleges and universities serve society best by giving prime allegiance to truth. Truth-seeking, in turn, requires conclusions openly arrived at, the discard of useless orthodoxies, and the receptivity to new ideas. First and foremost, then, our colleges and universities must be centers of free inquiry.

Efforts to politicize colleges and universities risk public reprisals with consequent restrictions on free inquiry. Legislative moves in this direction, at both state and federal levels, are already deeply disturbing. Likewise, demands made on campus through intimidation or violence are inimical to the spirit of free inquiry. The search for truth is the first casualty.

Political exploitation of campus problems by some public figures has become one of the sources of polarization on the campus. Public officials and others having the public's attention should gauge their response to campus disruption in the light of the fact that repressive and provocative pronouncements by those in authority mayhave the same inflammatory effect that extremist rhetoric has on the campus.

Campus violence already threatens some colleges and universities with repressive forces that could cripple their freedom for many years to come. Even so, this Committee is mindful of the dangers in laying out inflexible guidelines about unacceptable conduct or in specifying the precise moment when the hazard to the institution is such that civil authorities must be called upon. The question have been studied in detail by the Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent of the American Bar Association, which issued its report in February.

What, then, in view of their limited powers, can colleges and universities do about problems arising from campus tensions? At the outset, let it be noted that campus tensions are not necessarily harmful to higher education. It is the responses to tensions that lead to constructive or destructive outcomes. As one Committee consultant put it, "If there were no tensions on campus, there should be a committee established to create some, because a campus without tensions is intellectually moribund." Present campus tensions, therefore, provide an opportunity and an impetus for some overdue reforms in higher education. As the discontents of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees (expressed in Chapter II) make clear, almost everyone agrees that change is necessary in higher education.

It is equally clear that these four groups are not of one mind about the nature of campus problems, how to solve them, or who should solve them. Trustees are commonly assumed to stand firmly for order and against disruption, undisturbed by pressures until things seem to be getting out of hand. Reform proposals intended to alleviate student and faculty malaise seldom take account of trustees' worries about scarce resources, or even acknowledge that such worries exist. Faculty members, on the other hand, appear to be more directly involved in the internal issues besetting the campuses. Nevertheless, there is considerable difference of faculty opinion about steps to resolve controversies. In academic matters the interests of junior and senior scholars often conflict. Many of the former desire both participation in decision making and a redress of the balance between research and teaching. Though some faculty want to add colleagues having different political and social outlooks, others oppose strenuously what they regard as a political test for employment. Students on their part are also becoming increasingly divided, between those who are heavily involved in political issues on or off campus and those who resent interference with their professional and vocational preparation.

This Committee's recommendations cannot reconcile all the conflicting values and viewpoints. Nevertheless, we believe these recommendations respond to legitimate concerns; if given wide campus support, they can mitigate unrest by improving the conduct of the educational enterprise. Their adoption and, more important, their effectiveness once adopted, presuppose that the entire academic community must share and abide by certain principles—among them fair play, civility, concern for the individual, care in interpreting evidence, respect for privacy, equity in administering penalties, and faith in rational discourse.

The recommendations deal first of all with the roles and responsibilities of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, then with general matters of governance and institutional goals.

Students

Colleges and universities exist primarily for the education of students. Society assigns to these institutions no task more important than providing students the opportunity to ripen their intellectual and creative capacities, learn from the heritage of the past, and develop themselves as responsible citizens.

Student critics object to the current emphasis on a "manpower" perspective. They object to being shaped for slots in a less than ideal social order. Our institutions indeed must prepare trained manpower for a complex society. All the same, greater weight should be given to educating young people to realize more fully their own potentials on their own terms, and to help them find new solutions to the urgent social problems of our times. Here education, not just training, is clearly at issue.

Educational institutions foster the development of responsible adults by assigning real responsibilities to students to the extent of their capabilities and willingness to assume responsibility. They may hamper and retard that development by following policies of *in loco parentis* in regard to parietal rules (now on the wane) or policies that "the faculty knows best" in regard to the curriculum and other matters central to the institution's purposes (much less effectively challenged). For colleges and universities to provide effective educational environments for the development of competence and maturity, new policies are required. In wise balance, these policies give young people a more responsible role in the educational decisions affecting them, while at the same time acknowledging greater adult competence and greatest investment in institutional continuity on the part of the faculty and administration. The wise balance called for is, obviously, not easily identifid or achieved.

Although forceful measures are sometimes unavoidable when campus disruption goes to intolerable extremes, the use of force is basically undesirable. Punitive measures tend to foster—when they work—dependent compliance rather than responsible commitment. Firmness of policy needs to be balanced by openness and flexibility. If students are to be held accountable for their actions, they should have a voice in determining the permissible limits of their actions.

1. Students not only should be given substantial autonomy in their non-academic activities, but should also participate in matters of general educational policy, especially in curricular affairs. Since increased participation will contribute to effective institutional decision making and is also of educational benefit, students should serve in a variety of roles on committees that make decisions or recommendations. In some non-academic areas students should have effective control; in some general educational policy matters they should have voting participation; in other matters, they should act in an advisory or consultative capacity. Effective student representation will not only improve the quality of decisions; it will also help to ensure their acceptability to the student body.

2. As institutions give up policies of *in loco parentis* in response to students' educationally valid wishes for independence, students must know that they cannot be effectively shielded from the consequences of their behavior, especially when it violates the laws of society at large. The abandonment of parietal rules, however, does not relieve institutions of the need to have effective self-

government. The more effective the self-government, the less frequently and abrasively will police and other agencies of the society intrude on the campus.

3. Colleges and universities should regularly review, with legal counsel, their practices regarding such matters as the confidentiality of information about students and the privacy of student living quarters. They should also review their provisions for due process in disciplinary proceedings. These proceedings need not have, in every case, the formal, adversary aspects of a courtroom trial. But the option of formal proceedings should be open to any student whose future could be seriously affected by the outcome of a disciplinary decision.[10]

4. Students who want to propose changes in institutional practices or policies (as differentiated from asking redress of particular grievances) should be given the opportunity to learn in advance the institution's decision-making process that applies to their proposal. They should also consider thoroughly the evidence and arguments supporting their proposal and anticipate questions that will be raised by others, including fellow students. A well-considered proposal often grows out of preliminary discussion with faculty and administrators.

5. Students must recognize and respect the rights and privileges of their fellow students as they seek rights and privileges for themselves. These include First Amendment rights of free speech and peaceable assembly, the right to pursue without hindrance one's course of study, and the privilege of experimenting with ways of thinking, both conventional and unconventional. Threats, violence, coercive disruption of classes or lectures, and similar acts that tread upon the rights of others are intolerable.

6. To a very great degree institutional functioning depends upon the voluntary self-discipline of the students. On the other hand, in several institutions, overt threats of violence and personal injury to students and others by individuals on and off campus have had destructive effects upon disciplinary proceedings as well as the process of internal self-discipline. In those circumstances where internal mechanisms fail, a new kind of juridical authority may be required.

7. Students rightly expect administrators to exercise leadership, to take the initiative in proposing educational changes suited to a changing clientele and a changing society. But just as students are entitled to acceptance of their rights and responsibilities, so are administrators. Students should recognize that the administrator is responsible to widely divergent campus groups and is accountable to the board which legally governs the institution. Within these limitations, he must have freedom to initiate, guide, negotiate, and make decisions, if the institution is not to remain static. Attempts to circumscribe this freedom will either reinforce the status quo or create chaos.

Faculty

All the constituent groups share concern over the appropriate role of the faculty. Their chief criticism is that the professorial role—particularly in major universities—has become so distorted in the direction of research and scholarly achievement that many faculty seriously neglect their teaching function. That this is a real problem is substantiated by considerable evidence. In national surveys, for example, students complain repeatedly about lack of contact with faculty and faculty indifference to student needs. These complaints are especially common in major, research-oriented universities. Studies comparing the environments of universities with those of smaller colleges reveal among the former a comparative lack of student and faculty interaction in the classroom, an impersonal relationship between teacher and students, and a feeling on the part of students that the institution lacks concern for their individual development. It is significant that the major universities have been the prime targets of violent and disruptive protest.

The research commitments that draw professors away from teaching are upheld in a variety of ways. One factor is the strong demand for research services from both government and business. Another is the prestige accruing to institutions that employ distinguished research scholars. Many institutions find the temptation of instant departmental prestige and large research grants and contracts to be irresistible. Since the research-oriented faculty tend to recruit, screen, and train their replacements, the system is self-perpetuating.

The imbalanced emphasis on research, away from teaching, is also supported by the lopsided competition between the institutions and the scholarly discipline for the loyalty and concern of faculty members. Both teaching and research figure among a faculty member's contributions to his institution (though formalized procedures for evaluating teaching are rare, and public evidence is far more readily available on research competence). So far as the faculty member's standing in his discipline is concerned, however, with only rare exceptions—such as the authorship of innovative text books—it is solely published research that counts. Published research is what establishes the scholar's prestige among his peers in other colleges and universities. In the university world, therefore, it is also the main source of his economic value in the academic marketplace. No ambitious young faculty member can afford to neglect his disciplinary standing as determined by his published research. His movement from one institution to another is heavily influenced by the time and support he will gain for his research efforts.

Of course, many research-oriented faculty in universities teach graduate students as part of their research activity. Indeed, in many fields of graduate study, the laboratory is the classroom. Prestigious professors who are not accessible to undergraduates may be very accessible to graduate students to whom they have their basic teaching responsibility. It is not the Committee's purpose to suggest that all professors dedicated entirely to research, or to research and graduate teaching, should now teach undergraduates. The problem lies with overemphasizing research at the expense of undergraduate teaching.

This Committee does not think it desirable, even were it possible, to devalue the contribution of scholarly research. Such research may, in fact, contribute to the solution of social ills about which students and others in the academic community are actively concerned. What deliberate policy can do is introduce compensating influences to redress the balance. Specific suggestions are put forth in the recommendations that follow.

1. Effective teaching deserves greater recognition in hiring, promoting, and paying, especially in the major institutions. Explicit methods must be developed for assessing teaching competence, improving the learning process, and systematically reviewing the adequacy of the curriculum. Quality of teaching must be given greater weight in tenure decisions. Faculty scholarship, research, and public service should relate more closely to teaching; indeed, they can enhance teaching. Both individual institutions and national professional organizations should establish fitting rewards for exceptional teachers. The Committee urges the learned and professional societies to explore other ways of giving more status to teaching and improving its quality, especially at the undergraduate level.

2. In matters affecting teaching—e.g., new faculty appointments; the awarding of tenure; new courses, departments, or interdisciplinary arrangements—faculty committees should seek the counsel of students who have had direct experience with the matter to be decided. The faculty, by virtue of its earned competence, is in the best position to have main jurisdiction over academic matters. But students, as the consumers of higher education and as young people with important perceptions about our changing society, have a right to be heard on matters affecting the educational program. As was pointed out in an earlier recommendation, participation by students could strengthen the quality of the decisions made and help to ensure their acceptability to the studenty body. In this connection, faculty should welcome the development by student organizations of formalized and objective procedures for evaluating faculty teaching of undergraduates in all important courses. Too often, student evaluations of teaching are fragmentary and are not available to the teacher, who might improve his teaching if he were aware of students' criticisms.

3. Tenure policies—concerning a faculty member's right to hold his academic appointment until retirement once competence has been demonstrated (except when extreme malfeasance has been established by due process)—need to be reappraised. The justification for tenure is the crucial protection it gives to academic freedom. Professors who espouse unpopular views must be free from reprisal. Tenure was not devised in the spirit of trade union systems to guarantee job security. But it has come to serve this function too, at a cost. It sometimes has been a shield for indifference and neglect of scholarly duties. At a time when an increasing number of teachers, especially in community colleges and state colleges, are organizing for collective bargaining, the Committee recognizes that a challenge to the present concept of tenure is no small matter, that the issues involved are complex and difficult to resolve, and that a satisfactory solution must maintain effective safeguards for academic freedom. Nonetheless, we urge the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges (co-sponsors of the basic 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure) to join with representatives of other educational organizations that are concerned with tenure, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Student Association, and constituents of the American Council on Education, to reexamine existing policies. Standards for awarding tenure—a matter of institutional autonomy—need broadening to allow greater consideration of teaching ability. Scholarly communities must be protected as effectively as tenure now protects individual professors.

4. A climate of open discussion must be created in which risks for trying new approaches are minimized. Faculty members should respect the educational freedom of students in the classroom to raise questions and to discuss freely issues arising from their course work. To encourage innovations in curriculum, in degree requirements, and in standards for assessing faculty competence, institutions should seek resources to alter the reward system. Innovation can also be encouraged on our giant campuses through sub-divisions with greatly dispersed authority, budgetary autonomy, and architectural settings that encourage informality and intimacy. In many institutions, the hierarchial structure of institutional management and departmental authority needs to be altered. Rigid hierarchies tend to shield the decision makers from the discontents and constructive ideas of students and younger faculty members.

5. Renewed attention must be given to long-standing questions about the established

---

Footnotes at end of article.

standards for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Either Ph. D. programs should be reformed to provide more adequately for the majority whose careers will in fact center on teaching rather than on the conduct of research, or increased recognition should be given to alternative programs for those who will be primarily teachers. One important issue is the nature of the dissertation. Generally the dissertation is supposed to be a work of original research, but this standard is not uniformly applied and is inappropriate for many graduate students. Another issue is the role of graduate students as teachers. Although some are excellent teachers, graduate students tend to pursue their teaching assignments without adequate supervision in a system which treats assistantships primarily as a form of subsidy to students and a source of low-cost instruction. Supervised experienced in teaching, as well as participation in decisions on departmental policies, ought to be important parts of the learning experiences, especially for those graduate students planning academic careers.

6. Faculty need to take a more active role in reeaxaming institutional goals and in guiding change, instead of simply responding to reform proposals from other quarters. Too often, in fact, their authority on educational matters has been used to disguise complacency and unwarranted conservatism, and as an excuse to avoid making reforms. Many have resisted changes designed to meet the varied needs of a heterogeneous student body because they conceive their own role narrowly and selectively, as simply the trainers of an intellectual elite. Faculty need to reexamine critically both their role and their procedures for handling innovative ideas.

Administrators

It is altogether proper for the other constituent groups to hold administrators accountable for their actions and their inactions—but only within the limits of their roles and responsibilities and their power to act. When their responsibilities are ill-defined or their power to act is unduly circumscribed, serious barriers exist to the resolution of campus tensions.

1. Administrators are often properly blamed for their institution's shortcomings in organization and goverance. Other members of the college community, however, are typically uncertain about what administrators are expected to do and how their performance should be evaluated. Accordingly, institutions must define explictly who is responsible for what. Moreover, administrators often have responsibilities in certain areas but do not have the power to take major action without approval from higher authority or endorsement from a faculty committee. These limitataions, too, should be clearly spelled out.

2. Especially at the presidential level, responsibility must be accompanied by the necessary authority. Trustees, faculty, and students need to consider the possible ultimate consequence to them of weakening the president's authority. Institutions should have constitutions or bylaws which clearly define the responsibility *and* the authority of the president. In this connection, the nature of the presidency deserves rethinking. For example, fixed terms of office, renewable or unrenewable, might relieve some pressures on presidents, and also ensure institutional vitality. Fixed terms, or a system by which to review administrative tenure, might be preferable to the present system in which some presidents stay long beyond their real effectiveness or are sometimes sacrificed after one major incident. A division of authority—between "outside" concerns and "inside" ones, for example—might be considered where the burdens of the presidential office have grown too large for one man.

3. Colleges and universities also need to reassess the roles and responsibilities of other administrative officers. Their performance should be subjected to periodic review and evaluation. Additionally, the roles of administrative offices should be reexamined. For example, on some campuses the dean of students serves as adviser to students and overseer of student organizations, while also serving as prosecutor (and sometimes as judge and jury) in disciplinary matters. These responsibilities may conflict with one another and call for differing talents, and, where feasible, should be separated—the advisory responsibility assigned to one office, and judicatory responsibility to another.

4. Presidents and other administrators have an especially urgent responsibility to ensure that avenues of communication are open. Some presidents are cut off by overconscientious aides or secretaries; others are seldom seen on campus and never talk with students and seldom with faculty. How to keep the channels open will present a different problem on every campus. Nevertheless, it should always be possible for a student, faculty member, trustee, or layman who has a message to get through to the president. Accessibility, moreover, is not the whole answer. Presidents and other administrators must take positive steps to explain their plans and policies to the appropriate constituencies, through such devices as newsletters, annual reports, "town meetings," or position papers on particular issues. They must also provide students, faculty, and others with information sufficiently in advance to enable them to make meaningful contributions to decisions.

5. To communicate effectively administrators must be open and candid in giving reasons for decisions and actions. There are instances when the release of information would needlessly injure individuals. But the withholding of information on such occasions will be better understood and accepted if, at all other times, communication is candid. Here, also, continuing efforts are as important as those during crisis. Adminstrators should meet frequently with faculty and student groups, not only to listen but also to make known their thinking on basic issues.

6. The ability of presidents and other administrative officers to devote the time required for the communications we consider desirable is dependent on adequate institutional staffing. Highly effective administrative organization, procedures, and personnel to conduct the heavy administrative business of the institution, are needed to support presidents and other administrators as they devote themselves to the varied and time-consuming responsibility of modern institutional governance.

7. The rules by which colleges and universities govern themselves, and the defining of appropriate responses to infractions, are matters on which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees should seek agreement. But it is an administrative responsibility (if only by default) to see that these rules and procedures receive continuing assessment. Rules need to be tested for clarity, fairness, and adequacy to meet foreseeable circumstances. In many institutions administrators need to initiate a rulebook "housecleaning": to eliminate (or draw to the attention of those empowered to do so) rules that have outlived their usefulness, or are unrelated to institutional objectives, or that duplicate public laws and carry unwarranted additional punishment.

8. Administrators need to develop with civil authorities, especially law enforcement agencies, plans for handling campus disturbances that would require the presence of civil authorities. The plans must define the division of responsibility between campus and civil authorities, provide effective channels of communication between the two groups, and ensure due restraint in the handling of those causing the disturbance. The entry of large numbers of off-campus police during disturbances can heighten tensions rather than relieve them. Physically punitive action, however provoked, that can be interpreted as "police brutality" adds fuel to the flames. Inaction, on the other hand, can result in substantial property damage, danger to members of the campus community, and extended interruption of educational function, as well as reduced respect for the administration.

Trustees

As most informed critics of academic governance have concluded, the lay board despite its shortcomings, is still preferable to other methods of control. The reform of board organization and procedures should be undertaken even though no mere redefinition of trustee roles will eliminate existing frictions. Failure to make lay boards more effective participants in the total enterprise, however, is certain to increase the tensions now disturbing much of higher education. The effectiveness of trustees is not measured by the depth of their involvement in the day-to-day business of the institution or the firmness of their control. It is measured, rather, by the extent to which they are well-informed on educational issues, judicious in the exercise of their powers, and protective of the prerogatives of all members of the academic community.

1. Every institution should have carefully framed bylaws, subject to periodic re-examination, that set forth the board's essential authority and responsibility and defines its procedures. Periodic review of the bylaws will benefit from outside counsel and from attention to what other institutions are doing. Even such basic matters as the board's mode of selection and appointment, size, composition, term of office, should be re-examined. For example, switching to popular election of boards might dissuade men of detached viewpoint from applying, but self-perpetuating boards of lifetime members have faults as well. Institutions with the latter system should consider that fixed terms for trustees would preserve detachment and continuity, while at the same time ensuring periodic rejuvenation of the board.

2. Students, faculty, and others need to be well informed about how decisions are made in their institution and the reasons for policies that are decided. The bylaws of the trustees should be accessible to all members of the academic community and to concerned outsiders, as should agenda of each meeting. When major decisions are made, boards should promptly issue reports which explain reasons for the actions taken. Boards must have well-publicized rules governing the submission of petitions, and adequate procedures for prompt consideration of them.

3. Boards should make more effective use of special committees and other mechanisms through which they and representatives of students, faculty, staff, and alumni can communicate more readily.

4. In the matter of finances, ways must be found to reexamine institutional priorities so that there will be both wider opportunity for involvement and a greater sharing of responsibility among students, faculty, staff, and others.

5. Delegation of responsibility and accountability does not absolve trustees of the need to be well-informed about the institution's programs and to be serious students of higher education generally. Presidents and others who influence heavily the content of the board agenda should focus it more on educational issues and less on fiscal and housekeeping chores.

6. Although anything resembling a quota scheme of representation in board membership should be avoided, there should be greater diversity of age, occupation, and other salient individual characteristics that might broaden horizons and present other points of view. Some boards of trustees may wish to consider adding student and faculty mem-

bers from their own institutions; other boards, desiring to avoid the possible conflicts of interests that may arise from such participation, can achieve broadened viewpoints by adding members drawn from other institutions. Ultimately, the evolving nature of higher education may require reexamination and reassessment of the authority and functions of trustees in the governance of the university, along with reappraisal of a need to delegate some of their authority to other groups on the campus.

General recommendations

A. Governance

In certain basic areas of governance and decision making, many institutions have considerable autonomy to chart their own course. It is in these areas that the diverse interests of the members of the academic community are most likely to be reconciled. These include: (1) criteria for admissions; (2) criteria for recruiting, hiring, and promoting faculty and staff; (3) curriculum requirements; (4) performance standards and rewards for faculty and staff; (5) standards of conduct for members of the academic community; (6) academic performance standards for students, including criteria for grading and certification.

The Committee believes that campus conflict sometimes arises from a confusion of three questions: (1) the substance of a particular policy: What is it? (2) its validity: Is it a good policy? (3) the process by which it was made: Who decides it? To view campus tensions in terms simply of "Who decides?" rather than of "What gets decided?" is to regard institutional decision making as a power struggle rather than as a means of improving the educational environment. Validity is, of course, one important consideration, and educational decisions are most likely to be valid if alternatives have first been subjected to a complete airing and analysis by the parties concerned.

The need for thorough study of alternatives relates closely to the problem of communication. All four constituent groups cite inadequate communication as a major cause of tension. Decisions made without adequate study or simply presented as *fait accompli* not only create resentment and hostility, but also run the risk of being wrong. This is particularly true with decisions on strictly educational matters (curricular requirements, for example), where students, faculty, and others directly affected are likely to have valuable insights to contribute. Although improved communication does not eliminate problems, it usually results in sounder educational decisions and fosters governance by consensus rather than by force.

1. The processes of academic governance, especially those that determine and establish institutional policies, must be seen by all major groups concerned as essentially *fair*. Due process must be enlarged to include broad participation in the deliberation on important issues. If any part of the academic community feels that its own interest in a proposed new institutional policy has not been fairly presented and heard, the new policy is likely to be challenged.

2. Every attempt must be made to establish effective communications, so that policy questions and grievances can be aired by the campus community. A number of institutions have had success with such communications methods as (1) centralized files of important institutional records accessible to campus constituents; (2) rumor centers, especially during periods of campus turmoil, to which members of the community may telephone for accurate and up-to-date information; (3) ombudsmen to hear grievances, speed up communications, and unsnarl red tape; and (4) "official" campus newspapers, in which texts of important reports and other documents of wide interest to the campus community can appear. Members of the campus community recognize, however, that improved channels of consultation may render decision-making procedures slower and more cumbersome.

3. As an aid to effective decision-making, joint administrative-faculty-student committees should be established, wherever possible, to assist in resolving the problem and attaining the objective. More institutions should experiment with permanent legislative assemblies composed of administrators, faculty, and students. Some issues are better dealt with by faculty assemblies, some by student groups, and some by the president and his administrative staff; but each group's decision-making processes can benefit from inputs from the other groups. There are, additionally, issues of concern to all three groups which should be dealt with by a governance system in which all are recognized as legitimate participants.

4. The effective functioning of a college or university depends in large measure upon a shared commitment by members of the campus community to the principle of institutional self-governance and an assumption of the responsibilities that such a commitment implies. For example, in disciplinary proceedings all must be willing to provide testimony and to serve as triers of fact. It must be possible to conduct hearings without fear of disruption or retaliation against participants; there must be willingness to respect the finality of decisions.

B. Institutional Goals

The Committee's recommendations rest on shared views about the appropriate roles of colleges and universities in an unstable and troubled world. The problems of colleges and universities, like those of society at large, rule out as untenable a comfortable policy of "business as usual." As society gropes to discover and realize more humane, just, and viable patterns of life in an age of advanced technology on a crowded globe, colleges and universities need to develop mechanisms of "self-renewal," in John Gardner's phrase, to keep them in position to make appropriate contributions to society. In their educational function, colleges and universities need renewal to enhance their ability to prepare young people to cope with the kind of world that they will actually encounter.

1. Everywhere there is need to reexamine existing disciplines and to allocate resources for the design of new forms of intellectual inquiry; interdisciplinary programs which break down departmental rigidity provide one example of an appropriate response.

2. Faculties and staff of colleges and universities should be drawn from more diverse social and vocational backgrounds. The vocational experience of artists, writers, diplomats, government officials, and others can enrich and enliven the discourse on the campus and help to reduce the tendency toward academic provincialism.

3. Colleges and universities must respond, more effectively than they have in the past, to the educational desires of women. Wherever discrimination because of sex exists, it must be eliminated.

4. New curricula and resources are needed to further and self-development of students in ways traditional curricula have failed to do. More institutions should seek the resources to experiment with alternate modes of learning: cluster colleges, experimental education, work-study, community involvement for academic credit, and other living-learning arrangements.

5. Institutions should create centers for educational research and innovation to encourage the development of new approaches to education and the implementation of innovation in education—both in teaching techniques and in new courses, and to foster a continual questioning of conventional and traditional means of promoting the expansion of our frontiers of knowledge.

6. The American society overemphasizes the value of the traditional college degree. Further encouragement should be given to the development and support of new directions in post-secondary education.

7. Novel admissions practices should be tried by some institutions, both to extend access to higher education and to provide a broader population in which to test the quality and effectiveness of education programs.

8. Most collegiate institutions in the past have been heavily oriented to the purposes of the white majority. More attention must be given to the needs of ethnic minorities. Ethnic studies programs, however, should ultimately be incorporated into the regular academic programs so that the white majority will learn more about the history and needs of minority groups.

9. Institutions should recruit more students, faculty, and staff from minority groups that have been underrepresented in the campus population. Other institutions should not be "raided" for minority personnel and students; rather, though it will take time, the pool of eligibles must be enlarged and recruitment made from among those who would not normally expect to attend college or to have academic careers.

10. Many reforms in higher education are expensive. But if we are to have them, institutions must be given greatly increased funding from all sources—especially the federal government—to increase financial aid to students, to develop new kinds of educational programs, and to permit students as well as faculty to launch innovative research and teaching projects.

11. Trustees, administrators, and faculty have as great a stake in effecting institutional change as do students. Reform of the college is a shared responsibility requiring attitudes that encourage educational change by all of the campus constituents.

12. Institutions should resist the distortion of their research efforts because of outside sources of funds. We urge the federal government to support research and instruction in ways that will respect the autonomy of institutions, enhance scholarly innovation, and improve students' educational opportunities, and we also urge institutions to emphasize these principles in developing their research.

CONCLUSION

Unrest on the nation's campuses is only part of the mosaic of problems in American society: the poverty amid affluence, the continuing racial strife, the poisoned environment, the decaying cities, the apparent decline in the whole quality of life. These problems affect all of society, not simply colleges and universities. It is ironic that some seek destruction of the colleges and universities and that others within them remain averse to all constructive change.

These institutions hold our greatest hopes: as places of objective inquiry, for the solutions of society's problems; places of unfettered thought, for the debate of sensitive issues without fear of intimidation or reprisal; centers of teaching and learning, for the education of tomorrow's problem-solvers and leaders.

Just as those who compose the academic community must rise to the defense of colleges and universities as vital and enduring social institutions, so must they recognize that these institutions must be responsive to the need of the times. A college or university should be flexible enough to accommodate change, aggressive enough to promote change, and wise enough to anticipate the consequences of change. It must strive as never before to become a bastion of high purpose, a goad to the public conscience, an implacable enemy of the false, the inhumane, and the unjust. And in doing so, it must defend the use of reason as the means of moving toward its own and society's goals.

The survival of our system of higher education and its long-term contribution to

society depend upon rationality and civility, shared concern, and mutual respect among the members of the academic community. Students, faculty, administrators, trustees—all must recognize their necessary interdependence.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For a list of consultants, see Appendix A.

[2] Statistical evidence presented here, and in Chapter I, is drawn from recent research findings of the American Council on Education, especially from Bayer and Astin, "Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus, 1968–69," Fall 1969, *Education Record*. The authors defined violent protest as any campus incident which involved (a) burning of a building; (b) damage to a building or furnishings; (c) destruction of files, records, or papers; (d) campus march, picketing, or rally with physical violence; and (e) the injury or death to any person. Nonviolent disruptive protest was defined as any campus incident which involved (a) occupation of a building; (b) barring of entrance to a building; (c) holding officials captive; (d) interruption of classes, speeches, or meetings; and (e) general campus strike or boycott of classes or of school functions. The characterizations are those of Bayer and Astin, not of their Committee.

[3] New York: Basic Books, 1968.

[4] Bruno Bettelheim, "Obsolete Youth," *Encounter*, September 1969, pp. 29–42.

[5] *To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility: Final Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 211.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Robert F. Boruch, "The Faculty Role in Campus Unrest," *ACE Research Reports*, Vol. 4, No. 5, 1969.

[8] Martin Trow, "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education," *Daedalus*, Winter 1970, n. 16, pp. 41–42.

[9] George Duke Humphrey, "Securing Legislative Appropriations: An Administrative Viewpoint." *In* Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, *Proceedings*, 1949.

[10] Student rights and guidelines for disciplinary proceedings are discussed in the Report of the American Bar Association's Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent. See also "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students," *AAUP Bulletin*, Summer 1968.

APPENDIX A. CONSULTANTS AND AUTHORS OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Bennett M. Berger, Professor of Sociology, University of California, Davis.

William M. Birenbaum, President, Staten Island Community College.

Landrum R. Bolling, President, Earlham College.

Kenneth E. Boulding, Professor of Economics, University of Colorado.

Sandy Chadwick, Student, American University.

Allen Cloud, Student, Grinnell College.

Norman Cousins, Editor, *Saturday Review*.

Carl Davidson, Assistant Editor, *The Guardian*.

Tom Dawson, Editor, *Stanford Daily*, Stanford University.

Douglas Dowd, Professor of Economics, Cornell University.

Duane Draper, President, Association of Student Governments.

Jack Edens, Association of Student Governments.

David A. Henderson, Campus Affairs Vice-President, United States National Student Association.

Ralph Hetzel, Trustee, Pennsylvania State University.

Robert M. Hundley, Student, Columbia University.

Judson Jerome, Director, Center for Documentary Arts, Antioch Columbia (Antioch College at Columbia, Maryland).

David Johnson, Association of Student Governments.

Louis Joughin, Associate Secretary, American Association of University Professors.

Joseph F. Kauffman, President, Rhode Island College.

David A. Keene, National Chairman, Young Americans for Freedom.

Kenneth Keniston, Professor of Psychology, School of Medicine, Yale University.

Clark Kerr, Chairman, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

David J. Langston, Student, Columbia University.

Seymour Martin Lipset, Professor of Government and Social Relations, Harvard University.

Dean, E. McHenry, Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Steven Muller, Vice-President for Public Affairs, Cornell University.

John A. Peoples, Jr., President, Jackson State College.

Richard E. Peterson, Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service.

Samuel D. Proctor, Professor, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University.

Roger Rapoport, Former Editor, *The Michigan Daily*, University of Michigan.

Marcus Raskin, Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies; Trustee, Antioch College.

Morton A. Rauh, Vice-President, Antioch College.

William M. Roth, Trustee, University of California.

Peter Schrag, Editor, *Change*.

Edward Schwartz, Former President, United States National Student Association.

Charles E. Shepard, Student, Northwestern University.

Andrew Sidell, Student Body President, Pratt Institute of Technology.

Charles Sutton, Association of Student Governments.

Ian M. Thompson, Durango, Colorado.

Steven J. Tonsor, Associate Professor of History, University of Michigan.

David Wanser, Association of Student Governments.

Harris L. Wofford, Jr., President, State University of New York, College at Old Westbury.

Gwendolyn Patton Woods, National Coordinator, National Association of Black Students.

E. William Ziebarth, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota; Trustee, Macalester College.

J. L. Zwingle, Executive Vice-President, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

APPENDIX B.—STATISTICAL TABLES ON CAMPUS UNREST, 1968–69

TABLE 1.—PROTEST ISSUES AT INSTITUTIONS EXPERIENCING INCIDENTS OF VIOLENT OR NONVIOLENT DISRUPTIVE PROTEST: 1968–69 ACADEMIC YEAR

[Weighted population estimates]

Protest issue	Among institutions experiencing violent protests (N=145)		Among institutions experiencing nonviolent disruptive protests (N=379)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
1. U.S. military policy (e.g., Vietnam, CBW, ABM)	56	38.6	144	38.0
2. Selective service policy	40	27.6	88	23.2
3. ROTC programs	55	37.9	65	17.1
4. On-campus military or Government research	43	29.6	40	10.6
5. On-campus recruiting by Government or industry	52	35.9	114	30.1
Total, war-related issues (1–5)	71	49.0	194	51.2
6. Institutional services (e.g., food and medical services, housing and recreation facilities)	45	31.0	105	27.7
7. Institutional parietal rules (e.g., dress, dormitory regulations, drinking, sex, required attendance at school functions)	20	13.8	136	35.9
8. Institutional student disciplinary practices	67	46.2	102	26.9
9. Instructional procedures (e.g., class size, quality of instruction, grading system, student evaluation)	36	24.8	125	33.0
10. Tuition charges and fees	17	11.7	36	9.5
Total, services to students issues (6, 9, 10)	64	44.1	193	50.9
11. Special educational programs for minority groups (e.g., black studies, compe tory programs)	96	66.2	194	51.2
12. Special admissions policies for minority groups	55	37.9	97	25.6
Total, minority group students issues (11–12)	101	69.1	196	51.7
13. Civil rights (e.g., desegregation, voter registration)	7	4.8	17	4.5
14. Labor problems (e.g., wages, benefits, unionization)	28	19.3	10	2.6
15. Administrative indifference or inaction concerning local community problems	61	42.1	29	7.6
Total, off-campus issues (1–5; 13–15)	102	70.3	214	56.5
16. Police brutality	37	25.5	13	3.4
17. Requests or demands of amnesty	46	31.7	50	13.2
18. Administrative indifference or inaction concerning previous protest grievances	63	43.4	106	28.0

APPENDIX B.—STATISTICAL TABLES ON CAMPUS UNREST, 1968-69—Continued

TABLE 1.—PROTEST ISSUES AT INSTITUTIONS EXPERIENCING INCIDENTS OF VIOLENT OR NONVIOLENT DISRUPTIVE PROTEST: 1968-69 ACADEMIC YEAR—Continued

[Weighted population estimates]

Protest issue	Among institutions experiencing violent protests (N=145)		Among institutions experiencing nonviolent disruptive protests (N=379)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
19. Administrative response to previous protests	45	31.0	67	17.7
20. Mourning for students or others killed or wounded	22	15.2	34	9.0
Total, secondary issues (16-20)	96	66.2	157	41.4
21. Student participation in decisionmaking (e.g., inclusion on committees)	78	53.8	147	38.8
22. Free expression (e.g., censorship of publications, exclusion of "controversial" speakers)	19	13.1	51	13.5
23. Faculty (e.g., academic freedom, hiring, tenure)	51	35.2	65	17.1
Total, student power issues (7, 8, 21-23)	113	77.9	283	74.7
24. Other	30	20.7	60	15.8
Grand total (1-24)	145	100.0	379	100.0

Source: Office of Research, American Council on Education.

TABLE 2.—IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES OF PROTEST INCIDENTS ON CAMPUSES EXPERIENCING VIOLENT OR NONVIOLENT DISRUPTIVE PROTEST: 1968-69 ACADEMIC YEAR

[Weighted population estimates]

Direct results and consequences	Among 145 institutions experiencing violent protests		Among 379 institutions experiencing nonviolent disruptive protests	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
1. National Guard called in	2	1.4	0	0
2. Off-campus police called in	80	55.2	45	11.9
3. One or more persons killed	8	5.5	0	0
4. Some persons injured	45	31.0	0	0
5. Some protesters arrested	82	56.6	19	5.0
6. Some protesters indicted	37	25.5	10	2.6
Total, civil action against individual students (5-6)	87	60.0	24	6.3
7. Temporary restraining order or court injunction obtained	28	19.3	25	6.6
8. Classes suspended	60	41.4	42	11.1
9. National press or television coverage given to protest	69	47.6	143	37.7
10. Administration or faculty negotiated issues with demonstrators	90	62.1	316	83.4
11. Formal statement issued by faculty in support of protesters	43	29.6	67	17.7
12. One or more students dismissed or expelled	21	14.5	19	5.0
13. Some students suspended or put on probation	48	33.1	69	18.2
14. Formal student reprimands issued	52	35.8	41	10.8
15. Financial assistance withdrawn from some protesters	13	9.0	6	1.6
Total, major institutional discipline against individual students (12, 13, 15)	56	38.6	80	21.1
Total, either civil or institutional action against individual students (5, 6, 12, 13, 15)	109	75.2	84	22.2
16. Some faculty or administrators resigned as a result of the protest	13	9.0	2	.5
17. Other	23	15.9	29	7.6

Source: Office of Research, American Council on Education.

TABLE 3.—INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES AS RELATED TO MAJOR INCIDENTS OF CAMPUS PROTEST, 1968-69 ACADEMIC YEAR

[Weighted population estimates]

Changes	As a direct result of protest incident				Not as a direct result of protest incident					
	On campuses experiencing violent protests (N=145)		On campuses experiencing nonviolent disruptive protests (N=379)		On campuses experiencing violent protests (N=145)		On campuses experiencing nonviolent disruptive protests (N=379)		On campuses not experiencing violent or nonviolent disruptive protests (N=1818)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
1. Establishment of black studies program or department	68	46.9	34	9.0	44	30.3	186	49.1	324	17.8
2. Institution of other curriculum changes	32	22.1	74	19.5	86	59.3	218	57.5	749	41.2
3. Institution of special admissions policies for minority group members	23	15.9	19	5.0	38	26.2	76	20.1	155	8.5
Total, changes in racial policies (1, 3)	80	55.2	42	11.1	61	42.1	202	53.3	424	23.3
4. Liberalization of parietal rules	8	5.5	47	12.4	78	53.8	156	41.2	448	24.6
5. Changes in institutional rules and regulations governing students	17	11.7	54	14.2	79	54.5	187	49.3	746	41.0
6. Provision to students of greater voice or representation on existing committees	33	22.8	69	18.2	81	55.9	194	51.2	823	45.3
Total, changes in student power (4-6)	37	25.5	118	31.1	104	71.7	258	68.1	1,062	58.4
7. Formation of new committees or study groups on campus	78	53.8	131	34.6	89	61.4	145	38.3	604	33.2
8. Termination of ROTC program	4	2.8	2	.5	0	0	0	0	3	.2
9. Changes in ROTC program, such as making it elective	16	11.0	14	3.7	4	2.8	16	4.2	19	1.0
10. Discontinuation of some campus research for the military	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	2	.5	0	0
11. Prohibition of on-campus recruiting for some organizations	6	4.1	12	3.2	0	0	0	0	11	.6
Total, substantive institutional changes (1-6, 8-11)	104	71.7	204	53.8	116	80.0	336	88.6	1,128	62.0
12. Other	13	9.0	31	8.2	5	3.4	5	1.3	36	2.0

Source: Office of Research, American Council on Education.

TABLE 4.—INSTITUTIONAL SIZE AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENT AND NONVIOLENT DISRUPTIVE PROTEST BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

[Weighted population estimates]

Enrollment	2-Year colleges			4-Year colleges			Universities		
	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest
Under 500	224	0	0	129	3.1	4.7			
500 to 999	169	0	0	394	2.5	17.5	54	0	0
1,000 to 5,000	303	4.3	2.6	591	5.4	23.5	29	13.8	69.0
Over 5,000	68	16.2	35.3	159	13.8	23.9	222	22.1	42.0
Total	764	3.1	4.2	1,273	5.3	19.8	305	17.4	31.1

Source: Office of Research, American Council on Education.

TABLE 5.—INSTITUTIONAL SELECTIVITY AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENT AND NONVIOLENT DISRUPTIVE PROTEST BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

[Weighted population estimates]

Selectivity level	2-Year colleges			4-Year colleges			Universities		
	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest	N	Percent with violent protest	Percent with nonviolent disruptive protest
Low	608	3.0	5.2	307	3.9	14.0	72	0	0
Low intermediate	150	4.0	0	362	5.2	7.0	51	11.8	5.8
High intermediate	6	0	0	454	4.2	28.2	124	19.4	53.2
High				150	12.0	37.3	58	39.7	44.8
Total	764	3.1	4.2	1,273	5.3	19.8	305	17.4	31.1

Note: The institutional selectivity score is the median standardized score on the ACT, SAT, or National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test for students entering each U.S. college or university. These scores are coded into seven broad categories of institutional selectivity. For further specification of data sources and procedures, see Alexander W. Astin, "Predicting Success in College" (New York: Free Press, forthcoming).

Source: Office of Research, American Council on Education.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. MOSHER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO), for Monday, May 11, on account of official business.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. YATRON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for May 11 through May 14, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS to extend his remarks following the President's message on the International Coffee Agreement today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. LUKENS in two instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in four instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARBSTEIN in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. MCFALL.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.

Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. MOORHEAD in four instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in seven instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4869. An act to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona;

H.R. 15694. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard;

H.R. 15945. An act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; and

H.R. 15980. An act to make certain revisions in the retirement benefits of District of Columbia public school teachers and other educational employees, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4869. To further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona;

H.R. 15694. To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard;

H.R. 15945. To authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; and

H.R. 15980. To make certain revisions in the retirement benefits of District of Columbia public school teachers and other educational employees, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 12, 1970 at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers table and referred as follows:

2042. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 3, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Mobile Harbor, Ala. (Theodore Ship Channel), in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 24, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 91–335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2043. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of the estimated value of certain support furnished from military functions appropriations for the third quarter of fiscal year 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 638 of Public Law 91–171; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2044. A letter from the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Army, transmitting notification of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and national forest lands at Monroe Reservoir and Cannelton locks and dam projects in Indiana, pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 505a and 505b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2045. A letter from the General Sales Manager, Export Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements signed for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 during March and April, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2046. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report that no advances were authorized to the Lower Colorado River Basin development fund during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of Public Law 90–537; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2047. A letter from the Legislative Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting a revision in the letters accompanying two drafts of proposed legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2048. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the final conclusion in docket No. 153, *The Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Plaintiffs v. the United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 2734a(a) and 2734b(a) of title 10, United States Code, to provide for settlement, under international agreements, of certain claims incident to the noncombat activities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2050. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on Federal grants awarded for constructing waste treatment facilities which benefit industrial users, Federal Water Quality Administration, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2051. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on questionable claims under the medicaid program for the care of persons in State institutions for the mentally retarded in California, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Submitted May 8, 1970*]

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 994. H.R. 17548, a bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–1063). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9017. A bill to permit the District of Columbia Council to make rules and regulations under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1064). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15033. A bill to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1065). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 960. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 (Rept. No. 91–1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 11, 1970*]

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2624. An Act to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14306. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 91–1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause or rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13469. A bill for the relief of John R. Gosnell; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14449. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr. (Rept. No. 91–1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of James M. Buster; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 17549. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 17550. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits, to improve computation methods, and to raise the earnings base under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis upon improvements in the operating effectiveness of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 17551. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWGER (for himself, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. DENT, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. REES, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. MIZE, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 17552. A bill to improve law enforcement in urban areas by making available funds to improve the effectiveness of police services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 17553. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to add two Members of Congress to the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 17554. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. CAREY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. O'HARA, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 17555. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 17556. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado):

H.R. 17557. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 17558. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to revise the promotion system for certain officers of the Reserve components of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17559. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17560. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish education programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 17561. A bill to authorize the secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge in California and/or adjacent Western States for the preservation of the California tule elk; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 17562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17563. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 17564. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the term "claim" as used therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

H.R. 17565. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 17566. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 17567. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17568. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 17569. A bill to provide for the regulation of present and future surface and strip mining, for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface and strip miner areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 17570. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 17571. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 17572. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to give the Muscatine Bridge Commission additional time to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 17573. A bill to extend for 1 year the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17574. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to war risk insurance; to the Committee on Interstate ond Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.J. Res. 1227. A joint resolution designating July 12, 1970, as "Salute to Armed Forces in Vietnam Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 1228. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-Ins' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 607. Concurrent resolution, the Congress reaffirms its constitutional responsibility of consultation with the President on matters affecting grave national issues of war and peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 608. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding troop withdrawals from Vietnam and Cambodia, national policy in Southeast Asia and congressional responsibility for consultation with the President in all matters of war and peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 609. Concurrent resolution on the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Res. 996. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the election of a Member of the House as chairman of any standing committee if he has attained the age of 70 years; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HULL:

H. Res. 997. Resolution to authorize a select committee of the House to study firsthand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and then report its findings to the House of Representatives within 30 days of its adoption; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 998. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 999. Resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Res. 1000. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. LANGEN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. REES, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 1001. Resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives with respect to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. Res. 1002. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

378. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the use of lands in Fort Totten, N.Y., for hospital facilities and park and recreation purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

379. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

474. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Boston Housing Authority, Boston, Mass.,

relative to the war in Southeast Asia and national priorities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

475. Also, petition of a meeting of the faculty, students, and staff of the Department of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

476. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

477. Also, petition of the 12th district, Department of Louisiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, relative to support of the President's actions on Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

478. Also, petition of Norman M. Gelfand, et al., Chicago, Ill., relative to impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. Also, petition of the Canaveral Port Authority, Port Canaveral, Fla., relative to designating Cape Kennedy as the operational base for the space shuttle system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE OUTLOOK FOR A MORE DYNAMIC TRANSPORT ACTION SYSTEM

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1970, Mr. Robert E. Redding, the Housing Director in the Office of Facilitation located within the Department of Transportation spoke before the Middle West Shipper-Motor Carrier conference in Springfield, Mo. Mr. Redding's speech entitled, "The Outlook for a More Dynamic Transport Action System," sets forth the ideas and policies the Nixon administration is proposing and implementing, so as to provide the United States with an efficient transportation system. I certainly feel Mr. Redding's remarks merit the attention of both the House of Representatives and the American public.

The text follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR A MORE DYNAMIC TRANSPORT ACTION SYSTEM

I

When President Nixon on March 26 approved the official observance of National Transportation Week, to be observed later this month, its significance to the nation's economy took on new meaning.

Transportation becomes even more impressive when you realize that 13 percent of the nation's work force is engaged in some form of transport-related business. Significant also is the fact that some 20 percent of the nation's Gross National Product emanates from transportation goods and services!

A few years ago, some 10 percent of our total U.S. net civilian investment was in privately owned transportation facilities. It is estimated that public and private investment today amounts to more than one-half trillion dollars.

What a wonderful tribute it is to private enterprise that the world's finest transportation system exists in a nation—our very own—which possesses the world's only privately owned and operated inter-city transportation system!

Yet, as Transportation Secretary John Volpe says, "We are suddenly aware that our transportation system is not good enough. We have now come face to face with the inescapable fact that there is a vital public responsibility in this traditionally autonomous industry."

The Department of Transportation was established in April 1967 to develop an efficient, economical and safe national transportation system. That is quite an order.

And I doubt that anyone in those early months of the Department fully realized the broad dimensions of such a task. In fact, much of our effort in the last three years has been consumed by the simple need to define the properties of a national system.

We studied present transport operations and projected future needs. We developed policies which give direction to planning a total and balanced transportation system.

And we have now reached the point where systems implementation must begin—where we must apply our knowledge to produce constructive change.

As we enter the decade of the Seventies, we are prone to think of "technology" in rather glamorous terms. After all, we just left a ten-year period which included development of the space ship, the jumbo jet, the laser, and the mini-skirt.

The Seventies will, no doubt, contain similar advancements. But if we are to really begin putting the pieces of our transportation system together, the next ten years will have to produce some comparatively pedestrian advances—such as automatic signalling devices, rapid excavation equipment, and safer highway guard rails.

II

By far the largest portion of the transportation services we use in this country is provided by highways.

In 1968, the latest year on which we have information, total transportation costs throughout the nation were $171 billion—highways accounted for $142 billion, or *83 percent of the total.*

Breaking it down further, we find that truck movements account for $55 billion, or 73 percent of the total transportation freight bill, while movements by automobile and bus account for $87 billion, or 90 percent of the cost of passenger transport.

In intercity travel in 1969, it is estimated that of 1,130 billion person miles of travel, 977 billion were by automobile and 26 billion by bus, for a total of 1,003 billion, or 88 percent of the intercity total. Air travel was second with less than 10 percent of the total.

Urban areas are almost totally dependent on highway transportation. In 1968, in urban areas of more than 50,000 population, over 97 percent of all persons miles of travel were by highway vehicle.

In smaller urban areas the proportion of travel by highway is practically 100 percent.

In the movement of goods, virtually all movement within urban areas is by truck. In intercity movement, highway transportation is larger than many realize. Of a total of some 1,850 billion ton miles of goods movement in 1968, 430 billion, or about 23 percent, were by truck. Rail movement, with its longer haul distances, accounted for 41 percent.

However, the value of truck transportation is considerably greater in proportion, as indicated by the fact that regulated and private truck carriers together accounted for 73 percent of the freight transportation bill.

In presenting these figures, I do not mean to minimize the contributions of any of the other modes in our transportation system. All of the transport modes are needed to provide the mobility of people and goods our nation requires, and each of the modes should be encouraged to do the job it does best as complementary—not competing—elements of the total transportation system.

But, the figures are evidence of the fact that within our national transportation system, highways are the predominant mode. They provide the overwhelming proportion of the transportation services used by Americans today. They are the backbone of our whole mobility network.

There is every reason, also, to believe that highways will continue to be the predominant mode in the future. There is no alternative in sight which can provide either the volume or the variety of transportation services which are so indispensable to the way of life we Americans have chosen.

Motor vehicle travel now exceeds a trillion vehicle miles a year, and is expected to reach 1.5 trillion miles in 1985, or about a 50 percent increase in 15 years. This would follow a 100 percent increase in the preceding similar period of time.

This gives some indication of the dimensions of the challenge facing the highway program.

III

Our Federal Highway Administrator recently told Congress that the motorist driving on the Interstate Highway System "is probably the only taxpayer who gets his dollar back, with interest."

In the DOT stewardship report to Congress, the following major accomplishments and contributions were listed:

A relocation housing program that assures persons forced to move because of highway improvements decent, safe and sanitary housing. This means better housing for some 25,000 families annually.

Training programs which lead to permanent jobs for more than 60 per cent of the minority persons who participate.

A nation-wide planning program which has helped 233 urban areas of 50,000 population or more to achieve comprehensive plans for their communities.

A renewed emphasis on highway safety. Every 1,000 miles of Interstate highway opened to traffic means 200 fewer traffic deaths had older roads been used. Also, a special "spot safety improvement" program of the past few years has seen 7,158 projects costing $1.06 billion completed. At the same time, the States, with their own funding, have improved some 18,500 such spots. These are small projects which produce dramatic reductions in accidents.

A survey of all bridges in the Nation and establishment of national inspection standards for these bridges. Programs to train bridge inspectors are underway.

A number of transit improvement projects, ranging from exclusive bus lanes and extra median width for rapid transit facilities to a series of special feasibility studies and an urban corridor demonstration program are being conducted jointly with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Twelve percent of all highway program funds now are directly associated with social and environmental factors and at least that much again is indirectly concerned with environment.

The Department of Transportation, under Secretary Volpe, is setting the pace. We are working to bring about a new vitality, a new concern, a new dedication.

IV

I would now like to conclude my remarks today with a brief description of my Office of Facilitation which is responsible to DOT