

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 29, 1970

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

Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not: behold your God will come and save you.—Isaiah 35: 4.

Almighty and everlasting God, quiet our hearts and strengthen our spirits as we wait upon Thee in prayer. During trying times like these keep us steadfast and strong and renew in us the assurance that goodness never fades, truth never falters, love never fails. May there come to us the lift of life that is given to those whose talents are dedicated to noble purposes and whose lives are devoted to the welfare of our country.

We pray for our beloved America that in this day of decision she may be delivered from all envy and greed, all misunderstanding, and ill will which are the seeds of division and be led to a finer spirit of unity and a greater desire to serve which will make her quick to welcome every adventure in cooperation and open wide the doors of opportunity to all men: To the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 25, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1695. An act for the relief of Alfredo Caprara;

H.R. 1698. An act for the relief of Joeck Kuncck;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.

H.R. 2315. An act for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fullar;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 4246. An act to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees.

H.R. 4247. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress and to provide equivalent authority for administrative settlement and payment of claims under section 2733 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, United States Code;

H.R. 4574. An act to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands;

H.R. 13407. An act to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact;

H.R. 13740. An act for the relief of Kimball Bros. Lumber Co.;

H.R. 14118. An act to amend section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for

the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 573. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Ohio State University; and

H. Con. Res. 575. Concurrent resolution that the Congress sends congratulations and greetings to Ohio Northern University on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding and extends the hope of the people of the United States that Ohio Northern University will continue to grow and prosper in centuries yet to come.

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. 15733. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15 per centum increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16916. An act making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17868. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 16916) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17868) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes"; request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 10, 15, and 50 and recedes

from its amendments numbered 13 and 16, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12858) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12941. An act to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15021. An act to authorize the release of 42,200,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15831. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15832. An act to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15833. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15835. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15836. An act to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15837. An act to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15838. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15839. An act to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15998. An act to authorize the disposal of Surinam-type metallurgical grade bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16289. An act to authorize the disposal of natural Ceylon amorphous lump graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16290. An act to authorize the disposal of refractory grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16291. An act to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16292. An act to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 16295. An act to authorize the disposal of natural battery grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 16297. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

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

S. 737. An act for the relief of Konrad Ludwig Staudinger;

S. 783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Martens;

S. 1187. An act for the relief of Marcos Rojas Rodriguez;

S. 1628. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, and related purposes;

S. 2514. An act for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader;

S. 2661. An act for the relief of Kathryn Talbot;

S. 2916. An act to establish the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission;

S. 3122. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the Southern Division of the Southern District of Mississippi at Gulfport, Miss.;

S. 3167. An act for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke;

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Curtis Nolan Reed;

S. 3263. An act for the relief of Maria Pierotti Lenzi;

S. 3265. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Ordillas;

S. 3364. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Raul Jose Bruno Martorell y Fernandez (Jorge R. Martorell);

S. 3461. An act for the relief of Dr. Amado G. Chanco, Jr.;

S. 3630. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission;

S. 3675. An act for the relief of Ming Chang;

S. 3994. An act for the relief of 1st Sgt. Albert F. Thompson, U.S. Army, retired;

S. 4012. An act to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for a period of 60 days;

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; and

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to extend the reporting date of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JUNE 26, 1970.

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

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 25, 1970, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed without amendment the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 1259) entitled "Joint Resolution to extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to July 30, 1970."

Respectfully yours,

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, June 25, 1970, he did on June 26, 1970, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House:

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Borgnino;

H.R. 8512. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa; and

H.J. Res. 1259. Joint resolution to extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to July 30, 1970.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17868, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17868) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, CHAIMO, PATTEN, PRYOR of Arkansas, OBEY, MAHON, DAVIS of Wisconsin, RIEGLE, WYATT, and Bow.

APPRECIATION TO THE FIRST LADY, MRS. RICHARD NIXON

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to express my appreciation for the First Lady of the United States who has traveled by Presidential aircraft to Peru with a mercy shipment of supplies for the stricken survivors of the recent Peruvian earthquake which claimed some 50,000 lives.

In this expression of genuine compassion and heartfelt concern, Mrs. Nixon and her mission of mercy symbolize that which is best in this Nation. May her journey serve as a reminder everywhere that a great nation is a grateful nation, neither calloused by the accountments of its own well-being nor impervious to the worldwide fellowship of suffering, but sensitive to the needs of humanity and anxious to share of its own beneficent abundance with those whom misfortune has visited so cruelly.

Symbolically the First Lady represents today the best and deepest natural impulse of the American people which is not to be the envy of the world, but rather in simple acts of human kindness to be an inspiration to the world, faithful to the teaching of Him who said:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12858, DISPOSITION OF FUNDS AWARDED TO TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS, ALASKA

Mr. HALEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12858), to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1241)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12858) to provide for the disposition of cer-

tain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendment.

JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
ROY A. TAYLOR,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE MCGOVERN,
LEE METCALF,
MIKE GRAVEL,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
THEODORE F. STEVENS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The Managers on the Part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 12858, to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States, submit this statement in explanation of the action recommended and adopted in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment deletes the requirement that the Secretary of the Interior must approve the purposes and the manner of expending or using the claims judgment recovered by the Tlingit and Haida Indians. The amendment places complete control over the money in the Central Council of the tribe.

The Conference Committee recommends that the Senate recede from its amendment and agree to the bill in the form it passed the House. This follows the consistent practice adopted by the Congress when authorizing the use of other judgment funds by other tribes.

JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
ROY A. TAYLOR,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

AGRICULTURE ACT EXPIRES TOMORROW

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the present Agriculture Act expires tomorrow and apparently, the administration's philosophy of "benign neglect" has broadened to include the Nation's farmers.

This is a tragedy of unmeasured consequences. It is an indication of national neglect that holds the potential for disaster. If we do not pass a farm bill soon, the farmers have every right to rise up in outrageous protest.

The farmer needs help from Congress and understanding from the public they feed. Farmers do not need the hypocrisy we read in leading newspapers. Farmers do not need the headline-hunting charges from urban representatives. Farmers do not need the stubbornness of this administration that refuses any farm bill but its own. And farmers do not need the present division within the Agriculture Committee.

What we need is a viable, workable

farm bill. The lack of national concern is staggering. Even after hearings for more than a year, we are not one acre closer to a good farm program, or at least we are apparently fields apart.

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in the leadership of our colleagues, W. R. POAGE and PAGE BELCHER. I want to have confidence in Secretary Hardin. But I am afraid my confidence is not shared by the farmers of this Nation. And it will not be shared until we demonstrate that we can draft a good farm program. We in Congress must listen—and help.

STRAIGHT FROM THE HEARTLAND

(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 take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, a special one-half hour program to be televised tonight, June 29, at 10:30 e.d.t., over the American Broadcasting Co. network, entitled "Straight from the Heartland." This is a one-half hour documentary film segment of ABC network's "Now" series, which each Monday evening probes major issues of our society with in-depth reporting.

"Straight from the Heartland" was filmed recently in Grand Island, Nebr., a community located in the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I represent. Grand Island is near the center of Nebraska, and was chosen for this documentary by ABC, because of its location near the geographical center of the United States.

The program to be shown tonight is concerned with whether or not there is a "silent majority" of the population in the United States. In connection with the program, ABC commissioned a private firm to survey the thoughts, feelings, and opinions of Middle America. Those opinions are expressed in the documentary, from more than 500 interviews for this survey in a typical Midwestern small city. It includes opinions on major national issues ranging from the war in Asia and state of the economy, to civil rights, drugs, and youth of today.

I think that my colleagues will find this program interesting and informative as it reflects the thoughts and sentiments of millions of people throughout the Nation who are part of the silent majority, and I commend it to my colleagues for viewing.

CONTINUING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON MANGANESE ORE AND AMENDING SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14720) to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore—including ferruginous ore—and related products, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) (1) Section 1006 of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 is amended by—

"(A) inserting '(1)' immediately after 'paid to any individual';

"(B) striking out '(1)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(A)';

"(C) striking out '(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(B)'; and

"(D) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: '(2) as annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, if such amount is paid in a lump-sum to carry out any retroactive increase in annuities or pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 brought about by reason of the enactment (after May 30, 1970 and prior to December 31, 1970) of any Act which increases, retroactively, the amount of such annuities or pensions'.

"(2) The heading to such section 106 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'AND OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFIT INCREASE.'

"(b) (1) Section 1007 of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 is amended by—

"(A) striking out 'July 1970' and inserting in lieu thereof "November 1970";

"(B) inserting '(1)' immediately after 'also receives in such month';

"(C) inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ', or (2) a monthly payment of annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 which is increased as a result of the enactment (after May 30, 1970, and before December 31, 1970) of any Act which provides general increases in the amount of the annuities or pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, the sum of the aid or assistance received by him for such month, plus the monthly amount of such annuity or pension received by him in such month (not including any part of such annuity or pension which is disregarded under section 1006), shall (except as otherwise provided in the succeeding sentence) exceed the sum of the aid or assistance which would have been received by him for such month under such plan as in effect for March 1970, plus the monthly annuity or pension which would have been received by him in such month without regard to provisions of the Act enacted by such enactment, by an amount equal to \$4 or (if less) to such increase in his monthly annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 (whether such excess is brought about by disregarding a portion of such annuity or pension or otherwise)'; and

"(D) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'If, in the case of any individual, the provisions of both clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence are applicable to him with respect to any month, any increase in the annuity or pension (referred to in clause (2) of the preceding sentence) of such individual for such month shall, for purposes of such sentence, be treated as an additional increase in the amount of his monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act for such month in lieu of an increase for such month in his annuity or pension (as so referred to)'.

"(2) The heading to such section 1007 is amended by inserting 'AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT RECIPIENTS' immediately after 'RECIPIENTS'.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the

existing suspension of duties on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products, and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we could proceed, I suppose, with a discussion, but I reserve the right to object to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for an explanation of the minor Senate amendments adopted.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Finance added a new section to the bill, H.R. 14720, which, as you will recall, would continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore—including ferruginous ore—and related products. The new section relates to the present provision of the Social Security Act that requires the States to assure that social security beneficiaries who are also public assistance recipients under the programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled receive an increase of at least \$4 a month in their combined income from social security and public assistance.

This provision, the so-called \$4 pass-along requirement, which accompanied the 15-percent social security benefit increase enacted last December applies only to months prior to July 1970. It was enacted as a temporary provision in order to allow Congress an opportunity to consider the matter in connection with its work on major welfare proposals this year. This matter has already been considered and acted upon by the House. The proposed Family Assistance Act of 1970, H.R. 16311, which passed the House on April 16, 1970, would make the \$4 pass-along requirement permanent. Since the Senate has not yet completed action on H.R. 16311, it added to the bill now under consideration a provision extending the \$4 pass-along requirement for an additional 4-month period, through October of 1970, to permit the Congress time to act on a permanent extension of the requirement as part of its major welfare legislation.

In addition to extending the pass-along provision for another 4 months, the Senate amendment also provides that the requirement would apply to public assistance recipients who receive an increase in railroad retirement benefits. The House of Representatives has already passed H.R. 15733 which would increase railroad retirement benefits by 15 percent effective January 1970. Thus, equal treatment would be granted to railroad retirement recipients under the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, each of the States has taken action to implement the \$4 pass-along provision either by providing that \$4 of the 15-percent benefit increase enacted in December be disregarded in determining eligibility for benefits under the aged, blind, or disabled programs or

by increasing their standards used in determining eligibility under the programs by at least \$4 a month.

I believe that the House should accept the Senate amendment in order that the \$4 pass-along provision may be kept in force until Congress has had an opportunity to complete its action on the legislation which would enact the provision permanently.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would add only that I believe we should bear in mind, so far as the amendment added by the Senate is concerned, the House has gone on record favoring the principle of the amendment. In fact, we went on record as favoring it as a permanent proposition rather than the limited proposition of 4 months as contained in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17825, LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1111 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1111

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. 17825) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1111 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17825, Law Enforcement Assistance Act amendments of 1970.

The purpose of H.R. 17825 is to make the law enforcement assistance program more responsive to local crime problems,

insure greater participation by local governments in the planning processes, and enable the most effective use of Federal crime control funds in programs where they can have the greatest impact. The bill would amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 that established the Federal law enforcement assistance program.

Under the present act, the powers, duties and functions of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—are vested in a three-man Board composed of an Administrator and two Associate Administrators appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. H.R. 17825 would amend the act to abolish the triumvirate system and substitute a single Administrator. This should improve the administrative efficiency and staff capabilities.

In order to convince the States and cities that they can rely on the intent and continuity of the Federal undertaking, the Federal financial share is enlarged to expedite needed improvements and reform. The bill authorizes \$650 million for fiscal year 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972, and \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1973. The House in May approved H.R. 17575 approving an appropriation of \$480 million for LEAA for fiscal year 1971. This authorization would enable them to request additional funds.

A new grant program would be established for improving correctional facilities. Grant funds designated for planning, implementation of construction and renovation programs would be distributed to States and local units. Fifty percent of the funds would be allocated to State planning agencies according to their respective needs. The other 50 percent would be available for direct grants to State agencies or local units. The share of Federal expenditures for construction under this program would be upped from 50 percent to 75 percent.

The bill amends the 1968 act by making LEAA approval of a State plan for law enforcement assistance dependent on an express finding that the plan provides for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of a high crime rate. The States would be required to contribute a part of the non-Federal share of the cost of the programs to assist local units under the so-called matching requirement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule, House Resolution 1111.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) House Resolution 1111 does provide an open rule with 3 hours of debate for the consideration of this bill (H.R. 17825) known as the Law Enforcement Assistance Act amendments.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for the act for a 3-year period, through fiscal 1973, to reorganize the administrative operation of the program, to establish a program of grants to construct and modernize correction facilities and to require the States contribute one-quarter of the non-Federal

share of funding needed to support local government projects which receive Federal assistance.

The bill authorizes \$650,000,000 for fiscal 1971; \$1,000,000,000 for 1972; \$1,500,000,000 for 1973. This is a large increase over current spending—\$268,000,000 for fiscal 1970—but the progress of the States and local governments in getting their planning underway on comprehensive crimefighting, as well as the magnitude of problems facing our Nation due to crime, require that we attack the problem head on.

The bill sets up a new program in connection with authorizing the States to construct or modernize their correctional institutions. We will take 75 percent of that cost.

The bill is supported by the administration, as is evidenced by a letter from the Attorney General to the Speaker contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, there are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I supported this program when it started some 3 years ago. Crime, however, still continues on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, if enacted, provides a considerable amount of money. If money will stop crime, we certainly are on the road toward doing it in this bill.

As I said 3 years ago when we started this program, until such time as the courts and judges and juries and prosecutors and probation officers, ministers, parents, teachers, and everyone else decide they want to improve our moral fabric, we will not be able to stop the increases in crime.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine that next year when they come up for appropriations we will not have experienced much of a reduction in crime and until we start treating criminals as criminals and until we reach that point, we will not be able to stop the increase in crime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12941, TO RELEASE CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12941) to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent

that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts if in this entire list of 17 bills to be considered by unanimous consent, it is true that the other body receded in all areas on all 17 of the bills and added no amendments; and that there is nothing in the form of a nongermane amendment to the House-passed legislation?

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I may say that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is correct in every respect.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15021, TO RELEASE COBALT FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15021) to authorize the release of 40,000,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Is there any way under the rules of the House whereby these reports might be considered en bloc and disposed of rather expeditiously by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa in response to his parliamentary inquiry that under the mechanics of the rules of the House it will not be possible at this time to consider these conference reports en bloc because each report must be acted upon individually.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15831, RELEASE OF BISMUTH FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15831) to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15832, RELEASE OF CASTOR OIL FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15832) to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15833, RELEASE OF FLUORSPAR FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15833) to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15835, RELEASE OF MAGNESIUM FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15835) to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15836,
RELEASE OF MANGANESE ORE,
TYPE A, FROM STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15836) to authorize the disposal of type A chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading).

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15837,
RELEASE OF MANGANESE ORE,
TYPE B, FROM STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15837) to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R.
15838, RELEASE OF SHELLAC FROM
STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15838) to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R.
15839, RELEASE OF TUNGSTEN
FROM STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15839) to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15998,
RELEASE OF SURINAM-TYPE
BAUXITE FROM STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15998) to authorize the disposal of suri-

nam-type metallurgical grade bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16289,
RELEASE OF NATURAL CEYLON
AMORPHOUS LUMP GRAPHITE
FROM STOCKPILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16289) to authorize the disposal of natural Ceylon amorphous lump graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16290,
RELEASE OF REFRACTORY GRADE
CHROMITE ORE FROM STOCK-
PILE**

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16290) to authorize the disposal of refractory grade chromite from the na-

tional stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16291, RELEASE OF ASBESTOS FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16291) to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16292, RELEASE OF CORUNDUM FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16292) to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16295, RELEASE OF MANGANESE ORE, BATTERY GRADE, FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16295) to authorize the disposal of natural battery grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16297, RELEASE OF MOLYBDENUM FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16297) to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOCKPILE DISPOSAL BILLS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this completes final action on 17 stockpile disposal bills with a current market value of nearly one-half billion dollars.

As we recall, these bills were passed by the House in the format proposed by the Administrator of General Services Administration and specifically provided that the commodities provided by the legislation may be disposed of only after publicly advertising for bids, unless the Administrator determines that methods of disposal other than by public advertising are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable losses, or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets. When these bills

were considered on the floor of the Senate an amendment was introduced to each bill which limited the disposal of these commodities to a single method of disposal, namely, to the highest responsible bidder after publicly advertising for competitive bids. During the committee's consideration of these bills representatives from the interested Government agencies and industry testified that disposal of commodities in this manner in every instance would be disruptive to the ordinary marketing of these materials because it could upset the stable price structure of the materials in the market and could cause a decline in the market price. More importantly, it would eliminate the flexibility needed by the General Services Administration in its method of sale and preclude them from complying with existing law.

In view of the restrictions placed on General Services Administration by the Senate amendments, the House conferees were adamant in their opposition to these amendments and the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments, agreeing to the original House language.

The conference reports on the 17 stockpile bills approved by the House today will enable the Government to convert these excesses to revenues in the amount of approximately one-half billion dollars, thus acting as an effective weapon against inflation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEPPE. 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. 192]

Adair	Culver	Hastings
Anderson, Ill.	Daddario	Hawkins
Anderson, Tenn.	Dawson	Hays
Andrews, N. Dak.	de la Garza	Hébert
Ashbrook	Denney	Hosmer
Ashley	Dent	Jarman
Aspinall	Dickinson	Jonas
Ayres	Diggs	Jones, Tenn.
Baring	Dingell	Karth
Bell, Calif.	Dorn	Keith
Berry	Dulski	Kirwan
Biaggi	Eckhardt	Koch
Bingham	Edwards, La.	Kuykendall
Bianton	Esch	Latta
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Long, La.
Bolling	Fallon	Lowenstein
Bow	Farbstein	McCloskey
Brasco	Findley	McClure
Brock	Fish	Macdonald,
Brooks	Flowers	Mass.
Brown, Mich.	Ford,	MacGregor
Buchanan	William D.	Mann
Burton, Utah	Fraser	Mathias
Bush	Frelinghuysen	May
Carey	Frey	Meeds
Cederberg	Fulton, Tenn.	Mollohan
Clancy	Gallagher	Monagan
Clark	Gallagher	Montgomery
Clausen, Don. H.	Gaydos	Moorhead
Clay	Gilbert	Morton
Conyers	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Corbett	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass
Coughlin	Griffin	Ottinger
Cramer	Halpern	Passman
	Hamilton	Patman
	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
	Harrington	Pirnie

Poff	Ryan	Vander Jagt
Pollock	St Germain	Vigorito
Powell	Sandman	Waldie
Price, Tex.	Saylor	Watson
Pryor, Ark.	Sikes	Weicker
Rarick	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Rivers	Taft	Charles H.
Robison	Teague, Tex.	Wold
Rooney, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.	Wyder
Roudebush	Turney	Wyman
Ruth	Udall	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 291 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

HONOR AMERICA DAY

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 669) recognizing the importance of Honor America Day, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 669

Whereas the Congress wishes to lend support to the rekindling of the American spirit of patriotism and respect for the individual liberties that made America great; and

Whereas the Congress wishes to underscore the fact that though Americans face problems as individuals and as a nation they are proud of their country and welcome the opportunity to honor America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes the importance of the July 4, 1970, Honor America Day celebrations and calls upon the people of the United States to observe such celebrations with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Mr. CELLER. 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. 17825) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes.

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

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. 17825, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI 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 New York (Mr. CELLER) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, today the fear as well as the fact of crime haunts America. The increasing numbers of armed robberies, muggings, and forcible assaults have become the immediate terrifying concern of all our citizens. Controlling crime in a democratic society as our own presents a number of distinct challenges. Crime in America is essentially defined by State and local law. The vast bulk of these acts are investigated, prosecuted, tried, and convictions are had through State and local institutions. Local law enforcement agencies are basically the "front line," as it were.

The law enforcement and assistance program established 2 years ago was designed to provide Federal financial assistance to State and local governments to improve law enforcement capability. The program aims at public safety, to make our streets safe and to improve the quality of criminal justice. Each State must devise a comprehensive plan of law enforcement with the aid of Federal funds channeled through States, cities, municipalities, and counties. The moneys are allocated to States on a population basis. The State plans must envisage coordination of the various components of our criminal justice system—that is, the police and criminal court activities and the correction systems—prisons, probation, and parole. The program emphasizes that law enforcement is the responsibility of local governments with the States aiding.

The program generally has been relatively well received, but the program is still in its infancy. Plans must still be translated into action. More time and effort is needed therefore. During the brief time the plan was in operation there appeared to be need for some changes. Hence this bill, which provides for the necessary amendments.

All the amendments that are offered to the existing law in the bill before the Members have the approval of the administration and of the Department of Justice. The bill has administration approval, and it is interesting to note in a letter received by the Judiciary Committee, that the Attorney General enthusiastically endorses the bill. I emphasize the word "enthusiastically" because that is the word he used.

There is no minority view to the bill. The bill was unanimously adopted by the Judiciary Committee. More than 25 members of the Judiciary Committee have sponsored the bill. So there is widespread support for the bill before us. The bill amends the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, first by the amount of authorized appropriations. We provide for \$650 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$1.5 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

These are large sums, I admit, but they are not too large if we can make our streets safe and materially cure and prevent crime. For example, the New York City police budget, currently provides for \$568.4 million, and yet we spend, for example, less than 2 percent of all

Government revenues on our justice processes, including all police, all courts, and all corrections. So the amount generally, which may loom large before us, is not in comparison too great.

But may I say this. This problem is so gigantic that we must supply the necessary funds to cope with this problem. We can no longer be hesitant or lethargic on the crime problem. We must be active and resolute and determined as a rock. We cannot falter for the mere lack of funds. Any reasonable cost, though high, should not stand in our way. Nor can we be cynical about the situation, cynical about the cost. A cynic once was described as one who knows the cost of everything but the value of nothing.

I say to conquer crime and to imprison criminals is of inestimable value. The \$650 million is not too much to pay for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, for these purposes. We cannot be penurious. It would be unconscionable not to authorize this sum.

Even the public must have a conscience and the public should be slave to that conscience. There is an old saying: It is not that money makes everything good; it is that no money makes everything bad.

This bill also reorganizes the management of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. As the situation now exists, there is a three-man board, one Administrator and two Associate Administrators, and they must unanimously agree on most issues, no matter how important and no matter how trivial. Such a troika cannot work and it has not worked. It is inappropriate for any agency responsible for allocating vast sums of Federal aid. We provide that there shall be but one Administrator and two assistants. One officer shall be in control with the aid and assistance of two administrators.

There is an old saying, if I may be privileged to use that again, when two men ride a horse one man must ride behind. When three men ride a horse, indeed, two men must ride behind.

We abolished the so-called troika and establish a single administrator with two assistants.

We also establish a new program for the construction and renovation of correctional facilities, and provide that the Federal share shall pay up to 75 percent of the costs. Construction of other facilities are to be financed 50 percent from Federal funds and 50 percent from local funds. The Federal funds are the so-called action funds. The locality must match the Federal sum.

In the case of training, recruitment, and education, the Federal-local match is 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent local funds. The bill also provides that not less than 25 percent of the total appropriations for LEAA shall be devoted to corrections, probation, and parole. This is highly important, because we have been most neglectful on those phases of the criminal justice system—corrections, probation, and parole.

Under the bill before us we also require that the States contribute one-fourth of the non-Federal share of the funding needed to support local govern-

ment programs receiving Federal assistance. Heretofore the States generally were disinclined to contribute anything for local projects. They did not want to contribute a red cent. The mayors who appeared before us, the heads of local communities, bitterly complained. Trying to get help by contribution from the States to them seemed utterly impossible, despite the fact that most of these local communities were impoverished, on the verge of bankruptcy, and could not fully participate in this program because they could not adequately match the funds.

The State Governors, in many instances, said, "Let the Federal Government fund and let the cities match the funding. We will not contribute anything, not even a thin dime."

Only a handful of States have helped local governments. I would say that trying to get State help was as difficult as trying to get a penny from a miser by a beggar. Worse than that, in many instances it was utterly impossible. It was as useless as trying to fish in a desert.

We amended the bill by requiring that the States contribute one-fourth, at least, of the non-Federal funds, one-fourth of the amount that the localities must pay.

There is great need for a change in the overhauling of our prison systems. We provide for that in this bill. We provide for the setting up of new methods and processes for improving our correctional facilities. Entirely too many crimes are committed by persons who have already been in prison. Recidivism has greatly increased.

It is interesting to note some of the testimony of Mr. James Bennett, former head of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. He said:

Because too many crimes are committed by persons who have already been through some part of the correctional process much of the blame for the rising crime rates is being focused on our penal institutions, probation and parole. This is logical and perhaps proper when it is realized that from fifty to seventy per cent of those who leave our prisons go out to commit another and perhaps more serious crime than those which brought them to prison in the first place.

In addition to approximately 3500 county and city facilities, there are now 398 state penal, and correctional institutions for adults in the United States, and 220 state institutions for juveniles. All but a handful are archaic, grim and devoid of all but token facilities for training and rehabilitating their inmates. Sixty-one of the larger prisons were opened before 1900. Twenty-five of these are more than 100 years old.

A recent case, *Holt* against *Saruer*, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, decided in February of this year, held that in certain respects confinement in the Arkansas penitentiary system amounts to cruel and unusual punishment.

That surely points up the dire need for remedies in this regard. We strive in these new provisions to supply that need. We ask, of course, that the localities do their fair share.

So, my good friends, we hope that you will look with a kind eye on the amendments we have offered. We think they are fair and we think they are just.

We also require—and I should have mentioned this before—that LEAA ap-

proval of a State plan be based on an express finding that areas of high crime incidence receive an adequate share of assistance. The bill also authorizes the LEAA to support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars and in order to instruct and teach local law enforcement personnel advanced police tactics and processes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 17825 embodies amendments proposed by the Department of Justice as well as provisions which the committee, on the basis of its hearings and studies, has concluded are essential to strengthen the law enforcement assistance program.

The law enforcement assistance program established by the Congress 2 years ago is designed to provide Federal financial assistance to States and local governments to improve their law enforcement capabilities. This program marks a substantial Federal commitment toward improving not only the public safety of our citizens but also the quality of criminal justice throughout the United States. The program requires that each State shall adopt a comprehensive law enforcement plan under which the Federal funds are to be distributed to the State and thereafter to cities and counties. A major goal of the program is to foster law enforcement planning on a broad basis and to improve the coordination of the various components of the criminal justice system—police, corrections, and courts.

The law enforcement assistance program, I believe, represents the most promising technique by which the Federal Government can contribute to reduce the prevalence as well as the mounting incidence of crime in our streets. It is based on the recognition that law enforcement is essentially a responsibility of local government. It attempts to mobilize the resources of the States and the cities to control and prevent crime. Appropriations authorization for this program expires June 30, 1970. Thus, additional statutory funding authority is required to continue the Federal program. H.R. 17825 provides such additional authority for the next 3 fiscal years; it authorizes future funding at substantially increased levels, however, it limits the amount and duration of appropriations in order to enable the Congress to maintain legislative oversight of the program.

H.R. 17825 also seeks to make the Federal effort more effective, as the level of future funding increases, by making several revisions in the administrative and management structure of the program itself. Consequently, the bill abolishes the present three-man board which manages the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—and substitutes in its place a single Administrator. The requirement of unanimous tripartite decisions, the committee concluded, placed an intolerable burden upon the agency responsible for the allocation of vast sums of Federal law enforcement assistance. Other provisions of the bill, recommended by the Department of Justice, are intended to improve the staff capabilities of the Federal agency.

Mr. Chairman, it may also be helpful

if I itemize several other important provisions of the bill. These include:

First. A new program for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional facilities with provision that Federal grants may be up to 75 percent of the cost of a particular project. The bill also earmarks 25 percent of total appropriations for the purposes of corrections, including probation and parole;

Second. A requirement that LEAA approval of a State plan for law enforcement assistance be based on a finding that areas of high crime incidence receive an adequate share of assistance;

Third. A requirement that the State contribute one-quarter of the non-Federal share of funding for programs of local government receiving assistance under the State plan;

Fourth. A revision of the limitations on Federal expenditure share—so-called matching requirements—for discretionary grants to permit Federal funds to pay up to 90 percent of such program costs—and in certain circumstances authority to pay up to 100 percent if LEAA determines that the applicant is unable to provide any funds;

Fifth. LEAA authority to develop and support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars in such fields as organized crime to instruct State and local law enforcement personnel.

The enactment of this legislation, the committee believes, will forcefully indicate the seriousness and continuity of the Federal commitment to improving law enforcement. The establishment of a new program for the construction, renovation and acquisition of new correctional facilities should be of substantial assistance to State agencies which bear a large responsibility for the operation and maintenance of prisons and penitentiaries, and permit them to undertake long overdue programs. City and local governments that bear the substantial responsibility of fighting crime in the streets and that today carry increasingly severe fiscal burdens can expect some relief from provisions of the bill that require the States to defray a portion of the cost borne by local governments in matching Federal assistance. The bill requires that the States contribute a part—at least one-fourth—of the non-Federal share of the cost of law enforcement programs undertaken by the cities and counties under a State plan. This method of relieving units of local government of some of the burdens they would otherwise experience—as the level of Federal expenditure increases—was adopted in preference to reducing or eliminating the matching requirements of existing law. This was done because the committee believed that matching requirements serve as desirable incentives to assure continuity of State and local support of innovative programs. Matching requirements also serve to assure greater State and local involvement in the planning and execution of such programs.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments to the law enforcement assistance program proposed by H.R. 17825 are intended to substantially increase the level of Federal as well as State and local investment in the

criminal justice system, to make the entire program more responsible to local crime problems, and to insure greater participation by local governments in their planning process. The bill—H.R. 17825—was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and has been endorsed by the Attorney General of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, that in a nutshell comprises the amendments we have offered to a bill already salutary, but we believe this will make it even more salutary through the amendments we have offered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a few questions?

Mr. CELLER. Why, certainly.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any provision in the bill, restrictive provision, that would prevent the allocation of funds to a State in the absence of legislative action on the part of the State?

Mr. CELLER. There is nothing in the bill containing anything of that sort. This leaves it to the State planning agencies. I take it that the State has to set up planning agencies. I presume that before they can do that they must have legislation for that purpose, so that the action and planning funds can be allocated by the States. They are passed through by the States to the local authorities. No State legislation is necessary for that purpose. The bill itself is the legislative authority.

Mr. GROSS. The State of Iowa will not have a legislative session until next year.

Mr. CELLER. Iowa would not have any authority to determine how much shall go to Iowa. The State of Iowa shall have authority to determine how much it shall give to the various cities in the State and the localities in that State, and I presume would be under the control of the Governor or the State planning agency of Iowa in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to see the State of Iowa or any other State precluded from participating in the program without having had the opportunity, if it were predicated upon legislative enactment, to qualify.

Mr. CELLER. Within the authority which I indicated, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman yield to me?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to continue the questioning along the line of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

I have a letter from the Governor of Arizona in which he expresses grave concern over the requirement contained in this bill as he interprets it at least that there be State funds available to match up to 25 percent in non-Federal funds which the State would not get under the bill and the point is not that he does not feel that the State should be required to match, but the most important part I think is the fact that the State legis-

lature has already adjourned and there are not funds available for this matching purpose and there will not be funds available, presumably, until the next session of the legislature.

Mr. CELLER. Well, I think there could be a special session; although that is possible, it probably is not probable.

Mr. RHODES. No; it is not probable.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think there would be any trouble in working this out through your State planning agency and the LLEA. That is the working out of the modus operandi.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it the chairman's understanding that funds like this must be available before the end of the next fiscal year; in other words, June 30, 1971; or would funds which were made available after that time be applicable?

Mr. CELLER. I think both is the correct answer.

Mr. RHODES. In other words, funds appropriated at the next session of the legislature, which would be in January 1971, would be available?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I agree completely with the Chairman's answer to the question of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17825, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

The responsibility for controlling crime is not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. However, in the last decade, the rate of violent crime in our country has doubled. It is quite apparent that the efforts by State and local government have not been adequate to the challenge.

The Federal program was enacted in the belief that the anticrime effort was neither qualitatively nor quantitatively sufficient. As the Violence Commission indicated, the criminal justice system is not really a system. It is fragmented and disorganized. And the financial commitment of \$5 billion a year fulfills only about one-half of our Nation's needs.

It is generally agreed that the Federal Government should not be primarily responsible for detecting and apprehending criminals. On the other hand, local governments are not in a position to organize themselves and self-impose a system of criminal justice.

And so it is the States that must lead the effort. In 1968, the act declared that policy. Today, H.R. 17825 restates and confirms that policy. The block-grant approach is not only preserved but strengthened. State responsibility is not only retained but enlarged.

Two important amendments are designed to make the block-grant program more responsive to local needs. One amendment would require that each State plan provide for "the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence."

What does that mean? I call your at-

tention to page 11 of the accompanying report, No. 91-1174, where it says the following:

The purpose of this amendment is to assure that the benefits of Federal assistance are focused within each State in those areas where major crime is more prevalent. It is not the purpose of this provision to require the adoption of any arbitrary mathematical formula designed to tie the distribution of Federal funds to the relative incidence of crime in a particular area. What is required is that comprehensive law enforcement plans in each State shall generally correlate the benefits of anticrime efforts with the incidence of crime in particular areas.

The point is that benefits of anticrime effort—not anticrime dollars—are to be channeled where the crime is. For example, a correctional institution maintained at State expense which services an urban area with a relatively high rate of crime does provide assistance to that area without providing any dollars.

Any other construction of the amendment would fly in the face of the committee's purpose of fostering increased State responsibility in the war on crime. It should be noted that this construction of the amendment allows it to be equally relevant in Vermont, where 72 percent of the total expenditures for police and corrections are made at the State level, as in New York, where the percentage is only 17 percent. In both cases the State obligation is the same: to allocate the benefits of the Federal program—not dollars—to local governments in general accordance with the incidence of crime.

The other amendment that increases State responsibility with regard to local governments would require that the State pay at least one-fourth of the local matching requirement on programs receiving Federal aid from the State.

The committee believes that if the States "run the show," they should pay at least part of the costs. The States set the policies. The States establish the priorities among local governments. But 45 of the 50 States—hearings, page 605—decided that they only wanted to rule but not to pay. Instead, they passed on the obligations to match Federal moneys to their creatures—the local governments.

The words of Mr. Daniel L. Skoler, director of law enforcement programs at LEAA, quoted from his article entitled "State Implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control Act" which appears at page 417 in the Council of State Governments "Book of the States 1970-71," are appropriate here:

In the initial year of program activity, most States saw fit to pass on matching burdens totally to local government, despite the opportunity to solidify state leadership by providing some financial support to local units hard pressed to meet required matching contributions. This does not mean that the option is or should be closed. State subsidies, alongside of federal subsidies, may be a "must" to maintain the forward momentum of law enforcement improvement in face of the mounting financial crisis in the cities.

However, this amendment is not only prompted by a desire to affirm State responsibility and solidify State leadership in the war on crime, it also recognizes the present inability of local governments to raise revenues, an inability

often imposed by State law. As one mayor testified, at page 676 of our hearings:

Local governments across the Nation . . . are caught in a severe fiscal crisis between State-imposed restrictions preventing broadening of the local revenue base and increasing demands for service by local citizens.

Even if a city is completely committed to action to control crime, the city may not be a free agent to collect and dedicate the necessary resources to achieve this purpose.

Local revenue raising capability and, to some extent, local spending choices are severely constricted by State law.

Moreover, the committee recognizes that in many instances it is undesirable to localize tax increases. The attempt is often counterproductive because the people can easily sidestep the impact of a tax increase. This only aggravates the financial crisis of local governments.

Since 1959, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been studying how the three levels of government in our system should operate. Since 1964, this bipartisan and balanced Commission has recommended that the State pay at least one-half of the local matching requirement under Federal programs. In 1968, Congress adopted the principle when it enacted the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act—Public Law 90-445. In October 1969, the Commission restated its recommendation in a report entitled "Urban America and the Federal System." I quote from page 6 of that report:

The Commission has proposed that Federal funds for urban purposes flow through the state where, and only where, two basic conditions are met: The state provides adequate administrative machinery and supplies from state general revenues at least half the non-Federal share of required funds. If the state chooses not to meet these two conditions, a Federal-local relationship should obtain with respect to the particular program.

All too often in the past the States have treated political subdivisions as foreign powers so that aid to subdivisions was viewed as a gratuity rather than as a political obligation. I hope that this attitude is changing. If so, we can expect the States to make contributions in excess of the 25 percent requirement contained in the amendment.

It should be noted that with the adoption of this amendment, the incentives that are built into the act will finally have a chance to be effective. Section 301 of the act states the Federal share of funds for a program of riot control may be up to 75 percent of the cost but that the Federal share for a program to improve police-community relations may be up to only 60 percent. If the non-Federal share of the cost is borne entirely by the local government, of what effect is the congressional inducement to favor one kind of program over another when the decision as to priorities is made by the State, which has passed along the financial consequences of its decision to the local government? It has had little, if any, effect. The adoption of this amendment will rectify that defect in the scheme of the act.

The amendment would require that the State pay at least one-fourth of the local matching requirement for each project

or program. If locality A and locality B each have approved programs to improve police-community relations each costing \$100,000, the Federal Government would pay \$60,000 on each or a total of \$120,000. Locality A would pay \$30,000, as would locality B. The State would pay \$20,000, but \$10,000 would have to be earmarked for each program. The State would not fulfill its pledge to abide by the statutory conditions of the act if it paid \$20,000 for locality A and \$0 for locality B.

The committee is aware that one locality might be more needy than another and that a State might rationally distinguish. But that factor seems to be more than offset by the experience of localities in other cases of State aid. The point is made in a report of the American Assembly which is entitled "The States and the Urban Crisis" on page 171:

Most urban states give less per capita aid to their cities than to areas outside the cities. (See also a study entitled *Cities and Suburbs—The Case for Equity, Parts I and II*, which was prepared by the Social Science Research Associates of the State University of New York at Albany.)

Such a practice in an anticrime program would be tragic in view of the fact that the cities have more crime per capita—hearings, 595—and spend more per capita to fight crime—hearings, 548. For those reasons, it is preferable to adopt a uniform percentage requirement per program than to continue the practice of some States which, in the area of crime fighting, would countervail the policy of the LEAA program.

Two additional amendments would also benefit local governments. However, unlike the first two amendments I have discussed, they could equally be a financial benefit to the States. The first of these is the reduction of the non-Federal share of the cost that must be borne by the recipient of a discretionary grant. Presently, such a recipient must pay the same percentage as it would if the grant were a block grant. However, since it was thought desirable that LEAA have maximum flexibility in deciding to whom and when discretionary grants should be made, the matching requirement has been lowered to 10 percent, and even that is waivable in dire situations. The matching requirement is not totally abandoned because it was thought generally desirable to expend State or local resources so as to necessitate State or local budgetary oversight and thus guard against waste.

The other amendment would relax the present limitations on Federal subsidies for State and local law enforcement personnel. The relaxation would be complete with regard to discretionary grants and partial with regard to block grants. This is the compromise position recommended by the administration. The partial relaxation with regard to block grants would not free the regular, operational personnel serving in any of the law enforcement areas, be it police, courts, or corrections. The committee recognized that personnel costs consume a lion's share of State and local anticrime funds and that the need for additional funds is great. However, at this

time, our Federal financial commitment is limited. Our Federal purpose is limited. It is not the Federal purpose to assume the burden of law enforcement across this land. Rather, it is our purpose—and our steadfast hope—to modernize State and local law enforcement. Thus personnel costs incurred in modernization programs, such as training, research, development, and demonstration programs, are not subject to the limitations. But the day-to-day personnel costs are subject to limitations. One reason—sufficient in itself—for that result is that if it were otherwise the temptation would be to use Federal moneys for short-term salary needs, which are pressing, and to ignore the long-run advantages of experimenting with advanced techniques and practices in law enforcement. In other words, if the limitation were totally relaxed, I fear that the entire LEAA program might be transformed.

I believe the committee reasonably accommodated competing interests in adopting this amendment. It allows for salary subsidies without changing the character of the LEAA program.

So far I have discussed the significant amendments made to part C of the act, which treats with action grants. But a significant amendment was also made to part B, which treats with planning grants.

A study of the operation of the act made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and released just 11 days ago reveals that 45 States districted their respective States and established regional units to plan how the LEAA moneys would be spent. In 29 of those 45 States, it was found that the States did not give a cent of the Federal planning grants to any municipality or subdivision but rather gave all the planning money to the regional planning units.

It is obvious that if this is the way that the plans will be made to spend the block-grant money, it is imperative that hopeful recipients—such as large cities teeming with crime—share in that process.

I am not critical of the establishment of regional planning units. I believe they serve to coordinate a fragmented anticrime effort. However, I do believe, as does the committee, that the regional planning units should be representative of units of local government under the jurisdiction of the planning unit. A study conducted by the Urban Coalition found that areas of high crime incidence were often unrepresented or underrepresented on the regional planning unit—hearings, 727. The committee amendment to part B would cure this deficiency and require that regional planning units be representative.

A sixth amendment would create a new program to aid in the construction of correctional institutions. Grants would be made to State and local governments, not on the basis of any population formula, but on the basis of need. At least 50 percent of the funds have to be allocated to the State planning agencies. Since the States bear 68.7 percent of the costs of non-Federal corrections—

see table, hearings, 661—it is expected that the States will get much more than the required 50 percent. And it should be noted that there is no statutory requirement that the State "pass through" any percentage of a grant to local governments nor that the State help pay the local matching requirement. Moreover, on all grants under this new program, the Federal share of the cost may be up to 75 percent.

Perhaps this amendment helps illustrate why the Attorney General found H.R. 17825 to be a well-balanced bill. For just as the amendment, discussed before, which requires that the State defray a part of the local matching requirement on the block grants passed through to local governments may be viewed as helping local governments, so, too, may this corrections amendment be viewed as helping the States.

A seventh amendment would abolish the troika form of administering the program. Such a reform is quite necessary.

A letter written by the former Administrator of LEAA was introduced into evidence last week during hearings on this bill before the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Law. The former Administrator indicated that LEAA had been "crippled" and "demoralized" by the requirement that the three Administrators had to agree unanimously, even on mundane operational matters.

The committee agreed that the unanimity requirement was a burden too great to bear. The committee recognized that a decisionmaker might wish to seek the advice of high-level deputies. Thus the committee amendment would abolish no positions but would bestow the authority to make decisions to one man. It should be noted that section 502 of the act makes that authority delegable. Thus the only change that the amendment necessitates is the abandonment of the requirement of unanimity in making policy and operational decisions.

Finally, the bill would authorize an appropriation of \$650 million for the next fiscal year. The present appropriation is \$268 million. The House has already passed an appropriation of \$480 million for the next fiscal year.

I do not believe that such a sum is sufficient.

Last October 9, I introduced H.R. 14296 which called for an authorization of \$650 million. Thereafter, the Justice Department indicated that \$650 million was necessary and that the States could effectively use such a sum but no more. But the Bureau of the Budget, apparently for economic reasons, decided on the lower figure of \$480 million.

I have a long and clear record of economy in government. But at a time when the rate of violent crimes is streaking upward and our good people are afraid to walk the streets or visit the parks or to go downtown at night, at a time when property crimes take billions of dollars from our taxpayers and crime against the person inflict suffering beyond measure, I do not believe we can afford anything less than \$650 million.

One of the fundamental purposes of government is to insure domestic tranquillity. To insure that end, we must not dedicate ourselves halfheartedly. We

cannot postpone that task. If we spend billions to fight a potential threat thousands of miles away, why cannot we spend the millions it takes to fight an actual threat that is pounding at our door at this very moment?

The committee reported this bill favorably by a 30-0 rollcall vote. The Justice Department enthusiastically endorses this bill. I quote from the Attorney General's letter:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I was extremely pleased to learn that the committee voted today to favorably report a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and that the bill includes most of the amendments submitted by the Department of Justice. Although the bill departs in some few respects from the Department's requests, on the whole it is an extremely good and well balanced bill. The Department of Justice enthusiastically endorses it and urges its passage by the House of Representatives.

Your personal attention to this important matter and the fine work of your committee are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General.

Mr. Chairman, I too, urge the passage of H.R. 17825.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to commend the Judiciary Committee for reporting this bill out and I rise in support of H.R. 17825.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that a woman can no longer walk on the street alone at night, that a man may be mugged coming home late, that any elderly or infirmed person does not have much of a chance on our streets is a clear indication to me that H.R. 17825, the law enforcement assistance amendments must be supported.

All of this fear and the need for protection in a supposedly free society is appalling to me. When people feel they must stay home behind closed curtains, we no longer live in a free society. Every crime committed relates to each of us. Each murder, each robbery, each senseless beating inches away our freedoms.

With the sweeping insidiousness of crime tearing our society apart, we have become aware that the rights of the individual must be protected. The needs of our country at this time should be apparent to all of us. We must stop this wave of crime.

I heartily congratulate Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, ranking minority member WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, and the committee members for the outstanding bill we are considering today, H.R. 17825, the law enforcement assistance amendments. It is one that does respond to the needs of our society.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act has been in effect since 1968. It was certainly needed then, and it is

certainly needed now. These amendments to the act apply the experience of the 2 years the law has been in existence.

Critics of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act have stated that cities are not receiving the proper share of Federal funds. They say that since the majority of crimes are committed in urban areas, the cities, therefore should receive a proportionate amount of funds.

A section of the bill that will correct this situation is a requirement that law-enforcement assistance approval of a State plan must be based on a finding that areas of high crime rates receive an adequate share of assistance.

In my own city of Rochester, Mayor Stephen May says the city is eligible for \$150,000 in law-enforcement assistance, but would not be able to take advantage of this amount because of the requirement that the city match this amount by 40 percent—\$100,000.

I am extremely pleased with a portion of the bill that for the first time stipulates that the State must pay at least a fourth of the non-Federal share of funding for programs of local governments. I am certain this will enable more cities to take advantage of available funds.

A second objection has been that too much money has been spent on police programs, depriving other areas such as the courts and correctional institutions of their proper share.

Experience has shown us that a large number of criminals are nurtured and improve their craft in our penal institutions. Those who serve time are often released to commit bigger and better crimes.

I think we all realize we must reach the roots of the problem, and one way to do this is to reform our system of correction. The law enforcement assistance amendment takes a big step in this direction. It earmarks 25 percent of the total appropriation for corrections, including probation and parole.

It also stipulates that Federal grants may be made up to 75 percent of the cost of construction, acquisition and renovation of correctional institutions. Provision is expressly made for rehabilitation programs, and for staffing facilities with personnel meeting advanced standards of training and education.

In addition, the bill authorizes almost \$350 million more for 1971 than was authorized for 1970. It extends the appropriation authorization for 3 years, instead of two, which will add continuity to the program. It authorizes \$650 million for fiscal year 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972, and \$1.5 billion for 1973. I feel that the level of the authorization reflects the ability of localities to effectively use the funds available.

Mr. Chairman, this bill responds to the needs of our society and it has been worked out through 2 years of experience. I plan to fully support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is

indeed a sad commentary on life in these United States when for the most part it is unsafe to be on the streets in most areas of our country when darkness falls.

That is particularly so in the more densely populated communities because the incidence of crime is much greater proportionately where the population is more dense.

It is a deplorable situation. This bill, while it does not have all the answers, at least is a step in the right direction. If this bill passes and is properly implemented, it will at least be an improvement of efforts to make our streets safe.

I urge the adoption of his bill and subsequently the proper implementation by appropriations of significant amounts.

The rising crime rate threatens the safety of our citizens, and the problem is growing worse day by day. H.R. 17825 provides for the Federal Government to make a larger effort to coordinate with the State and local governments our battle against crime.

The thorough hearings conducted by subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee show that improvement is needed in at least three areas which the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968 has not adequately covered. H.R. 17825 provides substantially more money. It assures that more money will be allocated where the crime is greatest and therefore more needed. It authorizes the expenditures of funds for improvement of correctional institutions.

The bill authorizes appropriations of \$650 million for fiscal year 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972, and \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1973. This is the minimum acceptable level of Federal participation in the war against crime.

On March 19, I stated before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee:

Funds are being dissipated at state and regional levels and are not reaching local governmental units in high crime, urban areas.

The city of Cleveland, the larger part of which I represent, is a very good example. In 1969, the State of Ohio received \$1.2 million under the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act, yet Cleveland, which is the State's largest city and which has the ninth highest crime rate in the Nation for cities over 250,000, received only \$158,000. It is imperative that crime-ridden areas like Cleveland receive their fair share of Federal funds. The bill will amend the Safe Streets Act to require a greater percentage of funds to go directly to those local communities where the need is greatest.

Proper reform of our correctional system—prisons, probation, and parole—has been neglected far too long. Most crime is committed by recidivists. It is time to put increasing emphasis on the correctional institutions, juvenile treatment, narcotics control, and court reform. Unfortunately, the grants of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act have been used almost exclusively for police expenditures and the purchase of equipment. The bill would amend this act by establishing a separate Federal program for assisting in the construction,

renovation, and acquisition of correctional facilities and the development of improved corrections programs. I believe that such a program would lessen the number of persons who, after release from prison, continue to engage in criminal activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable action on H.R. 17825.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to participate as a member of the subcommittee which heard the extensive testimony and considered the amendments to the omnibus crime bill of 1968 which has now come to the House for consideration.

The measure as originally introduced has been revised and come before us as a "clean bill," H.R. 17825. In my opinion, it accomplishes part—if not all—of the needed improvements which appear to be indicated at this time. Let me say further that the measure is consistent with the President's declaration in his 1970 state of the Union message:

In referring to budget cuts, there is one area where I have ordered an increase rather than a cut—the requests of those agencies with the responsibility for law enforcement.

We have heard a great deal of over-blown rhetoric during the sixties in which the word "war" has perhaps too often been used—the war on poverty, the war on misery, the war on disease, the war on hunger. If there is one area where the word "war" is appropriate it is in the fight against crime. We must declare and win the war against the criminal elements which increasingly threaten our cities, our homes, and our lives.

The measure before us authorizes an appropriation of \$650 million for the next fiscal year, in contrast to the \$248 million authorized for the last fiscal year. Furthermore, a sum of \$1 billion is authorized for the ensuing fiscal year and \$1.5 billion for the following 2 fiscal years.

A great deal of testimony before the subcommittee concerned the control which the Federal Government might exercise with regard to distribution of these funds. On the part of the Governors of all of the 50 States, it was represented that the block grant principle which is inherent in this legislation has been eminently successful. Notwithstanding the complaints which were expressed in behalf of some city governments, it is clear that State governments have demonstrated a capacity to act responsibly with regard to improvements in law enforcement and that cooperation between State and local governments has been achieved in most instances. While the bill before us retains the block grant principle and continues the requirement that 85 percent of all funds shall be distributed in accordance with State plans, the measure now before us requires that 40 percent of a State's planning funds and 75 percent of its action funds shall be made available to units of general local government or combinations of such units of government.

There is the familiar charge leveled in some quarters today that the Congress

is advancing so-called repressive legislation. In the consideration of the measure now before us, we find a sharp refutation of that familiar charge.

What are the elements which characterize this legislation insofar as changes in emphasis or direction are concerned?

The amendments authorize funds for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of "correctional facilities" with a provision that Federal funds up to 75 percent of the cost of a particular project may be expended. In this connection, the authority for appropriations require that 25 percent of the total appropriations shall be for the purposes of correction—including probation and parole. As the committee report indicates, the "provision is expressly for rehabilitation programs." In addition, it is stated in the report that "facilities will be staffed with personnel meeting advanced standards of training and education."

While it is estimated that 95 percent of all correctional funds are now expended for custody, it is clear that the emphasis of this legislation is directed toward rehabilitation and full restoration of offenders to productive and law-abiding activities.

It is obvious to all observers that various parts of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration have encountered difficulties in administering the new program which was devised in the 1968 omnibus crime bill. In my opinion, the attempt to administer the overall program by a three-man board accounts, in part, for some of the program's deficiencies. The measure before us changes this concept by authorizing a single administrator who is primarily charged with responsibility for administering the program, assisted by two associate administrators. This change should enable the program to operate more efficiently.

Some of the Members may recall the amendment which I offered in 1968 to establish a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. This part of the 1968 bill was changed in the other body, and the concept is not as clearly delineated or as fully authoritative as I would like it to be. It had been my hope that such an agency might fulfill two important and appropriate Federal goals: research and training.

The entire philosophy of the measure before us—including the amendments which are being considered today—is that law enforcement is essentially a local and State responsibility. Indeed, the fact that the Congress has adopted the block grant principle is in itself a recognition that most decisions as to where and how funds should be spent to meet local law enforcement problems must be made at the local and State levels. However, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration serves as the coordinating agency to assure that programs and practices developed anywhere in the Nation shall be available to benefit every other part of the Nation. This applies to innovative techniques, utilization of scientific advances, and training programs which are ongoing or developed at the local or regional level.

However, it is clear from legislation, that the LEAA is concerned primarily

with planning grants and action grants. It is the purpose of the National Institute to develop an agency devoted primarily to "research" in all of its aspects. This should include research directed at crime prevention as well as to crime detection and law enforcement. It should cover rehabilitation as well as the testing of sophisticated equipment and systems. It should train personnel for handling demonstrations as well as for detecting and apprehending hardened criminals. The National Institute has not, in my opinion, been fully understood, and its activities have been sharply limited by administrative and budgetary restraints. I have a table of the grants which have been made by the National Institute. The 99 studies, many of which are still underway, appear to be directed essentially at research problems which can help produce answers to the complex problems of crime in our Nation. All of these research studies appear to have application to and can potentially benefit our crime-ridden communities. At the same time, none of these studies would appear to impinge on any State or local prerogatives. This, it seems to me, identifies an appropriate and highly significant Federal program in relation to the problem of crime in America—an area which deserves increased attention and overwhelming support.

It is my feeling that the National Institute deserves greater autonomy and increased stature in the Department of Justice. If one of the Associate Administrators of LEAA should be assigned to serve as Director of the National Institute—this might improve its operations. In any event, it deserves adequate funds. Last year the National Institute had an appropriation of \$7.5 million. This year, the Attorney General requested an appropriation of \$19 million. However, as was stated to the House at the time the Justice Department appropriation bill was being considered, the appropriation committee report specified that the total appropriation—of \$480 million—should be applied to "action grants." Such a requirement could effectively destroy the National Institute before it has been given a chance to demonstrate its utility.

It is possible that some may inquire as to the practical value of a project designed to understand the role of the vehicle in relation to police departments, and from this understanding to develop a better vehicle for policy use, as well as for a better policy for its use, and a better program for its procurement, replacement and operation. Of course, such a project can result in making the police vehicle a far more serviceable and useful element in police work.

A project dealing with the evaluating of the benefit of methadone in the treatment of criminal narcotics addicts is highly essential if such a program is to be adopted in meeting the increased problem of dope addiction.

Studies directed at communications, including detailed studies where a large number of alarms are involved, can be of specific benefit. Several projects which are concerned with new techniques for identifying dried blood subgroups hold the promise of extraordinary benefits in the detection and apprehension of criminal offenders.

During its brief existence, and with its extremely limited budget, the National Institute has divided its activities into five research centers which are described in the first annual report of LEAA. These include: First, the Center for Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation; second, the Center for Criminal Justice Operations and Management; third, the Center for law and Justice; fourth, the Center for Special Projects; and fifth, the Center for Demonstration and Professional Services.

For the next fiscal year, the National Institute hopes to develop a more refined priority list of research activity. Included in these plans are: First, a continuing evaluation of past and present activity including the monitoring and assistance of research activity conducted both inside and outside the Government; second, the establishing and testing of standards in law enforcement equipment—this function can enable the researching and testing of product capabilities and can serve as a coordinating agency of local, State, and Federal governments in order to increase the effectiveness of products and equipment designed to assist in law enforcement; third, development of criminal justice education, including curriculum needs in institutions offering degrees for police and correction officials; and fourth, the furnishing of technical information in all of the various fields of criminal justice service—including service to scientists, engineers, administrators and researchers on a comprehensive basis.

When one considers the multibillion-dollar program of research for weaponry and various other defense purposes, as well as the research budgets for health and the various scientific disciplines, it seems quite unbelievable that we should be discussing here today the need for a research agency and a modest allocation of funds to devise new and better methods for meeting the challenge of crime in America.

While satisfied with the overall provisions of this measure, I am convinced that greater understanding and additional support for the goals and purposes of the National Institute are essential if we are to gain the advantages which this agency can and should provide.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill—H.R. 17825—now before the House, I believe, represents one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before the 91st Congress. The program that it represents—law enforcement assistance—offers the greatest promise of improving the effectiveness of the system of criminal justice and reducing crime in America.

For decades we have neglected the criminal justice system. Today, many police are underpaid, poorly trained, and ill equipped. Criminal courts are unorganized, understaffed, and unable to cope adequately with the burgeoning number of cases before them. Our prisons are overcrowded and many believe actually manufacture crime.

The crime statistics for 1968 show that of approximately 4 million serious crimes, 85 percent were committed within the Nation's metropolitan areas. Robberies per capita in cities occur 10 times more frequently than in adjacent suburban police jurisdictions and 35 times more frequently than in rural areas. Urban rates per capita of almost every category of serious crime are greater than in the suburban and rural areas. But the rate of crime has increased everywhere.

The enactment of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 marked the beginning of a major Federal grant effort to help solve the urban crime problem. The act establishes a program of planning and action grants to State and local governments to improve all aspects of their criminal justice systems. All planning grants, and 85 percent of action grants, are required to go through the States according to a population formula in the act. Fifteen percent of the action grants may be allocated directly to the States or to units of local governments within the discretion of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA. The act also seeks to assure that local governments will participate in the planning and funding of programs. The statute requires that the States pass through 40 percent of planning funds and 75 percent of block grant action funds to units of general local governments.

Mr. Chairman, money alone will not provide a solution to the crime problems confronting America, but without a Federal financial commitment, we can expect little progress. In addition to money, it is essential that the Congress establish priorities and improve the administrative management of this Federal grant program. H.R. 17825, the bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, contains a number of amendments to existing law which are designed to make the block grant approach more responsive to urban crime needs.

Twelve days of extensive hearings before a judiciary subcommittee, which includes testimony from a number of Governors, mayors, and local law enforcement officials, provide a comprehensive review of the operations of the law enforcement assistance program to date and document the achievements, as well as the shortcomings, of the program from its inception.

Mr. Chairman, the first 2 years of operation of the law enforcement assistance program indicate that a beginning has been made in planning law enforcement improvement. Thus far, however, the program has failed to decrease the rate of crime or reduce its prevalence. Testimony before the committee dramatically illustrates that many States in their planning have failed to take into account the specialized and urgent crime problems of the major urban areas. H.R. 17825 contains several amendments which are intended to focus Federal funds in those areas of high crime incidence. The bill amends existing law by making LEAA approval of a State plan dependent on an express finding that the plan provides for the allocation of an

adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence. The bill also requires the States to participate in the funding obligations imposed on units of local government. This State-local partnership is accomplished by a requirement in the bill that the States defray a portion of the costs now borne entirely by local government in matching the Federal aid they receive. The bill requires that the States contribute at least one-fourth of this non-Federal share of funding.

I share the view reached by the committee that State interest in and concern for the operation of local police, local courts, as well as the corrections systems, will result in a much more effective law enforcement program. The latest figures we have for law enforcement expenditures are for fiscal 1968. They show that the State governments allocated only 2.7 percent of their total expenditures to the criminal justice system; whereas the Nation's 43 largest cities and 55 largest counties allocated 12.5 percent and 11.9 percent of their total general expenditures to criminal justice activities. State support alongside of Federal support to local units hard-pressed to meet matching requirements will maintain the forward momentum of law enforcement improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I have only touched upon two aspects of this legislation. One other amendment proposed by the bill deserves brief mention. This provision would abolish the present three-man management board which administers law enforcement assistance at the Federal level. It seems clear that funds alone will not yield the improvements needed to combat crime. Effective administration is essential. The committee has concluded that a three-man board requiring unanimity of decision is an inappropriate method of allocating vast sums of Federal assistance. H.R. 17825, therefore, abolishes the present troika and substitutes in its place a single administrator.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendments contained in this bill will insure greater participation by local governments in the planning processes and in the utilization of Federal funds. The measure was approved unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. Its passage by the House is recommended by the Attorney General of the United States. I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 17825.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

(Mr. POFF, at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today—H.R. 17825, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act—is a compromise measure which was developed by the Judiciary Committee under the splendid leadership of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER. It is a well-balanced bill which resulted from the sifting of a great number of proposals which were put forth and ex-

amined during 8 weeks of hearings and a number of executive sessions. I think the amendments will greatly increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal anticrime program.

We are all quite familiar with the ever increasing crime rate in our Nation and with the many problems which have been produced by the longstanding existence of uncoordinated segments of a criminal justice system which for the most part is understaffed, undertrained, and undercompensated. In the short period of its existence, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has made an impressive start toward alleviating these conditions and laying the foundations for a successful nationwide effort to bring crime under control. Attorney General Mitchell paid tribute to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on March 12 in responding to criticism of the block grant approach which is the keystone of the LEAA program. In his testimony Attorney General Mitchell stated:

I think that LEAA can take substantial credit for this new progress in coordinating the various segments of the criminal justice system. I also think that the LEAA is responsible, in some measure, for the new awareness among public officials that there must be a working relationship between the city, the county and the state.

Our staff has worked very hard to show the necessity for city-county-state cooperation for system-wide improvement. Police forces are basically under the control of city government. Court systems tend to be under county or state governments. Short term incarceration facilities are generally under city or county governments while long term correctional facilities are generally under state governments.

Thus, under the impetus of LEAA, we are seeing the emergence of regional planning commissions working with state planning commissions. For the first time, on a nationwide basis, an attempt is being made to evaluate, coordinate and integrate the hundreds of different criminal justice agencies and their programs in each state.

We have also been pleased that the states and the cities are utilizing federal funds in the broad range of functions which Congress intended—for the training of existing personnel and the hiring of new personnel; for new equipment; for the improvement of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities; for pilot research projects and for communications and educational projects.

The result is that today the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—the federal government's major program to reduce lawlessness—is achieving unprecedented goals in the nationwide war against crime. It has started a wave of criminal justice reform all across the nation, from the small towns to affluent suburbs to the largest cities. It is building a new corps of public-minded experts in the field of law enforcement and criminal justice. It is improving existing institutions and experimenting with new pilot projects. And perhaps most importantly, it is building the optimism and the hope of success against the crime problem which, I think you will agree, a year ago many of us believed was beyond control.

There has been criticism of the program. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have criticized the block grant approach for not delivering enough money to the large cities. However, even these two organiza-

tions have felt compelled to acknowledge the cooperative spirit of the LEAA officials during their early trying months of initiating a new Federal grant-in-aid program. Their joint report of February 1970, noted:

During the NLC and USCM examination of the Safe Streets program, LEAA officials have always been willing to discuss the issues of the Safe Streets program—its successes and failures—with an openness and candor which is refreshing. Though we have not always agreed with decisions made by LEAA, we believe that LEAA . . . has been among the best of the Federal agencies administering grant-in-aid programs.

I believe a comment by the National Governor's Conference in its September 1969, report entitled "Response to the Challenge of Crime" exemplifies the most prevalent reaction by State and local officials to the LEAA program. In this report the Governor's conference said:

The National Governor's Conference commends the Administrators and staff of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for their extensive and helpful cooperation with the states in implementing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-351). Their actions in fostering the development of qualified staff at the state level, providing wide latitude to the states in developing plans for improving the entire criminal justice system, and generally supporting the State-Federal partnership required in a block grant program, sets an outstanding example that could well be emulated by other federal departments. Their efforts to insure the success of this first program embodying a true block grant approach to an intergovernmental problem are noteworthy.

Although the bill reported by the committee reflects some concern that adequate funds should be made available to our large metropolitan areas, the bill retains the basic block grant approach adopted by the Congress in 1968. I believe the criticism which has been expressed by representatives of large cities has proved to be unjustified for the most part, and premature in the light of the circumstances surrounding the initiation of this new program. Most of the criticism about the allocation of funds by the State planning agencies was aimed at the subgrants made during the first year of funding under the program in fiscal 1969. In that year, only \$25 million was available for block grants to the States, 75 percent of which was required to be made available to local units of government. This small amount of money could not reasonably be expected to make overnight changes in a national criminal justice system that costs \$6 billion annually. As funding has increased, the amounts of funds available to large cities have greatly increased and will continue to increase under the projected funding levels for the program during coming fiscal years.

The bill does make some significant changes in the safe streets legislation. For the most part the changes are substantially those requested by the Department of Justice, all of which I believe to be meritorious and enthusiastically support. Those amendments include:

First, authorization of funds for the next 3 fiscal years, such funds to remain available for obligation until expended;

Second, a new block grant program for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional facilities;

Third, a revision of the "matching" requirements for discretionary grants to permit Federal funds to pay 90 percent of the cost of discretionary programs, with authority to pay 100 percent if LEAA determines that the applicant cannot provide any funds;

Fourth, expansion of the law enforcement education program;

Fifth, authority for LEAA to develop and support regional and national training programs, workshops and seminars for State and local officials in specialized law enforcement fields; and

Sixth, amendments to increase the administrative efficiency and staff capability of LEAA.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$650 million for fiscal year 1971, \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972 and \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1973. These funds may remain available for obligation until expended. This is an extremely important provision. LEAA experienced difficulties in getting all of its fiscal year 1969 funds obligated by the close of the fiscal year due to the fact that its appropriation was approved late in the fiscal year leaving a substantially shortened period for the completion of the application and grant cycle.

This situation has recurred in fiscal year 1970, since the appropriation was not approved until December 1969, in effect compressing the second-year program into 6 months. It would therefore be extremely helpful to have the June 30 deadline for fund obligation removed so that LEAA need not rush through the application and grant procedures. An additional advantage would accrue in the utilization of discretionary funds. If LEAA did not have a June 30 deadline to meet in awarding these funds, it could wait until all block grant applications are received and approved, and then structure its discretionary grant awards to complement the block grant program. In this way, discretionary funds could be used to support programs and activities that have not received enough block grant funds through the States and local units, and to augment especially worthy State plans or programs.

Aside from the authorization of funds, perhaps the most important part of the bill is the new part E added to title I of the act authorizing a program of grants to States and local units for the purpose of the acquisition, construction, or renovation of correctional institutions and facilities, the improvement of the programs and personnel standards of such institutions, and planning activities in the areas of correctional construction and program improvement.

The so-called correctional institutions—the jails, juvenile detention facilities and prisons have been grossly neglected for generations and in the opinion of many experts are a considerable factor in themselves in the generation of confirmed criminals. Because of the years of neglect, failure to replace outmoded facilities or build facilities where they are needed, a staggering requirement for construction has accumulated. This type of construction is typi-

cally very expensive, running in recent years upward of \$20,000 per inmate capacity, and increasing in cost at the rate of 15 percent per year. The unfortunate fact is that because of the accumulation of needs and the extreme expense of this type of construction, most States, counties, and communities in this country simply cannot afford to finance new facilities. The job will not be done unless the Federal Government provides financial assistance on a massive scale.

Although block grant funds awarded under part C of the act may be used for corrections, such funds have not been sufficient in view of the competing demands for funds for other components of law enforcement. In addition, since correctional systems are supported primarily at the State level in virtually every State, local units utilize very little of their 75 percent local funds for correctional programs. The result is that this major component of law enforcement is supported in most States solely or substantially out of the State's 25-percent share of block grant funds. Even at anticipated increased part C funding levels, the cost of necessary correctional construction and improvements will absorb virtually the entire 25 percent shares of most of the States unless relief is afforded by funding from another grant source.

Under the proposed amendment grant funds especially earmarked for planning and implementation of correctional construction and renovation programs would be distributed to the States and local units of government. At least 50 percent of these funds would be allocated in block grants to the State planning agencies of the States, according to their respective needs as determined by LEAA. State applications for such funds would be incorporated in the comprehensive plans now required to be filed under the act and block grants for corrections would be made to the State planning agencies now administering the block grants made under part C of the act. The remaining funds would be available for direct discretionary grants by LEAA to States or to units of local government, or combinations of States or local units.

Because of the very high cost of this type of construction, the matching formula for these grant funds would be 75-25 instead of the 50-50 basis now provided in the act. Among other requirements, applicants, in order to obtain these funds, would have to provide assurances that the design of facilities would be modern and innovative, that due provision would be made for rehabilitation programs, that the facilities would be staffed with personnel meeting the most desirable standards of training and education prevalent in the United States, and that the availability of funds under this new part would not reduce the amount of part C funds allocated to corrections programs. Natural geographical groupings of communities or counties would be encouraged to pool their requirements where convenient and build joint facilities. Similar encouragement would be given contiguous States with mutual problems and interests of this kind.

I believe that the construction pro-

gram authorized by this amendment will provide the funds to enable the States to make significant inroads on the many correctional problems and deficiencies that have made our jails and prisons revolving doors in the vicious circle of criminal recidivism that has plagued us for so long.

The bill includes a new, more lenient, matching formula for discretionary grants. Such grants are now subject to the same matching requirements set forth in the act for block grants—that is, States and cities must pay 40 percent of the cost of most programs and projects funded from the grants. This has severely limited LEAA's authority to fund programs of benefit to grantees who cannot meet these matching requirements. The outstanding example is the typical Indian tribe, which has severe law enforcement problems but which has literally no funds to contribute to the cost of LEAA programs designed to solve those problems.

This change is accomplished by section 4(3) of the bill which recasts section 301(c) of the act so as to free discretionary grants from the block grant matching requirements, and section 8 of the bill which inserts a new discretionary grant matching formula in section 306 of the act. Under this new formula, recipients of discretionary grants would be required to contribute only 10 percent of the cost of grant programs, and LEAA would have discretion to pay 100 percent of the cost of such programs if it determined that the grant applicant could not provide any funds at all. The bill also amends the act to provide that the limitations on the use of block grant funds for the compensation of personnel will not apply to discretionary grants, in order to further increase LEAA's flexibility in utilizing discretionary funds.

The bill makes a number of changes and additions to the provisions under which LEAA makes grants to colleges and universities for loans and grants to persons enrolled in law enforcement studies—either persons already employed in law enforcement or students desiring to pursue law enforcement careers. This law enforcement education program has been one of the most popular and successful of the LEAA programs, with some 730 schools making over 100,000 loans and grants by the close of this fiscal year. The LEAA Office of Academic Assistance which administers the law enforcement education program has already received applications from more than 950 schools for fiscal year 1971.

While administering this program, LEAA has received numerous suggestions from participating institutions and from students who have been the beneficiaries of this financial assistance regarding minor changes in the language of the academic assistance provisions which would increase the effectiveness of the program. The most meritorious of those changes are included in the bill. The first change would make the language describing the type of programs in which a student may enroll identical in both the grant section and the loan section of the act.

The different language in these two sections has created a considerable

amount of confusion on the part of many of the institutions participating in the law enforcement education program. The second change would make it clear that grant funds which are made available to full-time law enforcement employees can be used for the purchase of books as well as the payment of tuition and fees. The third change would provide that full-time teachers or persons preparing for careers as full-time teachers of courses related to law enforcement will be eligible to participate in the law enforcement education program. The final change authorizes LEAA to make curriculum development grants to institutions of higher education for the purpose of developing and improving graduate and undergraduate law enforcement curricula. These grants will provide up to 75 percent of the cost of the programs and projects which are funded pursuant to this section.

The bill adds a new section to the act authorizing LEAA to develop and support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars to instruct State and local law enforcement personnel in improved methods of law enforcement. Such training programs would be designed to complement the training activities of the States and local governments, and would be restricted principally to regional training programs and to training activities, such as organized crime, training, which individual cities and States rarely are able to develop for themselves.

From its inception, through June 15, 1970, LEAA has developed and funded 30 training projects for State and local personnel of operating law enforcement agencies and personnel involved in law enforcement planning. These projects, involving total awards of approximately \$1,040,000, were funded through State and local governments utilizing 15 percent discretionary funds appropriated under part C of the act. The success of these projects has established clearly the need for a continuing program of training in a wide range of substantive areas related to law enforcement. The amendment would enable LEAA to support such a training program for funds appropriated expressly for that purpose, so that large sums of discretionary funds need not continue to be diverted from their primary purpose of supporting short-term innovative or experimental programs.

The amendment would provide explicitly that LEAA's training activities would not duplicate the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 404 of the act.

In addition to the above amendments to substantive program provisions, the bill includes a number of amendments to the administrative provisions of the act. The first of these is an amendment to section 515 of the act to make it clear that LEAA may render technical assistance to the States and cities by grant as well as by contract. Although I believe the original intent of section 515 was to authorize LEAA to discharge its technical assistance obligations either directly by utilizing its own staff or through grant or contract agreements with third parties, the language of the section does

not expressly authorize grantmaking. It appears advisable, therefore, to clarify this ambiguity by appropriate amendment.

A second administrative amendment inserts language in section 516(a) of the act to make it clear that LEAA funds may be used to pay the transportation and subsistence expenses of persons attending conferences or other assemblages, such as technical assistance conferences, notwithstanding the provisions of section 551 of title 31, United States Code. Title 31, United States Code, section 551 provides that "unless specifically provided by law" no public funds appropriated for any purpose shall be used for "lodging, feeding, conveying, or furnishing transportation to, any convention or other form of assemblage or gathering to be held in the District of Columbia or elsewhere"—government employees are exempt from the prohibition. LEAA has been advised informally that the General Accounting Office interprets this limitation as applying to technical assistance conferences and other such assemblages sponsored by LEAA. The amendment, recommended by GAO attorneys, would expressly exempt technical assistance awards and awards for similar purposes from 31 U.S.C. 551. Again, I am satisfied that Congress originally intended LEAA to have authority to use its funds for this purpose and thus I consider the amendment to be a perfecting one.

A third administrative amendment would change the deadline for submission of LEAA's annual report to the President and the Congress from August 31 to December 31. LEAA's grant cycle ends with the close of the fiscal year on June 30. Since it requires approximately a month for the Government Printing Office to print copies of annual reports, LEAA is now left with 1 month in which to collect a vast amount of statistical information for analysis and inclusion in the annual report. This has proved not to be enough time. Moving the submission date back to December 31 would afford LEAA enough time to include in its annual report sufficient information to fully advise the President and the Congress concerning all activities of the previous year. LEAA's submission date would then coincide with the submission date for the annual report of the Department of Justice.

Another administrative amendment would amend section 521 of the act to provide expressly that LEAA's audit and inspection authority entitles it to inspect the books and records of second-tier grantees and contractors who do not deal directly with LEAA, such as a subgrantee who receives funds from a State planning agency. The language of the section is not entirely clear on this point and, in the course of its audit activities to date, LEAA has confronted a number of indirect recipients of assistance who were reluctant to grant access to their books and records and who relied on a narrow reading of section 521 in support of their position.

On one occasion, an attorney representing a contractor of a State planning agency had given an opinion to the contractor to the effect that section 521

did not require the contractor to open his books and records to LEAA. Although LEAA managed eventually in all of the above cases to obtain access to books and records for audit purposes, the problem can be expected to recur frequently as audit activities are stepped up significantly as planned. For this reason it is deemed desirable to have section 521 amended so that LEAA's auditors can point to a provision of law expressly authorizing them to have access to the books and records of all recipients of title I assistance, whether received directly or indirectly from LEAA.

Three other amendments are designed to improve the administrative efficiency and staff capabilities of LEAA. They include authority to place 15 positions in GS-16, 17, and 18, authority to appoint individual experts and consultants, and authority to pay consultants and members of technical advisory committees at the maximum daily rate of compensation payable by other Federal agencies. The Department of Justice requested authority to place 25 LEAA positions in GS-16, 17, and 18 and I would prefer to grant them 25 positions. However, the committee disagreed and revised the number to 15 positions.

Before discussing the provisions of the bill with which I am not in accord, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify one change made by the committee which I feel may be subject to misinterpretation. The present act, as section 601(a), defines "law enforcement" to include "all activities pertaining to crime prevention or reduction and enforcement of the criminal law." The committee amended the definition to include "all activities pertaining to the administration of criminal justice, including, but not limited to, police efforts to prevent crime and to apprehend criminals, activities of the criminal courts and related agencies, and activities of corrections, probation, and parole authorities."

This revision, I am afraid, can be construed as a narrowing of the range of activities included within the scope of the act. The use of the term "administration of criminal justice," particularly in light of the examples included in the definition, seems to suggest that activities outside of the formal, official functions and processes of the police, the courts and correctional institutions and authorities are excluded from coverage. I wish to make it clear that I do not understand, and I do not think the committee understood, that the revision would narrow the scope of law enforcement related activities included within the scope of the old definition. Any number of nonofficial activities of persons other than law enforcement officials could be included so long as they relate to crime prevention and reduction.

I support H.R. 17825. I am one of its coauthors. I support it because I think it is a well-balanced bill, one which improves the content of the law and functional utility of the program. However, the bill contains four provisions with which I disagreed in subcommittee and in the full committee.

First, I think it is unwise to dismantle the tripartite directorate without a fair opportunity for it to prove itself. The

September 1969 report of the National Governors' Conference praised the administration of LEAA as one which "sets an outstanding example that could well be emulated by other Federal departments." The February 1970 report of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors complimented LEAA for its administration of the program and called the agency among the best of Federal agencies administering grant-in-aid programs.

As an alternative, I suggest that the tripartite directorate be retained; that decision authority with respect to all administrative matters be vested in one of the three who would be designated "Administrator"; and that decision authority on all substantive program matters—such as fund allocation, grant making, contracts, and so forth—be vested in the vote of a majority of the three Administrators.

Such an alternative would have the virtue of expediting operation and management while retaining the benefit of collective judgment, experience, and expertise. Particularly in the field of law enforcement, it is wiser to collectivize the judgment of many and disperse command authority among many rather than concentrate decisionmaking power in the hands of one man.

Second, I have grave doubts about the workability of section 4(5) of the bill which would deny approval of any State plan which fails to provide "an adequate share of assistance to deal with law-enforcement problems in areas of high-crime incidence."

Aside from the obvious problem of defining what is an "adequate" allocation for a given area, the amendment might be interpreted to require States to base their subgrant allocations principally upon crime statistics. Although the committee report disclaims any purpose of requiring the adoption of an arbitrary allocation formula based on crime incidence, the report—page 11—does state that the purpose is to focus funds in areas where major crime is most prevalent and interprets the amendment as requiring that each State "shall generally correlate the benefits of anticrime efforts with the incidence of crime in particular areas." Mr. Chairman, this requirement surely will foster "statistical crime waves" as cities within each State vie with each other in compiling high crime statistics in order to claim entitlement to larger shares of title I funds. It will also restrict the freedom of a State to consider all factors—relative needs, existing resources and population distribution, for example—in allocating funds within the State in the most effective manner to achieve comprehensive statewide improvement in law enforcement.

The present act requires that LEAA approve a State plan only if it adequately takes into account the needs and requests of all local units within the State and provides for an "appropriately balanced" allocation of funds to all local units. I believe that these provisions of the present law are sufficient and are preferable to the committee provision which inevitably will have the effect of causing the

States to stress crime incidence to the exclusion of other relevant factors.

Third, I am concerned about a provision in the bill which would require each State to provide at least one-fourth of the non-Federal funding for all programs and projects implemented by local governmental units within the State. Although I agree with the general principle that the States should assume a greater financial responsibility for local programs and projects, I believe the committee provision compelling instant compliance is premature by several years. Most of the States are now voluntarily increasing their appropriations for title I programs as rapidly as they can and many States are assuming an increasing share of the non-Federal cost of local programs and projects. The new requirement would mean that some States might not be able to qualify to receive block grants, either because their budgets and appropriations for the next year or two are already fixed or because they simply will not be able to find the funds to meet the increased level of matching.

For these reasons, I urged in the committee that this provision be deleted and that LEAA be permitted to continue its present, increasingly successful efforts to persuade the States to voluntarily increase their financial commitments to LEAA programs, including a voluntary assumption of a greater share of the cost of local projects. Since my efforts were not successful, I am hopeful that the other body will delete the provision or, in the alternative, will delay its effective date for at least 2 years to give the States enough time to reassess their budgets and appropriation projections in order to comply.

Fourth, there is one troublesome provision in the amendment to section 520—the authorization section. That provision requires that not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated to LEAA shall be devoted to the purposes of corrections, including probation and parole. I favor priority treatment for corrections reform. However, I cannot understand how LEAA can as a practical mathematical exercise, enforce such a provision on a nationwide basis.

Under the block grant approach of the LEAA program, the States and cities order their own priorities and decide on their own allocations of funds among the various components of law enforcement. What happens if LEAA adds up all of the applications at the end of the year and discovers that they are \$5 million short of the 25-percent figure? Do they call some State agency and try to persuade it to add another \$5 million to its corrections programs? Or do they assess each State, or perhaps some combination of several States, pro rata share? I simply do not believe the requirement can be logically administered.

More importantly, I believe the provision inevitably will be taken by the States as an indication that no more than 25 percent of their funds should be devoted to corrections each year. What is intended as a floor might become a ceiling. I would prefer to delete the provision and leave the States free as they now are to allocate their funds among

the various components of law enforcement according to their own priorities, so long as their plans are comprehensive. This might mean that the total nationwide commitment to correctional programs would considerably exceed 25 percent in some years—as is expected to be the case next year—but might be less than 25 percent in other years.

As an alternative to the deletion of the provision, I would prefer that it be changed to provide that 25 percent of appropriated funds be allocated to part E—the new correctional construction program. Or perhaps specific dollar authorizations might be included for part E.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer amendments addressed to the provisions I have named. I believe that, on balance, the bill is a good bill, and I would like to see it passed by the House of Representatives as promptly as possible. I would not want to do anything which might jeopardize its passage and which might involve this body in lengthy debate.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a former law enforcement official and one who is deeply concerned over the increasing crime rate in this area as well as throughout the Nation, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 17825, amending title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This bill, which will authorize substantial appropriations for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for the next 3 years, and reorganization of the administration of the LEAA by substituting an administrator for the present three-man board, will, I believe, greatly further the purposes of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and aid local and State law enforcement agencies in effectively combating crime in this country.

I am particularly pleased to see that these amendments include authorization for a new program for the construction, acquisition, and renovating of correctional facilities, and earmarks one-quarter of the entire appropriation for the purposes of correction.

It has long been my belief that we can make revolutionary gains in the practices of what we do with the criminal once we have removed him from society. In fact we must make changes and improvements in the present correctional systems. Statistics indicating that 50 to 70 percent of those who leave our prisons go out to commit another and perhaps more serious crime than those which brought them to prison in the first place, have led the experts to conclude that our grossly neglected and inadequate correctional institutions have been a factor in promoting confirmed criminality.

The committee's report points out that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas held in a decision that in certain respects confinement in the Arkansas penitentiary system

amounts to "cruel and unusual punishment."

Incarceration should be humane and the most modern techniques of rehabilitation should be employed. I think it is archaic to lock a man in a cage for a specified length of time and then unlock the cage and expect him to be reformed.

Pilot projects designed to evaluate the effects of well-planned rehabilitation programs have proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that many offenders can be salvaged if we get to them in time. Offenders can be taught to have new values. They can be taught skills. Moreover, they can be converted from being life's losers into being life's winners. Unfortunately, there are few well-planned professionally conceived rehabilitation programs in our Nation's prisons.

We must vastly increase the psychiatric care which is available to inmates. In Federal prisons we have about one psychiatrist for every 1,500 inmates, while in State prisons the figure is about one in 5,000 inmates. If there is any one segment of our society which needs psychiatric care, it is our prison population.

In addition to psychiatric care, we must expend more effort to teach inmates new work skills to equip them to lead productive lives in society after they have fulfilled their prescribed terms.

Everyone has a role to play in the job that must be done. The Federal Government, through the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprentice Training, must make a major commitment toward providing the necessary resources to train our prison population in usable skills.

The time has come for men in prison to be trained on a huge scale as plumbers, sheet metal workers, barbers, computer programmers and for the hundreds of jobs which a growing America will demand. Organized labor, business firms and organizations all must play a role in this job-training program.

I am pleased to note that in order to qualify for correctional funds under this bill, applicants will be required to provide assurances that the design of facilities will be modern and innovative, that provision is expressly made for rehabilitation programs, and that facilities will be staffed with personnel meeting advanced standards of training and education.

I agree with the members of the committee that, of all the activities within the criminal justice process, corrections appear to contain the greatest potential for reducing crime. Then, if we are to wage an effective battle against crime, this is necessarily an important part of the strategy. Obviously no small amount of funds and emphasis will compensate for the effect of many years of neglect on our correctional systems. Therefore, it is appropriate that one-fourth of the funds appropriated for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration are required to be expended for correctional purposes.

As the sponsor of legislation providing a program of grants to State and local governments for the construction or modernization of correctional institutions, I am happy that the Judiciary Committee has seen fit to extend the

provisions of the LEAA to include such authority in this area.

Another provision of the bill which is of particular interest to me is that which requires the States to take into consideration and to provide adequate assistance to those areas having high crime incidence.

I am well aware of the economic impact of high crime incidence upon the governments in the Washington metropolitan area, including my own Prince Georges County, Md.

While I fully recognize that the primary responsibility for controlling crime rests with local government, its efforts to cope with the problem are hampered to a great extent by inadequate financial resources. Realizing this, I cosponsored legislation known as the Police Assistance Act of 1970 which would provide direct Federal assistance in the form of grants to those cities and counties having primary responsibility to provide police services in major urban areas. I represent such an area.

The legislation before us today in no way restricts funds to urban areas, but clearly requires the States to assist those areas which have high crime incidence whether they be large or small.

These are two of the provisions of the legislation before us which I find particularly desirable. I would like to reiterate my support for the entire bill and urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, many Members no doubt recall the words of my predecessor, Mr. Cannon, when he was a Member here. He had a statement which I believe was very true. I think about it in connection with bloc grants to the States. He used to say that when one sent a dollar to Washington only 50 cents came back.

It seems to me that when we sift it back through the State government, as opposed to the local unit of government where the funds are needed, we simply lengthen the trip of the money back to the people, and perhaps diminish the amount they receive.

In line with this, the mayor of the largest city in my congressional district, James Eagan, of Florissant, testified, and I should like to call attention to some of the comments he had to the Congress.

He spoke not only as the mayor of Florissant, Mo., but also on behalf of the Missouri Municipal League, to which some 380 cities belong, and as a member and representative of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Some of his statements, I believe, are appropriate to this problem we face of grants to the cities and bloc grants to the States.

He stated:

Local governments across the Nation, and Florissant, Mo., is no exception, are caught in a severe fiscal crisis between State-imposed restrictions preventing broadening of the local revenue base and increasing demands for service by local citizens.

Even if a city is completely committed to action to control crime, the city may not be a free agent to collect and dedicate the necessary resources to achieve this purpose. Local revenue-raising capability and, to some extent, local spending choices are severely constricted by State law:

States tell cities what taxes they may raise, and in some cases how high they may raise them.

States designate who may and who may not be taxed.

States set limits on how much debt may be incurred and what interest rates may be paid, and

States sometimes mandate services which must be performed and what people must be paid to perform them.

In this connection I am pleased that the act has been amended this year. This proposed statute would include the requirement of a 25 percent local contribution from the State government, so if we had a project on which the contribution was 60 percent Federal and 40 percent local the State government would put in at least 25 percent of that, or 10 percent of the total cost of the project. I would think this would be progress. Hopefully, we can make more.

I quote again from Mr. Eagan, who pointed out the need for local funds to be handled at the local level and that their position was:

If any mayor takes this money and buys Cadillacs for his police department, he is not going to get reelected. We have to stand and be counted the same as you do and the same as the State officers. I think the mayors in the State of Missouri are intelligent, competent men, and we can do away with a lot of the paperwork and a lot of supervision, though certainly remain accountable to you gentlemen for the money that you send to us. But to spend weeks and months filling out forms and dotting "i's" and crossing "t's" does not fight crime. Send us the money and then with men like our chief and the other chiefs throughout the State, we will have the tools to do the job and not have to hire three and four clerks to type out seven copies of this and five copies of that and hire a director at \$20,000 a year to say how he is going to work a committee to pass out this money.

We think that the best thing that you can do for us would be to give the money directly to the cities. Hold us accountable to you and, at the same time, what you are doing is holding us accountable to our voters because if we take the money and use it promiscuously and not in the best interests of our people, you won't have to take action against us because we won't be in office.

That ends his statement. I would urge support of this legislation.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, in passing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the 90th Congress stated in title I of that act that—

Crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by State and local governments if it is to be controlled effectively.

As the Judiciary Committee's report is entitled, what we are today considering is the revision and extension of Federal law enforcement assistance to State and local governments.

When our Nation's Government was first formed under the Constitution there were only a very few Federal crimes men-

tioned, such as treason, counterfeiting, and piracy. Since the common-law crimes have been held not to apply against the Federal Government, it is literally true that to a very great extent, the State and local governments have defined various crimes and are also charged with the enforcement of such criminal laws.

If there is one common characteristic in nearly everyone's ideas about Government, it is a desire that the Government be close in proximity and hopefully understanding. Even if it were possible to establish that the very best police force system in terms of efficiency would be a national police force, I doubt whether very many of us would want such a system.

The growing awkwardness of an overburdened centralized Federal Government has been demonstrated in ways so numerous so as to nearly defy categorization. The presence of dedicated case-workers and secretaries in our own offices is living proof of such problems. It seems to me absolutely necessary that the States assume new responsibilities and bring Government closer to the people.

We have seen in recent years a series of Federal efforts to aid and assist State and local levels of government. Indeed, the business at hand is to renew the program of assistance to law enforcement at State and local levels. Congress has declared crime to be an area in which it is necessary and proper for Federal assistance to be made available to the State and local law enforcement efforts, and I doubt whether many would quarrel with that determination.

Basic to the operation of this program of Federal assistance to law enforcement is the block grant concept wherein a State makes a thorough review of crime and law enforcement within its borders and prepares a comprehensive plan for improving the situation. Upon review and approval at the Federal level, funds to be spent in furtherance of such comprehensive plans are made available to the States.

My own State of Illinois, under the inspiring leadership of Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie, has been a pacesetter and has established a model or blueprint for action which can be of significant guidance and direction to other States. Governor Ogilvie, in testifying before the Judiciary Committee on behalf of the National Governor's Conference earlier this year regarding the legislation before us today, stated:

Under the Federal act, you have looked to the States for planning leadership in strengthening our system of criminal justice. I feel that this is most appropriate since the formation and administration of the organic criminal law is constitutionally the responsibility of the States. In Illinois, we have taken this responsibility seriously.

The record of Illinois is indeed impressive. Faced with a proliferation of 102 counties with sheriffs and 800 municipalities with police departments—Cook County alone having 121 municipal police departments, and the need to make some comprehensive plan and order out of these separate local law enforcement entities, the first executive order issued

by Governor Ogilvie established the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission—ILEC—as the official State agency for purposes of the 1968 act.

The ILEC has 32 members representing every facet of the State's system of criminal justice. Under the commission are 36 regional planning units. The chairman of the ILEC is Arthur J. Bilek, whose experience includes higher education as well as operational experience at many levels of law enforcement. He was chief of the Cook County police and is a full professor at the University of Illinois, where he directed the criminal justice curriculum at that institution.

Of the 32 members of ILEC, five are mayors and elected officials, 10 are representatives of law enforcement, two are judges, two represent the city of Chicago, three represent minority groups, eight are from corrections, one from the clergy, five are citizen representatives, and two are academicians.

The greatest allocation of planning funds by ILEC has gone to the city of Chicago. The State has consistently exceeded the requirements of the Federal act. Illinois was the first State whose legislature made a strong financial commitment to the program. The State appropriated over \$3 million for the matching requirements for Federal funding, but to that figure, the State added \$5 million for statewide programs to supplement the comprehensive State plan. One extremely desirable result has been the ability of the State to supplement the financial resources of local governments which are unable to develop their own matching funds.

In discussing the highly rewarding experience of the State of Illinois under its own as well as the Federal block-grant program, Governor Ogilvie strongly opposed substantial deviation or cut back in the block-grant concept. I quote from his testimony to the Judiciary Committee, at page 88 of the printed hearings, as he stated frankly and forthrightly that—

In view of the record of progress in Illinois, therefore, I must oppose any amendment which would cut back the block grant concept. Such an amendment would, first of all, take from the States much of the means by which they can discharge their primary responsibility for creating and administering the criminal laws. It would diminish the degree of accountability which should be demanded of the States, and in effect set up another co-equal level or responsibility which conceivably could work at cross purposes with State efforts. It would deny to communities some of the expert assistance now available through Illinois by our Law Enforcement Commission.

It would create twin paths for fund applications, and would further confuse local officials in their efforts to meet Federal requirements.

The strong statewide program in Illinois is rooted in a high degree of local autonomy, coupled with effective statewide planning and assistance. Our entire program is oriented in community action, under local control.

And I would be less than candid with you if I did not say today that we have created a workable system, a system that enjoys a high degree of support, a system that is getting the job done with a minimum of friction between State and local governments.

We have taken the hand you extended to us in 1968, and we have in turn extended our hand and our own funds to our communities.

Several major accomplishments have been noted as unimpeachable evidence that the Illinois program is working well. I would like to briefly list some as follows: First, \$1 million has been made available to an Action Now program to quickly put into the hands of local police departments funds to have management studies of their departments. The ILEC was the first State planning agency to implement such a program; second, a statewide public defender project was begun with funding of \$2.2 million and places Illinois in the company of a very few States with such programs; third, a youth guidance program was funded by ILEC to attack the dropout problem. The Chicago Board of Education participated in this effort; fourth, to establish police community relations offices, an operation store front was granted an award by ILEC. Several storefronts are presently open and functioning and acting as a bridge to the communications gap between the police and the communities; fifth, a model curriculum for police recruit training was made possible by an ILEC grant to the Illinois Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. In smaller communities officers had been placed on duty with no prior training and such an intolerable situation is being corrected; sixth, with the cooperation of the University of Chicago a survey has been completed of the Illinois jails. For the first time in Illinois' history, it is felt that there is factual data regarding local jails which can be used for planning and reform; seventh, a grant of \$108,000 to a legislative counsel on the diagnosis and evaluation of criminal defendants is part of a recodification project to transform the corrections statutes into a modern correctional code.

I would say then to my colleagues, that the State of Illinois has proven that our legislative effort in the 1968 act was well designed to provide the incentive for effective State action and improvements in law enforcement throughout the Nation. That law is in its infancy and the funds have only recently begun to flow to the States under their comprehensive plans. The Judiciary Committee has seen fit to authorize the continuation of this program for 3 years and at increasing levels of authorization. We are on the brink of making possible very real and tangible progress. The leadership of the State of Illinois is a source of some pride to me and can serve as an example to other States. It is up to this body to make further progress a reality by accepting the Judiciary Committee recommendations without adding any destructive or counterproductive amendments.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, at the request of Mr. RAILSBACK, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a most significant series of amendments to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. I believe I can say that we have all been pleased with the efforts of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to aid local and State agencies in their battle against the rising tide of crime in this Nation. But

with every new program and administrative apparatus there are many bugs and hitches that need to be ironed out before real effectiveness is achieved. This is the purpose of this present set of amendments, and I am confident they will do much toward tooling up the LEAA for more effective action in the war against crime.

One of the most desperate failings of the first 2 years of operation of this new program is the fact that funds were not very well zeroed in on the target. I was shocked to find that in one State a large city of 200,000 with a very severe crime problem received only \$188 in LEAA support while a village of 10,000 in the same State received nearly \$20,000. I am sure, of course, that this is one of the more egregious examples of poor allocation, but it points to the fact that we must be more discriminating in the future. The present amendments seek to accomplish just that by making LEAA approval of a State plan for assistance contingent upon the express finding that an adequate share of the Federal funds will be directed to areas of high crime incidence.

Mr. Chairman, another significant change contained in this bill is the requirement that States meet at least one-fourth of the non-Federal share of LEAA grants going to local law-enforcement agencies. During the first 2 years of operation the States almost uniformly left the local unit of government to pick up the entire non-Federal tab. When we consider the alarming fiscal pinch in which many of our communities and municipalities find themselves, it becomes obvious that this practice is in need of sharp alteration. Moreover, the localities which most badly need law-enforcement assistance—our central city and core urban areas—are least able to bear the non-Federal share alone because of their shrinking tax bases and rising education and welfare costs. I believe the requirement that the States bear their fair share along with the stipulation that funds be more rationally allocated will enable our beleaguered central city enforcement agencies to more adequately cope with the inhumanly difficult tasks we have called upon them to perform. And we all have an interest in the success of efforts to combat crime in the central cities, whether we live there or not, because crime like any other virus tends to infect the entire body to which it attaches itself.

Two other provisions of this bill are also quite significant. One of these is the loosening of the limitations on the portion of a recipient's LEAA funds which can be expended for salary purposes. While we certainly do not want to get into the business of federally supporting the salaries of regular law-enforcement personnel at the State and local level, there is nevertheless a strong need and justification for aid to the specialized and auxiliary personnel required to cope with the increasingly complex problem of crime control. Though the present stringencies were probably well intended, it is clear that they have in many cases encouraged investment in sometimes quite superfluous gadgets and equipment to the neglect of more pressing priorities.

The present bill remedies this by removing all restrictions upon the use of discretionary grants and relaxing the limitations on the portion of block grant aid which may be used for salary support.

Another important innovation in this bill is a greatly stepped up program for the improvement of our correctional facilities. Recidivism is probably the main contributor to our rising crime rates, and unless something is done to ameliorate the scandalous situation in which 50 to 70 percent of those serving prison terms are rearrested, we will never get the criminal forces in this society under control. This bill takes a step in that direction by increasing to 75 percent the Federal share for grants for the construction of correctional facilities, and requiring that recipient institutions employ the most modern and advanced personnel and program practices.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill greatly increases the funding authorization for the LEAA. There has been much hue and cry about the need for law and order, and indeed there should be considering the enormity of the crime problem. But we must face the fact that a successful war on crime can not be financed on a bargain basis. Repressive laws, lack of police restraint, the abridgement of individual rights and compromise of judicial process may appear as less costly alternatives; but in my opinion they will not solve the problem, and they are most definitely repugnant to our cherished values of individual liberty and constitutional government. The way to truly combat crime and restore order and security to our streets, parks, businesses, and homes is through the upgrading, modernizing, and professionalizing of our entire law enforcement and criminal justice system. As the Eisenhower Commission pointed out, the price tag for such an effort will not be low; but by passing this measure today I think we will be showing that a vigorous and unrelenting effort to restore law and order is perfectly compatible with the attainment of higher levels of justice and the preservation of our democratic system of individual liberty.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANLEY).

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the most pressing problems our local police departments are facing in this day and age is a startling decline in the per capita personnel engaged in law enforcement work. Most of our larger cities and metropolitan areas are now engaged in a program of early retirements after 20 years, as a result thousands of dedicated, experienced policemen are leaving their respective police forces in the prime of their careers. I would like to see the Justice Department determine on a nationwide basis the feasibility of assisting local government in establishing police reserve units at the community level.

I have spent considerable time in conference with law enforcement officials in my hometown and I am aware of the acute personnel problems they are facing. Right today, in Syracuse, N.Y., the police department could use 100 more officers. But, like most cities, Syracuse

does not have this kind of money on hand.

My suggestion could enable the Federal Government to assist local police departments in establishing a reserve pool of retired police officers who would be physically capable of part-time work and whose talent and experience might otherwise stagnate.

This is not a national police force. Nor would these local units be responsible to the Federal Government. They would be completely under the jurisdiction of their respective communities and they would be responsible to the police authorities in those communities.

The staggering crime rise in our cities and the collateral decline in per capita police personnel ought to tell all but the most foolhardy that the cities need help. But I do not know of one major city in the country that has the wherewithal to cope with this problem. While it is a local problem, it is national in scope, and so we as national legislators have a moral and political responsibility to assist the cities in their dilemma.

The community police reserves would act as supplementary manpower to our already beleaguered law enforcement personnel. They would free many of our cities' younger policemen from administrative details and a host of other para-police activities, while at the same time enabling local police departments to take advantage of the experience of retired officers who are still in the prime of life.

In city after city policemen are retiring in their middle and late forties. They are still physically and mentally capable and they have a great deal to offer their communities. They should be allowed to share these capabilities up to age 60. Beyond their natural desire to serve their communities, most of them, I believe, would enjoy remaining active in police work, if only on a reserve basis.

Now it stands to reason that an incentive ought to be discussed and I am suggesting for example that a \$1,200 stipend per year be considered in the council.

I do not think there is a Member in this Chamber who is unaware of the proliferation of hard drug use and of the startling increase in street crimes, muggings, rape, and burglary in our urban and suburban areas. Nor do I think that anyone here fails to realize that a basic component in this problem is the shortage of police manpower. It is not the whole answer, to be sure, but I think my suggestion could go a long way toward a responsible solution to the situation.

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

Mr. HANLEY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman has made a very interesting suggestion. It is something I believe the various coordinating councils might consider seriously. I hope your message will go forth to these councils to the end that they might embrace some part if not all of the idea that the gentleman has just suggested.

Mr. HANLEY. I thank the gentleman so much for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from

New York (Mr. HANLEY) has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, while I rise in general support of this bill, there is one provision which it seems to me contains great peril for many States. I want to alert my colleagues of the House who are from States which do not have their legislatures in session at the present time or who will not have the legislature in session before next year, that there is a great peril, it seems to me, that they will be barred from participation in this program by reason of the paragraph which appears on page 4 of the bill, lines 16 to 20, which for the first time imposes a requirement on the State of providing not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding.

My State of Iowa is one of those which is in this very vulnerable situation because our legislature is not in session and will not be in session until next year.

We have an outstanding program under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in our State under the leadership of our Governor, Robert D. Ray. There is an excellent ongoing program there. For example, at the request of Governor Ray and the Iowa Crime Commission, the Iowa General Assembly earlier this year appropriated \$300,000 for Iowa's share of an action program which is upgrading the Iowa Narcotics Bureau, and which set up a new State criminalistic laboratory and a new State criminal conspiracy unit. The Iowa legislature appropriated \$80,000 as Iowa's share of new corrections and rehabilitations programs administered by the State Department of Social Services. An appropriation of \$33,000 was provided by the General Assembly as Iowa's share of a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration aided project to revise the Criminal Code of Iowa.

Separate from these efforts to provide State funds to match LEAA Federal funds for these important projects, the Iowa General Assembly has also enacted legislation improving the various State law enforcement agencies and increasing appropriations for those agencies wherever it was felt necessary for the struggle against crime. Among the many State-sponsored and financed programs to improve law enforcement at every level have been schools for law-enforcement officers to train them in use of breath-testing devices, State schools for prosecutors, and other programs too numerous to cite in detail at this time. Governor Ray appointed a fine panel to the Iowa Crime Commission which has been designated the State Planning Agency under the basic act. It drafted and submitted in February an excellent State plan which the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration approved on April 21, 1970. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has allocated \$2,460,000 to Iowa for the Federal share of action programs under this approved State plan, and earlier allocated \$241,000 for the Federal share of the cost of planning.

But now for the first time with this requirement in subparagraph (6) on page 4 requires that with respect to any such program or project, the State must provide not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding. This places my State, and I fear many other States, in considerable peril of losing any participation in this program whatsoever.

I will, therefore, at the appropriate time, offer an amendment which will postpone the effect of this one-fourth contribution requirement for a period of 1 year. That amendment will be on page 4, line 20, after the word "funding," and will insert the words "for each fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1972."

If your State does not have a legislative session this year, it may under the present form of this bill, H.R. 17825, if it is passed without amendment, be unable to qualify for Federal grants under H.R. 17825 during the fiscal year 1971.

The bill, as presently drafted for the first time requires States to provide not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding for law enforcement programs or projects.

I have had a very urgent telegram from the distinguished Governor of my State, Robert D. Ray, saying the cost of a special session, or to call our legislature into session so they could comply with this requirement, would be prohibitive.

Leaders of our State legislative body have advised me that this cannot be done retroactively next year. No possible harm can be done, I submit to my colleagues, if this particular provision requiring a one-fourth State contribution is deferred for a period of 1 year, and I therefore hope that this very simple, corrective amendment I intend to offer will have widespread support and can obviate what would be a severe blow to law enforcement in many States.

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

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. I would like to clarify that a State—the State of Iowa, for instance—is not opposed to the idea of having State participation, or forcing the State to contribute. I know in my own case I do not oppose that idea or philosophy either. But the sole object, I repeat, in this case, as the gentleman has said so well, is the fact that if this language is left in the bill a number of States just will not be able to participate under any circumstances at all.

Mr. MAYNE. As I have stated to the House, Governor Ray has provided strong leadership in implementing the effective use in Iowa of Federal law enforcement assistance grants under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. In view of his fine record in this field, it is highly significant that I have just received a telegram from him in which he states that if this bill is passed today without amendment and goes into effect affecting the fiscal year which starts on Wednesday of this week, it is his considered judgment it will be impossible for Iowa to continue to participate in this heretofore highly successful law enforcement program. All appropriations affecting the fiscal year 1971 have already been established by

the legislature when it was in session earlier this year. The proposed legislation, H.R. 17825, would, in the opinion of my Governor, effectively prevent Iowa from participating in the crime control program throughout the entire fiscal year 1971 which ends June 30, 1971. This can be obviated by the amendment I will offer postponing the 25-percent contribution for 1 year but not delaying the operative provisions of the bill in any way.

I ask the support of my colleagues when this amendment is offered.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for yielding me additional time.

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

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I wish to commend the gentleman on his statement. I believe that all of us are aware that Iowa has done a very good job under its Governor. I would merely like to ask a couple of questions of the gentleman.

Has the State of Iowa to date appropriated any funds toward their law enforcement assistance program? I am just curious.

Mr. MAYNE. Yes, they have.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Do you know what percentage those funds would represent as far as the total funding of the Iowa law enforcement assistance program?

Mr. MAYNE. I do not have those exact figures available to me now, but I will be more than happy to get them for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. The reason I ask is I think that would be most relevant, because it may be that Iowa has appropriated substantial funds that might come close to the requirement.

Mr. MAYNE. But Iowa has not appropriated funds under a formula such as this, which for the first time imposes a mandatory, indispensable requirement for participation in the Federal program of 25-percent contribution. Such funds as our legislature has appropriated have been for independent law enforcement activities of the State of Iowa, and they do want to go ahead under this program and are perfectly willing to contribute 25 percent, but they are unable to do so until the fiscal year 1972. It seems a great pity to me to have Iowa cut out of this program for the first year of the one-fourth requirement. And it is not just Iowa. I am advised there are 45 States that do not have sessions between now and next January which may be in the same predicament.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois what possible harm can come from deferring this one-quarter requirement for 1 year so that we can be sure these States will not be excluded?

I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, first of all it is my understanding the Iowa Legislature does meet next year. Under the existing program, the appropriation funds from the Federal Government

come due about May or June of our fiscal year, which would mean at that time, there would have to be matching funds available. This is the information given to me, and I hope it is correct. There are only two States which cannot meet this.

Mr. MAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to say to me that the urgent action which the House takes today will not put one dime into the States under this bill until May almost a year hence?

Is that urgent action by the Congress of the United States? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. RAILSBACK. I think that may very well be the case.

Mr. MAYNE. That is a mighty slow timetable to take care of the urgent problem of crime in America today.

Mr. RAILSBACK. But if that is true, it would permit the Iowa State Legislature to take action, and I think all but two of the State legislatures meet at the beginning of 1971.

When I am asking these questions, I am not taking issue with the gentleman. I am trying to get information myself. I am interested in how these programs will work, and I am interested in what the gentleman will say. The information given to me was that all but two States will be able to meet this.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, in connection with his concern about the State supplementing and providing a portion of the funds for these programs. There are many of us on the Judiciary Committee who would have preferred to see a stricter formula, which would have seen more of these moneys going directly to the local governments which suffer from the bulk of the crime problem. We yielded our preferences on the assurances that this kind of formula or approach would see to it that many States, including my own where the impact of the LEAA funds on the larger urban areas has been very small, will provide a larger portion of the funds to the cities where the crime problem is at.

Many of us consider this the counterpart of the block grant program as a whole. It seems to me that it comes with ill grace from some of the Governors who were so enthusiastic for block grants to oppose requirement that these crime-fighting funds will go to where the crime problems are, namely the urban areas of the States.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, when are the funds provided in this bill distributed?

Mr. MIKVA. I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois on the timing. It would seem to me they would come in at the end of this fiscal year, which would be any time after July 1.

Mr. KAZEN. Would this be by July 1 of next year or 1972?

Mr. MIKVA. No. The grant comes in July of this year. I think the question

solely is the timelag involved as to when States put in their requests, and the local governments put in their requests and when the funds come into the particular area for a particular project. There is a timelag, but not under the bill.

Mr. KAZEN. For all practical purposes, there would be a 1-year timelag because, as has been pointed out, very few of the legislatures will meet before next January.

I know that if the legislature of my State passes an appropriation bill providing the State's share at the next session, and if that bill does not receive a two-third record vote, the money will not be available until about September of 1971 which would mean a year's delay in continuing this program.

Mr. MIKVA. Is the gentleman aware his State of Texas does not provide any such funds?

The States came in and said they want the money to come in in block grants. They said the block grants programs are going well. How are they working well if Texas is one of the States which does not provide any help to its local communities? I would be reluctant to say that.

Mr. KAZEN. I would be too. But I want this bill to be effective as soon as possible. Why call this an emergency fund measure if there is to be a 1-year lag before the money is to go into the local communities where the problem exists?

Mr. MIKVA. The provisions of this bill go into effect immediately and if, in fact, Texas has been denying funds to its local communities with which to take advantage of the law, if that is the situation in Texas, then I would say that it is their problem to make it possible for this to be more immediately effective.

That is not a problem with this bill. This bill will become effective July 1, 1970.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, the latest crime statistics released by the FBI reveal an alarming increase in the incidence of serious crime in the United States and in my own State of Indiana.

The national index of serious crime rose by 13 percent in the first 3 months of 1970 over the first quarter of 1969. In Indiana, the serious crime rate leaped 22.4 percent in the first quarter of 1970 over this period last year. And major crimes in my home community of South Bend rose 20 percent over the same interval.

The law enforcement assistance amendments now before the House are aimed at aiding State and local police officials do a more effective job of coping with this alarming problem.

If we are to wage effective war on crime, we must do more than give lip service to supporting law enforcement authorities.

We must provide substantial financial assistance for education and training of police officials, for building and modernizing correctional facilities, and for improving all aspects of our criminal law system.

The action of the judiciary committee

in approving \$650 million in Federal funds for law enforcement assistance during fiscal year 1971 reflects a more realistic appraisal of the extent of the increasing crime problem than does the administration's request for only \$480 million for the same period.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reported by the judiciary committee recommends that a total of \$3.15 billion be spent over the next 3 years for law enforcement assistance. In addition to the \$650 million which the committee recommends for fiscal year 1971, the committee recommends expenditure of \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion respectively in the following 2 fiscal years.

This total recommended expenditure, Mr. Chairman, comes close to the \$3.5 billion contained in law enforcement assistance legislation which I introduced in February.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is essential that the House pass this bill to prevent and control crime.

I would also urge, Mr. Chairman, that prompt action and support be forthcoming for two other bills aimed at preventing and controlling crime—the Pretrial Crime Reduction Act and the Correctional Services Improvement Act, bills which I cosponsored earlier this year.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

In the first instance, it is very essential that the States make some allocation of a portion of this program. We provide that the States shall contribute at least 25 percent of the non-Federal funds, so that the entire burden shall not be on the localities.

Most of the cities and most of the countries are broke. Let us not forget that. They implored the States for help. The States very imperiously said "No, not a thin dime."

That cannot continue. The States must assume some responsibility in this tremendous program. There can be no delay.

The amendment suggested would delay this emergency program. The crooks and the thieves and the muggers do not delay. They brook no delay. They act immediately on impulse.

We should not delay. We should do nothing that would impede the free flow of funds so that we can tackle and conquer this dreadful scourge, the crime which is besetting our Nation.

There is talk about State legislatures not meeting. Only two State legislatures will not meet; that, Kentucky and Virginia. But Virginia has already appropriated funds without earmarking them necessarily, which can be used for this very purpose under the terms of this bill. The only State, really, that is left is Kentucky.

Most States have interim appropriations. They make appropriations for contingency funds that can be used for emergency purposes.

We cannot be stymied here because of some archaic provisions of the States. We have to go forward with this program. There should be no delay. I hope any amendment that involves delay will be decisively voted down.

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

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

Mr. MAYNE. I should like to point out to the distinguished chairman of the committee that those of us who support this amendment are not asking for delay in the program proceeding. We are only asking that the mandatory requirement that the State contribute one-fourth be deferred for 1 year, because we believe it is impossible for many States to comply with that requirement.

Mr. CELLER. But the effect will be delay, d-e-l-a-y. I cannot see it any other way.

For that reason, I will vigorously object to any amendment of that character. Let the States devise something. Why should one State or two States or three States stymie this program? Let the States rise to their duty here. Let the States really understand, and the State legislatures really understand, how gigantic and how perilous the fiscal problems of local governments are.

There should be no delay. This amendment should be decisively voted down when it comes before us.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a doubtful feeling about the postponement which is sought in this case. While we are not now debating the amendment, I would have great hesitancy and reluctance in delaying such provision of this legislation for 1 year.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I am not skilled in the knowledge of the law in Iowa and I do not want to leave the slightest impression that I know what the law of Iowa is. However, I would find it hard to believe that the State of Iowa could not take advantage of a grant from the Federal Government pursuant to a law that was passed in June or July or August when that legislature met in January the following year and could then proceed with appropriations in the regular course.

I do, however, think I know what the law is in my State. In my State the legislature meets in odd years. That means sometime on or before the 10th of January of 1971 the legislature of the State of Ohio will meet. They can appropriate money immediately thereafter to meet requirements that will occur immediately or during the biennium.

Mr. Chairman, if the States could not take advantage of grant-in-aid programs of the Federal Government such as the LEAA program with this provision then we would not have had the success in so many programs that were enacted into law at the Federal level in the last 30 years.

I do not see how the State of Iowa could fail to benefit if they moved promptly after the legislature convened in 1971.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me, principally to ask some questions.

On page 4 of the bill, line 10, section 303, it reads:

(5) Section 303 is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following

new sentence: "No State plan shall be approved unless the Administration finds that the plan provides for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence."

The question I wish to direct to the chairman with respect to this particular amendment is this: Was this amendment born of the need that apparently is reflected in the experiences that some of us have had in some States where we do have areas of recognized high incidence of crime but have been unable for one reason or another to get State agencies to allocate the proportionate amounts of money? Will this amendment take care of that?

Mr. CELLER. Yes indeed. We had very concrete evidence brought before the committee that in innumerable instances where there was a high incidence of crime there was not sufficient attention paid by the State planning agency with reference to the allocation of funds. They were woefully and inadequately treated in that regard.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I compliment the chairman and his committee for taking care of this through this amendment. And, I take this opportunity to express myself in favor of the adoption of this measure and to compliment the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the Chairman for yielding to me and I rise in support of H.R. 17825—the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act Amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to compliment the committee for having raised the amount of money from the original request of \$493 million to over \$650 million.

Many of us feel that it should have been even a higher figure than that. However, we are very pleased that the committee has gone this far.

I think also that the committee is to be complimented upon seeing to it that an allocation is being made for the correctional institutions in the various States. They are in a deplorable condition. In my opinion we will find in the course of the next 2 or 3 years that unless the moneys do go to these institutions we will have a continuing series of scandals, particularly in State institutions which might be called correctional institutions but which do not function as such.

It is also my hope that the proposed amendment to shift the National Institute of Law Enforcement to the Department of Justice will be defeated and further that the committee requirement that State funds be used to sustain the local communities to the extent of 25 percent of the matching funds will be upheld.

Many of us felt originally that Federal money should go directly to the local law enforcement agencies and to the local communities because this is where the problem must be met. If the State is going to run the program through block grants to the States, then the State should contribute.

I might further point out that we have to have some vehicle to require the State

to contribute to this program because there is a great area, namely, the correctional institutions and the courts, which are often under State control and of course we must expect that the States are going to take up this part of the burden of handling the problem of crime.

I think the committee has done an excellent job. This, actually, is far and away the most important anticrime bill of the entire year. It is the one that deals with crime at the local level in the communities and the cities where the muggings and attacks take place on the streets. This is the only program which the Federal Government has for sending substantial amounts of money to the local level in order to assist the local communities in their fight against crime. We spend most of the Federal efforts on other very difficult areas of Government and have not devoted enough in handling the problem of crime because law enforcement is a local function.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will move very quickly in future years under this program toward matching the \$5 billion in local expenditures presently being made. Then we will begin to really do something about home and street crime.

I thank the chairman very much for yielding to me. I hope the bill passes in the form in which it has been presented to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Judiciary Committee for its excellent work in increasing and refining the program authorized for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I have followed the activities of the LEAA in Maryland and the Washington metropolitan area with great interest. Assistance has been granted for projects as varied as the needs of the system of criminal justice. Chief among these needs are the requirements for better training for personnel in the field of criminal justice, modern management of law enforcement institutions, and better techniques for the correction or treatment of offenders.

In the field of personnel, LEAA funds assist students enrolled in the criminal justice curriculum at Montgomery College in my district. At the State level, a prosecutor training coordinator is being established to upgrade standards of performance by all Maryland State prosecutors. On the management side, the International Association of Police Chiefs has received support for its pioneering work in analysis and promotion of advanced police administration and operation. Maryland is participating with the help of LEAA in Project Search, a demonstration project to test the feasibility of a computerized criminal information system for easy access to offender records. The new Narcotics Treatment Agency in the District of Columbia has received a substantial grant for its important work.

The research arm of LEAA, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has awarded grants for research in neglected fields such as the

problem of student violence in higher education, and the special problems of an urban judicial system.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has approved a new grant program to improve correctional facilities, as recommended by the administration. The President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation recently reported that there are plenty of promising new ideas in the field of corrections, but very few of them have been tested or implemented for lack of funds. What money is spent on corrections now goes almost exclusively for custody and administration. Nothing has been left for the critical personnel requirements that must be met for rehabilitation of offenders. As the task force recommended, Federal funds to aid in upgrading correctional systems should help encourage cooperation among communities or States where joint facilities would be convenient and efficient.

I have read the committee's report on these amendments with a feeling of optimism. By and large, the States and localities have responded with new efforts to deal with crime. We have not yet seen dramatic results in only 2 years, but I think the LEAA and cooperating States and communities have laid some of the groundwork for solid progress in the seventies.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the chairman for yielding some time to make some inquiries. It goes without saying I will support the Law Enforcement Assistance Act extension as provided by H.R. 17825. However, I must observe that in my home city of Independence, Mo., which is a city of 110,000 population, our chief of police has had very serious difficulty in receiving a grant. As a matter of fact, as channeled through the State, our city has received almost nothing.

My inquiry is whether this extension of the act will provide some safeguards built in which allow for some right of appeal.

The problem is somewhat as follows: Independence is a suburb. Those who commit crimes come from the big city to the west, Kansas City, Mo. The criminal comes into our city, commits an offense and proceeds to get away. Later the criminal may be apprehended for some other crime in Kansas City, Mo. The record shows no crime was committed in Independence, which is not the true situation. Because the criminal is prosecuted in Kansas City, Mo., the suburb city is denied grants for training and other purposes because statistics erroneously indicate we do not have a high crime incidence. I wonder if the distinguished chairman could address himself to that problem?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield, I believe we had a great deal of discussion along those lines, in the course of 12 days of hearings on this legislation. The bill does provide that areas of high incidence of crime deserve an adequate share of assistance. But that does not preclude aid being given to other areas.

I think the gentleman need have no apprehension on that score.

Mr. RANDALL. I am grateful for the assurances of the chairman.

Notwithstanding the fact remains that there is a definite need for a better definition to establish some kind of standard of what constitutes an "adequate share of assistance" as set out in H.R. 17825. It is my understanding that there will be an abandonment of the geographical-population basis. Instituted in its place will be a new formula based on need. I suppose this means there is not much of a change, in fact, because the areas of high crime incidence are also the areas of large population. If that is true, then this amendment is more a change in form than in substance.

Mr. Chairman, we all know too well that there is a high crime incidence in the high population areas. The complaint from our suburban area has been that the places with a high density of population receive all the funds and the other areas receive none. Certainly this is unfair and unrealistic, because a criminal pays no attention to political subdivisions or boundaries of a city which actually appear only on a piece of paper which we call a map or by a small city limits sign at the side of a road. Certainly policemen in the suburbs should be just as well trained and equipped to apprehend and overtake those who have committed a crime and are making a getaway as those who have chased them out of the big city. Many times the hideaway for hoodlums is beyond the perimeter of the city, or out in the suburbs. Many criminals hole up in the rural areas. In the past few years, under State allocation the lions' share has been allocated to the big cities to the almost complete neglect of the smaller cities in the suburbs and rural areas.

I am hopeful that a way may be found in order that the Federal funding to the smaller communities may be increased either by better State allocation or some way provided for an appeal to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. There should be some kind of safeguard or, put differently, a right of appeal, from the interpretation of what constitutes an adequate share of assistance. Even under the new act such a phrase may be too vague and open to too many different interpretations. I am hopeful that the new distribution procedures will be more responsible to the law enforcement needs of small cities. Certainly it could not be any less responsive than at present based upon the record of allocation to many of our smaller cities in the 2 years just passed.

Mr. Chairman, I shall listen very carefully to any proposed amendments that may be offered providing for specific allocations that may be helpful to our smaller cities.

Let us not forget that law enforcement is not keyed to some boundary as it appears on a map. Law enforcement is a matter of preventing the violation of law if possible and then most certainly apprehending and punishing the offender. Certainly none of these activities by enforcement officials fit nicely into geographical boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, while H.R. 17825 needs some changes, it is most encouraging that the effort is being made to extend the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968 for a period of 3 years, and include some much needed amendments to the 1968 act. I know we are all grateful to the committee for its increased appropriations to \$650 million for fiscal year 1971. It should have been higher. Law enforcement should enjoy a very high priority among our expenditures; \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972 is not too high a figure considering the thousands of allocations for the use of these funds. While \$1½ billion for fiscal year 1973 may be subject to question, it should be remembered that this is an authorization bill and experience gained through the intervening years will indicate the needs for the actual appropriation. It is a privilege to support H.R. 17825.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a marked step in the right direction. It is a bill to attack crime on the local level through the State and local police enforcement agencies, and it is, indeed, a recognition of the fact that 97 or 98 percent of all crimes are local in nature, and about 2 percent of the crime, certainly not more than 3 percent of the crimes, relate to Federal criminal statutes.

So this is a bill that is of vital importance, and will be after it becomes law, and is administered effectively—and I am not making an observation with regard to what administration might be in power, because we all know that we can pass the most effective law in a certain field or activity, and if it is not administered effectively it does not meet the objectives that the Congress has in mind and the objectives that are capable of being achieved under the law, or under the bill once it is enacted into law.

I also want to say a few words for some forgotten people, and they are very important people in connection with the safety of you and me, and all Americans. I want to say a few words about the members of the various police departments throughout the country.

We do not hear too much about them. They are called names by some who want to use insulting references about them, and to downgrade them. I can remember when I was a kid we called them "cops," but this was not a derisive reference. Most of the police officers I knew, when they caught some of us stealing a ride on a streetcar, would give us a good, swift kick where we felt it. And this we preferred, rather than have them report the incident to our parents, because then we would get a more severe punishment at home.

I also remember as a kid that police officers were judges in the first instance—as they are today. The role of a police officer is more than enforcing the law.

In a sense he is a judge in the first instance, if somebody commits a misdemeanor which may not be serious, of whether to report it to his parents and let them know or bring them into court

where the youngster might get a record which he will carry throughout his life. So the role of a police officer is more than that of wearing a uniform and enforcing the law.

Where would we be without them? If we did not have police enforcement agencies and police officers, there would be chaos. In every hamlet and in every city and in every part of our country.

I think if public officials would speak up more in support of our police departments, it would stimulate them to carry out their duties and to enforce the law. I cannot conceive of anything that is more discouraging to a police officer or to the police department than a situation where one who enforces the law immediately becomes the defendant and is charged with police brutality or some other charge.

So it is my purpose today to say a few words for the man who wears the uniform. None of us is perfect—and certainly they are not perfect. But their devotion to duty is about as near perfect as any human agency can be—remembering the tens and tens of thousands of police officers and other enforcement officers who work on the Federal, State, and local levels.

We cannot ignore the fact that there is widespread fear throughout the country because of crime. That fear is in the minds of our womenfolk and naturally and properly so. When our womenfolk are in fear that fear is transmitted to our loved ones, our wives and children, if one is blessed with children.

I know every morning when I leave the hotel, I say to Mrs. McCormack, "Mother, put the double lock on the door." I do not like to say that. Then I say, "Do not open the door unless you know it is the voice of someone who might be knocking," like one of the boys who has been working there for years and who has become sort of a member of the family.

So we are dealing with that fear—widespread fear. Such widespread fear can bring about mass frustration. Mass frustration can be harmful to the very institutions of our Government. We have seen it happen in other countries.

I think some of us should say a good word for the man who wears the police uniform—this is the right and constructive thing to do and we should encourage it. I think if people in public life would let it be known that they are going to enforce the law and want the law enforced, and then back up the police officers, it would have a tendency to reduce crime.

So far as I am concerned, as Speaker of the House, about 3 or 4 years ago, there was a mass march where they were going to come up on the Hill. These were not people acting emotionally—these were people with trained minds—cold and calculating minds. They were going to march up to Capitol Hill in Washington from all over the country. They had their battle plans prepared. They were going to march up the Hill and take over the House of Representatives. They were called the "Unrepresented Congress"—they always have a high sounding name. They were going to take over this very Chamber. If they had taken it over, even

if they took it over for a minute, they would be taking over a part of our Government.

I wish their plans had been for the Senate, then it would not have directly been my job as Speaker but it would have been the job of the Vice President or of the leadership over there, to cope with that problem. But it was the House of Representatives. I had several meetings with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and other leaders.

They included the Attorney General, representatives of the FBI, representatives of the Metropolitan Police and our own police. I gave the Chief of Police three instructions and they stand today. They will stand until I leave as the Speaker:

First, I shall not stand for defiance of the law;

Second, I expect the police to enforce the law;

Third, and most important, I will back you up.

Those are the instructions that I gave on that occasion, and those are the instructions that the Chief of Police of our Police Department have to this very minute, so far as I am concerned as Speaker, and I apologize to no one. When we have a breakdown of law tyranny starts; there is a direct attack upon the institutions of the Government that we love and that we believe in.

So today I am thinking of those thousands of men who have wives, families, and children. When they are murdered, their wives and children suffer keenly the anguish of the death of a loved one. Today, talking extemporaneously, I want to say a few words for the police and the enforcement agencies of our Government, Federal, State, and local, with the hope that public officials will back them up when they enforce the law and not put the police officer in the position of feeling that he is the defendant instead of the man who is arrested.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 17825, the bill developed by the Judiciary Committee to extend and improve the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

You can readily appreciate my concern and interest in this legislation, for I am a resident of the city of Newark, N.J., which unhappily was listed by the FBI in the crime index of cities with populations of over 250,000 as first.

In developing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act 2 years ago, we fully recognized that the crimes which most concern all Americans are local in nature and properly the responsibility of local and State law enforcement agencies.

Homicide, robbery, rape, aggravated assault—these constitute an insidious menace that spreads through every street and every alley in every neighborhood, forcing people to determine their activities not by choice or desirability but by fear. They have, in effect, severely limited the lives of our citizens, and particularly those who live in the

urban areas, where the threat of crime is greatest.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was established to provide desperately needed financial assistance to aid local and State police in carrying out law enforcement and criminal justice programs to bring under control the street crime which is of such immediate and terrifying concern to us all.

The beginnings made so far have been impressive.

In New Jersey, with the small amount of action grant money—\$860,000—made available last year some very worthwhile programs were undertaken, including one that took a narcotics education project directly into the schools, another that sought to improve the response time of police to radioed calls and one that enabled the State police to hold a unique school on organized crime.

A large sum of the initial year's funds went to implement the "ALERT" System (Allied Law Enforcement Radio Tie), a portable radio system reserved for emergency use and operating on the same frequency regardless of location, that implements a prime recommendation of three special commissions: the 1967 President's Crime Commission, the 1968 Kerner Commission and the 1968 Lilley Commission in New Jersey. I was delighted to learn that a \$100,000 discretionary grant has been approved, for the 12-month period beginning July 1, 1970, to expand the project. The grant will extend this emergency communication system to eight additional sites, an expansion which is necessary to keep pace with the changing pattern and nature of civil disorders. Also, an "ALERT" radio system coordinating control center will be developed and installed in the New Jersey State Police Division Headquarters.

However, with the limited funds available 21 applications had to be denied.

Thus, it is imperative that we approve this legislation to increase funds for use under the act, particularly in view of projected multiyear plans which must be submitted by the States.

This legislation is also urgently needed to make law enforcement assistance more directly responsive to the needs of high crime areas and to insure more local community participation in the planning and expenditure of funds.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other areas of crime which need assistance, and I am glad to say that Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5, of which I am a member, is now holding hearings on proposals to deal with organized crime.

However, overriding all problems is the menace of street crime. It must be eradicated if we are to have a free and safe society and not a nation of terrified individuals scuttling in fear between work and home, and living behind locks and bars.

I believe the bill before us will greatly improve the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act so it will more effectively and expeditiously provide the aid our law enforcement officials throughout the country most desperately require, I urge its unanimous approval.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I take this occasion to commend the dean of the New Jersey delegation, Mr. RODINO, for his remarks, and I want to add my voice in support of this bill. Many of you know that the State of New Jersey has been in the newspapers consistently for the past 3 or 4 months on matters of criminal activity. They are beginning to clean up some sectors that have needed it for a number of years.

They are beginning to clean up some sectors that have needed correction for a number of years. This bill would be of tremendous assistance to New Jersey. I can think of no other place which is more or less a bedroom for a criminal element who come in there to live but who ply their nefarious trades elsewhere in addition to New Jersey.

This is not a true New Jersey picture per se, because many of the people who move into our State and who have come in there have done so because we have been unable to trace their previous activities by name and description very rapidly, but we do have that situation staring us in the face.

We have excellent police departments, in fact, some of the finest are in our cities, but they have been handicapped, and we need some bloc grants. We need all the support we can get.

When New Jersey comes to face the test financially and we look at the situation as far as the Federal levies are concerned, we must take note of the fact that New Jersey is the No. 1 contributor, and we pay more money into the Federal Government to get back a Federal dollar than any other State in the Nation.

This bill will mean the difference in handling the criminal element properly, in getting better training for our police departments, and in getting better equipment which they need so badly.

Last, but not least, I am hopeful it will enable us to get the support we need, and perhaps to get the judiciary to work more than 4 or 5 hours a day for more than 4 or 5 days a week, so we can get our backlog cleaned up.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

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

Mr. Chairman, before I comment on the bill, I want in behalf of the police of the Nation, having represented the policemen as I have been nationwide for a number of years, to extend my heartfelt thanks and commendation to the Speaker of the House for his very warm and laudatory and pertinent remarks.

He recounted an incident that occurred here a few years ago, at a time when there was a threat by a group to unlawfully take over possession of the House of Representatives. He spoke to the Chief of Police, ordered him to enforce the law, and gave him the authority to do so. Even more important, he assured him that he would sustain the officer in his actions. That element of trust

and support, Mr. Speaker, is what has been lacking over the last several decades throughout this country. That element is, in my judgment, the prime cause of the conditions that we find today in our Nation. The public officials of the Nation have abdicated their responsibility—if not completely, at least they permitted an erosion of their responsibility. Imperceptibly but inexorably, they permitted their authority to erode, and that reflected itself on the police. The police today find themselves in a position where they are required to enforce the law from, not a single standard, but a multistandard base. The end result is confusion in the ranks.

What makes the situation even more disastrous is that there is confusion among the people. We had a perfect illustration of that in the city of New York. We have it still to this day. I am a product of that police department, having retired after 23 years of service, and I am proud of it as any policeman would be, but I know the conditions, and those of us who have viewed it over the past few years know the disaster that has resulted. This bill would provide additional moneys, but moneys are but a single step of what should be a multifaceted approach on the part of all responsible officials in authority.

I suggest strongly that the authorities look to their responsibility and discharge it properly. They are wrong in their belief that making concessions or taking backward steps or relinquishing the old standards will help. There has been fruitless compromise with a principle that brooks no such action.

Let me tell the Members this attitude is a fallacy; they believe they are paying tribute or at least making concessions to the minority groups. That is the least the minority groups wish. They want law enforcement. I know during the last presidential campaign there was volatile and hostile rhetoric throughout the country. I understood it.

I understood why the minority groups resented the law and order slogan—it was only because it assumed an evil connotation. Right after the election, and following the time when the rhetoric subsided, the minority groups themselves vigorously solicited public officials for law enforcement, and they, themselves, assumed vigilante positions in order to provide safety in the streets for their women and children.

Yes, it was in the very heart of Harlem, in my town. And that is only a sample. In my judgment it is typical of what is occurring all across the Nation.

One can go to Philadelphia, where there is a tremendous police commissioner, who assumed a firm position. He gave no quarter. Despite the fact that there was great resistance at the outset, with the passage of time and the display of a fair and equitable enforcement of law, the minority groups accepted it and said, "This man is fair; he is firm but he is fair."

That is the answer. We can provide all the money we want in the Congress, but unless that money is properly utilized, unless the public officials in positions of authority assume a firm, honest, and

forthright position and commitment to professional law enforcement, the money will be wasted.

I suggest very strongly that we listen carefully to the words given by the Speaker this afternoon. He said it in very simple terms. It was simply stated, but it is profound in its results. It is profound in its results.

We should give the police officers the authority and the support that they deserve, and they will manifest their dedication in a good, honest to goodness law enforcement fashion, with the result being that the people of the Nation will benefit.

There will be a diminution of fear, because there will be an increase in the respect the people have for police officers—not just the law abiding, but also the lawless. There will be a rededication and a renewed effort on the basis of this knowledge, which will only naturally result in more productive police officers—

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I am privileged to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I should like to make another observation.

As we study history down through the ages, we find that eternal effort and struggle toward the establishment of a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men. Where law ceases, tyranny starts; there is no question about it.

Whether it is in my office, with a gang takeover, or in this Chamber, in a town, in a city, in a State, in a college or university, or in the Nation it is the same.

It seems strange to me that those who call themselves liberals—I am a progressive, with a better liberal-progressive record than most of the liberals and as good as any of them—do not realize that where law ceases tyranny starts. That is just the entire opposite of what mankind has been fighting for for countless generations—for centuries, in fact—the emancipation from absolutism in government and the establishment of a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men.

I agree with what the gentleman from New York has said. What we have said is fundamental. It goes to the very existence of democratic institutions of government.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the Speaker.

Furthermore, it is the type of law enforcement that we require from our police officers that is involved. That is where this money becomes essential. Police officers today do not need solely police training per se as we have known it. Today they need a new perspective. They have it in many places throughout the Nation, but there should be a greater emphasis on community relationships, on human relationships with people.

In the process of law enforcement and in the process of this training the deep-rooted prejudices of man must be eliminated.

I say this because without the elimination of those prejudices there is the fear that they will manifest themselves under some adverse conditions. That is where

we have the difficulty between the races and the difficulty between the different ethnic groups. We have conditions today in the city of New York that point this up. We have Unity Day where Americans of Italian origin complain about alleged intimidation and harassment and group guilt by association. They suggest that this is a matter of policy. I went there today and spoke in order to bring this matter into focus, because in my judgment it is not a matter of policy anywhere in the Nation or in any department within the Nation but is just a matter of human failure on the part of some individuals. I know administrators, when they learn of this, proceed with disciplinary action or try to correct the condition in some manner as they should. But the fact is that this exists. Now, whether it be against Americans of Italian origin, blacks, Puerto Ricans, Irish, Germans, or any other group is not the point. If it is against any individual, it is wrong. No police department, if it examines itself closely, can absolve itself completely of any blame for these practices. They are all a little guilty. But it is not as a matter of policy but, rather, on the basis of an individual's conduct and mentality.

Mr. Chairman, this is where this money should be spent—in training, training, because without decent human relationships then ordinary police actions become a secondary matter.

We are living now in the age of civil rights—the civil rights of all people in every field. I could not emphasize the importance of this bill today any more than this. I am not sure that it provides enough, but I believe it is a step in the right direction. If we can train our people philosophically and psychologically in connection with their responsibility to their fellow men, to the people they supervise, if you will, and whose protection they are charged with, if you can do that substantially, then we will have made a great stride toward providing our people in this country a little more and help the cities in some measure with their fiscal difficulties.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. CELLER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the cosponsors of H.R. 17825 which continues the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act enacted in 1968. Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 held extensive hearings on this bill. Although there are some provisions in the legislation which I would like changed, generally it is a good bill and I intend to support it.

The increasing crime rate in the United States is an important subject and an issue that must be faced squarely. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will require many solutions. I think we would agree that the rate of increase is intolerable—that it must be reversed. That we cannot accept an America where cities must close down at night because of muggings, housebreakings, rapes, robberies and other acts of violence. It is traditional in America that the task of controlling crime is the responsibility of

local and State governments. This is the way it should be. Local people should run their own affairs wherever it is possible and this most emphatically includes running the police departments and courts.

There is a Federal role, however, and it is critically significant. The Federal sector provides a model to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the 50 States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and correctional systems.

The Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968 was a giant step forward in the Nation's fight against crime. In the 2 years since the act was signed into law, Federal anticrime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend \$1.257 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdictions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1969. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime-fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief to local jurisdictions caught in the bind between burgeoning crime statistics and voter resistance to property tax increases. But the important thing is not the dollars involved so much as the recognition and acceptance of Federal responsibility for helping to make our streets safe for all citizens. Traditionally, this has been a local responsibility, but it is obvious that local jurisdictions can no longer carry the burden alone and that they will lose ground steadily in the fight against crime unless they receive more Federal help. It is a new role for the Federal Government. We are sailing in uncharted waters and must feel our way cautiously. We have made a good beginning. The bill before us today takes off from this good beginning and deserves support.

Quick, fair criminal justice, rehabilitation, elimination of the social and economic causes of crime and adequate law enforcement are the cornerstones of the solution to crime in the streets. Of all the activities within the process of criminal justice, corrections has by far the greatest potential to reduce crime. The reason is clear. Probably four-fifths of all serious crime is committed by repeaters, criminal persons convicted before by crime. At least half of these people could have been rehabilitated and most of the others kept from harm's way. But we fail to even try. Ninety-five percent of every dollar that we spend in penology is for custody. Five cents is for rehabilitation and crime reduction. We manufacture crime in the prisons and jails of America. Little wonder we suffer so much crime.

I am therefore pleased that H.R. 17825 increases the amount for correction, probation, and parole to 25 percent of the appropriated funds. At present, the bulk of the funds has been committed to enforcement—crime laboratories, equipment, automation, and so forth. It should be self-evident that this use of funds will provide only short-term gains. A broader use of the funds is essential if long-lasting results are to be achieved.

Finally, the controversy over block grant awards to the States continues.

While the block grant concept appears to be entrenched, at least for the moment, alternatives should be considered. The figures of the A.C.I.R. indicate that many urban centers with disproportionately high crime indices, are not receiving a proportionate share of funds. In California, the San Francisco bay area cities of Oakland and San Francisco received only 23.4 and 15 percent, respectively, of the fiscal year 1969 funds they would have gotten if funds had been distributed according to crime index, while Los Angeles received 122.1 percent of the amount by crime index. The distribution of funds in California was patently unfair and needs a close re-examination. If the block grant concept was responsible for this malapportionment, it should be carefully reexamined.

Another weak point of the block grant approach to funding is the proportion of funds that went to nonurban areas. Crime in the streets is predominantly, overwhelmingly an urban problem and if the act fails to acknowledge this fact it is in serious need of amendment.

Crime is a stubborn problem. There is no easy or cheap way, no tough talk, no repressive action that will cause it to vanish. Crime tarnishes the quality of life in America today.

H.R. 17825 is a major step in the right direction but it is not enough. It will take strong leadership on a national scale, determined efforts and vast resources to reduce crime. We must dedicate ourselves to this aim.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for the thoughtful and constructive improvements that have been added by this legislation to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

I believe that the 1968 act undoubtedly was a milestone in the development of effective law enforcement in this country. I believe the additions that have been made in this bill represent a very significant additional forward step in this critical area. I particularly appreciate the fact that the committee is now making the requirement that State plans must provide for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in all areas of high crime incidence. I think this is an improvement that is very helpful in connection with State planning for law enforcement. I am proud of the fact that the committee is continuing to emphasize through its legislation the importance of training and of the availability of training to the officer out in the precincts and across the country. I happen to believe that the National Police Academy operated by the FBI is a great institution, but it has always been extremely limited in the number of officers able to take advantage of it and able to benefit from it. It has simply not been able numerically to do the job of training

that is needed across this country if we are going to have effective law enforcement. I think that this bill is a step further in that direction, and I want to congratulate the committee again for a fine piece of work and express my full support of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of this legislation which is designed to assist in providing better law enforcement by increasing Federal appropriations for training and equipping police departments, sheriff's departments, and other law enforcement agencies in our Nation. It should assist States and local units of government in controlling crime and violence and improving the quality of criminal justice.

We do not want a Federal police department. Hitler had one. We see danger in it; but this aid to the States, counties, and cities is badly needed. A section in a recent questionnaire that I sent to my constituency permitted them to recommend more, less, or the same spending for various purposes. In response, most people recommended spending more money for crime control.

I desire to commend the Speaker on his challenging statement a few minutes ago. I agree with him that the public should back up our officers when they are trying to enforce the law. Part of the trouble today is the officers are not getting the support that they deserve and too often the officer rather than the criminal finds himself on trial.

In my home State of North Carolina and in most other States, an officer is legally justified in using such force as is necessary—even to taking a life—in order to prevent the commission of a felony and to prevent the escape of a felon. If the officer is doing his duty, he is supported by most of the people. On the other hand, here in Washington if an officer has to take a life even to save his own while doing his duty he is suspended and put on trial and condemned by the press. Nothing could be more demoralizing to law enforcement.

Officers need to be better trained and this legislation should help. They need to be better equipped and, again, this legislation should be helpful. And, they need to be better supported by all citizens.

Our people are fed up with crime and disorder. They are demanding effective action to restore law and order to our streets and homes. It is time for someone to speak out for the rights of the majority who obey the law, work, and pay taxes to provide a better way of life for those less fortunate. We cannot continue with crime outstripping the population growth by 11 to 1.

If today's riots and law violations continue and become worse, those who are demanding unrestrained freedom will find that they have lost all freedom for themselves and for other citizens as our democracy will be replaced by martial law in our cities and curfews will be imposed in cities across the Nation. Two years ago Eric Sevareid said in a TV editorial:

History is pretty certain that any given community will prefer tyranny to anarchy if it comes to that choice because in a state of anarchy everyone is helpless.

The criminal has long received all the protection to which he is entitled under the Constitution. The Supreme Court has seen to that. Now is the time to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I too add my voice to my colleagues who have commended this committee for a splendid job well done.

In our Nation today the concern of our citizens for their bodily safety, in their homes, in their apartment house lobbies, or on the streets, even on some of the main thoroughfares, is a debilitating and corrupting factor that cuts through all income levels, all racial and ethnic groups. It is a corrosive element in our society this fear of bodily safety.

This bill meets the problem intelligently, thoughtfully and, while perhaps, with not the volume of resources that many of us would like, it is still nevertheless a good, solid step forward.

I believe it is a very healthy thing that this Congress is united in support of this bill. Mr. Chairman, 3 or 4 years ago the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) and I joined in sponsoring the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. It is my opinion that Bob McCLORY can feel proud, as I do, of the fine work that that institution has done.

I had an amendment prepared that I was planning to present to this House that would have given the National Institute 4 percent of all LEAA funds which would have given them a dollar funding of approximately what the Attorney General requested in his testimony before the House Judiciary and Appropriations Committees. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) also had another amendment about which some of us had reservations that would have transferred the institute from LEAA into the Office of the Attorney General. Because of his fine statesmanship in deferring action on his amendment, I am going to defer action on mine, respecting his view that all minor elements of discord should be removed from our consideration of this legislation today, and that it be considered on a totally nonpartisan basis as an indication that this Congress can stand firmly behind this first-class piece of legislation that the distinguished chairman and his hard-working committee members have brought forth.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I share with the gentleman from New York the view that the National Institute of Law Enforcement should get better recognition and that they should receive appropriations from the Committee on Appropriations to a greater extent than they have heretofore been accorded. Therefore, I shall be very

glad to assist the gentleman—I know the gentleman is of like mind—in getting funds sufficient for the effective carrying out of the purpose of that institute.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I will be delighted to yield to my honored colleague.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his generous remarks, his very constructive suggestions, and his cooperation throughout the history of this legislation in helping to establish the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. I share with the gentleman his thoughts as to the shortcomings which the National Institute has shown, including the current difficulties it is having with respect to adequate funding. I think there are two basic problems that confront the National Institute. It should have greater stature and perhaps greater autonomy and professional status. Second, the National Institute should have adequate funds to carry out its primary objectives, principally in the area of research and development in all of the various aspects of the problems of crime in America, and in handling the fundamental responsibility with respect to training in the various aspects of the training of law enforcement members and related disciplines with regard to the problems of crime.

I am hopeful that the subject of appropriations can be ironed out during this session, and that either in this session or in future sessions that the full status and the full realization of the responsibilities and aspirations of the National Institute can be obtained.

Again I want to commend the gentleman for his initiative, for his support, and for his constructive work in behalf of this concept.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize the point the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) made, and the chairman made, in regard to spending more money on law enforcement. The important goal toward which we must strive is not just to spend more money on law enforcement—not just to add larger gobs of the same medicine to cure an illness that does not respond satisfactorily to our current cures. The real answer must be to spend more money more wisely, more effectively, and with more insight, than we have in the past.

My colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRAGGI), spoke about the need for better police-community relations. We are going to have to do a great deal more thinking before we know exactly how to produce these better police-community relations. Some of the things that we have done in the past are quite insufficient to today's needs. The business of buying ice cream cones for the kids, or a boat ride up the river, or a regular Saturday afternoon ball game, the traditional police athletic league activities, beneficial as they are and constructive as they are, fall far short of the need to devise sensitive and relevant programs to bring the police into a better relationship with the communities which they

are supposed to serve, and indeed which they want to serve.

And I agree totally with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) that there is no policy, there is no consensus among the 400,000 law enforcement professionals of America, that there is any particular group or element in our society who they do not feel as concerned about as other groups.

In our cities, specifically, we are going to have to do things differently so far as recruitment of police professionals are concerned, so far as extending the ladder of opportunity to engage in police work down into the communities, particularly the low-income and the minority communities—we are going to have to devise means of creating in the police training programs sufficient opportunities for on-the-job training, promotion and advancement for those who want to go into law enforcement activities, and make a career out of law enforcement, initially with less than full professional skills.

We must make advances in employing neighborhood people in jobs they can usefully perform, as many cities have already done. Indeed, some of the cities that have the best police-community relations are those cities which have succeeded in integrating minority group members, both into our law enforcement professional ranks and into our civilian law enforcement personnel, in the station house, and on traffic, ticketing, and non-crime-fighting activities inside and outside of the police station.

In Los Angeles at the present time, for example, no police professional is involved in a station house in any chore that does not involve the command function. In that city a station house job that involves answering a telephone, taking fingerprints, keeping files, typewriting and the like is carried on by neighborhood residents, many of whom are black or Mexican-American.

Likewise on the streets in Los Angeles, no police professional is involved in parking ticketing. Both of these chores that do not involve crime fighting on the streets, and in the station house are largely given over to paraprofessional employees from the neighborhood. Great strides have been made in improving police-community relations, when neighborhood residents—many minority group members—can be seen by their neighbors to be filling meaningful jobs in the criminal justice system.

One of the last concerns is that of police hardware, systems and techniques. We have failed miserably in this country to apply the extraordinary benefits of science and technology to our police work.

We have done it in other areas. We have done it for our space effort. We have done it for our military and we have done it for our industry. But it is extraordinary to me that we have done so little to give the police special assistance to help them to carry on their work.

Only a couple of weeks ago on the floor of the House, in fighting for larger funds for the Institute, I described in a colloquy with another colleague from

New York the need for better police transportation. I stated that, while we had dozens and dozens of special purpose vehicles for the Air Force, Navy and Army, what we give to the police to perform their exacting and anxiety-ridden duties was a family car with a searchlight on top, a two-way radio and maybe in some cases a shotgun rack in the back. I described on the floor of this House how three or four punks or hoods could surround a police car and could immobilize it with an ice pick, could set it on fire with a quart of kerosene or gasoline, and could bash in the windshield or the windows with a baseball bat and leave these police professionals totally vulnerable to an angry mob.

Here not a week later what I suggested became the appalling truth as it was reported on the front page of the New York Times of June 25, which described an occasion that took place in an upstate college in New York.

This was on the front page of the New York Times of June 25:

At one point, the Ontario County Sheriff reported, the students surrounded three police cars and trapped the policemen inside while they sheared off radio antennas, deflated tires and smashed hoods, roofs and mirrors on the vehicles.

So, even forgetting the very valid points my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) made about the urgent need to improve police-community relations—and even forgetting the highly desirable priority that this bill places on producing better rehabilitation and correctional systems—and turning just to hardware, to police communications and police transportation, to alternatives to the policeman's lethal weapons, to better means of identification such as unique blood prints, unique antibody prints, unique fingerprints and voice prints, to the application of the computer to the law enforcement process, to the instantaneous identification of fingerprints, and to the trial process—Mr. Chairman, we have not even begun to scratch the surface.

So I hope in the years to come, as the National Institute begins to provide some fallout from the initial year or two of research and development which is being carried on now, that our colleagues in both the House and Senate will realize that the problem of crime in the streets in America cannot simply be solved by providing vastly more of the same, but that we must use our experience, our science and our technology; yes, the professors in our universities, the technicians in our space age industries, the police professionals in our law enforcement agencies—all of them working in concert, to produce systems that are more scientific, more sophisticated, more responsive to the needs of the 400,000 devoted and dedicated police professionals in our Nation who are trying desperately to enable us to walk our streets safely.

In the meantime, this bill constitutes an excellent step forward, and I urge my colleagues across party lines to support the bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17825. This is one way in which we can assist the local law enforcement agencies not only in upgrading their equipment but also in training their men in law enforcement. Everyone recognizes the need today to combat crime at all levels. Certainly we do not want a Federal law enforcement agency, but we want to help our local and State law enforcement agencies wage an effective war on crime and to truly make our streets safe for the law-abiding citizens.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with what the distinguished Speaker and other Members have said here this afternoon about the importance of the police officer and the importance of law enforcement, to all of which I thoroughly subscribe.

I would also like briefly to call attention to another provision of the bill which I think has received little attention in the debate this afternoon, and that is the provision that grants may be made to a State planning agency if there is incorporated in the State's plan a comprehensive statewide program for the improvement of correctional programs and practices throughout the State, and the accompanying provision that—

Not less than 25 percent of the amounts appropriated under this measure shall be devoted to the purposes of corrections, including probation and parole.

These provisions make this a forward-looking measure because thereby it goes to both of the important phases of the problem: detection of crime and enforcement of the law on the one hand, and the importance of rehabilitation and correction on the other.

It so happens that I have had a certain amount of exposure to the criminal law, both as a prosecuting attorney and as a defense counsel. I became convinced through that experience that much of the time we are not really doing anything except removing people from circulation, which in certain instances may have a limited virtue. But that is temporary. We are not getting at the real causes and roots of the evil. Most of these folks whom we remove from circulation get back on the street, and the problem remains with us.

I was a vigorous prosecutor when I was prosecuting as a young man, but I sometimes wondered what I was accomplishing. When I became more associated with the defense, particularly in the case of the defense of a young man or a person without a criminal record, I was often encouraged in my defense by the fact that I knew that if he were convicted, we would not do him or society any good.

One of the things I like about this bill is that it provides that under the programs which qualify, personnel standards and programs of the institutions and facilities must reflect advanced practices, and that the States must improve recruiting organization, training, and education of personnel in correctional activities, including probation, parole, and rehabilitation.

These provisions form the second and equally important half of the crime and safe streets program. While my philosophy is such that I am always skeptical about what can be accomplished through legislation, nevertheless, if we could spend some money and really do some good to give serious scientific study to correction and probation and parole and to improvement of our very, very, very unsatisfactory penal institutions in our States, which institutions are really schools for crime and disorder; if we could do that under this bill, and make even a little progress toward that goal, the measure would be highly worthwhile.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, as has so often been said, ours is a society of laws and not of men.

I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) and also our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK), for their remarks in this general field of the necessity for urgent support of the law enforcement side of the ledger.

We must have an orderly society, otherwise we are going to have tyranny or anarchy or chaos in this Nation. We have certain guidelines within which to govern ourselves as citizens in this country. Let us go clear back to Holy Scriptures and some of the Members will remember the 20th chapter of Exodus wherein we will find what is known as the Ten Commandments, wherein it is enumerated: "Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not covet," and so forth.

These are basic laws of society, as a framework within which we must conduct ourselves, so as not to encroach upon the rights of others. Law enforcement people are merely the tools to insure that these rights are not violated. We in the Congress pass Federal laws, the States pass State laws, and the city councils pass ordinances, and all are passed as a framework within which society can exist.

Some of my colleagues know I have been a college football official for nearly 25 years. In that capacity—and I am sure there are many football fans who know this—if a halfback is running down the sideline and his foot just touches the sideline, he is out of bounds, and the ball is dead, and it stops there.

Why? That is the rule.

On the other hand there may be some baseball fans who know that if a batter hits a ball down the baseline and it hits the chalk, it is a fair ball, and it continues in play. Why? That is the rule.

We have these rules as a framework for our society, and within which we can live. Some of our college students are dissidents and say, "Let us violate the law, and let us not agree." Then we have riots and tyranny and chaos and anarchy. That is why we must do more than just enact the laws; mere enactment will not do the job.

I heard one reference to college administrators, and I heard it said that it is more difficult to install backbone into a college administrator or into a judge than it is to do a heart transplant these

days. A large portion of our problems come through some of our courts and some at the highest levels. They seem to be preoccupied with the rights of the wrongdoers, to the exclusion of the rights of 96 to 97 percent of the hardworking law-abiding, responsible citizens in our society. If the judges would have some backbone and courage—or guts, if you please—many of our problems would be resolved. Too many have an "uncle dogooder" complex, and in trying to create an image of compassion and humanitarianism, turn loose vicious criminals to again and again prey on society.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his statement in that respect. Insofar as the backbone of the judiciary is concerned, we have been subjected over the past several years to a new trade, where the skyjackers have been running planes at knife or gunpoint into Cuba. Several weeks ago we had an incident where one of the members of the judiciary saw fit to impose a very light fine and prison sentence upon a skyjacker, only 2 years, and then make some ridiculous remark that it should be suspended, that the poor fellow knew not what he did.

The contention is that we should extend mitigating circumstances to this man who has committed a criminal act, notwithstanding the fact that the law enforcement people worked arduously to run down the thing and that many people who were passengers on that plane that day had their lives placed in jeopardy.

The gentleman from Ohio has hit upon the crux of the matter. It is that the judiciary is not supporting law enforcement and meting out proper punishment when the time arises. Pretty soon we are going to get to the ridiculous posture of handing out sacks of lollipops to kidnapers or to people who commit crimes with guns.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This again gets back to the very purpose we are here in the Committee of the Whole today on this law enforcement act.

I want to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for reporting this bill out. It is important for the continuation of our orderly society. I believe it will contribute in great measure to the training of police personnel on the local level, with a Federal contribution of three-fourths to one-fourth by the local communities.

We must build respect for law enforcement agencies. This is one measure we can use to implement that purpose.

I am reminded that the Los Angeles Police Revolver and Athletic Club recently, in response to epithets put on law enforcement officials, calling police officers "pigs," has turned this around. They have taken the letters of the word "pig" and transposed them into the sign of the pig, making it a symbol of respect, using the initials as "Pride, Integrity and Guts."

I believe that applies to law-enforce-

ment officials, who lay their lives on the line every day to protect society.

Mr. Chairman, let us give the law enforcement agencies the proper tools to do this very difficult and unrewarding job. Let us pass this bill with an overwhelming vote.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, today in the District of Columbia, so far as the treatment of juvenile offenders is concerned, the greatest single need we have is for coordination of effort in the existing agencies. No number of new agencies, no vast input of millions of dollars is going to replace the need for a youth coordinating council.

We have 20 or 30 groups in the District of Columbia interested in youngsters, and one does not know what the others are doing. Frequently there are jealousies among the agencies. So the children still fall through the cracks. Fifty or sixty percent of youthful offenders become criminals at adult age.

We even have problems in respect to helping youngsters, because of misplaced concern for civil rights. Let me give an illustration. If we are going to help a youngster who is in trouble, all those people who are involving in trying to help him have to have at their disposal the fullest possible information.

Under current policy, if a schoolchild gets in trouble with the law, the police officer, the enforcement agency, cannot even tell the schoolteacher, who spends 6 or 8 hours a day with that youngster, the nature of the violation by that youngster. The teacher does not know about the fact that the youngster is in trouble. She cannot give him proper guidance.

This kind of an emphasis on civil rights, noble as the motivation, cannot help that youngster.

We need a coordination of these efforts. We need a complete dissemination of information among all of the elements which are trying to help that youngster, or he will not be helped, no matter how many more agencies we create and no matter how much more money we provide.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, let me commend my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee for their excellent work in bringing H.R. 17825 to the floor of the House. This is an excellent bill which will both reaffirm our commitment to provide protection to our citizens and which will strengthen the law enforcement system in this Nation.

The passage of the Organized Crime Control and Safe Streets Act 2 years ago was one of the most important steps ever taken by the Congress in asserting our dedication to the elimination of crime. The act was doubly wise because it took into consideration the reality that the control of crime is a responsibility of local governments, but that the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the efforts made by our local law enforcement agencies.

H.R. 17825 continues to recognize that basic fact. It recognizes that the development of strong law enforcement programs at all levels of government

will take time. It recognizes that the criminal tide in this Nation cannot be turned around overnight.

Most importantly, however, this bill recognizes that we must do more, that our commitment must be strengthened and our support must be increased. I am pleased to see that the committee has recommended considerably increased funding for the law enforcement assistance administration for the coming 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of this Nation have the right to walk the streets of this Nation in safety, they have the right to be free from fear of organized crime, they have the right to be protected from muggers, thieves, and robbers. The crime rates, which have increased beyond all justification in recent years, must be reversed, for they represent one of the saddest measures of the state of our society.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that Arkansas has done an outstanding job so far of organizing its resources to combat crime on an effective, workable, and realistic basis. With the continued support which will be provided in H.R. 17825, we can make significant progress in fulfilling our goal of providing safe streets for the citizens of our State.

This bill has my strong support. With the passage of this bill, we in the Congress can say once again that we have no intention of permitting crime to grow or the criminal to prosper as long as we have the resources to fight it. The people of this Nation expect and will accept no less.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Law Enforcement Assistance Amendments, which will expand and strengthen Federal support for the war on crime waged by State and local governments.

The LEAA's mission is to help them hire more policemen, purchase patrol cars, illuminate city streets, improve rehabilitation, probation and corrections work, build better facilities, improve the administration of justice—in short, to help them do whatever needs to be done.

Recent court decisions have given the estimated 40,000 local police departments new responsibilities in helping to enforce the law—responsibilities which require sensitivity and judgment, not to mention adequate funding and support.

The LEAA is an effort to help them meet these responsibilities, and these amendments should make the LEAA even more constructive. I commend the committee for its hard work and foresight in drafting these amendments.

I am especially pleased by the new program to improve correctional facilities and programs that was recommended by the Department of Justice and endorsed by the committee.

Our prisons, probation and parole have been neglected, and have, in fact, encouraged criminal behavior instead of correcting it. As a result, more than half of those released from our prisons go on to commit another crime.

Only a paltry amount of present law enforcement expenditures goes for corrections, and almost all of that meager sum is spent on custody, rather than rehabilitation. The law authorizes grants

for corrections purposes, but competing demands for these funds have left little for corrections. Of the acting grants awarded to States in fiscal 1969, only 13.8 percent went for corrections.

These amendments should make possible the development of new correctional facilities and the improvement of correctional programs, both of which are long overdue.

The war on crime takes in prevention, detection, apprehension, solution, conviction, and correction. These amendments, and the special provision for new emphasis on the correctional phase enable the Federal Government to help State and local governments on all fronts in waging and winning this war.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, the crime rate in this country has become so frightening that concerned citizens are looking to every source possible for solutions to this awful situation.

Today, we are considering the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970—a measure designed to help combat crime. This act authorizes a \$3.2 billion outlay over the next 3 years to provide grants for research, education, training, upgrading correctional institutions, and other law enforcement purposes.

While this bill is certainly not perfect, we feel it is a measure that will prove beneficial to our law enforcement agencies across the land and ultimately be helpful in the reduction of crime.

We have reached a time in the history of this country when people are terrified to be on the streets at night. Organized crime and narcotics claim more victims daily. As much as 75 percent of the street crime is attributed to the drug addict, and juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose 800 percent in the United States between 1960 and 1967. There is not much the drug addict will not do to support his \$100-a-day habit.

Crime has risen over 120 percent since 1960—11 percent alone in 1969. While most crime previously has been in poor and ghetto areas, the largest increase now is in suburban and even rural areas. The cost of crime zoomed past \$31 billion in 1968. And one of the most heart-rending statistics we have noted is that 75 percent of the serious crimes are committed by the under-25 age group.

There can be no doubt that our Nation is in the grips of a wave of lawlessness and subversion which can only be combated by immediate action against those who would act wantonly without regard for the just laws and ideals of order upon which this country was founded.

Mr. Chairman, let us hope this bill will help solve some of our problems on crime and let us hope it is the first in a series of measures designed to rid this country of the crime wave we have been subjected to over the last decade. I urge its passage.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, one of our traditions has been to put money where it is both needed and can do the most good. The original Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968 while well motivated fails this basic tradition and demand. The statement of Detroit's mayor before the Judiciary Committee well demonstrates the need to put the money where it will do the most good. The

mayor pointed out that Detroit has 19 percent of the State's population and 40 percent of the State's crime. Yet, Detroit received less than 6 percent of the planning funds that came to Michigan last year—and less than 18 percent of the action funds. Much the same thing has been true in Minnesota's major cities.

While the idea of funneling grants on the sole basis of population looked good at the time, our attempts to achieve an equity produced an even greater inequity.

I certainly do not call for the elimination of funds to lower crime areas—a lower crime rate in some areas may be tied to moneys received through our 1968 action. But to ignore high crime areas for the sake of an arbitrary mathematical formula does little to fight the worst of the problem. The requirement that the States allocate adequate assistance to localities where the volume of crime is the greatest is good sense and good legislation.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, H.R. 17825.

Law enforcement has always been, and remains today, essentially a local responsibility. We cannot effectively stem the alarming rise in crime nationally without assisting law enforcement agencies on the local level.

My colleagues and I are charged with the responsibility of seeing that potential or real crimes against the Nation are combated, but, in the last analysis, it is the cop on the beat who must daily risk his life in his efforts to prevent crime in the streets, and to curb crimes against our society.

This bill provides the training and equipment necessary to wage the battle against crime in this country on that all-important local level.

The block grants provided to the States for use on local levels can be meted out as local conditions dictate, and this method is an obviously superior course to any national guidelines that this body or the Department of Justice, or any other Federal law enforcement agency might impose.

There could be no better time for passage of legislation providing for more sophisticated, more effective means to fight crime than in this day of spiraling crime rates, when fear of bodily harm is the constant companion of our Nation's citizens as they walk our Nation's streets.

The training of local law enforcement officers provided for in this bill will enable them to secure arrests of dangerous criminals despite the recent rulings of our courts that make such arrests almost impossible through sheer technicality.

And when an arrest is made by an officer who follows every procedure ever demanded by any court, then, even under the most liberal judicial review, there will be no writ of certiorari by which an arrest can be overturned.

It will then be incumbent on judges at every level to uphold the convictions that will make punishment of crime commensurate with the crimes committed. This will make our streets all the more safe,

and make good our constitutional mandate to insure domestic tranquillity by reducing the threat and the incidence of crime.

To insure the success and effectiveness of the bill, I also intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) which will delay State contributions under this act for 1 year.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have been a consistent supporter of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, which has contributed to the anticrime program in my hometown and Third Congressional District of Jacksonville, Fla. It is a good and sound program and I urge the House to approve the amendments to the act we are considering today.

There is one section of the proposed bill before the House of Representatives today which I would like to comment on. Part E of the amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, contained in H.R. 17825, provides for a new program for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional facilities, with provision that Federal grants may be made up to 75 percent of the cost of a particular project. This I believe to be a key element in eliminating crime in the United States.

I first introduced a bill to accomplish this in June 1966, in the 89th Congress, and a similar bill in the 90th Congress, much of the thrust of which was included in the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967. These two bills along with my present bill, H.R. 13902, of the 91st Congress have been supported by the American Correctional Association and many local and State officials who feel the need for many improvements in our present prison system.

For almost 150 years our Nation has mostly "put away" its criminals and violators of the law, placing them behind thick walls and metal bars. In this way they have been said to pay their debt to society.

Over 40 percent of those who have paid their debt this way have ended up right back where they started from: right back behind bars.

In 1968, I held a seminar on law and order in my congressional district. At that time, former Federal Bureau of Prisons Director Myrl E. Alexander said:

The treadmill of arrest, imprisonment, release and re-arrest is too well known by us all. So long as recidivism remains the rule and not the exception, the entire system of criminal justice will have failed.

The main reason we have crime "repeaters" is, as most corrections and law enforcement officials believe, that many of our correctional institutions are antiquated museums. These age-old prisons and correctional institutions have been built with only one thing in mind, maximum security. According to James V. Bennett, former Director of U.S. Bureau of Prisons, there are approximately 3,500 county and city facilities and correctional institutions for adults in the United States, and 220 institutions for juveniles. All but a handful are archaic, grim and devoid of all but token facilities for training and rehabilitating their inmates. Sixty-one of the larger prisons were

opened before 1900. Twenty-five of these are more than 100 years old.

The facilities where our criminals are incarcerated are the tools we use to train these people to be good citizens. We need adequate, modern, and functional facilities, not dungeons.

My present bill, which would establish a program to provide grants to State and local governments for the construction or modernization of certain correctional institutions, is along the lines of the Hill-Burton hospital plan and would in fact be an important part of the answer to help stop the rising crime rate which costs our Nation some \$27 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House of Representatives will pass the amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, including the corrections facilities construction program, patterned after my bill H.R. 13902, and previous legislation I have sponsored and supported in this field. These improvements are long overdue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill although I have grave doubt that the expenditure of \$3.1 billion which it authorizes will have the result of reducing crime as predicted.

This bill will not unshackle and free the law-enforcement officers of the Nation from the court decisions that have made them all too often impotent to halt the criminals. Neither will it do anything to compel the courts to mete out sentences commensurate with the crimes and expedite the trial of criminals.

It will do nothing to bring about swift and certain punishment of so-called white collar criminals who all too often these days escape punishment or are treated much too leniently by the courts and prosecutors.

I support the bill for the good that it will do but here again the problem cannot and will not be solved simply with a deluge of money. It will take the combined best efforts of judges, prosecutors and law-enforcement officers as well as the public.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today the current appropriations for the support of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act will expire. Crime, however, is still a significant problem. Appropriations must be authorized that not only would continue law enforcement assistance, but would also strengthen the program.

This bill includes provisions that provide for several fundamental improvements. Of greatest consequence is the emphasis that this bill places on rehabilitation. This area of crime control has too long been ignored. If a substantial number of those persons now in prisons could be rehabilitated, crime statistics could be radically reduced. After all, research has shown that 50 to 70 percent of those once convicted and released later commit another crime. If more effort and money were directed toward correction, this trend, perhaps, could be retarded.

This bill aids in achieving this by designating funds for the establishment of a program to construct and renovate correctional facilities and by recognizing the importance of probation and parole in a

program of effective law enforcement. A further innovation is the authorization granted LEAA to make grants to States for the establishment of a criminal justice coordinating council for any unit of local government. If any program, including one of law enforcement, is to be successful, there must be complete interaction of all sectors at all levels.

Finally, the requirement of partial State funding of local government programs will increase the involvement of States in law enforcement. This will help to insure the development of a law enforcement program having the greatest impact.

Crime is a problem that cannot be ignored. If this problem is to be ameliorated, more comprehensive efforts are needed now. For these reasons, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, all of us recognize that crime and violence pose one of the biggest problems facing our Nation today. It is imperative, in my opinion, that we take some positive steps in dealing with this crisis, lest we soon realize that the scope of the problem has broadened far beyond our capacities to deal with it.

There has been much talk about fighting crime and the means by which this might be accomplished. There is almost unanimity in the desire among law-abiding citizens to make our streets and highways safer and to protect our homes and families from the menace of crime and violence. The question is—how can this best be done?

The rate of crime continues to climb all over America. Most major crimes have multiplied several times in recent years—and there is a direct ratio between the rate of increase and the confusion in the public's mind as to how crime should be attacked. It goes without saying that law enforcement authorities cannot do the job alone. It is also clear that law enforcement officials have a much harder task today than they did a decade ago—despite the fact that there are more police, using better equipment and techniques and receiving better pay than ever before.

There has, of course, been a great increase in the activity of the lawless element of society. They have been encouraged by some headline decisions by a majority of the Supreme Court, in recent years, and these decisions, in turn, have caused the general public to lose interest in and respect for the law. Such actions and decisions have been nothing short of encouragement to the criminal element. It is disturbing for certain lawless elements of society to know more about their rights than the general public, simply because word gets around among those who are the benefactors of leniency in the courts.

There must be a partnership between government and private citizens to wage an all-out war on crime and violence in America and this must be greatly expanded and encouraged now, if it is to be effective in stemming the tide which is now causing such havoc in many parts of our country. Money alone cannot solve the problem of crime in America. Money may be an incentive for harder police

work and improving the techniques of fighting crime, but there is no substitute for apprehending criminals and seeing that they are speedily tried and punished for their misdeeds.

We must stop placing undue restrictions on our police, many of which go far beyond the limits of reasonableness. We want to—and should—protect the rights of the accused, but restrictions of the type which have been imposed in recent years are barriers to prosecution and do not provide proper safety for the public at large; they simply aid those who are bent on criminal actions and are used successfully by elements of society which seek to tear down what the majority of our people work hard to build.

I feel that the amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which we now have before us, are a step in the right direction but I would frankly like to see something done of a concrete nature in allowing our police and other law enforcement authorities more leeway in dealing with the problem. We need more stringent action to strike some fear in the minds of those who now think they can get away with crime, disorder, violence, and harassment of society. It is my feeling that present laws are adequate to deal with the situation, but the fact of the matter is that law enforcement authorities are handcuffed in their operations to such an extent that the effectiveness of the law is greatly reduced.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is providing helpful funds under the 1968 act, and the bill before us would authorize appropriations for the next 3 years, so that local and state officials may beef up their police and crime detection activities. This will be useful, but I cannot help but be critical of the approach taken by far too many people at the highest levels of government who still think that money alone will do the job.

Government's biggest assets in fighting crime and violence are intangibles, such as public support, cooperation between State, Federal, and local law enforcement authorities and proper interpretations of our laws. Something must be done to restore the public's cooperation in this multilateral campaign.

Television, radio, and newspapers—all communications media—can play a vital role in creating a better climate for law and order in our Nation. More emphasis should be given to the public's role and less to the idea that the criminal element has somehow attained a hero status because they more frequently come out on top than do the law enforcement authorities. We must remember that far more crimes are committed than are ever reported and the number that is reported becomes less and less significant year after year because bystanders and witnesses refuse to give police the evidence which would aid in prosecutions and convictions.

Public responsibility is perhaps the key ingredient in fighting crime and violence and should be encouraged. Some Federal judges—and, particularly, certain members of the Supreme Court—have apparently lost all awareness of

this fact and seem to be preoccupied with the rights of the criminal, regardless of the consequences to society at large. Unless this philosophy is reversed, we cannot expect victories in the war on crime, no matter how much money we appropriate or how much new equipment we provide. The roadblock to success in fighting crime is clearly in the philosophy which the former majority of the Supreme Court has foisted upon the American people and which has permeated law enforcement from Maine to California.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation (H.R. 17825), although I must confess that I continue to have reservations over the extent and manner of Federal participation in local and State law enforcement. Federal participation and Federal funds can lead to even more centralization in Washington. Just look at what has already happened to public education in this country. The Federal Government, through the use of Federal funds, has become the dictator of many of our public school policies.

Certainly we are justified in our efforts to provide proper assistance to local and State authorities in their own efforts to prevent and control ever-increasing crime in our streets and throughout our Nation. But it must be a partnership responsibility. We must avoid the kind of help that could result in the Federal takeover of all law enforcement in this country. Such centralized control of law enforcement, if it should ever come to pass, could lead to a dangerous state of affairs, resulting in a police state as dangerous as crime itself.

However, our people are deeply disturbed, and rightly so, over the inadequacy of State and local funds to enable our police forces to do the job that must be done.

Our policemen play a vital role in preserving the stability of our communities. In this connection, I want to point out that, after a violent decade, sprinkled with riots and other forms of disorder, we could justifiably expect to see the turbulence of the times mirrored in the casualty reports of the Nation's police forces.

And so the FBI figures, which show that 557 policemen lost their lives in the performance of their duties between 1957 and 1970, are not surprising.

Whenever loose talk about killing "police pigs" occurs—as is all too frequently reported in the news—we ought to recognize that it may not be idle, empty-headed conversation. Because all too often such talk does result in the loss of life.

In the first 2 months of this year, the FBI reports the deaths of nine policemen. Police officers badly injured stood at 2,394. Most such injuries and deaths result from old-fashioned crime, but some stem from more modern causes symptomatic of the age we live in.

The many-faceted stresses tugging at our Nation today should make us realize that it is not indestructible. Americans could, if they so chose, do just as Samson did—pull the columns of society down around their heads.

Destroying the America we know and

love would not be an easy task, but it could be done. Other great and powerful nations in history have been destroyed by their own people—often by the aggressive action of a small minority and the indifference and complacency of a substantial "silent majority." And there are self-proclaimed revolutionaries abroad in the land, such as the Chicago Seven, who have assumed for themselves just such a task.

These people are either ignoring or overlooking the fact that the United States has the most nearly complete freedom and liberty—the best, the most humane, the most tolerant, and fairest system of justice, and the greatest degree of equality of opportunity in all the world. None of these things are perfected, for that is a constant struggle which goes on in countless ways.

And in addition to all this, we have achieved the kind of material prosperity which the world heretofore only dreamed of. With only 5 percent of the people of the world, we utilize 50 percent of the world's resources. The list of American "firsts" in material things is, of course, no surprise, and contains, among many other things, such items as more and better food and clothing and shelter, and more cars, more trucks, more planes, more telephones, more television sets, more radios, and doubtless more homes and churches and school facilities than any other nation in the world.

But, of course, American "firsts" in freedom and liberty and justice are far more important. But without peace within our Nation and among our people, these cherished freedoms cannot long survive, and regrettably they are already being seriously threatened. We need and must have internal peace, free of irresponsible, forcible, and destructive dissent.

Of course, everyone in this country should, beyond any question—and does—have freedom of speech and should not hesitate to express themselves openly, freely, and fully.

But, we should be "eternally vigilant" against those who would degrade our freedoms by using them as a cloak for terroristic activities more reminiscent of czarist Russia in 1905, or Japan of 1930, or Germany of 1932, than of America in 1970.

The peaceful processes of society cannot long continue without the existence of basic order. And so, no one gains when police are defamed or attacked, except the small but vocal bands of revolutionaries who seem to be so adept at gaining and being afforded access to the television cameras of the networks and to the front pages of many big-city newspapers.

Respect for the police, the protectors in many ways of civilized society, the guardians against lawless elements always lurking in the shadows, used to be axiomatic. It was an accepted fact of life. Children were taught when in trouble and in need of a friend—to seek out a policeman. Unfortunately, this kind of teaching is not so prevalent today in modern America. The news of recent years seems to indicate otherwise.

There must be a return to basics in the homes and schools of America and

to the fundamental Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded, and without which, it cannot continue to survive.

Five hundred and fifty-seven men killed on the firing line of American civilization is indeed a heavy toll to pay. Hats off to the law enforcement officers of the United States. Like all humans, they make mistakes, but they have a tough and vital job to do and they desperately need, not just adequate compensation, and not the silent—but rather the active support, good will and sympathetic understanding of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Let us make no mistake about it, to whatever extent we fail them, we fail and can blame ourselves.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the expanded authorizations for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided for in the bill before us now. Additionally, the elimination of the three-man board of administrators and increased emphasis on correctional facilities help make the measure an excellent piece of legislation in the criminal justice field. I commend the Judiciary Committee and its able chairman (Mr. CELLER) for their fine work.

There is, however, one area which I do not feel the present bill develops fully. Although virtually all Members of this body recognize that our major cities are afflicted with a higher incidence of crime in relation to the other parts of the country, this bill, H.R. 17825, does not fully address itself to that aspect of the crime problem.

There is a requirement that LEAA approval of a State law enforcement assistance plan be based on a finding that areas with a high incidence of crime receive an adequate share of assistance. But this is only a very small step in an area where we should be taking leaps and bounds.

It is in the cities that the Federal Government should be concentrating its efforts to fight crime. The cities are the headquarters for most criminal syndicates. The cities are the central distribution points for illegal goods, including dangerous drugs, narcotics, and pornography. And the cities are, unfortunately, the training grounds for young criminals of all types starting with street gangs, through car theft rings to the organized crime units.

Yet, despite the fact that the criminal element concentrates its efforts in the cities, we here in Congress have chosen to spread our limited resources over a much broader area based on population. The result is the general population is not served as efficiently as it should be in the fight against crime. Rather than allocating funds based on the number of people in general, we should be allocating funds based on the number of criminals in the various jurisdictions. Let us fight crime where crimes are being committed. That is the most efficient approach.

Nevertheless, the measure on balance is a good one and indicates this body's interest in allocating more Federal dollars to help solve a serious and perplexing crime problem.

I would like to comment on two par-

ticularly good provisions of the bill which will assure us that LEAA will be more instrumental in influencing change in our criminal justice system.

An important aspect of the bill is the increased emphasis placed on improvement of correctional facilities. Too often the poor quality of our prisons contributes substantially to the rising crime rate. Unless we improve all aspects of our criminal justice system, no one aspect will be as effective as it should be.

I would point out that this section would permit discretionary grants by LEAA directly to localities where the need is greatest. It further provides that special emphasis be given to areas with a high incidence of crime.

This is particularly important to the city of New York which at present is unable to satisfy adequately the demands placed upon its correctional system. The situation is growing worse every day. As the number of criminals processed through the present jails and prisons increases, the number of second- and third-time offenders also increases.

The direct relationship between a poor correctional facility and the rising number of repeat offenders in the area has been clearly established. If we are to cut down on the number of recidivists moving through our criminal justice system, the best place to start is to improve our correctional facilities. I firmly believe an improved prison system that placed emphasis on rehabilitation rather than retention would have a significant downward effect on the crime rate in New York City.

A second important aspect of the bill mandates a changeover from a three-man board of administrators to just one administrator. This provision is essential if LEAA is to function as an efficient body in administering this increased Federal allotment. The present arrangement results in a strangulation of the decisionmaking functions since unanimous agreement has proven much too difficult to obtain. The bill wisely retains the posts of associate administrators functioning as deputies, thus reaping the benefits of collective judgment, experience and expertise.

Mr. Chairman, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration properly administered can be one of our most successful tools in the fight against crime. LEAA has laid new milestones in a continuous effort to upgrade the effectiveness of the law enforcement officer, improve the functioning of the judicial processes and develop truly rehabilitative correctional facilities. I strongly urge my colleagues to approve this measure by a large margin.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 17825, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, of which I am a cosponsor, amends title I of the present act, which established a Federal assistance program aimed at crime reduction and prevention.

There are significant problems with the present law and its implementation. I make no claim that H.R. 17825 adequately addresses all of these problems. Nor does it even completely resolve those problems which it does address. It does succeed, however, in moving in the right

direction, and given the nature of some of the legislation dealing with crime which is being considered in this Congress, that in itself is a distinction, albeit not a very satisfactory one.

One of the most persistent problems, and one which H.R. 17825 does address, concerns grants for law enforcement purposes—so-called action grants. Unfortunately, the block grant concept, which was embodied in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 despite the opposition of many of us, remains. This concept enables moneys to go to the States, which in turn pass on a percentage of these funds to units of local government.

I had very serious reservations about this block grant approach in 1968, and I think history has borne out the validity of these reservations. The block grant approach simply does not enable the cities, which experience the highest crime and which are the most strained for funds to fight this crime, to receive sufficient amounts of moneys. A study undertaken by the National League of Cities-United States Conference of Mayors, and published in February of this year, very succinctly states the situation:

The program, as presently administered by the states, will not have the necessary impact vitally needed to secure improvements in the criminal justice system. The states, in distributing funds entrusted to them under the block grant formula of the Safe Streets Act, have failed to focus these vital resources on the most critical urban crime problems. Instead, funds are being dissipated broadly across the states in many grants too small to have any significant impact to improve the criminal justice system and are being used in disproportionate amounts to support marginal improvements in low crime areas.

I should have preferred total abolition of the block grant approach. We were not able to achieve this, but H.R. 17825 does remedy the problem to some extent. The bill amends the present law to require that LEAA approval of a State plan for law enforcement assistance must be based on a specific finding that the plan allocates adequate funds to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence. Thereby, more funds than in the past will be funneled into the high crime urban areas.

In addition, under H.R. 17825, the States will be required to provide not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding with respect to each program or project undertaken by units of general local government, or combinations of such units. It simply is not credible to contend that the cities, faced with enormous problems of every nature which require the expenditures of massive amounts of funds, should be required to bear alone the burden of finding the matching funds for Federal grants. They cannot do so. They need help. H.R. 17825 requires that they at least get a modicum of such help. Given the facts that crime is really a problem which extends far beyond artificial municipal boundaries and that the cities often pay out far more in State taxes than they receive back in services from the State governments, this is entirely warranted and necessary.

Additional key elements of H.R. 17825 are those establishing a new grant program to improve correctional facilities, and requiring that 25 percent of all appropriations made for law enforcement assistance be committed to the purposes of correction activities.

The American correctional system handles approximately 2.5 to 3 million admissions a year. And yet, given the enormous number of individuals affected, and the enormous role the correctional system can play in achieving rehabilitation of criminals, the President's Crime Commission describes conditions which "are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation" and it depicts life in many penal institutions as "at best barren and futile, at worst unspeakably brutal and degrading." The Commission's report describes local jails, which handle misdemeanants, as follows:

Not only are the great majority of these facilities old but many do not even meet the minimum standards in sanitation, living space, and segregation of different ages and types of offenders that have obtained generally in the rest of corrections for several decades.

H.R. 17825 offers no really effective solutions, for the corrections system requires massive overhaul. New ideas and new approaches must be tried. Obviously, if the moneys authorized by this bill are merely used to build new fortress-like structures to isolate convicted men and women, all we will wind up with are new buildings. The old problems and the old failures will still be around. While H.R. 17825 is a step in recognizing some of the problems, it is just a start. We cannot fail to continue, once this bill is passed.

Let me mention two other provisions contained in H.R. 17825. Under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was established with a three-man administrative set-up. Unanimous decisions of the three-man board were required to initiate and effectuate major policies. Such an administration was simply unworkable, and H.R. 17825 abolishes it in favor of a one-man chief.

The other provision of H.R. 17825 to note is the significant increase in authorizations for the next 3 fiscal years. The authorization for fiscal year 1971 is set at \$650 million; at \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972; and at \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1973. It is absolutely essential that adequate funds be available. I make no claim that authorizations set by H.R. 17825 are sufficient. They are not. But, once again, they signal a step in the growing recognition that the fight against crime and the struggle to reclaim criminals for society, are won by money, effort, and dedication and not by the rhetoric of repression and vindictiveness.

H.R. 17825 should be passed. It is not a perfect bill. It does not provide the magic key to criminal prevention. But it is a step in the right direction. And, if this bill is passed, and if poverty is eradicated, and if opportunity is offered to every American to obtain a decent job, and if decent housing is provided for

every person, then we will be fighting crime effectively and intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 17825

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970".

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Section 101(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administration shall consist of an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall exercise the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Administration by this title. The Administrator shall be assisted in the exercise of his functions, powers, and duties by two Associate Administrators who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 3. The third sentence of section 203(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended to read as follows: "The State planning agency and any regional planning units within the State shall, within their respective jurisdictions, be representative of the law enforcement agencies, units of general local government, and public agencies maintaining programs to reduce and control crime."

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this time to ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) if it is proposed to go on with this bill this evening and, if so, it is the intention to read the entire bill, or what is the program?

Mr. CELLER. Well, the agreement among most Members was that there would be no final vote until tomorrow. However, I did not anticipate we would complete general debate so soon. So I feel we might go on and read a few sections of the bill so as to dispose of as much of the bill as we possibly can in order to shorten the period of time for the consideration of the bill tomorrow. I would suggest we go on for 1 hour reading the bill, if that is agreeable with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Reading the bill? Why would we want to do that? Let me ask the gentleman this question, Why there is to be no vote today on this bill?

Mr. CELLER. There is no vote today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, but why?

Mr. CELLER. You might address that question to the leadership.

Mr. GROSS. But it is the intention of the gentleman to read this entire bill?

Mr. CELLER. I did not say the entire bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why consume time by reading the bill? I cannot quite understand the program. Are we merely killing time by reading the bill? Why not consider the bill as read and open to amendment at any point?

Mr. CELLER. I will be glad to do that if the gentleman will not object, I will be glad to make that request now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

GRANTS FOR LAW-ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES

SEC. 4. Part C of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 301(b)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Renting, leasing, and constructing buildings or other physical facilities which would fulfill or implement the purpose of this section, including local correctional facilities, centers for the treatment of narcotic addicts, and temporary courtroom facilities in areas of high crime incidence."

(2) Section 301(b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) The establishment of a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for any unit of general local government or any combination of such units within the State to assure improved coordination of all law enforcement activities, such as those of the police, the criminal courts, and the correctional system."

(3) Section 301(c) is amended by—

(A) striking out "amount of any Federal grant made under" and "amount of any grant made under" each place they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "portion of any Federal grant made under this section for the purposes of";

(B) striking out "amount of any other grant made under this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "portion of any Federal grant made under this section to be used for any other purpose set forth in this section"; and

(C) striking out "construction of" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "renting, leasing, or constructing".

(4) Section 301(d) is amended by—

(A) striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "section";

(B) by inserting immediately after "compensation of" in the first sentence the following: "police and other regular law enforcement"; and

(C) striking out the period in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", nor to the compensation of personnel engaged in research, development, demonstration, or other short-term programs."

(5) Section 303 is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No State plan shall be approved unless the Administration finds that the plan provides for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence."

(6) Paragraph (2) of section 303 is amended by striking out the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and that with respect to any such program or project the State will provide not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding";

(7) Section 305 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 305. Where a State has failed to have a comprehensive State plan approved under this title within the period specified by the Administration for such purpose, the funds allocated for such State under paragraph (1) of section 306(a) of this title shall be available for reallocation by the Administration under paragraph (2) of such section 306(a)."

(8) Section 306 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 306. (a) The funds appropriated each fiscal year to make grants under this part shall be allocated by the Administration as follows:

"(1) Eighty-five per centum of such funds shall be allocated among the States according to their respective populations for grants to State planning agencies.

"(2) Fifteen per centum of such funds, plus any additional amounts made available by virtue of the application of the provisions of sections 305 and 509 of this title to the grant of any State, may, in the discretion of the Administration, be allocated among the States for grants to State planning agencies, units of general local government, or combinations of such units, according to the criteria and on the terms and conditions the Administration determines consistent with this title.

Any grant made from funds available under paragraph (2) of this subsection may be up to 90 per centum of the cost of the program or project for which such grant is made; however, if the Administration determines that the applicant is unable to provide sufficient funds the amount of such grant may be up to 100 per centum of the cost of such program or project. No part of any grant for the purpose of renting, leasing, or constructing buildings or other physical facilities shall be used for land acquisition.

"(b) If the Administration determines, on the basis of information available to it during any fiscal year, that a portion of the funds allocated to a State for that fiscal year for grants to the State planning agency of the State will not be required by the State, or that the State will be unable to qualify to receive any portion of the funds under the requirements of this part, that portion shall be available for reallocation under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section."

TRAINING, EDUCATION, RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND SPECIAL GRANTS

SEC. 5. Part D of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 406 is amended—

(A) by striking "in areas directly related to law enforcement or preparing for employment in law enforcement" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "in areas related to law enforcement or suitable for persons employed in law enforcement";

(B) by striking out "tuition and fees" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "tuition, books, and fees"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Full-time teachers or persons preparing for careers as full-time teachers of courses related to law enforcement or suitable for persons employed in law enforcement, in institutions of higher education which are eligible to receive funds under this section, shall be eligible to receive assistance under subsection (b) and (c) of this section as determined under regulations of the Administration.

"(e) The Administration is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, strengthening, improving, or carrying out programs or projects for the development or demonstration of improved methods of law enforcement education, including—

"(1) planning for the development or expansion of undergraduate or graduate programs in law enforcement;

"(2) education and training of faculty members;

"(3) strengthening the law enforcement aspects of courses leading to an undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree; and

"(4) research into, and development of, methods of educating students or faculty, including the preparation of teaching materials and the planning of curriculums.

The amount of a grant or contract may be

up to 75 per centum of the total cost of programs and projects for which a grant or contract is made."

(2) Part D is further amended by inserting after section 406 the following new section:

"Sec. 407. The Administration is authorized to develop and support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars to instruct State and local law enforcement personnel in improved methods of crime prevention and reduction and enforcement of the criminal law. Such training activities shall be designed to supplement and improve, rather than supplant, the training activities of the State and units of general local government, and shall not duplicate the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 404 of this title."

GRANTS FOR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND FACILITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by inserting immediately after part D the following:

"PART E—GRANTS FOR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND FACILITIES

"Sec. 451. It is the purpose of this part to encourage States and units of general local government to develop and implement programs and projects for the construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional institutions and facilities, and for the improvement of correctional programs and practices.

"Sec. 452. A State desiring to receive a grant under this part for any fiscal year shall, consistent with the basic criteria which the Administration establishes under section 454 of this title, incorporate its application for such grant in the comprehensive State plan submitted to the Administration for that fiscal year in accordance with section 302 of this title.

"Sec. 453. The Administration is authorized to make a grant under this part to a State planning agency if the application incorporated in the comprehensive State plan—

"(1) sets forth a comprehensive statewide program for the construction, acquisition, or renovation of correctional institutions and facilities in the State and the improvement of correctional programs and practices throughout the State;

"(2) provides satisfactory assurances that the control of the funds and title to property derived therefrom shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this part and that a public agency will administer those funds and that property;

"(3) provides satisfactory assurances that the availability of funds under this part shall not reduce the amount of funds under part C of this title which a State would, in the absence of funds under this part, allocate for purposes of this part;

"(4) provides for advanced techniques in the design of institutions and facilities;

"(5) provides, where feasible and desirable, for the sharing of correctional institutions and facilities on a regional basis;

"(6) provides satisfactory assurances that the personnel standards and programs of the institutions and facilities will reflect advanced practices;

"(7) provides satisfactory assurances that the State is engaging in projects and programs to improve the recruiting, organization, training, and education of personnel employed in correctional activities, including those of probation, parole, and rehabilitation; and

"(8) complies with the same requirements established for comprehensive State plans under paragraphs (1), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12) of section 303 of this title.

"Sec. 454. The Administration shall, after consultation with the Federal Bureau of Prisons, by regulation prescribe basic criteria for applicants and grantees under this part.

"Sec. 455. (a) The funds appropriated each fiscal year to make grants under this part shall be allocated by the Administration as follows:

"(1) 50 per centum of the funds shall be available for grants to State planning agencies.

"(2) The remaining 50 per centum of the funds may be made available, as the Administration may determine, to State planning agencies, units of general local government, or combinations of such units, according to the criteria and on the terms and conditions the Administration determines consistent with this part.

Any grant made from funds available under this part may be up to 75 per centum of the cost of the program or project for which such grant is made. No funds awarded under this part may be used for land acquisition.

"(b) If the Administration determines, on the basis of information available to it during any fiscal year, that a portion of the funds granted to an applicant for that fiscal year will not be required by the applicant or will become available by virtue of the application of the provisions of section 509 of this title, that portion shall be available for reallocation under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section."

(b) Section 601 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The term 'correctional institution or facility' means any place for the confinement or rehabilitation of juvenile offenders or individuals charged with or convicted of criminal offenses."

(c) Part E and part F of title I of such Act are redesignated as part F and part G, respectively.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. Part F of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as redesignated by section 6(c) of this Act) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 515 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Funds appropriated for the purposes of this section may be expended by grant or contract, as the Administration may determine to be appropriate."

(2) Section 516(a) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and may be used to pay the transportation and subsistence expenses of persons attending conferences or other assemblages notwithstanding the provisions of the Joint Resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution to prohibit expenditure of any moneys for housing, feeding, or transporting conventions or meetings', approved February 2, 1935 (31 U.S.C. sec. 551)."

(3) Section 517 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 517 (a) The Administration may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates of compensation for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for GS-18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) The Administration is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, technical or other advisory committees to advise the Administration with respect to the administration of this title as it deems necessary. Members of those committees not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while engaged in advising the Administration or attending meetings of the committees, shall be compensated at rates to be fixed by the Administration but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate authorized for GS-18 by section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code and while away from home or regular place of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized

by section 5703 of such title 5 for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

(4) Section 519 is amended by striking out "On or before August 31, 1968, and each year thereafter," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On or before December 31 of each year".

(5) Section 520 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 520. There is authorized to be appropriated \$650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Funds appropriated for any fiscal year may remain available for obligation until expended. Not less than 25 per centum of the amounts appropriated shall be devoted to the purposes of corrections, including probation and parole."

(6) Section 521 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall apply to all recipients of assistance under this Act, whether by direct grant or contract from the Administration or by subgrant or subcontract from primary grantees or contractors of the Administration."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. Section 601 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) 'Law enforcement' means all activities pertaining to the administration of criminal justice, including, but not limited to, police efforts to prevent crime and to apprehend criminals, activities of the criminal courts and related agencies, and activities of corrections, probation, and parole authorities."

(2) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "or" the second place it appears and by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", or any agency of the District of Columbia government performing law enforcement functions in and for the District of Columbia. Funds appropriated by the Congress for the activities of such agencies of the District of Columbia may be used to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of programs or projects funded under this title."

SEC. 9. Section 5108(c) of title 5 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration may place a total of 15 positions in GS-16, 17, and 18."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAYNE

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAYNE: Page 4, line 20, after "funding" insert "for each fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1972".

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize at the outset that the purpose of this amendment is to make it possible for all States to participate in this program as soon as possible. The amendment certainly will not delay the war on crime or defer the operative sections of this bill going into effect in any way. Not one whit. The only thing which it will delay is the new mandatory requirement in this bill which requires States to furnish one-fourth of the non-Federal funding. All that my amendment will do will be to defer that par-

ticular requirement being imposed on the States during the fiscal year 1971 which begins this Wednesday, July 1 and ends June 30, 1971.

If my amendment is not adopted, many States may not be able to join in the Federal grants contemplated by the bill until a year from now when fiscal 1972 begins.

There is a real danger, as I pointed out during general debate, that those States which do not have legislatures in session at the present time and will not have them in session until next year, will be cut out of all Federal grants under this bill during fiscal 1971. Now, this can be obviated through the adoption of my amendment which can do no possible harm but which will insure that those States that have not yet passed the necessary legislative appropriation may nevertheless participate in the program authorized by this bill without having to wait an entire year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this language which appears in subsection 4(6), lines 16 through 20, on page 4 of the bill, there is a requirement which requires each State plan to provide that the State provide not less than one-fourth of the non-Federal funding for programs and projects to be developed and implemented by units of general local government with the assistance of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants. Under the bill as presently written, if a State fails to submit a State plan providing such 25-percent State contribution, or if the State fails to come through with the 25-percent State contribution once its State plan has been approved, then the funds which would have been allocated to the State through the block grant formula go instead to the pool of funds distributed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administrator in his discretion.

The intention of this provision was not, of course, to wreck the block grant program, but to encourage each State to contribute to local government programs and projects to improve and strengthen law enforcement. I strongly support the principle of this provision.

However, I am fearful that the effect of subsection 4(6) as it now appears in the bill, rather than being to increase and strengthen the block grant program and State participation, may well be to kill the block grant idea if my amendment is not adopted.

A relatively small number of the States—some authorities say as few as five—now contribute to local programs and projects now receiving law enforcement assistance grants through State planning agencies. Most of the States, including Iowa, do not now have any State legislation authorizing State contribution to such local law enforcement programs and projects or appropriating funds for this next fiscal year for such programs and projects—and practically all of these States, including Iowa, will not be holding any session of their respective legislative bodies until January 1971. Most of these States, again, in that January 1971 session would not, either by constitution of the State or by practicality, be able to enact authorization

legislation and appropriations permitting a State contribution of 25 percent of local law enforcement programs and projects for fiscal year 1971, although many could enact such legislation for fiscal year 1972 and thereafter.

I am advised by Members of this body who have had a great deal of experience in State legislatures that the appropriations committees of many State legislatures customarily defer their work until fairly late in their legislative sessions. It is not unusual for State legislatures not to take final action on appropriations until after July 1, and many State legislatures are so set up that that is the last thing done. It seems clear that States whose legislatures meet next year but do not pass appropriations for this purpose prior to July 1 could not qualify for receiving law enforcement assistance grants from the Law Enforcement Administration for fiscal year 1971—and the funds that would have been allocated under the basic act to these States if they had approved State plans and met the 25-percent State contribution requirement would flow instead into the general pool of funds which is distributed according to the discretion of the Law Enforcement Administrator directly to local programs and projects, not through State planning agencies. Thus, the State block-grant approach would be lost and there would be no assurance that a particular State would not suffer a substantial reduction in Federal funds. I believe that the Governors and the State planning agencies generally agree that this would be disastrous. I have already referred in general debate to the strong message I received from the distinguished Governor of Iowa, the Honorable Robert D. Ray, on this subject urging that the effective date of subsection 4(6) be deferred to the start of fiscal 1972 which is July 1, 1971, as provided in the Mayne amendment. This would enable all States except one—the legislature of which does not meet in 1971—to enact legislation meeting the 25-percent State contribution requirement in sufficient time to avoid deprivation of the very necessary anticrime grants of this bill. No possible harm can come from this amendment and Members should vote for it to make sure that their States will be able to participate. The Mayne amendment will not delay or impede the war on crime one iota. It will insure an opportunity for participation by those States which will not have their legislatures in session until sometime next year.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

When this bill was considered in committee it was unanimously voted out of the committee. I want to emphasize, as I did in my direct statement, that the Attorney General said that he enthusiastically endorsed the provisions of the bill. That meant he endorsed the bill without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. The amendment was never discussed in the committee. It comes to us out of the blue.

All Members realize the need for a State contribution. Now we are told the State of Iowa wants to put off the time this year. When next year comes around

they will want to put it off for 1 year. When next year comes around I suppose there will be some other excuse for delay. Now the need for immediate State participation is overwhelming. The need brooks no further delay. The amendment spells out 1 year's delay in postponement. A delay of 1 year may be fatal. You do not have the extortionists, the armed robbers, and the muggers waiting for a year. The cities and counties cannot wait a year. The cities are anxious to put up their allocated portion. The counties are willing to do the same thing. But the State of Iowa wants to hold off.

Now, no State as far as I know is unwilling. There have been sporadic objections. Objection is made that the cities do not need such funding. I will tell the gentleman from Iowa that he has made much out of nothing. He has sought to balloon nothing into great proportions. His own State meets annually. Does the gentleman know that?

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

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman from Iowa know that his own State meets annually?

Mr. MAYNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have been advised by my Governor and leading members of the State legislature that my amendment is vital and necessary to make the State be able to participate in this program. And it will not in any way delay the operative features of this act, despite the statement which was made by the distinguished chairman. You go right ahead with all of the Federal programs, the only thing that is delayed is the one-quarter requirement on the States for 1 year. It will not delay anything one iota.

Mr. CELLER. But that is the very backbone of this legislation—the one-quarter contribution. Now, the State of Iowa meets annually. The only other States that do not meet next year I think are Kentucky and Virginia. The gentleman has talked to a Member from the State of Kentucky, Mr. PERKINS, and Kentucky does not complain. Also Virginia does not meet, but Virginia has a method by which it appropriates interim funds to cover situations of this sort.

Who in the world is Iowa that Iowa can stand out against 49 other States and be reluctant to make the contributions to local governments in view of the enormity of this situation? I cannot appreciate that.

Mr. MAYNE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. In just one moment.

And since the argument is made that the State legislature will not meet—and we know the State legislation of Iowa does meet, then let the State of Iowa get busy and do that which is needful here, and that which is the desire of the State of Iowa.

I have great respect for the State of Iowa. It has made substantial contributions to our Nation. I do not mean to disparage Iowa or its legislators, or any citizen of that distinguished State, not in any sense of the word. But I think there

is a clear misunderstanding here, and I think the gentleman who has taken the floor to offer this amendment does not appreciate the situation. I am trying to inculcate upon his mind the need, the real urgency that exists in this regard.

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

Mr. Chairman, evidently the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) thinks that the State of Iowa should go to the expense of a special session of the State legislature. That is the only possible way Iowa and other States can qualify, because most of the legislatures have adjourned for this year.

We in Iowa are well aware of the fact that our legislature meets once every year, and I do not understand why the gentleman would question our knowledge of the Iowa legislature.

Now so far as Kentucky is concerned, if Iowa could get just a part of the poverty funds that go to that State, we might be able to move some of those funds around and to take care of the situation.

I do not understand why the gentleman takes the attitude that he does toward any state which cannot possibly qualify under the terms of this bill for some of the funds. All we seek is justice and equity.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Although Iowa meets in January, it is not essential for Iowa to act immediately.

Mr. GROSS. On the contrary, we would expect the legislature to act as quickly as possible to either qualify or not to qualify. We have no desire to delay anything.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; of course.

Mr. CELLER. First, there must be appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations and after the appropriation is passed by the House, there must be arrangements made with the States for them to set forth and promulgate such plans.

All of this takes time. During the interim the State of Iowa or any other State would have plenty of time to make its arrangements to make its payment of its share.

So I do not see how this could inconvenience a bit the State of Iowa or any other State. That is the plea I am making in view of the importance of this.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the new program formula will not become operative until sometime next year, apparently in mid-year? Is this what the gentleman is saying—that any State or government will have approximately a year in which to qualify without suffering any penalty of being denied any funds?

Mr. CELLER. If there is no inordinate delay and there is no unreasonable delay in the promulgation of these plans. But they cannot just be run out of thin air. There must be deliberations and hearings on those plans. That takes time which the State of Iowa must have, as to what its views may be of the appropri-

ation of funds to the extent of 25 percent like any other State.

Mr. GROSS. Then if what the gentleman is saying to me is true, there can be no possible reason—no valid reason for opposing the amendment. With the amendment in the bill—and I support it—it would be made certain that Iowa and other States in a similar predicament would not be passed over or deprived of funds for lack of timely legislative action.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I understand this provision was put into the bill because there was sharp controversy in the committee with regard to the percentage of allocation to the States in the application of the block-grant principle which is involved here.

I supported the retention of the formula which we have now, which grants to the States 85 percent of LEAA funds. But it seems to me that by providing the States with this block-grant authority, to use Federal funds substantially as they choose, the States, in turn, should assume responsibility for allocating a certain amount of State funds for local governments' use. This 25 percent appears to be a percentage contribution that is acquiesced in by the State governments themselves. I understand, too, that when the original act was passed, it became necessary for States to implement the program, even though they had already met and even though a part of the fiscal year had passed before the program was fully implemented.

I understand that in the application of the block-grant principle, the 75-percent contribution by the Federal Government is given to the States in reliance upon their providing the additional 25 percent. But there is no reason why it would delay receipt of funds by the States, and no reason why, after the fiscal year had begun, which it will have begun in almost every instance, the States cannot ultimately appropriate the portion of the funds that they are required under this provision to provide. I cannot conceive of any State receiving the funds on the basis of this law and then not fulfilling its obligation. I think that is the only thing that they have to concern themselves with.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. KYL. There has been a lot of hedging on the actual question that is involved here, so I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the Congress adopts the bill which we have before us and the President signs that bill into law and, we will say for the sake of the hypothetical situation, the bill becomes law on August 1, 1970, would the Federal Government distribute any of the funds under this bill to a State which had not in fact, through its legislative process, set up machinery to contribute the 25 percent called for under the bill?

Mr. McCLORY. Yes, I believe they would.

Mr. KYL. In other words, whether the

State has acted to contribute 25 percent, the State would still get the block grant?

Mr. McCLORY. Yes, sir; that is my understanding. They would have an obligation to fulfill the 25-percent contribution ultimately, but they would not have had to contribute it in advance. The States cannot act on this until after we have passed it.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman permit me to ask the chairman of the committee, or would he ask the chairman of the full committee if he agrees with that?

Mr. McCLORY. I will yield to the Chairman for his response to that inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman repeat his inquiry?

Mr. KYL. The question is this, Mr. Chairman: If this bill becomes law, if it passes the House and is signed by the President, say, on August 1, 1970, would the Federal Government distribute funds under this bill to a State which had not through its legislative process agreed to contribute the 25 percent?

Mr. CELLER. No, it would not. The State would have to agree.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, this is exactly the problem with which we are concerned. The State of Iowa has had its legislative session for the year. I want all to understand that they have had an excellent crime program which has been given great, good publicity in the State of New York, as a matter of fact. But we are afraid that since the legislature will not meet until January of next year, and there are a number of other States in the same position, those States would be obviated from participation in the program.

Mr. McCLORY. It is my understanding that after the States have received the Federal money or at the end of the fiscal year, would assume the obligation imposed on them to provide for the appropriation of the 25 percent funds. They do not do it in advance. They could not do it now. They could not have done it in anticipation of the enactment of this law.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCLORY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCLORY. It is my understanding of that, following the enactment of this bill, and following the application for these funds, it will be the obligation of the States to enact laws which will implement the program through the 25-percent contribution.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. The State legislature in my State will meet in January.

If my State legislature passes enabling legislation to take advantage of these funds prior to next July, the end of the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year, will they be able to take advantage of the funds?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, definitely.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. If they do not pass legislation prior to the end of the fiscal year, July 1, 1971, they will not be able to take advantage of them?

Mr. CELLER. They will not.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has answered now quite consistently with the way I answered the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I must again ask the gentleman from New York, will the State be granted any funds from the Federal Government before the State passes that enabling legislation?

Mr. CELLER. As a condition precedent, the States must supply a plan which is consistent with the statute. They must supply the plan first. The State must take action.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, if this is the case, then the response given to the gentleman who just preceded me is not an accurate response. No money could go to his State until they have enabling legislation.

Mr. CELLER. The State must come forward with the form of a plan. That is specifically mentioned in this bill, and that is a condition precedent to any funds.

Mr. McCLORY. That is in the law today, and as it has been since 1968. The only change being made in retaining the same formula for distribution of the bloc grants to the States—which is something we want to retain—that we impose on the States an obligation to contribute 25 percent of the grants that go to the local governments. This could be fulfilled by the end of the fiscal year. It does not have to be fulfilled in advance. Is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that with this amendment we will speed up tremendously the use of our Federal funds for the fighting of crime. I am also convinced that without the amendment our Federal input will be held in abeyance until at least January, February, March, or April, until the legislatures act. So we are going to have our Federal funds tied up here until we get final action by the various State legislatures.

I am convinced that to speed up our fight against crime and to get the advantage of our Federal input now, we have to have this amendment or we are going to hold up our Federal funds until the States have acted. While they can act rapidly in comparison to the Congress generally, it is a cinch it will be next year, in February, March, or April before my State is going to be able to comply with the requirements in this act. Our Federal share will be tied up here and held in escrow until then.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, we all know this act expires tomorrow night at midnight. There is no guarantee, if the language of the bill and the report is veritable, and the distinguished chairman has said the States must come in with their plan in hand, but he overlooks that it requires the plan in one hand and money in the other hand—that is, the 25 percent. Most of the legislatures convene in the States next year. It will be that way in my State. Another fiscal year will have expired before the money will be in the hands generally of these States so they can come up and participate in this plan.

Can we yield to the chairman to say something on that?

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. That is not quite accurate.

Mr. LENNON. How inaccurate is it?

Mr. CELLER. The State must present its plan to the LEAA, and then it does not follow that when it presents its plan it must have the money in its hand. That is not true. The money it contributes, the 25 percent, can be contributed by the State subsequently. There is no time limit. There is nothing in the bill which says when it shall be paid.

Mr. LENNON. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask another question. Assume the State comes in, comes forward and offers its plan until September of this year, comes in then with its plan, does it have to wait until next May or July or June to get the money in its hand?

In the meantime, the grant cannot be considered, can it? It will be delayed that long.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, I believe that the LEAA would ask from the State in that regard a pledge. The LEAA would say, "Are you willing to defray one-quarter of these non-Federal funds?" If the State planning agency said it would, I do not believe the LEAA would be a shylock and demand a pound of flesh immediately.

Mr. LENNON. Will the distinguished chairman tell the gentleman how we can answer for the members of the several State legislatures? How can the administrator at the State level answer for action of the State legislature? One cannot do that. We cannot answer for the Congress, much less the State legislatures.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, the State legislature would have to make some appropriation.

Mr. LENNON. It cannot do it until it convenes.

I believe the chairman ought to accept this amendment as being fair and just and, as somebody said earlier, an honorable amendment.

Mr. CELLER. But there is no time set when the legislature must meet. That is a matter for the LEAA to determine with the State planning agency.

Mr. LENNON. Those States whose legislatures are in session this year, who can act quickly, will be given priority. I believe the distinguished chairman knows that.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think there would be priority.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman's State would pledge payment of 25 percent, and my State would actually pay the cash, I do not believe my State would get any preference over the gentleman's State.

Mr. LENNON. But I call attention to the fact that the gentleman cannot pledge that until the legislatures of the various States state their positions.

Mr. CELLER. There are always funds available in the States. The Governors know how to work these things. There are plenty of ways they can devise to cover this situation. We have the same situation, more or less, now.

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to seek a complete clarification of this issue, and I would direct a few questions to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York.

The State of Iowa is not in an unusual or unique situation. Our legislature has met for this year. It has adjourned this year's session. It will not go back into session unless called into a special session. The Governor would not call the legislature into special session this year to consider this one matter, because the cost of doing that would exceed the amount of money involved in the program we contemplate.

These are by questions: The Iowa Legislature will not meet until January 1971. Obviously, then, it will not have had an opportunity to comply with the regulations, the policies under this bill, until 6 months after the start of fiscal year 1971. It will not have had an opportunity to present an overall plan, nor will it have had an opportunity to say, "Yes, we will contribute one-fourth of the amount of money to the local governments for crime control." Will the Federal Government, in this period between the time the bill passes and becomes law and the time the legislature sets up its own program and agrees to contribute the 25 percent, send any funds to the State of Iowa or another State in the same position? Will it send those funds in the regular amount specified by the law? Can the State participate in this program prior to the time the State legislature takes the action prescribed by this law?

Mr. CELLER. Well, until a proper plan is submitted Iowa will get no funds. There must be a plan submitted and it must be a proper plan according to the decision. That is the situation under the present statute.

Mr. KYL. Let me repeat what the gentleman said.

Mr. CELLER. Iowa must present a proper plan before it gets its proportion of funds based on population.

Mr. KYL. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does the plan under which Iowa is operating today and which has been approved—does that plan constitute sufficient basis for participation under the bill we are debating today?

Mr. CELLER. There would have to be an additional plan under this new bill.

Mr. KYL. What the gentleman is telling me, then, is this: If the State legislature does not meet this year or if it has already met and adjourned, then that State cannot participate under the program until it has met and passed the enabling law and that law has been approved by the Federal Government?

Mr. CELLER. I hate to think that the people of Iowa are so shortsighted that they do not have emergency funds to take care of the very situations that have developed which we are talking about.

Mr. KYL. I say to the gentleman from New York that the State of Iowa, like the other 49 States, has a constitution under which it operates. There is no provision for using funds of this kind unless they are earmarked. There are no contingency funds available. As the gentleman has said, there is no way for that State or one in the same position to participate until next year under this bill unless we adopt this amendment.

Mr. KAZEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think he has put his finger on the crux of the matter under discussion. I keep hearing that you have to have a plan and you cannot get the money unless you have a plan. Suppose under the facts that the gentleman in the well stated that the State of Iowa or any other State that has not made provisions for the one-quarter State participation comes up with a plan, let us say, in October of this year pursuant to the provisions of this bill. Even then no funds would be forthcoming from the Federal Government until the legislature passed the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. KYL. That is the way I understand the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. KAZEN. Regardless of how good their plan may be. They may have a plan, but it will not be approved unless the legislature already appropriated its share.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KYL was allowed to proceed for an additional minute.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out again to the gentleman from New York, that the State of Iowa has not been negligent in this matter. As a matter of fact, its program under the current Federal legislation has received wide acclaim in the gentleman's own State of New York as being a model program. There is nothing selfish about the State of Iowa. We approve the idea of putting in 25 percent. But the point is that under this law and under the explanation that the gentleman made, there is no way in which we can participate at all unless we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I must respectfully differ with the gentleman, because the State planning agency can make its plans even without the legislature's approval. The

legislature will approve later on if money is involved.

Mr. KYL. Can we get the funds?
Mr. CELLER. The LEAA will take from the State planning agencies a pledge or a promise that if and when the State legislature appropriates, then the 25 percent will be available. That is the way this is done.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I understood the amendment until it was explained.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) if he will respond to a few questions concerning this bill.

In the overall picture it seems to me we have reached the ultimate situation, where we are now protesting because the Federal Government does not make funds available before the States ask for it. Do I understand it correctly, I ask the gentleman, if a State has plans, they can submit the new plan before they get the money? Is that correct?

Mr. MIKVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNGATE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct. Under the act, as I read the section and report, it is very clear that if they submit the plan tomorrow and their plan had to meet given conditions and the State provided 25 percent to the local government for their share, that plan could be approved and any specific project under it could be approved and funds could start flowing immediately.

Mr. HUNGATE. And, the first step in any part of this program would be to submit a plan, a different plan, a new plan or an additional plan, and this can still be done and can be done until July 1, 1971, and many States such as Iowa and Missouri where the State legislatures do not meet until next year, the plan would be submitted by the law enforcement agency of the State; Is that correct?

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct.

Mr. HUNGATE. Now, the next problem is with reference to the 25 percent of the local share. Let us see exactly what we are talking about. Many of these projects I understand are 60 percent federally financed and 40 percent State financed.

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct.

Mr. HUNGATE. In other words, 60 percent is going to be Federal and is to be paid by the Federal Government, 30 percent by the city or municipality and 10 percent of the total cost is all the State would be required to pay; Is that correct?

Mr. MIKVA. That is correct.

Mr. HUNGATE. We have a few fiscal year starting July 1, 1970, in a couple of days, which will run until June 30, 1971. The plan could be submitted any time during that year, could it not? It could be submitted by the State of Iowa or the State of Missouri or any State between now and the end of the year and at the end of that time when the State legislature meets could it appropriate the funds necessary to support the State's 25-percent contribution any time between then and June 30, 1971?

Mr. MIKVA. This is absolutely correct. And, in that interim time the Federal funds could flow to the States on the basis of the plan that had been sub-

mitted and the projects under that plan to which the State is to provide that assistance could be carried out.

Mr. HUNGATE. When the original bill was passed, is it not true it was passed near June 30, near the end of the fiscal year?

Let me ask if that delayed in any way the State plans to go on and submit plans and provide funds, if available?

Mr. MIKVA. No, it did not. Many States will appropriate money just as they will here in order to achieve the purposes of the program.

Mr. HUNGATE. May I ask the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH), if what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) explains is generally true?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The explanation is absolutely correct. Iowa and other States have sufficient time to act for fiscal 1971. The program in Iowa got off to a good start following the June 1968 enactment of this legislation, and the situation is exactly the same here. If Iowa could not have acted in a year in fiscal 1969, Iowa would not have participated in the program. But it did act quickly then, and can act quickly this time—if it wants to.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his comment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there is clear authority for the way we propose to proceed. If the law, as stated by the gentleman from Iowa were correct, we could never have started this program in fiscal 1969 in Iowa, where it is so highly complimented. This is sound legislation, and the amendment ought to be defeated. We ought to proceed in accordance with the experience we received in fiscal 1969. States can act fast when they want to.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNGATE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee—and I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) and the distinguished minority leader on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH), is the chairman's understanding of the provisions of the bill the same as that of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA)?

Mr. CELLER. I am absolutely in accord with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the chairman for his statement.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Iowa State Legislature for four terms, I am very concerned this afternoon as to the hardship which faces my State.

Normally the legislature does not appropriate funds until perhaps near the close of the session. Because of the increase cost to the State in order for it to stay in the program the additional sum cannot be appropriated. However,

I talked to the crime commissioner in Iowa, George Orr, this morning. He says that if this amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), is not adopted, we will absolutely be forced out of the program, and it is a program for which we have a high regard and have had great success.

We have been talking about a State plan here this afternoon. That is not the problem we are faced with in Iowa at the present time, because we can always come up with a State plan, what we cannot come up with right now is the 25 percent. We have absolutely no way of transferring the funds in the State of Iowa from one department to another at this time.

The next session of the State legislature will not convene until January of next year, and it will probably be June or July of next year before the 25 percent that we need to participate in this program can be granted. We want this program. It has served a great purpose in Iowa. The amendment is urgently needed in order to comply with the law as it is written. The State of Iowa only ask that we be allowed to participate. And it is not only just one State, but there are other States who are affected by this.

These matching funds of 25 percent are critical, we know. We are willing to participate and come up with our share in the program. We just ask at this time that you take into consideration the fact that our legislature has not met and will not meet until next January. The funds could not be available until the summer of 1971. Give consideration to our plight, and that of the other States, and adopt this amendment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE). While there may be some long-range benefits from the changes contemplated by the bill in paragraph 2 of section 303, the short-range effects on many States would be devastating. It would be virtually impossible for Iowa, and for many other States to meet the matching fund requirements this coming fiscal year, or perhaps even the following year. It would seem clear that the States would have to match Federal funds in fiscal year 1971 in order to continue to qualify for funds under the act. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible for Iowa to meet this requirement without calling a special session of the general assembly.

It seems to me that there is one question which should always be asked when we deal with legislation of this type. That question is, "What will be the effect of this legislation on the States, not only from a substantive standpoint, but also from an administrative standpoint?" Too often we forget to ask this question.

Mr. Chairman, we must at a minimum delay the effective date of this legislation. I prefer the language contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) providing complete elimination of the proposed changes. If this is done we can go back and determine more accurately the effect of the proposed change on the various States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHERLE) there were—ayes 23, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 15, line 18 after "Sec. 9" insert "(a)".

On page 15, after line 20, add the following new subsections:

"(b) Section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 8191. Determination of eligibility

"The benefits of this subchapter are available as provided in this subchapter to eligible public safety officers (referred to in this subchapter as "eligible officers") and their survivors. For the purposes of this Act, an eligible officer is any person who is determined by the Secretary of Labor in his discretion to have been on any given occasion—

"(1) employed as a law enforcement officer or fireman by a State or a political subdivision of a State,

"(2) an officially recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department, or

"(3) serving without compensation as an officially recognized or designated member of a legally organized law enforcement agency of a State or political subdivision of a State thereof,

and to have been on that occasion not an employee as defined in section 8101(1), and to have sustained on that occasion a personal injury for which the United States would be required under subchapter I of this chapter to pay compensation if he had been on that occasion such an employee engaged in the performance of his duty."

"(c) The heading at the beginning of subchapter III of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and the item relating to such subchapter in the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter are amended by striking out 'LAW ENFORCEMENT' and inserting in lieu thereof 'PUBLIC SAFETY'.

"(d) The amendments made by the first section of this Act are effective only with respect to personal injuries sustained on or after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. CELLER (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think it would be beneficial if the committee knew the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER MADE BY MR. CELLER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane. It refers to compensation and to personal liability and it has no relation whatsoever to the bill under consideration, which concerns law-enforcement assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is proposed would simply extend to any

policeman or fireman in the United States who is killed or totally disabled in line of duty benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

The amendment is offered as an amendment to section 9 of the pending legislation. Section 9 of the pending legislation deals with title V of the United States Code, which contains the Employment Compensation Act.

The Honorable Henry S. Boutell of Illinois, while sitting as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, ruled on May 22, 1962, on an amendment to provide for an educational test for immigrants to a bill to regulate the immigration of aliens in the United States:

The Chair would point out in passing on this question that an examination of this bill shows that it is a general immigration measure, the title being "to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States." Section 35 repeals all of the laws inconsistent with this law. Any amendment to the bill in the opinion of the Chair which is clearly and distinctly connected logically with the general scope and intent of the bill would be germane. . . .

It is not the province of the Chair to pass on the merits or demerits of any amendment, or its wisdom or justice. It appears to the Chair that this amendment is clearly, distinctly, and logically connected with the general scope of a bill regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States, and under these circumstances the Chair feels constrained to overrule the point of order and hold that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 which the instant legislation seeks to amend says as follows:

Congress finds that the high incident of crime in the United States threatens the peace, security, and general welfare of the nation and its citizens. To prevent crime and to ensure the greater safety of the people, law enforcement efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective at all levels of government.

Under the rule laid down by Mr. Boutell that the amendment must be "clearly and distinctly connected logically with the general scope and intent of the bill," the policeman and fireman amendment would be germane in the sense that it is offered as an amendment ultimately to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

This amendment, to provide survivor benefits to families of police and firemen killed in the line of duty, would provide essentially a form of additional compensation. Section 301, subsection (b) of the Safe Streets Act allows that up to one-third of any grant made under this section may be expended for compensation of personnel, which shows a germaneness, and I urge the Chair not to hold in one sense that this legislation before the committee is germane, that it is in order to provide assistance to police officers as they fight crime, but that their widows and children are not germane to this legislation if it seeks to compensate them if they fall in the battle against crime.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) has offered an amendment to the bill to which the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has raised a point of order on the grounds that the amendment is not germane.

The Chair has studied the bill and the amendment. The bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to assist States and local government to control crime and violence. It authorizes appropriations for 3 additional years; changes management from the 3-member board to a single administrator; sets up a new matching grant program relating to correctional facilities; and provides for matching grants for enforcement assistance and education.

The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana proposes that upon a determination by the Secretary of Labor to make State and local policemen, as-well-as firemen, or their survivors, eligible for benefits under the Federal employee compensation for work injuries statutes.

The Chair does not believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is germane to the bill and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for bringing out an outstanding piece of legislation. In addition to authorization for 3 years, which for planning purposes is absolutely essential at the local level, and the increase in funds, I think perhaps the most significant change, other than the construction program, is the fact that recognizing the impossible administrative quandary this organization was in under a three-man board, this committee grabbed a very difficult problem and reversed the situation, appointing a single administrator, so that he could go on with the very important work which must be done.

As part of this entire program, I introduce a bill, H.R. 16133, Mr. Chairman, which will have authorized the establishment and conducting of a permanent training program for prosecuting attorneys at the Federal, State, and local level, specifically dealing with organized crime. I want to compliment the committee because in section 407 of their bill they have instituted a training program for law enforcement at the State and local level.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Turning to page 8, section 407—

Sec. 407. The Administration is authorized to develop and support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars to instruct State and local law enforcement personnel in improved methods of crime prevention and reduction and enforcement of the criminal law.

In the report I note the committee cites as the prime example of the type of program they wish to see emphasized as one against organized crime. Am I correct that the language of section 407 is broad enough to include prosecutors?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct in that regard and in his reference to the report.

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, section 407, of course, does

not include Federal prosecutors either in an organized crime effort or in any other effort.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. But we now have an informal, in-house training program for Federal prosecutors.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I would hope that at some proper time we could give special emphasis to the program now ongoing in the Department with respect to special training in fighting organized crime, in techniques for our Federal prosecutors. I know we do that, but I think it is important to follow the lead which the gentleman's committee has set with respect to State and local law enforcement officers, and to follow that same lead with respect to the training of Federal prosecutors in fighting organized crime, in the techniques of enforcement, by recognizing it specifically in legislation and giving it the emphasis which only the gentleman's great committee can give it, and make it positive that funds will not be removed from this program. If we give them legislative authority at some point, then we can be sure the Department will continue that program.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Florida for his statement. I think his statement is the result of a considerable amount of research the gentleman has done. It is a point well taken.

We are now in the throes of consideration of a bill involving organized crime. I can assure the gentleman undoubtedly we will consider the suggestions the gentleman made with respect to Federal attorneys anent organized crime, and the seminars and the methods of instruction and the techniques, and so forth, to which the gentleman made reference.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the ranking minority Member to comment on this suggestion I have made?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I compliment the gentleman from Florida for discussing this matter today. I think it brings into focus something that needs to be brought into focus, and we need to continue the activity, which has produced so much in the State and local prosecutors' fields, also in the Federal field.

I am pleased to say I shall bend whatever effort I can summons to that end for that legislation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FASCELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I asked for the time because I want to get into the RECORD the fact that the concept of this legislation as a program that should be made permanent in law with emphasis on training in fighting organized crime, in techniques for the Federal prosecutors involved, which is involved in a bill which I have introduced, a great part of which is now in the pending legislation, and the Federal part of it, that is, a

training program for the Federal prosecutors will be under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, has the support of the following organizations: The National League of Cities, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the National District Attorneys' Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the International Narcotic Enforcement Officers Association, and the International Conference of Police Associations. It also has the support of some distinguished eminent gentlemen in the law-enforcement field, such as Virgil Peterson, the former chairman of the Chicago Crime Commission, and Milton R. Wessel, who was a member of a special group appointed by the Attorney General.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I join the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee in complimenting the gentleman in the well for the very fine statement he has made. I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17825, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act Amendments.

The 11th Congressional District which I represent is one of many within the confines of New York City.

Like every other large city in our country, New York City is experiencing increasing difficulty by virtue of the ever rising crime rate.

New York is unable to withstand alone the fear, injury to person, loss of property, and the financial drain produced through the commission of crime.

So all eyes are turned to the Federal Government in search of some relief.

At the outset I want to say that the cost figure for the entire country, of \$650 million for fiscal year 1970, is way below what is necessary to begin to do the job of making our streets safe. However, there are several portions of the bill which I believe will be most helpful.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, established under the bill, may make grants to States having comprehensive State plans approved by it for the following purposes:

First. Public protection, including the recruiting of law enforcement personnel, the training of personnel in law enforcement, and the development, evaluation, implementation, and purchase of methods, devices, facilities designed to improve and strengthen law enforcement and reduce crime in public and private places.

Second. The organization, education, and training of special law enforcement units to combat organized crime.

Third. The organization and education of special law enforcement units for the prevention, detection, and control of riots and other violent civil disorders including the acquisition of riot control equipment.

Fourth. The recruiting, training, and education of community service officers to assist law enforcement agencies in the discharge of their duties and provide community identification with local law enforcement officials.

Fifth. To assist in the construction, renting, or leasing of State facilities including local correctional facilities, centers for the treatment of narcotic addicts, and temporary courtroom facilities in areas of high crime incidence.

Further, this line establishes a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to assure improved coordination of all law enforcement activities.

While there is still much to be done this bill is a step in the right direction.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge immediate passage of H.R. 17825.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for their very great consideration which they gave me in connection with my legislative proposal pending before that committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 17825) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1111, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill be put over until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JUNE 23, 1970.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on June 23, 1970, approved the following public building projects:

Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Miami, Florida: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Albany, Georgia: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Post Office, Walkiki Station.

Chicago, Illinois: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Lansing, Michigan: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Buffalo, New York: U.S. Courthouse (Alteration).

New York City Metropolitan area: (a) Foreign Surface and Bulk Mail Facility; and (b) Preferential Mail Handling Facility (Alteration).

Washington, D.C.: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1519, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me ask the gentleman a couple of questions.

Are all amendments to the bill germane?

Mr. PERKINS. The House is acting first, the conference report could be amended. The Senate provisions were germane.

Mr. GROSS. All amendments are germane.

Mr. PERKINS. All amendments adopted to the bill were germane.

Mr. GROSS. What is the difference in the money figures in the two bills?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senate bill increased the authorization to \$750,000 for fiscal year 1971. The House amendment maintained the authorization at \$500,000. The House amendment placed no ceiling on appropriations.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may respond?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman.

The Senate bill had \$750,000 for the second and third years, and \$500,000 for the first year. The House had \$500,000 for the first year and an open-ended authorization in the second and third years. The conference report provides \$500,000 for the first year and \$750,000 in the second and succeeding years.

Mr. GROSS. Then the total amount was increased in conference by the other body; is that correct?

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct, with respect to the actual dollar amounts.

Mr. GROSS. By how much?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The difference between \$500,000 and such sums as may be authorized in the second and third years, which are of course open. The total amount would be \$2 million over 3 years in the Senate bill and in the conference report.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understood the House version, it was \$500,000 the first year and an unlimited authorization thereafter.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The Senate

version was \$500,000 the first year and \$750,000 for the next 2 years.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the conference report provides \$500,000 in the first year and \$750,000 the next year and the year after that in contrast to an open-ended authorization, it seems to me the conference report is more restrictive rather than more liberal.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The gentleman from Iowa asked his question in terms of specific amounts, but the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct in that the conference report does impose greater limitations on the amounts spent.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, or the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is there any mandatory expenditure provision in this conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. There is no mandatory spending provision in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But it is an increase of about a half a million dollars?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. It is an increase.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 24, 1970.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and for other purposes, S. 1519 (H.R. 10666).

Except for a few minor points the conference report adopts the principal features of H.R. 10666 as it passed the House by a vote of 259 yeas to 11 nays on April 20, 1970.

In the legislation that passed the House of Representatives the Commission was established as a separate and independent agency from any agency or department of the Government.

In the Senate version of the legislation the Commission was to be identified and associated directly with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The members of the committee and, indeed, the Members of the House felt very strongly that the House approach to the establishment of the Commission was the soundest in view of the many agencies and libraries and library science interests that were not connected with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To cite a few: The AID Libraries, business libraries, Department of Defense libraries, Library

of Congress, National Archives, National Agricultural Library, Smithsonian Institution, and special libraries such as museums, and historical associations.

All of these do not come within the purview of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administration and direction.

I am very pleased that the conference report retains this significant feature of the House-passed bill.

Unlike the House bill the Senate measure authorized the Commission to accept contributions and to disburse the same for the purposes of the Commission.

The conference report contains this provision.

In other aspects the resolution of differences were as follows:

First. The Senate bill provided that the Commission shall have responsibility for developing or recommending plans for the national policy, while the House amendment limited the function to developing plans. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

Second. The Senate bill explicitly included language relating to special library and informational needs of rural areas, while the House amendment did not. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

Third. The Senate bill required an appraisal of resources and services, while the House amendment confined the appraisal to resources. The conference report adopts the Senate provision.

Fourth. The House amendment stated that the Commission shall appraise "deficiencies" of library and information resources, as well as their "adequacies," while the Senate bill did not. The conference report adopts the House provision.

Fifth. The Senate bill required that the Commission advise Federal, State, and local agencies regarding libraries and information sciences. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference report contains the provision of the Senate bill but modifies it to authorize, but not to require the Commission to furnish such advice.

Sixth. The Senate bill required reporting through the Secretary to the President and to Congress. The House required reporting directly to the President and Congress. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

The Senate bill set January 31 as the reporting date, while the House amendment specified January 1. The conference report contains the provisions of the Senate bill.

Seventh. The House amendment authorized reports in addition to the annual report while the Senate bill did not. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Eighth. Section 6 of the Senate bill and section 6 of the House amendment specified the composition and membership of the Commission. They differed in a number of respects and substantively in the following particulars:

Both bills provided for a 15-member Commission. The Senate bill specified that the Librarian of Congress be a stat-

utory member of the Commission while the House amendment did not.

The Senate bill provided that at least five members of the Commission be professional librarians or information scientists while the House amendment set five as the maximum number of such professionals.

The Senate bill but not the House amendment required that at least one member of the Commission be knowledgeable with respect to the technological aspects of library services.

The conference report rewrites section 6 with the resolution of these differences as follows:

The conference report provides a 15-member Commission and specifies that the Librarian of Congress be one of the members of the Commission with the other members of the Commission being appointed by the President with two to serve initially for 1 year, three to serve initially for 2 years, three to serve initially for 4 years and three to serve initially for 5 years. After the expiration of such terms the conference report provides that the terms of office of the members of the Commission shall be 5 years.

The conference report provides that only five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information scientists and the remainder shall be persons having a special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services. The conference substitute requires that at least one member of the Commission be knowledgeable with respect to the technological aspects of library services.

Ninth. The Senate bill increased the authorization to \$750,000 in fiscal year 1971, while the House amendment maintained the authorization at \$500,000. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1970. The Senate limited the appropriation in the following fiscal years to \$750,000 each year. The House amendment placed no ceiling on appropriations for fiscal years after fiscal year 1970. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science was cosponsored by 25 Members of both sides of the aisle, was reported unanimously out of the Education and Labor Committee, and was passed by this body on April 20 by a vote of 259 to 11.

The establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science fulfills one of the major recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries which was initiated by the President in 1966 under the chairmanship of Douglas Knight, former president of Duke University. In addition to establishing the Commission, this bill affirms that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies to insure that adequate library instructional services are provided to all our citizens.

The legislation as agreed to in conference establishes the 15-member Commission as an independent agency, with

administrative services to be provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Commission would carry out the following responsibilities:

First. Advise the President and Congress on the implementation of national policy in the area of library services and information science;

Second. Conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the needs of the Nation in this area and the means by which these needs can be met;

Third. Evaluate present resources and programs;

Fourth. Develop and coordinate plans and activities for meeting these needs;

Fifth. Promote research and development activities;

Sixth. Report to Congress and the President on its activities; and

Seventh. Publish other reports and materials as deemed appropriate.

The establishment now of a National Commission may very well save us many times its small cost in future years.

I respectfully urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees for the House I rise in support of the adoption of the conference report on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act.

The conference report upholds the House position and should be passed promptly. The major issue was the location of the Commission and while some felt the Commission should be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I believe an independent commission best serves the needs of the Commission and of libraries throughout the Nation.

This bill has been long in coming since the Commission headed by Dr. Douglas Knight first made the recommendation which this legislation implements. The Commission can play a major role in advising and appraising the Congress and executive branch of the needs in this vital field.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 17825.

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

There was no objection.

AID FOR COLLEGE PENSION PLAN

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the existence of sound and innovative pension programs is of essential importance to the achievement of our national retirement goals. It has clearly been the policy of this Nation to support and encourage such programs. The outstanding pension system in higher education is supremely deserving of such encouragement and support.

H.R. 9010 has been introduced to protect this system from obstacles which threaten to impair its continued effective operation. This bill has received tremendous and widespread support throughout the country. One of the most recent expressions of approval for this measure is an editorial entitled "Aid for College Pension Plan" appearing in the April 19, 1970, issue of the Plain Dealer. Published in Cleveland, with a circulation of over 500,000, the Plain Dealer is a respected journal. Its editorial is an effective and just presentation of the merits of H.R. 9010 and the remarkable pension system that bill would protect:

AID FOR COLLEGE PENSION PLAN

Granting federal charter status to a non-profit pension system for higher education would be to the benefit of some 300,000 teachers and administrators at more than 2,000 colleges and universities.

Companion bills to grant such status are now in the judiciary committees of both houses of Congress and we think they should be approved.

The pension plan of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association College Retirement Equities Fund was created in 1906 with a grant from philanthropist Andrew Carnegie. Recent developments in insurance laws would mean that without federal charter status the plan would be increasingly subjected to separate regulations in each state of the nation.

Testifying in behalf of the bill in the House, a spokesman for the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) said: "Without timely relief the effect upon the system may be the destruction of that uniformity which is absolutely critical both to the individual teacher and to higher education as a whole. The heart of education's pension program is its uniform availability throughout the nation . . ."

It is important that this plan be preserved in its present form. It helps give financial security to higher education personnel and makes it possible for them to change jobs without losing pension benefits. The TIAA-CREF plan has proved its value.

THE CHICAGO TRUCKING STRIKE

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

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, a news article in this morning's Washington Post indicated that six Chicago trucking companies have agreed to a wage pact substantially higher than the na-

tional agreement which was ratified by the majority of Teamster members in the country some weeks ago. This Chicago settlement followed on the heels of last week's rejection by two Chicago Teamsters locals and one independent union of a pact which was in keeping with the national agreement.

The new agreement by these six Chicago carriers, if followed by the rest of the Chicago carriers, could lead to disaster for our already harassed national economy. When the national agreement was negotiated in May, it was stipulated by both the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Trucking Employers, Inc., the bargaining arm for the Nation's truckers, that if the majority of Chicago truckers agreed to a pact higher than the national agreement, the national contract would automatically be reopened. In short, Mr. Speaker, whatever the majority of Chicago truckers agree to will set the standard for the Nation disregarding the fact that the national contract has already been submitted to and ratified by the Teamster rank-and-file.

This may sound hard to believe, but it is true. Since April 1, the Chicago locals have been on strike at an astounding cost to the Nation's economy, and please note that I say Nation's economy, not just the Chicago economy. It is now estimated that the nationwide dollar loss from the Chicago strike is close to \$2 billion. The strike has and is affecting not only truckers but more importantly manufacturers and other shippers who simply cannot get their goods to market or receive the raw material so essential in manufacturing.

Appeals have been made to the President to intercede in this dangerous situation. It is known that the administration has sent mediators including Mr. J. Curtis Counts, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to Chicago but to no avail. The situation is simply a power play to undermine the leadership of Mr. Frank Fitzsimmons, president of the IBT. On the other hand, the Nation's trucking companies are financially assisting the Chicago carriers to resist a higher settlement for fear the national contract would be reopened. I realize and applaud the administration's desire to keep their hands off the collective bargaining process and to allow insofar as is possible the affected parties to settle their differences peacefully, but the situation has gotten out of hand.

We have a national emergency. We could face the prospect of an inflationary contract settlement between the majority of the Chicago truckers and the three unions and then watch helplessly as the IBT and the Trucking Employers, Inc., reopen the national agreement which will subject the country to another series of violent and costly strikes. The Chicago situation has become a symbol of the labor unrest existing in the country today. Many responsible people have called for constructive labor law reform. Coalition bargaining and industrywide bargaining has led us down the path to the present perilous predicament we are faced with. We, the Congress, should seriously consider this question.

More importantly, we should, and I do,

call upon the President to use the powers granted him under Taft-Hartley to call an 80-day injunction and to use his office to settle this dispute.

Now, some people will say, "Well, why not just settle the dispute by agreeing to the higher settlement even on a national basis. The trucking companies are free to petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief in the form of increased rates." I ask you—who pays these increased rates? The public does, and the public is sick and tired of having to pay the price for irresponsible action on the part of a handful of union officials and companies who care not one whit for the welfare of the public.

To put it in simple terms, the national agreement calls for a wage increase of \$1.10 per hour spread over 39 months. The agreement the six Chicago carriers agreed to calls for a wage increase of \$1.65 an hour spread over only 36 months. That is 50 percent higher. Add to that additional fringe benefits demanded by the Chicago unions, and you have a frightening picture. There are approximately 450,000 Teamsters involved in this question and such a settlement would bring added costs in the billions. A suffering economy cannot be expected to withstand such pressures.

Again, this situation was brought about by internal union politics and an unwise decision by the Trucking Employers, Inc., to make an unheard of agreement which totally disregards the wishes of hundreds of thousands of truck drivers who have said, "We like the national contract, and we will work under it." Now, they face the prospect of being told there has been a mistake, and we are going to renegotiate your contract. Be prepared to go out on strike.

I feel that immediate action must be taken to save our country from a nationwide catastrophe. Therefore, in closing, I request and urge that the President use the powers of his office available to him under the Taft-Hartley law to bring about an end to this costly dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the above-mentioned article from the Washington Post and the New York Times article of June 27, 1970, relating to the same subject:

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1970]
CHICAGO DRIVERS REJECT NEW OFFER

CHICAGO, June 26.—Truck drivers and terminal workers in the Chicago area have overwhelmingly rejected a proposed new settlement of their 78-day combination strike and lockout, thus continuing their threat to upset a national master freight truck settlement reached April 2, it was announced today.

The national agreement provided pay increases of \$1.10 an hour over 39 months and \$4 a week in fringe benefits. However, it contained a stipulation that the agreement would be reconsidered if the Chicago area truck drivers won a larger settlement.

The national agreement, which came after a series of wildcat strikes was reached by Frank E. Fitzsimmons, acting Teamster Union president, and Ray F. Beagle, chief negotiator for Trucking Employers, Inc. Involved were 450,000 truck drivers. The Chicago drivers rejected it.

The latest trucking industry offer here was for an increase of \$1.65 an hour over 45 months. The local union leaders had recom-

mended rejection and according to the vote announced today, the members went along, 23,813 to 6,478.

SAME FOR 39 MONTHS

Under this proposal from five major trucking associations, the Chicago pay increase over the first 39 months could have been identical with the national settlement, and it could have averted new national negotiations.

The unions, including the independent Chicago Truck Drivers Union and several teamster union locals, have been demanding a raise of \$1.65 an hour over 36 months.

"This vote represents the feeling of the drivers, dock workers and office personnel in the Chicago area," said Ray Schoessling, president of Chicago Teamsters Joint Council 25. "This conflict will go on for some time unless the employers realize we're not going to settle for less."

According to the union's estimates, only 10,000 drivers are idle now although 40,000 are involved in the dispute.

The Illinois Motor Truck Operators Association, representing 500 companies, had signed new three-year contracts April 9 while five other major associations continued to hold out. An estimated total of 2,300 companies since have signed contracts.

Union officials said these contracts along with rotation of work and efforts to find other temporary employment for drivers had reduced the number of idle to the 10,000 figure.

The strike has been a severe blow to Chicago area business and industry. Selective strikes were started April 6, and then the five major trucking groups locked out their drivers on April 10.

These five associations that have continued to resist the union demands are Cartage Exchange of Chicago, Inc.; Central Motor Freight Association; Northern Indiana Truckers, Inc.; Northern Illinois Truckers, Inc., and Motor Carriers Labor Advisory Council.

The chief industry negotiator here, J. L. Pfeiffer, scheduled a meeting of association officials, but declined comment.

In Washington, J. Curtis Counts, director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, who helped negotiate the rejected proposal at the direction of President Nixon, expressed disappointment and said new mediation efforts would be begun.

Mr. Schoessling said the unions were willing to resume bargaining, but only on the basis of the unions' demand for an increase of \$1.65 an hour on a 36-month contract.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1970]
SIX CHICAGO TRUCKING FIRMS SIGN WITH UNION

CHICAGO.—Six trucking firms, including one of the nation's largest, signed agreements with striking drivers Saturday, bowing to union demands for an \$1.65-an-hour pay boost over 36 months.

The agreements followed overwhelming rejection Friday by Teamster Union members of the latest management offer of a \$1.65-an-hour raise over 45 months.

The 11-week-old strike-lockout affects 40,000 drivers, dockworkers and terminal personnel in the Chicago area.

August Burnier, secretary-treasurer of Teamster Local 754, said the agreements could cause other trucking firms to end their holdout against union demands.

A VETERAN'S VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, June 30 marks

the end of the great debates on Cambodia by the other body and a vote on the inglorious Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments.

No doubt, Americans around the Nation have been somewhat puzzled and less than amused by this dramatic, play-like exercise in futility characterized as a no-win contest to which the other body has contributed the best of its armchair strategists while other urgent legislative business of the Nation has been set aside. If anything is certain, however, it is that the Cooper-Church amendment has been so amended itself that it gives the appearance of being designed to mean whatever the individuals of the other body conveniently says it means when they take to the political stump for reelection later this year.

Be that as it may be for the homefront political consumption, it seems that the Vietnam veterans, those who took part in the Cambodian action, and the remaining troops who can look forward to a safer and earlier withdrawal have a somewhat different but more definite view as to what the Cooper-Church amendment means as a symbol. I refer to it as a symbol because its words mean nothing except as cast in the framework of its sponsors and initial supporters whose intent it has been all along to bludgeon the President into a commitment of immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all American troops from Southeast Asia.

The following is a letter I received from a veteran of 19 months' duty in Vietnam. It is, I believe, the more typical view of what Cooper-Church means from the standpoint of the GI whose life depends on the President's flexibility of action, and is a vote of confidence in the President which several Members in the other body seem to be avoiding with an obsession. The letter follows:

JUNE 20, 1970.

HON. JOHN E. HUNT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUNT: The last of April I returned from a 19-month tour in Vietnam with the Army Combat Engineers and I'm still there in spirit.

I'm writing you about the pending so-called "Cooper-Church Amendment". You no doubt know that it is being pushed by the anti-military, "peace-at-any-price" forces here in America. If passed, it would greatly tie the hands of our Commander-in-Chief and our military leaders on the specific conduct of military operations in Southeast Asia. It implies that the current Cambodian operations are entirely separate, involve a different enemy, and are not part of the same war in neighboring Vietnam. (When I left Vietnam in April, our battalion had one company improving a Special Forces camp right on the Cambodian border, which was there deep in the jungle just to help stop the heavy infiltration.)

In effect, the Amendment tells the President, "We don't believe you" and "We don't trust you" and brings discredit and distrust upon him and the Administration in time of war—thus indirectly helping our sworn enemies. Also, it greatly endangers our servicemen and others in Indo-China. In particular, it tells the enemy our future intentions—our "unit movement orders"—in clear violation of all normal security procedures, thus violating both the Uniform Code of Military

Justice and the Federal Code which prohibit the communication of classified information (such as military troop movements) to unauthorized persons.

Please use your great influence as a U.S. Representative and as a member of the influential Armed Services Committee against this insidious attempt to undermine our Government and its armed forces by the "peacemongers" and their allies.

Requestfully yours,
Spéc. DAVID CAVANESS.

BIASED NEWS REPORTING OF CBS

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a commentary by James J. Kilpatrick, June 16, 1970, in which he cited the biased news reporting of CBS.

I think this commentary by Mr. Kilpatrick is an excellent example of staged news which goes beyond a reporter's biased viewpoint.

The commentary follows:

BIAS NEWS REPORTING OF CBS (By James J. Kilpatrick)

Vice President Agnew named no names the other night, in his latest criticism of the news media. He spoke generally of what seemed to him one-sidedness in presentation of the news, and he singled out Vietnam as a topic in point. Unless I am grossly mistaken—and I don't think I am—Mr. Agnew was talking about the CBS Evening News. If so, he was right on target.

On the evening of May 6, the CBS Evening News came up with a report so slanted as hardly to qualify as "news" at all. It came from correspondent Gary Sheppard at Tien Nhon near the Cambodian border. He sought out a few men from Alpha Company, Third Battalion, 22d Infantry Regiment, right on the eve of their going into Cambodia. In somber tones, he spoke of their approaching ordeal.

Sheppard had lined up one soldier who was ready to risk a dishonorable discharge by refusing to go in. "Are you scared?" Sheppard asked him. And he got the response he expected. "Time grew shorter," Sheppard continued. "Other men of Alpha Company began to speak out as well, and it became apparent that there were few of them who really wanted to go." He had a soldier lined up to say, "We're just really not prepared." Sheppard pushed them with a question of his own: "When the choppers come in here in a little while and load you guys up, are you going to get aboard or are you going to stay here?" He had another question: "How many of the men here do you think really want to go in?" And still another: "Do you say that morale is pretty low in Alpha Company?"

And so on. The whole transcript may be read, courtesy of Senator Bob Dole of Kansas, at page 14684 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7. The Senator said that CBS News "has come perilously close to attempting to incite mutiny" through Sheppard's interviews.

The Senator is not a reporter. I am. I have been a reporter for 30 years, and as such, I willingly label Sheppard's "report" for what it was—a disgraceful violation of the good reporter's commitment to objectivity, and to his responsibility to cover the news, not to make it. Regular viewers will have their own opinions on whether this was an isolated incident, or part of a recurring bias. Anyhow, on May 6, that's the way it was on CBS News. This is James J. Kilpatrick.

TEST PROGRAM IN OMAHA

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am horrified and extremely angered to learn from this morning's edition of the Washington Post of a test program now being conducted in Omaha, Nebr.; under this latest outrage against fundamental human values, young, elementary school pupils are being administered various behavior modification drugs to, according to the Post, "improve classroom deportment and increase learning potential."

When I read this shocking story, it seemed to me that the bright American promise of 1789 is fast turning into Huxley's brave new world in 1970.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the classroom is really a creative, learning experience. Yet, in Omaha, through drugs, physicians are attempting to induce conformity; in other words, they seem to be attempting to create Huxleyan alpha students from those identified as gamma. This may seem unbelievable; but, it is happening nonetheless.

Now, the rationale, or excuse, offered for this frightening project in Omaha is that the students involved are hyperactive. But I seem to recall that many of Western civilization's greatest minds and most outstanding achievers were similarly characterized during their early schooldays. Accordingly, then, should behavioral drugs such as Ritalin and Dexedrine have been administered to young Albert Einstein, or young John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

Mr. Speaker, there are many terrible and terrifying aspects to the Omaha test, but let me mention only a few at this point.

First, the drugs employed in the Omaha test are admittedly listed by the Federal Government as dangerous substances; the FDA advises physicians to use extreme caution in prescribing one of the drugs, Ritalin, because it might lead to addiction as well as other serious side effects. Nevertheless, the drug is given in Omaha to small schoolchildren. In Heaven's name, what have we come to when we use our own youngsters as guinea pigs in a grotesque game of psychological chance? Where are we heading when we administer drugs to children of six which would not be safe if given to people 10 times that age? The awful thing speaks for itself.

And it speaks to a second consideration as well; namely, how can we possibly expect our national effort against drug abuse to have meaning when those in authority abuse drugs themselves? How can we ever hope to convince a teenager that amphetamines, such as Dexadrene, are extremely harmful when we ourselves give amphetamines to elementary school students? Is it any wonder that our children do not hear us when we tell them that drugs are killers? There is a rather obvious credibility gap here; in addition there also seems to be a humanity gap.

A third consideration, Mr. Speaker, is that in many of the so-called IQ tests

which are given, those scoring as genius are often found to be the most unruly, hyperactive members of their class. But in Omaha, it appears from the story that rather than seeking to channel hyperenergy into creative energy, they are seeking to deaden it into abysmal regularity. And is this not the exact result that we warn against in our exhortations to young people to stay away from drugs?

On the basis of these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I am now commencing an investigation by my privacy subcommittee to determine if any Federal funds whatsoever have been used in this monstrous project. I am asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for information, as well as the NIH, and the NIMH, and the FDA. If our investigation indicates that Federal funds are involved, I will call for hearings of my privacy inquiry to probe the entire affair.

In closing, let me state that it becomes a very frightening experience to read the newspaper each morning and learn of the day's new assault on human dignity and decency. Incidents such as the Omaha test may be isolated; but taken together, they seem to represent the most concerted attack on our basic humanity ever mounted in the history of the world. This is very sad, and very dangerous. And it certainly militates in favor of increased congressional effort in this area, such as would be provided by my proposed Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions.

We owe such an effort to ourselves, and to all those of our children who may one day be victims of the Omaha test.

CONGRESSMAN OLIN TEAGUE TO RECEIVE THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to announce to the House that our great colleague, the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, has been selected for the American Legion's highest award. Our colleague, Mr. TEAGUE, will receive the American Legion Distinguished Service Award on the morning of September 2 in Portland, Oreg., at the Memorial Coliseum, before a full session of the National Convention of the American Legion. The National Executive Committee of the American Legion, in awarding to our colleague this coveted award, has cited Mr. TEAGUE for outstanding service as a civilian, as a soldier, and as a Congressman who has served with dignity, honor, and courage.

It has been a great privilege for me to serve for many years under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE). I would like to commend my colleague and say that his great honor is richly deserved. He has sponsored more beneficial and constructive veterans' legislation than any other man in the history of the Congress. And I might remind my colleagues that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is the only Veterans' Affairs

Committee in the Congress, House or Senate, so I am happy this morning for my great colleague, Mr. TEAGUE. We are proud of his many accomplishments and superb leadership.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to my beloved colleague from California (Mr. TEAGUE) who is also a great, able, and distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you very much. I certainly want to join in the commendation of my cousin, OLIN, which is richly deserved. He is a truly great chairman, a truly great Member of the Congress, and certainly an outstanding American. I thank the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the House.

Mr. DORN. I thank my dear colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House and the people of our country the following release of American Legion National Commander J. Milton Patrick:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—Rep. Olin E. Teague, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, will receive the American Legion's highest award at the Legion National Convention in Portland, Ore., Aug. 28-Sept. 3. Legion National Commander J. Milton Patrick announced that the Legion Distinguished Service Award for 1970 will be presented to the Texas Congressman before the full convention session at Memorial Coliseum on Wednesday morning, Sept. 2.

The Legion National Executive Committee, in selecting the veteran Congressman for the award, cited him for his service to the "nation, as both soldier and civilian, with dignity, honor and courage."

The NEC also recognized that Mr. Teague "has demonstrated his exemplary statesmanship on several missions as a special Presidential representative to Asian and Pacific nations."

Mr. Teague, severely wounded in combat in World War II, was also recognized by the NEC as having "worked diligently and consistently throughout his Congressional tenure, and especially as Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, to bring equity and justice to the veterans' benefits program."

In Europe during World War II, while commanding the 1st Battalion of the 314th Infantry, 79th Division, he was in combat for six months, won 11 decorations, including the Silver Star with two clusters, and was wounded a number of times. He spent two years in Army hospitals due to combat wounds.

Mr. Teague was discharged from the Army as a colonel in Sept., 1946 to take a seat in the 79th Congress to which he had been elected the previous month. He has represented Texas' 6th District in Congress continuously since that time.

Congressman Teague of College Station, Texas, has been chairman of the important Committee on Veterans Affairs since 1954. He also is the second ranking member of the Committee on Science and Aeronautics, established in the 86th Congress, and is chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight Program.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans in all walks of life, I

was shocked and distressed at the death of one of the most extraordinary figures in our national life, Walter P. Reuther.

Few Americans have made so many and such constructive contributions to their time as this gifted and dedicated man.

As the president for many years of the United Auto Workers, Walter Reuther was a fighter for better wages and working conditions for the members of the UAW.

But Walter Reuther felt that he and the union of which he was the leader, and, indeed, the entire American labor movement, should be concerned about more than the interests of trade union members.

He believed that the idealism and compassion and commitment to social justice which characterized his own life should motivate the trade union movement as well.

It was this conviction that caused Walter Reuther to be an effective proponent of peaceful uses of atomic energy, of medical care for the aged, of civil rights and better housing and better education for all the American people.

It was this conviction that caused him to be such an eloquent spokesman for free and just democracies in underdeveloped areas and to support of programs aimed at building an enduring peace in a troubled world.

As Representative in Congress of many thousands of members of the United Auto Workers and as one who, as a college student, was himself a member of the UAW while working on an assembly line at the Studebaker plant in South Bend, Ind., I am aware of the high regard in which Walter Reuther was held by my own constituents, and I take this opportunity to speak of my own great respect for him as well.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert an article by James C. Miller, published in the South Bend Tribune after Mr. Reuther's death, and I also insert editorials from the South Bend Tribune and the Plymouth, Ind., Pilot News:

AREA LABOR LEADERS RECALL REUTHER

(By James C. Miller)

Tributes to Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers who was killed with his wife, May, and four others in a plane crash near Pellston, Mich., Saturday, poured into local UAW offices today.

"I've known Walter Reuther personally ever since he became active in the UAW and the news of his death came as a great shock," said Stanley Ladd, president of the St. Joseph County AFL-CIO Council.

Odell Newburn, president of Amalgamated Local 5, UAW, disclosed plans to commemorate the life of Reuther and his contribution to the UAW membership with a memorial service at the UAW Local 5 Hall, 1426 S. Main St. The hall has been draped in black and photos of Reuther are being displayed in the lobby.

ED STANEK PAYS TRIBUTE

On behalf of the officers of the St. Joseph County CAP Council and its affiliate locals, the following tribute was released by Ed Stanek of Local 5: "The coming of the summer season is normally a time for rejoicing and carefree activities. This year it is also a time for all of us to pause and thank God that he allowed such people as Walter Reuther

er and his wife to have made a major contribution to the well being of his fellow man. Because they were here . . . our world is better."

Reuther, whose red hair matched his fiery temper, always regarded South Bend as the home of the UAW. Local 5 (Studebaker) and Local 9 (Bendix) were the first locals organized by charter in July, 1933. J. D. (Red) Hill, who has prepared a book for release this fall on Locals 5 and 9, recalled the birth of the UAW, which he says started from the American Federation of Labor, a federal-local union not affiliated with an international.

FIRST CONVENTION IN 1935

The first UAW convention was held in Detroit in 1935, but the first free convention was held in the Indiana Club in April, 1936. Reuther was an active delegate to this convention.

"South Bend was always a word on the tongue of Walter Reuther at every convention," Ladd recalled. "Walter never forgot the time he hitchhiked his way to South Bend and lived on peanuts for a week to attend the first convention here."

Throughout the nation, UAW leaders acknowledge the fact that the most powerful union in the country was born on the banks of the St. Joseph River.

The labor movement's attention was drawn to South Bend in 1936, when the first sit-down strike in the country was taking place at Bendix by Local 9.

ESCAPED ASSASSINATION

Having escaped an assassination attempt in 1948, Reuther returned to the city and was instrumental in settling the Bendix strike in 1949. The strike was settled in the Pentagon Bldg. in Washington. The strike proved to be the longest in the union's history. Reuther's arm, which was partially impaired by the shot which struck him in the assassination attempt, was still in a cast when he met with company and union officials to settle the strike.

In a statement released by Raymond H. Berndt, direction of Region 3, UAW, he said:

"I am completely shocked and distraught at the loss of my good friend Walter P. Reuther, his wife, May, and his associates in this terrible tragedy. I know that my loss and grief are shared by the 130,000 auto workers in Region 3.

WILL BE CONSTANTLY MISSED

"I know from having worked with Walter over the past 31 years that the vacuum created by the loss of this great labor leader will never be completely filled. The skill and craftsmanship he displayed in building the UAW will be evident in the weeks and months and years to come, as the UAW continues to advance on the course that he so carefully planned. He will be constantly missed so long as those who knew him in our organization continue to live. He was rare, unique and invaluable character."

Reuther rose from obscurity to leader of the most power union in the United States. His climb took him to the picket lines, where he underwent repeated beatings, and to the negotiating tables with the "big three" auto makers, where he matched wits and won huge benefits for his 1,600,000 members.

HERE MANY TIMES

South Bend, when Studebaker Corp. was in full swing, was known as an automobile town and this fact brought the popular Reuther here on many occasions during the decades of the '30s to the '60s.

Reuther, 62, his wife, May, 59, and four others died in the flaming wreckage of a Learjet which crashed just a mile and a half from the airport near Pellston, Mich., Saturday. They were en route to visit the UAW's \$15 million education center nearing completion on Black Lake in northern Lower Michigan.

FIVE DOLLAR TREASURY

While his stature grew within the UAW organization, his bankroll dwindled to nothing. In 1936, he was so poor that he had to hitch hike to his first union convention, held in South Bend. The local union he belonged to in Detroit had just 13 members. To keep its charter, it had to pay per capita dues on two fictitious members.

Reuther, jokingly, recalled the debate when it was decided he be entrusted with the entire union treasury to defray his expenses to attend the South Bend convention. The local's only woman member, the financial secretary, reluctantly reached in her purse to give him the local's entire funds—a five dollar bill.

The powerful union leader also later recalled confronting a South Bend hotel clerk and asking him for the "widest bed in the hotel." The clerk, looking at his slight build, appeared puzzled, but complied with the request. "What he didn't know," Reuther recalled later, "was that five of us were going to sleep in that bed all week."

In 1952, Reuther made a memorable appearance at the centennial celebration of the Studebaker Corp. As featured speaker, he said "When labor gets invited to a 100th birthday observance in honor of management, it is certainly a new experience for labor. I know of no place I should rather be invited to, though, than the 100th anniversary of Studebaker."

Named UAW president in 1946, following the death of Philip Murray, Reuther continued his drive for the growing CIO-UAW membership.

[From the South Bend Tribune,
May 12, 1970]

WALTER REUTHER

The death of Walter Reuther in an airplane crash has taken a fighter from the American industrial scene.

Even his enemies—and he had plenty, inside and outside the labor movement—honor him as a man who achieved great benefits for the members of the United Auto Workers. Much of what he accomplished for the UAW rubbed off onto workers in other industries.

Throughout his 40-year career as a labor organizer and leader, he held tenaciously and often belligerently to his goal of achieving a better lot for the workers in the UAW plants.

Reuther came up the hard way, fighting it out through the roughest days of union organizing, the sit-in strikes in the giant automobile factories during the 1930's. His career was shaped by the concept of bigness that has overtaken American industry; like some others, he sensed that the craft-oriented union that dominated American labor thinking up until the Depression was not broadly enough based to accomplish the goals he saw. His approach, the industry-wide union, has been accepted as a basic part of American industry today.

He did not accomplish this alone, of course, and never claimed as much. But his determination and cool nerves had a vital role in furthering the concept.

From the moment he emerged on the national scene, Reuther displayed a stronger social conscience than many other labor leaders. A vigorous liberal he conceived the union's purpose as something broader than improving wages and working conditions. In fact, it was his dissatisfaction with the lagging pace of some other labor leaders in the fields of equal employment and other social goals that caused many of his disputes with them.

He was a man of integrity; no scandals have marred the operation of the UAW during his long tenure as president.

At 62, Walter Reuther was only three years from mandatory retirement as UAW president. It is tragic that he could not have lived to enjoy the leisurely benefits that would

have accrued to him upon completion of a hard-driving, often angry, and memorable career.

From the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News,
May 13, 1970]

WALTER REUTHER—REAL LEADER

Walter Reuther epitomized a type of public figure almost unique to the United States.

In some countries a union leader is merely a government bureaucrat charged with keeping the membership in line. In others, he may be like a feudal baron who rules a blue-collar constituency and concludes treaties with the official government.

Not that American union leaders have ever been unaware of or hesitant to use their political clout. But if they advance far enough in the union movement and build a record of having performed their job with integrity, they eventually begin to be considered in the same league as college presidents or successful businessmen—rather like elder statesmen and founts of wisdom. Presidents ask them for their advice and they are appointed to government fact-finding commissions.

That this is true today is largely because of men like Walter Reuther. No short obituary could possibly do him justice. Suffice it to say that when news came of the tragic accident which took his life and that of his wife, the first thought came, to most minds was not that the president of the United Auto Workers had died but that a great union man and a fine American had died.

Not just auto workers, not just union men, but all Americans mourn the untimely death of Walter Reuther.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to call attention to the June 1970 issue of the UAW publication, *Solidarity*, which is a special memorial issue in tribute to Walter P. Reuther.

Because this memorial issue contains an invaluable summary of the life and contributions of Mr. Reuther, as well as some of the tributes paid him by many leaders in American life, I insert the text of this issue of *Solidarity* in the RECORD: WALTER PHILIP REUTHER—1907-70—"WHOSE MEMORY IS ENSHRINED IN THE HEARTS OF ALL OF US"

A SMALL PLANE CRASHES—AND WORKERS
MOURN

It was dark and raining in the area and lightning lit up the woods of Northern Michigan:

And the small jet plane crashed, ending the lives of Walter and May Reuther, evoking the longest and most solemn hours of mourning in the history of the UAW. The time: about an hour after sunset on the night of Saturday, May 9.

Minutes before the tragedy, the UAW-chartered, Lear twin jet had been approaching the Emmet County Airport at Pellston in northern Lower Michigan in what seemed to the airport ground station as a normal pattern. One of the two pilots had just radioed the calm words "I've got the airport in sight."

The landing lights of the jet blinked against the dark sky as the plane descended toward the runway beneath a mass of clouds hovering 800 feet above the earth.

One and one-half miles short of the landing strip, the sleek aircraft, unexplainedly much lower than it should have been, snapped off the top of a 50-foot elm tree. The plane hurtled into the ground and burst into flames in a wooded area.

Lost were the lives of the 62-year-old UAW president; his wife, 59; Oskar Stonorov, 64, the architect of the UAW Family Education Center at Black Lake, and Reuther's aide, William Wolfman, 29. Also killed were the pilot, George Evans, 48, and

copilot, Joseph Karaffa, 41. The Reuthers and Stonorov were enroute to Black Lake, 40 miles southeast of Pellston, to work on details of completing the education center.

Investigators from the National Transportation Safety Board examined and reconstructed the wreckage in what was expected to be a months-long effort to determine the cause of the crash.

The tragedy opened floodgates of grief among UAW members and officers.

Mourners in many lands throughout the world, ranging from prime ministers to workers in the shops of industry, wired condolences. Many traveled to Detroit to pay their final respects.

At 8 a.m. on Wednesday, May 13, in a light spring rain, the doors of the Veterans Memorial Building along the Detroit River were opened to the first of the thousands of mourners. For two days, 14 hours each day, they filed silently along a royal blue carpet past the oak caskets in which Mr. and Mrs. Reuther lay in state.

Among the first in that reverential line were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Rydholm.

"We felt so close to him because of how much he had done for workers like us," said the 71-year-old Rydholm, a retired member of Cadillac Local 22 who joined the UAW in 1936 during the sitdown strike at the plant.

"We felt he was just like a father to us," said Mrs. Rydholm, tears glistening in her eyes. Rydholm, wearing a dark suit and tie, told how he and his wife attended "just about every meeting held in Detroit" at which Reuther spoke.

In that sorrowful line walked rich and poor, black and white, young and old—even the lame and the blind. There were the captains of industry and the leaders of government—but most of all there were the workers to whom Reuther had dedicated himself.

Such a mourner was Sam Smith.

He came on his way to work, at 7:30 p.m., dressed in blue overalls and carrying a metal lunch pail past Reuther's coffin draped with the UAW emblem.

"He bargained for the broom pushers like me, too," said Smith, a stocky, 44-year-old black who was on his way to his third-shift job in the janitorial department at the Dodge Main plant. "He wanted the laboring man to live good and make money like others with prettier jobs. He was a great man. . . ."

"I offer my thanks for having a man like Reuther to look out for those like me," said Smith, a Local 3 member who has spent 22 years in the plant. "A lot of people's lives depended on him."

Children carrying schoolbooks filed past the caskets. Among them were Catherine Dent, Deborah Hing and Theresa Dickerson, all 15 and all sophomores at Cass Technical High School in Detroit.

"My grandfather worked at Hudson Motors," said Catherine, "and Mr. Reuther did a lot of great things for people that helped my granddad. It made his life much better and I guess it made mine better too."

Deborah, daughter of a UAW member, said: "I respected him. The things he did were so good for people."

Theresa, daughter of Robert G. Dickerson, president of General Motors Local 572, said: "My father is a great admirer of Walter Reuther and I can see why. I really liked everything Mr. Reuther said and all that he stood for."

Wistfully, sadly, 64-year-old Victor Godard stood as an usher near the caskets and turned his mind back to the earlier days of the UAW.

"I can still picture him in 1941 with that microphone in his hand, getting Ford to do right by the workers," said Godard, a Ford Local 600 retiree.

During the two days in which the bodies lay in state, Godard was in constant attendance as an honor guard, guide and usher. Godard said he was hired at Ford on

May 7, 1923, was fired for nine months in 1940-41 for union activity and retired in 1967.

"I'm retired today, with a comfortable pension," he said, adding: "Reuther is the man I have to thank for that. He's the best thing that ever happened to working people."

George Bouhana of St. Clair Shores, Mich., came, still bearing the scars of beatings and a knife wound he suffered at the hands of strikebreakers during the 1930's at the Mack Avenue plant of Briggs Manufacturing Co.

"I had to come down to pay my respects," said Bouhana, one of the original members of Local 212 and now a businessman. "Walter Reuther was so great a man and a leader. He was able to do things for people that many of us were fighting and organizing for."

There was the young member of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union who came early "in my father's place," he said, explaining that "if my father had not died two years ago, he would have been here. He worked for Chevrolet for 29 years and he thought that Walter Reuther was a great man. And so do I."

Walter Coates of Local 900 touched the casket as he passed through the line and wiped his eyes.

"I feel so bad I could cry my eyes out," Coates said. "Nobody can take his place. He had honest guts. He stood up for people."

Sadie Schweitzer, 63, a tiny, frail woman who helped man soup kitchens during the Thirties, came because "I wanted to be part of the honor guard. It was the least I could do." She is a former member of Chrysler Local 7 who helped the Ford workers organizing drive after working hours.

Of the many groups and delegations paying their final respects, among the first in line was the executive board of the Spicer unit of Local 12 from Toledo, Ohio. Wearing their light blue union jackets and headed by Unit Chairman Frank Golembiewski, the 13-member board had left Toledo at 7 a.m. and filed past the biers 75 minutes later.

Some leaning on canes, others kneeling briefly at the caskets, many weeping and a few saluting, the friends of Walter and May Reuther passed by the caskets and the flags of the United States, Canada and the United Nations and a green and white banner emblazoned with a peace symbol.

For a few moments, 69-year-old John Galard, a UAW retiree, stood watching the procession. Galard looked aside and said, simply:

"He was a very good man."

Then like so many others, Galard lifted a work-toughened and wrinkled hand, wiped his eyes and slowly walked away.

"He was a very good man." The words seemed to echo.

MAY REUTHER: THAT DAY ON A DETROIT STREETCAR

One winter's afternoon, close to the first of the year 1936, Walter Reuther boarded a streetcar on Detroit's west side on his way home from work.

He had been back in the United States only a couple of months after the two-and-a-half year trip around the world he and his brother, Victor, had taken. He was working at his trade in a small tool and die shop and had immediately joined the UAW. He was spending more hours of each 24 hours trying to organize workers than the eight hours he worked in the shop.

A few seats back in the streetcar there was a strikingly pretty girl, with hair as red as his own, whom he recognized as May Wolf, a young school teacher he had met on a few occasions and had known only casually before he and Vic had gone abroad.

Despite their slight acquaintance, they had a lot to talk about. He was trying to organize auto workers; she was an active member of the Teachers' Union and was trying to organize teachers.

It was a whirlwind courtship. They were married March 13, 1936. After the ceremony there was a gay but short wedding dinner with relatives—short because May and Walter had to get to a union organizing meeting where Walter was speaking.

Steady employment—paid employment at his trade, that is—was a problem for the young husband. Weeks before the wedding he had been fired for union activities from the job he held at the time he met May on the streetcar.

After he was elected to the UAW International Executive Board at the union's convention in South Bend in April 1936, employment in the auto industry was out of the question. But UAW executive board members in those days were not paid union officials unless they were also appointed to the staff. Walter was not appointed to the staff but he started spending full time organizing.

Earlier, he and a handful of other UAW members (most of them unemployed too) had pooled what little resources they had to rent a small, shabby suite of offices on the second floor of a building on Detroit's west side. When Westside Local 174 was chartered Sept. 1, 1936, and Walter was elected its first president, these offices became its headquarters.

From the very beginning, May Reuther was an integral, and essential, part of that office. It wasn't just that a substantial portion of the rent and other expenses came from her salary as a school teacher in the first several months; it did, but it was much more than that. She held the office together.

During the rest of that spring's school term and the first months of the fall term, she continued to teach. But as soon as school was out she came straight to the union office, and she stayed there until it was closed for the night—often after midnight.

The hours were long and the work was hard. It was dangerous too. One afternoon there was the sound of a loud explosion. The car of a union member, which had been rigged up with sound equipment and drafted into service, was blown up in the alley back of the building. Fortunately, no one was in it.

Things picked up a little in the early fall of '36. Dodge workers won a seniority victory by threatening to strike. A few weeks later Bendix workers in South Bend staged a successful sitdown strike; in November, so did Midland Steel workers on the east side of Detroit. In December, Kelsey-Hayes workers went on a sitdown strike. The day the strike started, 28 Kelsey-Hayes workers were members of Local 174. The next day more than 2,000 were members. By the time the strike ended in victory on Christmas Eve, almost all the nearly 6,000 had joined.

The little westside Detroit office became a boiling cauldron of activity. May Reuther took a leave of absence from her teaching job. She never went back.

Sometime during this period, the members of Local 174 voted to pay their president a salary. It was the first regular income he had had in nearly a year. May officially became his secretary, but she would not accept a salary.

Early in 1942 she resigned as Walter's secretary in anticipation of the birth of their first daughter, Linda, who was born August 25 of that year. Lisa was born five years later. As Walter's union duties, his other activities and the demands on his time increased, she made her first job that of seeing to it that every second counted of the limited amount of time he could spend with his family—counted for the children, for herself and for him.

THEIR HOME TAUGHT THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

To the very first UAW convention Walter Philip Reuther ever chaired as president (Atlantic City in 1947), he proudly introduced

his father and mother, Valentine and Anna Reuther.

He told delegates about the time his mother made a shirt for him out of the torn cloth of an umbrella he and his brothers had tried to use as a child's parachute.

And he introduced his father as "a good pal of mine, an old fighter in the ranks of labor, a trade unionist from way back when the going was rough . . . who indoctrinated his boys when they were pretty young, and he told them the thing most important in the world to fight for was the other guy, the brotherhood of man, the Golden Rule . . ."

And Val Reuther told the delegates: "I am extremely happy that the seed I have tried to sow in the minds of our children is bearing fruit . . . that they are engaged in the trade union movement that has always been dear to my heart . . ."

Their father, who died in 1968, organized the family into study groups. They studied the ideas and ideals of the labor movement and the world's social reformers. Every Sunday, after church, they debated the ideas they had been studying.

And the seed kept growing.

THE LIFE-LONG CRUSADE OF WALTER REUTHER

Walter P. Reuther, a newsman once said, was the only man in America who could reminisce about the future.

What made him rare among labor leaders was that he saw the labor movement not just as a means of getting another nickel in the pay envelope but as an instrument of social progress.

To him it was a means by which workers and their families not only could improve their own standard of living but by which, in cooperation with men and women of good will in all walks of life and throughout the world, they could make their contributions to improving the quality of society.

This concept of the labor movement was to him not a strategy, not one of several avenues labor could choose to advance the welfare of its members. He believed it was the only way the labor movement could achieve its ends.

"Labor cannot make progress at the expense of the rest of the community," he said. "Labor can make progress only as the rest of the community makes progress."

What made him unique among labor leaders was his eloquent articulation of this principle and his singleminded devotion to it.

This concept did not mean that the economic welfare of the workers he represented in collective bargaining was a secondary concern. On the contrary, the constant improvement of the real wages of UAW members, in terms of increased purchasing power, the increase in their economic security and the betterment of their working conditions was his primary responsibility, his first priority, the foundation on which he built.

Under his leadership in collective bargaining the UAW pioneered, for millions of workers: company-paid hospital-surgical-medical benefits, cost-of-living protection and automatic annual-improvement-factor wage increases, fully funded company-paid pensions, supplemental unemployment benefits and guaranteed annual income.

On broader fronts he led the UAW members in the fight for civil rights and civil liberties, for adequate housing for all Americans, improved medical care, consumer protection, the elimination of poverty, hunger and disease throughout the world, a clean environment, nuclear disarmament and a rational world community in which nations would live at peace.

Reuther was committed also to the proposition that workers and their unions had to be active in the political process. In the UAW, political participation was a union activity almost on a par with collective bargaining. Registration and get-out-the-vote drives and all-out campaigns to support candidates democratically endorsed by labor,

from precinct delegate to President of the United States, became the order of the day.

"There's a direct relationship between the bread box and the ballot box," the UAW president often said. "What the union fights for and wins at the bargaining table can be taken away in the legislative halls."

He also recognized, and so did most UAW members, that many of the broad social and economic reforms to benefit all the people could be secured only through political action.

Reuther and his fellow officers from the early days of the UAW set the highest standards of clean and honest unionism. He was known throughout his career as an implacable foe of corruption in the labor movement, a reputation recognized and lauded by high government officials and other outstanding American leaders, both within and outside the ranks of labor.

He first became active in the UAW in the winter of 1935-36. He had just returned from a round-the-world trip which had kept him and his brother Victor, working their way most of the time, in Europe and Asia for two and a half years. Although he had worked as a tool and diemaker in the auto industry, mostly at Ford, for about seven years before the trip and he had talked unionism to his fellow workers there, the UAW had not come into existence until August of 1935, shortly before he returned from abroad.

At first he had no trouble getting work in tool and die shops, but as his union activities became known, he was blacklisted and jobs became at first difficult, then impossible. For nearly a year he worked full time at organizing the UAW without any regular income.

He was a delegate to the UAW's convention in South Bend in late April, 1936, the first convention at which UAW delegates elected their own officers, and was elected to the International Executive Board, then a non-salaried position.

All of the rest of that year he spent full time working at organizing auto workers in plants on the west side of Detroit. The young UAW was not a strong organization. The total membership of the union at the time of the South Bend convention was probably not more than 10,000 and most of that was in Ohio, Indiana and Wisconsin rather than in the heart of the industry—Detroit.

Organization wasn't easy those remaining months of 1936. Most auto workers wanted a union. But they had a great suspicion of the national AFL leadership, which had been extraordinarily inept and almost disastrous in attempts to organize the industry in the previous two or three years. And they had a mortal dread of management's labor spies, of the blacklist which denied employment to known union activists and of physical violence at the hands of company goons which some had suffered already. There was a widespread "wait and see" attitude.

Yet hope and confidence was high among those working at the task of organizing. The Committee for Industrial Organization, formed at the AFL convention in November, 1935, and headed by John L. Lewis, was assuming leadership in organizing the mass production industries. The CIO's activities were overcoming the suspicion of the AFL.

A few victories, even small ones, Reuther and his associates felt, would overcome the fear.

They were right, but the victories were not to come until nearly the end of 1936 and the early months of 1937.

Reuther drew together a handful of UAW members from west side plants and got a charter on September 1, 1936, as West Side Local 174. Reuther was elected president. They had a total of 78 members.

Later that month Dodge workers won a small victory in a seniority dispute by threatening to strike. In October, Bendix workers

in South Bend won recognition with a sit-down strike. The momentum of organizing began to accelerate. Midland Steel workers on Detroit's east side won a sitdown strike in November. Kelsey-Hayes workers, members of Local 174, under Reuther's leadership won a 75-cent-an-hour minimum wage, recognition and other benefits in a sitdown strike that was settled Christmas Eve, 1936.

Then, at a very end of the year came the historic General Motors sitdown strike. Two West Side Local GM plants—Cadillac and Fleetwood—were among those on strike. Victor Reuther, who had been working in the Kelsey-Hayes plant at the time of that strike and was one of the strikers, was dispatched to Flint by Local 174 to help there—the very heart of the GM empire and the heart of the sitdown strike. Roy Reuther, another brother, had been in Flint for months on assignment from the International Union.

The GM strike lasted until mid-February. After the Cadillac and Fleetwood strikes had settled into efficient routines, Walter Reuther and others would go to Flint for visits lasting from a few hours to a few days to help out there. He was on hand when workers in Flint Chevy Plant Four sat down and joined their fellow GM workers on strike. The strategy for this maneuver, a morale booster that may have been decisive in winning the strike, had been worked out by Roy in a way to frustrate attempts by the GM private police to prevent the sitdown by physical violence. Walter Reuther helped carry it out.

Then GM capitulated and signed an agreement, recognizing the union and pledging to negotiate a contract. Within weeks, Chrysler workers won a similar sitdown strike.

By mid-spring the suspicions and fears had been overcome. West Side Local's membership now stood at 30,000. The International Union had grown to more than 300,000.

The UAW was established. The new union was to make a lot of history in the next 33 years and Walter P. Reuther, who was to become its president in 1946, was more than any other single person, to give to that history its unique and most significant shape.

Ford, however, held out. In May, 1937, Reuther and other union representatives went to the sprawling Rouge Plant in Dearborn to distribute handbills to workers. As they climbed the concrete steps of the Miller Road overpass between the plant and the parking lot, hoodlums employed by the company's "service department" attacked them.

Pulling Reuther's suitcoat over his head, they pounded him down the concrete steps, pummeling him all the way. Then they left him, bleeding and battered, on the cement walk below.

The brutal attack has gone down in labor history as "The Battle of the Overpass." Reuther and the UAW, however, continued their efforts to organize Ford workers. The company fought back until 1941 when it finally agreed to recognize the union and UAW overwhelmingly won a National Labor Relations Board election to nail down its representation rights for Ford workers.

The new union was severely tested not long after its initial great successes by the internal political fight. Although Reuther was one of the main targets of the conservative, pro-AFL wing, he and his associates played an increasingly stabilizing role that did much to keep the extremists from destroying the organization altogether.

Then, in the summer of 1939, with the union still shaky, facing a challenge from a small dissident group that had returned to the AFL, and with employers seeking to take advantage of the factional strife, Reuther directed a strike that re-established the union on a firm foundation.

This became known in UAW history as the GM Tool and Die Strategy Strike. GM's refusal to recognize the reconstructed UAW-CIO as the exclusive bargaining agent and to deal with it satisfactorily on legitimate

grievances was causing turmoil in the plants and in union ranks. Production workers, however, having gone through the sitdown strike in 1937 and a severe recession in 1938, were not prepared to take on the giant corporation again in what might have been another protracted strike. Besides, most of them were laid off that summer during the long model changeover period so common then.

Tool and diemakers, on the other hand, were busy tooling up for the new models. Moreover, they were aroused and militant because of serious grievances.

Reuther, by this time, was director of the union's GM Dept. He and the leadership in the GM plants knew that if the tool and diemakers struck, production of the new models could not proceed and the corporation would be effectively closed down. GM production workers, however, not on strike would collect unemployment compensation. The tool and diemakers voted overwhelmingly to strike.

Within a few weeks, GM management yielded. Tool and diemakers won a substantial wage increase and the adjustment of other grievances—and the corporation recognized the UAW-CIO as the sole collective bargaining agent for all its workers in about 40 of its principal plants, a contractual arrangement that was overwhelmingly endorsed by the GM workers themselves in subsequent elections conducted by the NLRB.

At the 1946 convention, Reuther was elected president of the UAW. His election reflected a growing concern on the part of the membership over the increasing influence of the Communist Party in union affairs through appointment of party members or sympathizers by some other UAW officials to several staff posts.

Reuther's election was not a clear cut victory, however. A majority of the executive board opposed him politically. This situation was corrected at the 1947 convention, when candidates sharing his views were elected to all the top offices.

It was then that he coined the slogan "Teamwork in the Leadership; Solidarity in the Ranks," a principle that has guided the administration of the UAW ever since.

On an April night in 1948, Reuther and his wife, May, were in the kitchen of their modest home. He had just stepped to the refrigerator when a shotgun blast from outside hammered into his chest and right arm. The assailant escaped into the darkness. Reuther was hospitalized for three months.

The attacker was never found. One hoodlum told Detroit police five years later he had driven the would-be assassin's car. He named two men. But he later slipped out of police custody and fled the country. Without his testimony, there was no case.

The following year, Victor Reuther was the victim of another shotgun blast. His right eye was destroyed and his collar bone fractured. That assailant also was never found.

Walter Reuther was elected president of the CIO in 1952 to succeed the late Philip Murray. He served in that post, in addition to the UAW presidency, until the end of 1955, when the AFL and the CIO merged.

He was a principal architect of the merger and visualized a united labor movement as a powerful force for achieving labor's organizing, economic and social objectives.

After twelve years of effort, Reuther, his fellow UAW officers and most UAW members became disenchanted with the failure of the united federation to realize the bright promise held forth by the merger itself. It soon became content to sit complacently, in Reuther's phrase, "on its fat status quo." In protest, the UAW left the AFL-CIO in 1968.

In May, 1969, the UAW and the Teamsters Union, with a combined membership of nearly four million, formed the Alliance for Labor Action. ALA's primary objectives are organizing the unorganized industrial and

white collar workers and effective social and political action on such matters as the war on poverty and hunger, development of an effective housing program, work on the civil rights front, the achievement of peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world, environmental control and generally improving the quality of American society.

Reuther and his associates were determined that the best possible machinery be provided to all union members for redress of any grievances against the union itself and that justice in such matters not be denied by delay.

Thus, in 1957, the UAW Convention approved a recommendation by the International Executive Board for the establishment of a seven-man Public Review Board, composed of prominent citizens of unquestionable integrity from outside the ranks of labor, to which such cases can be referred. The PRB operates completely independently of the International Union and renders judgments on all cases appealed to it.

The results of its work have not only been to provide impartial justice for UAW members but also to improve the whole machinery of internal justice in the union through constitutional changes it found to be necessary or desirable.

THE PRESS: "HE BROUGHT WORKERS DIGNITY"

"When Walter Reuther was on hand, organized labor never seemed to merit the accusation that its leadership was elderly and stuffed shirt . . . Mr. Reuther sought to identify his union with the younger workers, the blacks, the peace campaigners. This loss affects the entire American labor movement."
—*Christian Science Monitor*

The infinite scope of Walter P. Reuther's impact on his times has been reflected in editorial comments on his contributions to the labor movement, the nation and to humanity.

Following are excerpts from representative editorials in U.S. and Canadian newspapers and magazines:

"Walter Reuther never lost his sense of commitment, his social concern, his dedication to the worker at the lower end of the economic scale. He was labor's conscience."
—*Capital Times, Madison, Wis.*

"Walter Philip Reuther was a man of many brilliances and boundless creativity who dedicated his life to improving the condition of other men's lives . . . His death is a large loss to the nation, to men battling for peace and justice everywhere."
—*New York Post.*

"Mr. Reuther was the liveliest, most far-sighted and most significant labor leader of his generation. What set him apart was his ability to translate ideas into practical action. He was a product of the machine age who understood the machine and tried to find a way for men to live with it. Industrial workers—and management, too—have much to thank him for."
—*St. Louis Post Dispatch.*

"He left his imprint upon the social and economic life of the United States . . . He leaves an immense estate to his heirs . . . And, as always, all Americans are among his beneficiaries."
—*Washington Post.*

"It is almost as difficult to think of a United States without Walter Reuther as it is to think of the labor movement without him . . ."
—*Philadelphia Bulletin.*

"Over the years he was principally responsible for making the UAW a powerful fountainhead of beneficial ideas. His most notable monuments are a comprehensive program of social security under the union label and a model system of safeguards for union democracy . . . The death of Walter P. Reuther is an even more substantial loss for the nation than it is for the labor movement . . . the void of his death will be greater still in the realms of idealism and social inventiveness."
—*New York Times.*

"At a time when many liberals were dis-

enchanted with the labor movement, Walter Reuther was a symbol of enlightened unionism and social activism."
—*Wall Street Journal.*

"There are men in Windsor today who remember the bad old days . . . when auto workers gathered outside the plant gates every morning and a few were chosen, almost by whim, for a day's work. Today, those men, retired or close to retirement, have Walter Reuther to thank for the pensions, the security, and the human dignity that they enjoy."
—*Windsor (Ont.) Star.*

BROTHERHOOD, HE SAID

Deep sorrow often finds its way into words on paper—thus it was that UAW members by the thousands just had to write and express their grief at the death of Walter Reuther.

Into Solidarity House came these letters, postmarked from all over America and Canada.

Among them was this poem from George Conibear, retired from General Motors Local 653, Pontiac, Mich., which he titled, simply, "A Memoriam:"
"Brother, he said.

And he was his brothers' keeper.
He kindled anew the flame of dignity in men
Who, long suppressed by bitter tyranny,
Found freedom from fear and want in his
Brotherhood.

Brother, he said.
And you knew his blood coursed in your
veins;
That your wounds were his wounds;
Your tears, his tears.
And you came to know his tears were your
tears;
His wounds, your wounds: Brotherhood.

Brother, he said.
Brother he is.
Eternally."

"Walter Reuther fought for a better life for us all."
—*Toronto Star.*

"Walter Reuther's death has taken from the labor movement—and the political scene—one of the most aggressive, visionary and effective men of the time."
—*Cincinnati Post and Times-Star.*

"The impact of his loss on those of us in the national black community could not be equalled by the death of any other American leader who is not black . . ."
—*Michigan Chronicle.*

"In the field of race relations there are few unions who can claim to match the record of Reuther's UAW. He flung open the doors of union membership to white and black alike and there were no double pay scales, either . . . He will be long enshrined in the affections of those for whom he labored . . . He brought them dignity."
—*Detroit Free Press.*

"During his 24 years as president of the UAW, the dynamic Reuther exerted an influence on American life far beyond his role as a fighter for fatter paychecks for his 1.6 million members. At the time of his death . . . he was working on a plan for mass produced housing, and was deeply involved in the civil rights struggle, the fight for cleaner air, and a legislative campaign for low-cost health insurance."
—*Newsweek.*

"We have many crusaders in our midst today, but few men with the magnitism and genius to achieve soundly constructive results. Walter Philip Reuther, a fighting liberal who hated communism, was one of a rare breed."
—*San Francisco Examiner.*

"His impact on labor history is profound."
—*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.*

"The death of Walter Reuther has silenced one of the most compassionate and creative voices of our time."
—*Des Moines Register.*

THE WORLD HAS LOST A GREAT LEADER

From around the world to the UAW came cables by the hundreds from government and

trade union leaders. A few excerpted messages follow:

Willy Brandt, chancellor, Federal Republic of Germany: "The Social Democratic Party of Germany mourns in him a man who was among the first to offer the hand of reconciliation to a former adversary and to help smooth the path to a democratic and peaceful partnership with the peoples of the world . . . His good relations with the leaders of European social democracy helped decidedly with the improvement and the solidification of relations between America and Europe."

Tage Erlander, former premier of Sweden: "The world has lost a great leader, we have lost a friend who has always been a model for all of us."

Harold Wilson, prime minister, Great Britain: "I learned with distress the news of May and Walter Reuther. I well know what a tragic loss this is and how much they will be missed by all who knew them."

T. C. Douglas, leader, New Democratic Party of Canada: "The labour movement has lost a great leader and forces of progress a fearless champion."

Golda Meir, prime minister, Israel: "The people of Israel will sorely miss a true and devoted friend of our people whose memory is enshrined in the hearts of all of us who knew the warmth of his friendship and the immenseness of his contribution to so many causes of mankind."

Philippine Labor Secretary Blas F. Ople: "Walter Reuther's death shocked Filipinos who have heard of his courageous leadership and his concern for human dignity in developing lands."

Presidium, Central Committee, Engineering Workers Union of USSR, Moscow: "We learned with deep sorrow of Walter Reuther's passing . . ."

Benjamin Bentum, president, Ghana Trade Union Congress: "Condolences for the loss of a man who has done so much for all workers in the world."

Fidel Velazquez, president, Confederation of Mexican Workers: "Please accept our expressions of sorrow on the death of one who struggled so hard for us . . ."

Y. Benaharon, secretary general, Histadrut, Tel Aviv: "America and Free Labor have lost an outstanding leader and workers of Israel a dedicated friend . . ."

Harm G. Buiters, general secretary, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Brussels: "For all who prize freedom, the death of Walter Reuther is an irreparable loss. As founder and executive board member of IOFTU, his was a magnificent contribution to our international cause . . ."

Giulio Polotti, general secretary, Union of Italian Workers: "We join you in the great sorrow . . . valiant leader and spokesman for the rights of the worker."

A DEDICATED CITIZEN

Following are excerpts from messages sent to the UAW from executives of the auto industry:

James M. Roche, chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.: "We are shocked by this tragedy. Mr. Reuther was an able and dedicated leader. Our industry and our country will miss him."

Henry Ford II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co.: "Walter Reuther was an extraordinarily effective advocate of labor's interest. His tough-minded dedication, his sense of social concern, his selflessness and his eloquence all mark him as a central figure in the development of modern industrial history."

Lynn Townsend, chairman of the board, Chrysler Corp.: ". . . His devotion to the ideals and principles in which he believed were evident not only at the bargaining table but also in his untiring efforts to improve the condition of his less fortunate fellow man."

Roy D. Chapin Jr., chairman of the board, American Motors Corp.: "Industry, the labor

movement and the nation will long remember him as a great and dedicated leader."

Karl E. Scott, president of Ford of Canada Ltd.: "Walter Reuther was a man of great stature and dedication. In his advocacy of labor's interests he was effective and eloquent. He brought to the development of modern industrial history a deep sense of social concern."

WE ARE POORER FOR HIS PASSING

President Richard M. Nixon: "He was a man who was devoted to his cause, spoke for it with eloquence and worked for it tirelessly. Mr. Reuther's death is a deep loss not only for organized labor, but also for the cause of collective bargaining and the entire American process."

U Thant, secretary general, United Nations: "The world has lost a wise, courageous and statesmanlike humanitarian."

Frank E. Fitzsimmons, general vice president of the Teamsters Union and co-chairman of the Alliance for Labor Action: "America has lost one of its great citizens. Organized labor has lost a great champion. I have lost a dear and personal friend."

Thomas E. Boyle, president, International Chemical Workers Union: "... Countless times we sought his counsel, friendship and interest. Never did he fall us."

Ralph Bunche, United Nations: "I admired him for his courage, his forthrightness and wisdom but above all for his ability to interpret the aspirations of and to keep in tune with the common man."

Secretary of Labor George P. Schultz: "He believed passionately in the democratic system and the rights of man... His death is a bruising loss, not only to American labor, but to all of us..."

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch: "His leadership and dedicated concern for the betterment of his fellow man will long be remembered."

Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D.-Maine): "Mr. Reuther had been a courageous and responsible spokesman for creative and humane programs."

Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D.-Mass.): "For more than three decades, he was one of the most powerful advocates of health care as a matter of right... Walter Reuther made the wave of the health revolution that is cresting now in America."

Senator Frank Church (D.-Idaho): "The loss of Walter is a grievous one."

Senator Jacob Javits (R.-N.Y.): "Posterity will be grateful to him for his great contribution to world peace and world development."

Senator Harrison A. Williams (D.-N.J.): "Walter Reuther dedicated himself to fighting for a better life for all of the forgotten Americans left out of our affluent society."

Senator Ralph W. Yarborough (D.-Texas): "A huge debt of gratitude is owed to Walter Reuther for his contributions toward the betterment of the quality of life in America..."

AFL-CIO Executive Council: "Walter P. Reuther was a dedicated trade unionist who well and truly served his fellow man."

Michigan Governor William G. Milliken: "He fought courageously and successfully not only for better wages and benefits for his members, but also for a better contract with life for all citizens."

Former Michigan Governor G. Mennen Williams: "Walter Reuther affected the life style of the United States like few in his generation... He made richer lives for millions and left this a better world."

AGREEMENT—AND LIVES OF MILLIONS ARE ENRICHED

Two winters ago, a 30-year-old Ford worker in Cincinnati coined a phrase: "We have a family union! Even my daughter's future is somewhere in this contract."

How times have changed since the '40s!

Under Walter P. Reuther's years of dedi-

cated, inspiring leadership, UAW members and their families moved a long way toward receiving a fair share of their equity in the wealth they help create, and toward making the tragic days of the Depression almost ancient history.

This, Walter Reuther often noted, was his chief interest at the bargaining table. A master bargaining strategist, widely acclaimed as "the best union negotiator anywhere," he led the way in achieving important economic gains and broader, often innovative fringe benefits vital to the security of workers and their families.

During Reuther's presidency, wage rates of auto workers more than tripled. Comparable increases were won for other workers represented by UAW, including those in the aerospace and agricultural implement industries.

Today's average straight time hourly earnings for UAW members in the auto industry, for instance, come to about \$4.03. They averaged \$1.32 an hour in 1946 when "The Red-head" first was elected to head the union. New and unprecedented fringe benefits and marked gains in the few which were already established also were won by Reuther-led negotiators during those years.

As the equity of UAW members increased, so did their security. But today's hard-and-fast wage rates and fringe benefits were considered daydreaming by workers who could only yearn for them before Reuther won leadership of the UAW.

In the pre-Reuther period, about the only fringe benefits enjoyed by UAW members were a somewhat skimpy vacation pay program, three hours call-in pay and the start of shift differential payments.

Statutory holidays, such as Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving, New Year's Day and July 4, were nothing more than days on which workers didn't work and for which they weren't paid.

Workers, moreover, had no protection against layoffs, against sickness, against old age.

Seniority protection was severely limited compared to today. Smoking was tightly restricted. Personal relief time as a contract right simply did not exist.

Pensions were a benefit reserved exclusively for executives.

"Over the Hill to the Poorhouse" was a popular refrain mirroring actual fears and insecurities of workers, many of whom were confronted by its reality once they became, in Reuther's words, "too old to work and too young to die."

Layoffs without income to tide over a worker and his family were, to company officials, part of the game—until the UAW changed the rules. And if a worker, his wife or child couldn't get medical care or enter a hospital because he didn't have the money to pay for it, well, there was the charity ward.

Walter Reuther challenged such inequities and injustices. But, he also stressed, achieving security and dignity for workers and their families involved more than just winning "another nickel in the pay envelope."

Decent wages were essential, but so were the same fringes for workers that companies willingly provided for executives and supervisors. So was establishing the understanding that the community, the union and the worker must make progress together.

As Reuther often said, establish the principle in the contract and then build on it. In that way, innovative contract principles, embodying important but seemingly modest gains, were expanded in subsequent negotiations into much broader benefits giving increasingly greater security to workers and their families.

UAW-won pensions were an example of this. They amounted to \$100 a month (including Social Security) when UAW first gained them for auto workers in 1949 and 1950, a few years after Reuther was elected UAW president. Today, a worker can receive

up to that amount in retirement benefits in a week.

And a major UAW—and Reuther—goal for this year's negotiations is the "30 and Out" program—pension benefits of \$500 a month after 30 years of service, regardless of age.

Similarly, Reuther and the UAW targeted the guaranteed annual wage principle as a main union objective in the 1955 auto negotiations. The contract settlement provided for Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB), a pioneering principle never before achieved by an industrial union in major negotiations.

Those first SUB agreements provided benefits to laidoff workers of 60 per cent of take-home pay for up to 26 weeks.

Negotiations for contracts which followed greatly improved these. Short workweek benefits, for instance, were won in 1961. In the agreements that year, the initial principle was considerably broadened to provide 62 per cent of gross pay plus \$1.50 for each of up to four dependents for a maximum of 52 weeks.

Said Reuther, in announcing the settlement: "This puts our members within an economic inch of the guaranteed annual wage."

The Reuther-led UAW negotiating teams travelled that final economic inch in the current contracts, won in 1967. Gained by the union were Guaranteed Annual Income Credits together with SUB payments of 95 per cent of weekly after-tax pay less \$7.50 for certain work-related expenses not incurred during layoffs.

Similar improvements, once the principle was gained, have been won in hospital-medical-surgical insurance coverage, paid vacations, life and sickness and accident insurance and many of UAW's other fringe benefits for its members and their families.

For with Reuther at the union's helm, UAW repeatedly scored historic and widely acclaimed gains. The union has achieved more collective bargaining "firsts" than any other union in the U.S. or Canada dealing with major corporations. These "firsts" include:

The first annual improvement factor wage provisions which established the principle that workers have the right to share in the fruits of advancing technology.

The first major cost-of-living allowance provision to protect the purchasing power of wages against escalation in living costs.

The first major funded pension program, fully financed by the employer—including an early retirement benefit of up to \$400 monthly.

The first survivor pension benefit subsidized by the company.

The first transition and bridge benefit program to assist surviving families of workers who die while in active employment.

The first nationwide prescription drug plan.

The first supplementary unemployment benefit program, later expanded into a guaranteed annual income credit plan.

The first nationwide short workweek benefit plan.

The first comprehensive hospital-medical-surgical health care program covering the entire family, fully paid for by the company and including retired auto workers and their dependents.

When the union's accomplishments since '48 are spelled out, you find thick books of highly technical language—but if you look beyond the books, you see American and Canadian UAW families enjoying their highest-ever standard of living.

The Cincinnati Ford worker's daughter will probably go on to college because her father can afford to widen her horizon.

Illness in the family can't become a crushing economic burden.

A new, decent home with a garden is not impossible.

Should he be made idle by a layoff, unemployment will not interrupt the family's dreams. His income will continue. The young couple can age together without fear.

When *Solidarity* interviewed the young family two years ago, the Ford worker and his wife said something much like this:

"We consider ourselves just ordinary people trying to get along, trying to be good citizens. We never really sat down with someone for hours like this and looked at our total lives in the light of a union contract. We wish all UAW members could have this experience. For one thing, they'd know the value of their union better.

"Walter Reuther was a man we always admired, even when we were still in school. We see him on TV. Next time he comes to town, we're going to be in the front row with our little girl. Years from now, when she's in school, I hope she tells her teacher that one day her parents took her to see Mr. Reuther..."

BLACK LAKES: WHERE THE UAW STAKES ITS FUTURE

His Camelot...

The beautiful and inspiring place of dreams and hopes, the Round Table of justice and wisdom and mercy...

This is the UAW Family Education Center at Black Lake, Mich., as its creator saw it through the wide window of his mind.

Walter Reuther died trying to reach his Camelot, on the eve of its transformation from a dream to reality. It symbolized, in living trees and shimmering waters, his hope for the future of the union he had led for a quarter of a century.

Said Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein of UAW's Public Review Board, at the funeral services for Walter and May Reuther:

"There were moments in the past several years... when Walter turned more and more to the thoughts of his Camelot, his Garden of Eden—the beautiful center he was building on Black Lake, where the UAW family might escape the harsh pressures of our city and, in a congenial and beautiful setting, find a Sabbath for their souls, take counsel one with another, sit at the feet of the wise and learned men, renew their spirits..."

The center became one of Reuther's personal priorities during the four years from 1966, when the 20th Constitutional Convention authorized its construction, until April 24, 1970, when the 22nd Convention instructed the International Executive Board to implement the education program there, and formally designated the facility as the Walter P. Reuther UAW Family Education Center.

He devoted almost every minute away from his immediate work to planning the entire project, then increasingly to on-the-spot inspection. He particularly made sure that the natural beauty of the 1,000-acre site on the southern shore of Black Lake was preserved. Not a tree or shrub was touched without his permission.

Delegates to the many UAW Councils which met at the center during March and April were treated to a lovingly conducted tour by Reuther of every part of the center. Often accompanied by his wife, he took them from the meeting rooms and dining facilities through the vast gymnasium and Olympic swimming pool, and the classrooms and bright children's playrooms, to the quiet lounges and living quarters. Reuther knew every detail; he had been living it all for years.

What is the Family Education Center all about? He long ago had answered that question for himself, in the mirror of the future, a dozen years before his first step down the bright, shimmering paths along the beribboned trees.

"The center is about the most crucial issue of our times: the quality of leadership," he told everyone who came to Black Lake.

He told the National CAP Advisory Council this:

"This is a time of testing, testing of the values of the American dream. This is the most difficult time in the history of our country. The great changes taking place around us are straining the fabric of the human community and we must find the leaderships, at all levels, to solve the problems ahead—leaders who combine the technical competence with social vision, idealism and commitment."

That, said Walter Reuther, as he looked far down the elevated corridors connecting the center's soaring buildings, is what this dream is all about.

"We made it this beautiful to bring the best out of everyone who comes here," he said. "I believe no one can leave here without being enriched spiritually."

The family education program will be unique, he pointed out. It will include each member's entire family as they search, through a rich and diversified program, for the social vision and idealism which, as Walter Reuther firmly believed, the labor movement must have to achieve its purpose.

Walter Reuther's brother, Victor, summed it up best when he told the *Solidarity* House staff, as they mourned during that tragic week in May:

"Ours is a union that is concerned about the brotherhood of man, and about all phases of the life and well being of people, their children, their families. That's why the family center was built... It's beautiful... it soars like a cathedral out of those beautiful woods and beside that lovely lake, and our people need to know and feel and enjoy that kind of beauty—and they will.

"That will be a center that will help transmit to new generations the kind of philosophy our union has acquired over 30 years."

TO MAKE AMERICA TRUE TO ITSELF

Early this century, it was written by the poet Thomas Curtis Clark:

"Let us no more be true to boasted race or clan,
But of our highest dream: the brotherhood of man."

In search of that highest dream, Walter Reuther never really stopped moving. The world over, and over, he sought to mend men's ways, to cause them to see each other as humans, here on this earth with their dreams for a few years—too few to waste on hating.

Human rights and civil rights were all the same to him and so pleading for black Americans' right to vote years ago was just an extension of his negotiating with General Motors for workers' right to a fair income, to relief from punishing work schedules.

It was an exciting path he cut: first, while still in his 20's, working with the fading democratic youth movement in Germany to stop a maddened government from killing Jews; and in his last hours on earth pleading to end the slaughter in Southeast Asia.

Between Germany and Cambodia were a thousand more steps for human justice:

White workers were wronged in Kohler, Wis., and for eleven years the union he headed fought their battle to a final and decisive victory.

Black women, hospital workers, were wronged in Charleston, S.C., and he walked in the hot sun, arm in arm with those strikers.

He awakened President Johnson at 2 a.m. one morning when he heard that striking Mexican-Americans were being rounded up and beaten by Texas Rangers—and orders went out quickly that brought their release.

On a day in June, 1957, Walter Reuther said these words to the annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"I'm proud to belong to the NAACP be-

cause it is made up of people who are dedicated in a great crusade to make America true to itself.

"That is what this is about: make America live up to its highest hopes and translate those hopes and aspirations into practical, tangible reality in the lives of all people, whether they are white or black, whether they live in the North or in the South..."

"The task is difficult. The struggle will be hard. But let us always remember that human progress has never been served to mankind on a silver platter.

"What we need to do is to keep the faith."

The convention that first elected Walter Reuther president in 1946 did something else significant: it voted to establish the union's Fair Employment Practices Dept. "to eliminate discrimination affecting the welfare of the individual members of the local union, the International Union, the labor movement and the nation."

It was a broad stage on which to fight for human rights and the newly elected president had a great union to support him in what had been a lonely effort.

Into Congressional hearings he went, calling on the nation to live up to the guarantees of 100 years before: the Emancipation Proclamation.

He met a young minister named Martin Luther King, Jr., and, sometimes from the same platform, they made it emphatic that the struggle for freedom was a moral struggle that would call upon the conscience of the world's most powerful free nation.

To the UAW's 25th anniversary banquet in Detroit in 1961 came the Rev. Dr. King to say that blacks and whites, together, succeeded in a revolution—and they called it the UAW.

To Selma, Ala., went Walter Reuther to say that the UAW was there for a revolution—and some day they'll call it freedom.

DELANO: "HIS SPIRIT WILL STAY WITH US"

They hoped to find a home and they found only hatred.

"Okies—the owners hated them because the owners knew they were soft and the Okies strong, that they were fed and the Okies hungry..."

That was John Steinbeck back in 1939 when his *Grapes of Wrath* nudged the nation for the shameful way America was treating its migrant workers.

The tragic story—of white Oklahomans who lost their farms to the Depression, to floods, to dust storms and journeyed westward in search of jobs and green fields—fitted into Walter Reuther's long list of worries. He saw beyond the outskirts of Detroit and Flint and other auto production centers then in ferment.

"This entire country needs organizing," he said in those pre-war days. "What we are going to do in our industry must only be a down-payment on the total organizing effort we must put forth because there is no security for any organized worker as long as other hungry men are walking the streets or toiling in the fields. We must turn with full strength on the slave trade on America's farms..."

For years, he and the UAW supported the efforts of the National Sharecroppers Fund whose rewards came with heartbreaking slowness. Men, women and children continued to die in the fields or at the hands of rural sheriffs—and who cared?

It wasn't until late 1958 when, with funds from the UAW and Walter Reuther's encouragement, NSF Director Frank Graham, Eleanor Roosevelt and Archbishop Lucey of Texas were able to form the Nation Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. Men and women of conscience rose up and at public hearings in Washington pointed America at its trails of shame.

In the fall of '65 Delano's grapefields were struck. Still it wasn't national news until that December when Walter Reuther arrived

and faced the guns of sheriffs and their deputies alongside leaders of the strike, Cesar Chavez and Larry Itliong.

From that moment on, the Delano strike and the strike of migrant workers along the Rio Grande River in Texas had the UAW's fullest support—and the nation came to know its shame.

And then last month, El Malcriado, the voice of the farm workers, confirmed for tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking Americans what had been translated to them: that Walter Reuther had perished.

He had been among them only a few months ago when they named their new union hall in Delano after his brother, Roy.

"His heart," said El Malcriado, "went out to the suffering masses in every corner of the globe. He was a man who thirsted for justice and freedom—who wanted to see the good things of the earth shared by all, including the least of his brethren . . .

"But his spirit will stay with us. God grant him rest."

THEY MADE US BETTER PEOPLE

Three clusters of red roses, the Stars and Stripes, Canada's red-orange maple leaf, the flags of peace and of the United Nations . . .

And between the two caskets a handful of daisies that told of the love of the two young surviving daughters.

And across the land in 400 or maybe 500 factories where daisies could never grow, workers by the hundreds of thousands bowed their heads, stared at the black, silvery steel of their machines and their three minutes of silence told of their kind of love.

And everybody was remembering a lady named May Reuther and a man named Walter Reuther who, nearly 40 years before, chose people as his career, who moved between picket lines and the parlors of the mighty carrying the same message: people must count for something in this world; their dreams of peace and brotherhood must be fulfilled.

And then that rich, mournful voice that made almost hymnal a worker's song written during the Depression years in honor of an executed trade union organizer:

"I dreamed I saw Joe Hill last night,
Alive as you and me.
Says I, 'But, Joe, you're 10 years dead.'
'I never died,' says he . . ."

By then, 11 eulogists had spoken, each sharing briefly the broad stage of the Ford Auditorium in downtown Detroit with the two lonely caskets, watched by 3,400 big and little people there by invitation, watched too by countless millions as television showed the sadness of yet another tragedy.

Shop stewards sat alongside United States senators and the leaders of industry. It was that kind of a memorial service. Outside, men and women made the sidewalk their cathedral. A loudspeaker system carried the words spoken within, words somehow converted from tears by great struggle. The words echoed off nearby tall buildings as the city's traffic hushed, too:

A retired plant worker, nearing his 80s: " . . . From the faceless, nameless auto workers of the '30s to the struggling grape pickers of the '60s, men responded to his call to unite in the battle for human dignity and justice . . ."

And those daisies shimmered.

A United States senator said: "You were a part of Walter Reuther's constituency if you were poor, powerless . . . if you were old, if you were sick and if you are just."

And you could see him—shorter, frailer than he should be for the mountains he dared climb—striding down the halls of Congress, on his way to a Senate or House hearing that would affect the lives of many.

An educator said of Mrs. Reuther: "Although a national figure . . . who lived through periods of danger for the safety

of her family . . . her sensitive feelings for people and their welfare were never blunted . . ."

And you could see her, too—a gracious lady with a slow smile that started in her eyes. She was more comfortable just away from the edge of the spotlight history focused on the man she shared with the world.

A civil rights leader said: "All Americans—most especially the black, the poor, the underprivileged—have lost a champion."

And you could see him alongside Martin Luther King, Jr., on that hot, spring day in Selma, Ala., dust rising from the road as people began their march for freedom in new seriousness.

And a former Cabinet member said: "They strengthened us, they renewed our faith. They thought better of us than we thought of ourselves and, by thinking so, made us better people . . ."

And Mrs. Coretta Scott King, widow of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "The secret of his success with blacks was that he was there in person when the storm clouds were thick . . ."

And the chancellor of a major university said: "I, too, knew Walter Reuther as a leader of enormous power and influence and impact on the world—but much more importantly, I had the rich privilege of knowing May and Walter Reuther as parents, as neighbors, as people . . ."

And a young man said: "As we walked through the woods at Black Lake, I thought of those many who would follow in our footsteps . . ."

And a rabbi said: "Our hearts go out to Linda and Lisa. They have shared their parents with all the dispossessed children of our land . . ."

And a trade union leader from overseas said: "Walter's imaginative and dynamic idealism will continue to be a source of inspiration to all trade unionists throughout the world . . ."

And then a man who worked closely at his side said: "We knew that a better future for mankind has to be made. It will not just happen . . ."

And you could see him in a hundred and more local union halls, in a hundred and more hotel conference rooms, on the streets, on college campuses, in legislative halls: chin out, eyes sweeping his audience, a raised hand that sometimes became a fist, then a spread hand again, his words reaching for the conscience of men.

"And standing there as big as life,
And smiling with his eyes,
Joe says, 'What they forgot to kill
Went on to organize,
Went on to organize.'"

The memorial service had ended. But midway through the third stanza of the Ballad of Joe Hill, a strange compulsion seemed to take over the mourners. Deep, sad thought turned to sound: a rising, gentle whisper like a prayer.

And Henry Ghant, a UAW Local 212 shop-worker for most of his last 20 years, wasn't alone in his lament.

"I never died," says he.
'I never died,' says he."

And how those daisies shimmered!

EULOGIES

Eleven men and women spoke as eulogists at memorial services for May and Walter P. Reuther. For reasons of space only, their remarks here are excerpted:

Dave Miller

(Chairman of the National UAW Retired Workers Advisory Council)

Today the world mourns the loss of a great and good man. The old, the underprivileged the oppressed and the poor have lost their champion . . .

There are so many memories. I remember the day three of us stood on a windy corner in this city in 1935 and he told us he had found a room that could be rented for \$10—\$10 a month for a headquarters for the organizing drive on the west side of Detroit.

And between the three of us we didn't have \$10 . . .

I remember the inch-by-inch progress upwards; the escalator clause; the too-old-to-work, too-young-to-die slogan . . . It came slowly and painfully but when we put it all together it meant a new life and a new world for the workers in the plants . . .

He did not live to see the kind of world he visualized. Perhaps none of us will, but in his years upon this earth he touched the lives of millions of people and made them better.

From the faceless, nameless auto workers of the '30s to the struggling grape pickers of the '60s, men responded to his call to unite in the battle for human dignity and justice.

U.S. Senator Philip A. Hart

We meet here today, not so much to discuss Walter Reuther's life, but to read his will, to examine his legacy.

When I say his will I mean that unwritten document that he spent a lifetime composing. And everyone here today in an heir . . .

You were a part of Walter Reuther's constituency if you were poor, powerless . . . if you were old, if you were sick, if you were weak and if you are just.

History will not forget that he was one of the first in the nation to begin talking about what is now such a popular thing: national priorities. When nearly everyone else was still complacent about a national priority system that had stopped making sense years ago, Walter Reuther was wondering how often we should pick up rocks from the moon when our cities couldn't pick up garbage.

And if opponents of that senseless war in Indochina ever muster the political muscle to shut it down, Walter Reuther's name will be in the books as one of the movers and they'll write this down about him: he was not a selfish man, that's why we have so much to inherit . . .

Dr. J. William Rioux

(President of the Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit Mich.)

I have come to speak of Mrs. Walter Reuther . . .

She was an endless searcher and a learner who displayed an intense interest in an understanding of the major problems facing large urban areas . . .

It was important to her that young people—be they four years of age or 20 years of age—be dealt with as carriers of potential to be developed and that they be taught and responded to in open, honest and encouraging ways . . .

In our efforts to create new research and training programs geared to the 1970s, focused on young children and families in urban situations, she quietly but firmly and enthusiastically supported aspects which focused on involving members of the community in planning and implementation of those programs. And she gave strong encouragement to our increased efforts to recruit minority students to our campus.

Whitney Young

(Executive Director of the National Urban League)

We mourn today the loss of Walter Reuther and his lovely wife . . .

Walter Reuther was my friend. He was the best kind of friend . . .

Whenever the going was tough, Walter Reuther was with us . . . He was one of the first to help Cesar Chavez and the striking grapeworkers in California. Wherever and whenever the poor and the oppressed needed him, Walter Reuther was there.

He knew that the gains of well-paid union men were endangered so long as there were other workers who were jobless, whose chil-

dren were hungry and who were denied their basic rights because of discrimination . . .

He would have been shocked and shamed at the recent action of some of New York's construction workers who desecrated the flag under which they marched and who damaged the patriotic ideals they professed when they attacked students who asked for peace and domestic reform.

Walter Reuther remembered that the parents of those same workers were also beaten when they demonstrated for what they believed in . . .

He was one leader who never had to be convinced of the justice of the claims black people were making on society and he was one leader who never needed detailed interpretation of what was happening in the ghetto. He knew. He was there. He was a believer. He was a man . . .

John W. Gardner

(Chairman of the National Urban Coalition)

What I say this morning will be very brief—and I must say that it will be highly personal . . .

None of us can speak of May and Walter without emotion and without the deepest gratitude. A friend of mine once said that the purpose of a free society is to produce great individuals and in producing May and Walter Reuther, this society justified itself many times over.

When we speak of them as typical Americans, we flatter ourselves.

They were the kind of Americans we would all like to be. They were the good, vital, generous, loving people that many of us strive to be and never quite are.

They strengthened us, they renewed our faith, they thought better of us than we thought of ourselves and by thinking so, made us better people.

It's a bitter thing to lose them now when we need them so much. But we can serve their memory best by being the kind of people that they wanted us to be.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I come to extend my personal sympathy and that of my family to the families of May and Walter Reuther, to their friends, associates and members of the UAW.

Walter Reuther was to black people no mere remote headline personality. For blacks, he was preeminently the most widely known and respected white labor leader in the nation.

The secret of his success with blacks was that he was there in person when the storm clouds were thick. We remember him in Montgomery. He was in Birmingham. He marched with us in Selma and Jackson and Washington. And he was in Memphis.

Only yesterday, there he was once more in Charleston, the leader of a million and a half workers giving personal support to a strike of only 400 black women . . .

We shall all miss him because we are all better off—black and white—as beneficiaries of his creative life.

Dr. Durward B. Varner

(Chancellor of the University of Nebraska)

All the civilized world knew Walter Reuther as one of the most powerful figures in the history of organized labor.

I knew May and Walter Reuther as devoted, loyal and proud parents of their two daughters, Linda and Lisa . . .

The concerned leaders of the nation, and of the world, viewed Walter Reuther as the leader of a persistent and determined battle for basic human rights, with the goal of a minimum level of dignity for all mankind.

I knew May and Walter Reuther as early and unwavering colleagues in the establishment of the Meadowbrook Music Festival and the Meadowbrook Theater so their people, too, could share in the riches and the beauty and the dignity of the arts.

The leaders of industry knew Walter Reuther in the heat of the bargaining room where he labored with dramatic effectiveness to better the conditions of existence for all those whom he represented.

I knew May and Walter Reuther in the warm glow of their gaily decorated home at the Christmas season where we exchanged simple gifts: Texas pecans from our family, Grandmother Reuther's homemade wine from theirs . . .

Sam Brown

(National youth leader)

For many in my generation, our most direct contact with Walter Reuther was in the struggle for social justice . . .

I came to know him not in bargaining sessions . . . but in the struggle for peace in Vietnam, at a time when students and workers were preparing to fight in the streets of New York. The strong, clear voice of Walter Reuther provided another voice and another vision, a vision of peace and justice.

But his life was much more than these visions of a just world at peace: they had substance and I saw the substance of those dreams of Walter Reuther in the UAW Family Education Center at Black Lake.

Walter Reuther was up early in the morning and we walked together . . . by the lake and he talked about paths where families could walk among the trees . . .

The scope of Walter Reuther's dream became clear. He envisioned not simply a world where racial justice, human justice and economic justice are true in the abstract, but a world in which he knew that economic justice was only the first step . . .

He also dreamed of a world where men could walk in peace with themselves and with nature, a world in which young people and old people, black and white, students and workers, could share a world of peace and justice because men were at peace with themselves—as he was . . .

Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein

(Rabbi Emeritus, Temple K.A.M., Chicago)

When the dire and dreadful news came to me, the words of Chaim Nachman Blalk, the poet of the Hebrew renaissance, flashed before my mind's eye: "There was a man and, behold, he is no more!"

Our hearts go out to Linda and Lisa. They have shared their parents with all the dispossessed children of our land. Would that we could share their grief as generously as they have shared their parents' love with us.

There were moments, I am sure, in the past several years—when violence became the general mood of our times, when our government became more deeply mired in a futile and immoral war . . . when Walter turned more and more to the thoughts of his Camelot, his Gan-Aden, his Garden of Eden on Black Lake where the UAW family might escape the harsh pressures of our city and in a congenial and beautiful setting find a Sabbath for their souls, take counsel with one another, sit at the feet of the wise and learned men, renew their spirits that they might return with clearer vision and steadfast strength to the workaday world and rebuild it closer to the heart's desire . . .

Ivar Noren

(General Secretary of the International Metalworkers Federation)

The international labor movement is also mourning a great leader.

IMF—the International Metalworkers Federation—is a section of that movement, including over 10 million trade union members around the world. It is on their behalf and together with some other IMF representatives that I have come here to pay tribute to Walter Reuther and what he stood for.

Walter Reuther clearly realized that in modern society the trade unions must take a stand—both nationally and international-

ly—on the great problems of social policy of our times and throw all their powers into a democratic transformation of society . . .

He shared our belief that organized labor has an important role to play in our efforts to build a better world for all people; a world of brotherhood and peace.

Irving Bluestone

(Administrative Assistant to Walter Philip Reuther)

In this indescribably painful hour, I am deeply honored to have been selected, in behalf of the UAW, its officers and its members, to speak this last farewell . . .

Walter never believed that the end purpose of the labor movement was "more." Rather, he saw the labor movement as an instrument for social justice, for human progress, for the perfection of the democratic heritage, a means by which workers and their families not only advance their own welfare but by which, in cooperation with men and women in all walks of life, and throughout the world, they make their contribution to improving the quality of the whole society.

His aim and purpose were economic and social justice. But to him the ideals of social justice, economic security, peace and freedom, human dignity and human brotherhood were not matters merely for philosophic discourse but practical goals to be achieved, dreams to be made real . . .

Where shall we find such men who can lead us, as did Walter with boundless energy, to a new and brighter day? Who can dream for humanity and realize their dreams? Who can aspire for people and fulfill their aspirations? We shall find them among the countless men and women of good will and deep commitment who live and hope and work in all corners of the earth, whose voices will respond exultantly to the challenges of a new day, whose actions are guided by a vision of love, peace, brotherhood and justice.

Walter had faith that these voices will prevail. He never wavered, never faltered in this faith, nor can we waver or must we falter if we are to be true to his memory . . .

IDEAS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN HIS LONG SUITS

The first in a series of remarkable documents known as the "Reuther Plans" was born in 1940, a somber year for foreign war and domestic unemployment.

And by a strange turn of history, the last of the Reuther Plans lay on the desks of U.S. senators in 1970, once again a deeply troubled year of battles abroad and laidoff workers at home.

In the 30 years between, Walter P. Reuther offered to the nation and the labor movement dozens of carefully drafted, often ingenious plans. They were proposals to solve massive problems of unemployment, inadequate health care, dilapidated housing, hostilities between nations, insufficient production of vital materials, the direction of the American labor movement, the needs of the elderly and a host of others.

The red-haired, five-foot-seven union leader fought as strenuously in the chambers of Congress and the White House for his plans to improve the well-being of the nation as he battled in the bargaining rooms of the giant corporations to upgrade the living and working conditions of laboring men and women.

At first, Reuther's studiously formed ideas were dismissed by scoffers as "crackpot" and "idle dreams."

At the end, his advice and counsel were sought by presidents and world leaders.

Ironically, the initial Reuther Plan showed the nation how to convert its peacetime machinery to warplane production, while the last plan described how the nation could turn defense production, including warplanes, to peaceful uses.

It was the late summer of 1940 when Reuther (then serving as director of the UAW

General Motors Dept.) saw a way through the gloom saturating the people of the United States. Fifty per cent of the auto industry's potential capacity was lying unused then, and more than 100,000 auto workers were unemployed.

Week by week, the world war seemed to be creeping closer to the U.S., with the Battle of Britain fully underway and German Junker 88s and Messerschmitts laying devastation upon England.

Reuther grasped a way to overcome, with a single major stroke of government policy, the problems of unemployment, idle capacity, the need to increase assistance to Britain and the campaign to bolster the nation's own defenses.

He called the plan: "500 Planes a Day. A Program for the Utilization of the Automobile Industry for Mass Production of Defense Planes."

Radical, unheard of—"impossible" and "crackpot" to some critics—Reuther's plan called for mass production of warplanes with the same machine tools and manpower used in making autos, without halting normal car production.

Within six months, he asserted, the auto industry could "turn out 500 of the most modern fighting planes a day, if the idle machines and the idle men of the automotive industry were fully mobilized and private interests temporarily subordinated to the needs of this emergency.

"This plan is labor's answer to a crisis," said the daring Reuther, then 33 years old. "New plants cannot be built and put into operation in less than 18 months. In 18 months Britain's battle, for all her people's bravery, may be lost, and our own country left to face a totalitarian Europe alone."

On Dec. 23, 1940, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt received the plan at the White House. The document contained nearly 7,000 words of detail on national goals, proposed output of fighter or bomber planes, charts and descriptions of available men, machines and plant square footage and answers to anticipated objections.

Roosevelt turned the plan over to the government's Office of Production Management. There, it was belittled by OPM Director William S. Knudsen, the former chief executive of General Motors Corp., who said that no more than five per cent of the auto industry's machine tools could possibly be converted for making airplane components.

Later, two congressional investigating committees were to assail the auto industry's failure to convert its plants and its insistence on making profits by building cars while soaking up vital defense materials such as steel, rubber and aluminum.

The attack on Pearl Harbor and America's entry into the war forced the industry to begin converting virtually all of its facilities for war production. It was a year after he had submitted his plan, and Reuther stood vindicated—but heavily saddened.

Almost 30 years after unveiling that plan, Reuther appeared on Dec. 1, 1969 before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and proposed a comprehensive program to convert to civilian production the defense industries supplying armament for the Vietnam war.

Reuther recalled in his reconversion plan the bitter lesson of 1940, saying:

"Now, 30 years later, defense employers are pursuing essentially the same stubborn line taken by the pre-Pearl Harbor automobile industry. Having found a sheltered and highly profitable berth resting on the dangerous assumption of perpetual confrontation and conflict among the major powers in a nuclear age, they are determined not to be dislodged from it."

As he urged in a somewhat similar Reuther Plan in 1945, he called for converting certain war plants to mass-produce housing.

Reuther noted that: "If that proposal had been implemented a quarter of a century ago, we would not today have a national housing crisis . . ."

His reconversion program, last of his completed plans, called for the government to set aside a portion of each defense contractor's profits in a trust fund. This money then would be released to help industries carry out government-approved plans to switch to civilian production and to minimize hardships on workers during the transition.

By 1949, Reuther's unique ability to develop comprehensive, workable ways to solve a vast array of problems was becoming known to the public. In that year, A. H. Raskin wrote in the *New York Times Magazine*:

"Ideas have always been Walter Reuther's long suit. Author of a score of 'Reuther Plans' for solving the problems of war and peace, he has what his friends call a brain with jet propulsion. His adeptness at formulating and dramatizing ideas both novel and challenging has been the principal ingredient in his rise to economic and political power.

"If the speed of a man's mind could be measured in the same way as the speed of his legs," Raskin wrote, "Walter Reuther would be an Olympic champion."

Walter expressed his concern to an interviewer, saying:

"We must build a decent society so we can all be secure and live at peace."

That, in the final judgment of history, may have been Walter P. Reuther's most comprehensive plan.

IN CONGRESS, PLEASE FOR THE GOOD LIFE

A devout believer in the social mobilization of labor, who was determined to make changes "within the system," Walter P. Reuther made nearly 100 appearances before congressional committees during his 24 years at the helm of the UAW.

Giving testimony on practically everything from peaceful uses of atomic energy (1956) and medical care for the aged (1969) to curtailment of the Senate's filibuster rule (1951) and price supports for farmers (1955), Reuther expounded the UAW's views on virtually all aspects of American life.

In January 1943, Reuther, then a UAW vice president, told the War Manpower Commission that war production could be increased through full employment and suggested a guaranteed weekly wage. In this proposal, Reuther asked for the "initiation by government of a National Wage Policy which will guarantee 40 hours' pay per week to employees who work less than 40 hours a week through no fault of their own," and, "institution by the War Labor Board of an industry wage stabilization policy and the creation of tripartite (government-management-labor) wage commissions in the automotive and allied war industries to work out and administer a master wage agreement based on the principle of equal pay for equal work."

In giving an analysis of the UAW's political responsibilities, Reuther explained:

"The attitude of the UAW on political activities is that we are deeply committed to the participation in American political activities as an organization because we sincerely believe that politics is really the practical housekeeping job of democracy and that all of our people, whether they be of labor or industry or small business or of education or farm groups—that everyone has the responsibility to help keep democracy's house."

Explaining the social consciousness of UAW, Reuther said in 1953:

"Even if it were desirable, it is not possible for labor to separate itself from society as a whole.

"It is not possible for labor to be a special interest group at odds or in conflict with those not members of unions because union

members and their families form too great a portion of the total population of the country. . . . Labor must make what progress it can with the community and not at the expense of the community."

By 1951, Reuther had addressed Congress on: price controls and a fair tax program; expanded Social Security; a national health program; repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; need for a Civil Rights Act; the Defense Production Act; federal aid to housing; federal aid to education and creation of an expanded foreign policy program.

Displaying his amazing foresightedness, in July 1945 Reuther told Congress of his plans of converting war plants to the mass production of needed railroad equipment.

In August 1951, he urged Congress to initiate a progressive spending tax "that will cut the wealthy's standard of luxury before cutting the American standard of living."

During June 1951 testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Reuther (speaking of the Defense Production Act) said:

"You have to put in provisions that if the steel industry or any other basic industry refuses to expand production capacity sufficiently to meet the nation's needs . . . then the government, as the agency of the people, must . . . step in and fill that deficit."

In a blast at the poor showing of the steel industry in taking on new projects, he needed their leadership for ". . . trying to drive our economic automobile down the road to the future with a rear-view mirror instead of a windshield. They have been looking where we have been instead of where we are going."

In one of his most poignant appeals for change, Reuther, beginning in October 1951 and continuing up to his death, campaigned mightily for the abolishment of Senate Rule 22 which allows unlimited debate (filibustering), with cloture requiring a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate.

Appearing before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, he said:

"We believe that Rule 22 is a very fundamental weakness in the democratic process . . . adequate debate should be assured to permit a clash of ideas . . . but the filibuster is not a clash of ideas. The filibuster is a technique designed to impede the legislative processes, not to facilitate them. . . .

"There are millions . . . in America who can make contributions in all kinds of fields, and they are being denied that opportunity in America simply because we are tolerating double standards of citizenship. And we are tolerating those, not because the majority of American people believe in them, not because the majority of the people in the Senate agree with that, but because under Rule 22 that minority—wedded to bigotry and narrow, selfish, special interests—has the tool with which to block the ability of the majority to act."

Reuther's intense concern for all aspects of the nation's welfare led him to an appearance before the House Agriculture Committee in March 1955 to back legislation benefiting farmers by providing price support for basic commodities.

Reuther declared: "We know that the farmer, like the worker, is entitled to a just return for his labor, which will permit him to share in the better life made possible by our increasing productivity. We believe that the answer to our economic needs involves raising the buying power of our families without tearing down the standards of others in the process."

Always fully documented and prepared for his frequent congressional appearances, Reuther on numerous occasions was praised by congressmen for his expertise in handling whatever subject matter he presented.

Commenting on Reuther's backing of the farm price support program, Rep. Harold D.

Cooley, who was chairman of the Agriculture Committee at the time, commented:

"Mr. Walter Reuther . . . made the best farm speech that I have heard in our committee room during the entire 20 years that I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture."

Remarking on the preparation of the UAW's brief calling for the changing of Rule 22, Sen. William Benton, who presided over the hearings of the Rules and Administration Committee, said:

"I think it is remarkable that you have, through your organization, prepared such a thorough brief, and it is a notable contribution to our hearings. Of course, I don't know why I should think it is remarkable in view of the long record of your organization in this field but this is a more complete presentation by far than we have had brought to us before."

**HOUSING, HEALTH, SCHOOLS, AND PEACE—
NO PROBLEM WAS TOO GREAT FOR SOLUTION**

Always the forward thinker, the labor leader in speaking about the impact of automation in 1955 before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, didn't condemn the job-gobbling inventions, but recommended that "we must do all in our power to make sure that the potential abundance of the new technology will be used with social wisdom to improve standards of living and welfare and to provide increased leisure for all Americans."

On the peaceful uses of atomic energy, Reuther told a Joint Committee in 1956:

"Our success in harnessing the atom, to lift the burden of poverty and disease from hundreds of millions of the world's people living in hunger and ill-health, would establish America in a position of moral leadership against which communist propaganda would be impotent.

"Harnessing of the atom for peaceful purposes will give us the tool with which to wage freedom's most effective propaganda . . . the propaganda of the democratic deed."

In February 1959, Reuther shared his ideas for economic growth with the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. In his testimony, Reuther proposed a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage; aid for distressed areas; a shorter work week; minimum federal standards for unemployment insurance.

In advocating health care for the aged, Reuther, during testimony in support of the Forand Bill in July 1959, commented:

"When three out of five older Americans have no greater income than \$1,500 a year, it does not take a mass of statistics and it does not take a means test to demonstrate we are dealing with a group in great need."

A nearly yearly occurrence with the UAW president was his appearance before the Joint Economic Committee to comment on the President's Economic Report. In these reports he always made it a point to stress:

"Our nation is more richly blessed than any other nation in the world . . . yet, we are still failing to satisfy many urgent and basic human needs."

During his testimony in the '60s, Reuther gave the UAW's views on:

An Anti-Poverty Program (1964): "President Johnson has served this country well in placing 'war on poverty' high on the national agenda. He has demonstrated both a high measure of compassion for human need and suffering and a keen awareness of a major flaw in the quality of our society."

Federal Safety Standards for Automobiles (1966): "We have a heavy responsibility to every living American and to the generations yet unborn to expand our effort . . . to bring auto design and construction hazards to an irreducible minimum."

Federal Reinsurance of Private Pension Plans (1966).

Problems of the Cities (1966): ". . . 70 per cent of our current population lives, and dies, in cities. In less than 20 years more Ameri-

cans will live in cities than there are Americans today . . . It is time we realized that people are the city's most valuable resources . . ."

Improvements in Social Security benefits along with Medicare and Medicaid (1967).

Establishment of a nonprofit Corporation for Public Television (1967).

Farm Workers Unions (1967): "For 30 years, while the rest of America has marched forward, farm workers have been left behind and have been denied such basic rights as Social Security, unemployment insurance, a minimum wage, workmen's compensation and membership in unions."

Tax Reform (1969): "The deep rumblings of a taxpayer's revolt are becoming more audible as the small and middle income home-owner is forced to carry a disproportionate share of the tax burden while the rich, by taking advantage of the many tax loopholes available to them, escape paying their fair share."

National Health Insurance (1969): "Only a comprehensive nationwide program of health insurance as part of the Social Security system can provide the reliable and equitable financial base needed to marshal and expand our health resources to assure the delivery of the full range of preventive, curative and rehabilitative health services to all Americans."

Postwar Economic Conversion (1969): "It is not enough to have a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. There must also be a plan to absorb the human and economic impact of ending the war . . ."

In what was to be his last appearance before a congressional committee, Reuther, on Feb. 26, 1970, told a House Labor Subcommittee of the need for federal reinsurance of pension plans:

"As the richest nation in the world we cannot continue to deny our older citizens their measure of economic justice and human dignity.

"We must act now to assure society's promise to present retirees and to avoid the potential failure (of pension plans) for even a small number of the millions of workers rightfully anticipating a secure retirement."

FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO . . . DEMOCRACY

Walter Reuther, in his tenure as leader of the UAW, was oft-praised.

Many are the citations bestowed upon him. He received numerous awards named in honor of great leaders who had preceded him in history, including Eugene Victor Debs, Samuel Gompers, William Tubman, Frederick Douglass, Walter White and John Dewey.

United States Presidents acknowledged Reuther's capabilities by appointing him to various governmental agencies.

Numerous labor, university, press and other organizations honored him.

West Virginia State College made him a Doctor of Humanities and St. Mary's College conferred upon him a Doctor of Laws degree, as did Tuskegee Institute.

He was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Detroit's Wayne State University presented to him the 1952 Alumni Award for outstanding achievements and a Roosevelt College group cited his "distinguished service to the principles of American democracy."

Retired and aged Americans, health groups and organizations of the physically handicapped gave thanks for his many efforts and the National Council of Senior Citizens praised him for working on behalf of better health care under Social Security.

Recognition for efforts on behalf of causes extending beyond the United States came in the last two decades, including tributes from the 1961 International Freedom Festival and from youth and labor organizations of Israel. And, of course, his own membership:

The 20th Constitutional Convention, in 1966, paid tribute to Reuther for his 30 years of service to the union. Ten years earlier, he

received in South Bend, Ind., site of the first UAW convention, this citation:

"To our dynamic president, Walter P. Reuther, who embodies in heart and mind the spirit of human brotherhood and the expression for a better tomorrow . . ."

AND MANY AN OLDTIMER'S EYES GLISTENED

When a young Walter Reuther was gaining full stride as the union's leader, he made a pledge to those who helped give birth to UAW.

It was a pledge UAW has fulfilled time and time again at the bargaining table and in the halls of government where all the elderly could be helped.

Fulfilled, in fact, far beyond the hopes of worn-out workers who, in the cold of Milwaukee's winter of 1949, cheered when their president cried out to the UAW-CIO education conference:

"For years they've taken a worker, a young fellow with bulging muscles, with a lot of drive, a lot of ambition, and they take the best years out of you; and when you get too old and can't buck the line any more, they dump you on the industrial scrapheap.

"They don't worry about what you're going to eat. Some of these fellows say, well, it's too bad. You're too old to work and too young to die. And we're going to say yes, a fellow who works years in these factories and gets to the age where he ought to be retired is too old to work, but he's still young enough to live, and we're going to fight for the wherewithal so he can live as a decent American citizen when he's too old to work."

A frail woman of 63, Sadie Schweitzer, remembered and she came, as the nation paid tribute, to stand as an honor guard. "It was the least I could do," said the woman who helped man the union's soup kitchen during the Ford organizing drive in 1937.

Many an oldtimer remembered.

" . . . I can still picture Walter (said Victor Godard) in 1941, with that microphone in his hand, getting Ford to do right by its workers. . . ."

And many an oldtimer's eyes glistened with moisture as he passed in final tribute before the man who changed it all; the man who, in the long-ago winter of Milwaukee made the pledge that still lives on. Like this:

More than 200,000 members have retired under UAW-negotiated pension plans.

As early as 1968, families of retirees had received \$1.5 billion in benefits.

"We're enjoying benefits we never would have received without him," was the solemn tribute of 40-year Chrysler office worker Wilbur Dark, among the many thousands of retirees who joined those mourning the death of Walter and May Reuther.

"If it wasn't for him, we wouldn't be retired now," agreed Local 51 retirees Regina Pejka, 70, and Peter Kraydich, 73, who stood as honor guards.

On the grape boycott front, in petitions to Congress and in getting out the vote, the "old reliables" continue to show their gratitude for the man and the union who, some 20 years ago, changed the life that lay ahead when they became "too old to work and too young to die . . ."

Their sadness over his death reflected the simplicity of their lives:

"I'm retired today with a comfortable pension. Reuther is the man I have to thank for that . . ."

TO THE YOUNG HE SAID: "WE CAN BRIDGE THE GENERATION GAP"

Merle Hill never met Walter P. Reuther. But he knew him.

Merle knew Walter Reuther as the leader of a union that hears the outcries of young Americans anguished by a society they consider unjust.

And Merle Hill, at 25, a rank-and-file member knows the UAW as an organization where youth can work for orderly change and improvements in society.

There is room in UAW for those with stars in their eyes, he feels, alongside workers who are relatively content.

They had stars in their eyes—those men emerging from the great Depression of the '30s with a determination that there would be a union in the automobile industry.

Like the many young men then leaving Appalachia, high school dropout Walter Reuther had a vision of a better tomorrow when he came to Detroit as a 19-year-old journeyman tool and die maker.

On a trip that was to take them around the world, he and his younger brother, Victor, helped a number of students in Berlin escape capture by Hitler's storm troopers. They worked in the anti-Hitler underground.

Walter Reuther never lost sight of the vision that carried UAW from the cradle of organization to maturity.

"Many of the unions had stars in their eyes in the early days," Reuther told delegates to last April's UAW convention. But tragically, he lamented, many have lost the inspiration of that vision.

To assure that his own union's inspiration doesn't die off with the dwindling number of oldtimers left from the early days, Reuther and the union's executive board launched the most ambitious program of any union to assure continuity of leadership for succeeding generations.

To a young local union editor at the union's convention two months ago, Reuther revealed his personal feelings about any "generation gap" within the union:

"Age is a matter of the spirit. I know young people who are old in spirit, who don't really want to go out and change the world. I want to change the world. I feel it just as strongly now as I did when I was 23. The people who feel as I feel and the people who feel as you do—we have to bridge the generation gap and we have to join forces and do this job together."

"HE WAS THE WORKERS' VOICE IN HIGH PLACES"

This was Walter Philip Reuther, public figure:

He was "my young engineer" to President Franklin Roosevelt, who liked the 33-year-old Reuther's plan for converting auto assembly lines to warplane production.

He was like a loving son to Eleanor Roosevelt. They worked together on many projects for humanity and their friendship covered a span of nearly a quarter of a century.

President Harry S. Truman used his proposals on reconverting the nation's industrial production from war to peace.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower considered him the "idea man" for labor.

President John F. Kennedy was a personal friend who asked his advice frequently. They spent an hour together just a week before the President's assassination.

President Lyndon Johnson admired Reuther as one of the most persuasive and influential innovators in the country, often sought him out for advice.

Hundreds of leaders in many fields looked to Walter Reuther for ideas, for concern, for help, for inspiration, not just in the U.S. and Canada, but around the world.

He formed genuine friendships with many. When Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Reuther visited Sweden, the UAW president invited his host and friend, Tage Erlander, then Swedish prime minister, and the then mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, out for a brisk row around the lake.

He worked throughout his life with the few in power for the sake of the many without power. He was their voice in high places.

AROUND THE WORLD, HE WORKED AT HIS DREAM

Walter Philip Reuther followed a dream of a better tomorrow in a better world.

To him, "foreign aid" was not the shipment of guns and gunboats but of food, fer-

tilizer and seed for the hungry, engineers to make arid lands green—and foreign aid was also something in which the labor movement had to have a role because workers could best speak to other workers.

He gave voice to that dream in his first convention speech as president of the UAW when he announced:

"We are building a laborer movement, not to patch up the old world so you starve less often and less severely; we are building the kind of labor movement that will remake the world where the working people will get the benefits of their labor."

He reminded UAW delegates that:

"People of all nations and of all tongues want the same things that we want. They want an opportunity to enjoy economic security and well being . . . an opportunity to live with freedom and justice in human dignity, without fear of tomorrow."

Shortly after the convention, Reuther began the work transforming his dream of international brotherhood into reality.

The 1949 convention adopted a proposal made in 1943 by CIO President Philip Murray for the enactment of an international fair labor standards treaty designed to eliminate the exploitation of workers.

Convention delegates also approved a recommendation to affiliate with the Geneva-based International Metalworkers Federation (IMF), which today represents 10 million metal workers in 51 countries.

That same year Reuther headed the CIO delegation, which with representatives of the AFL and 47 free world labor organizations met in London and founded the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) to help workers in free countries build their futures through their own unions.

In 1950 Reuther was elected president of the IMF Automotive Section.

Reuther and other UAW leaders worked closely with the ICFTU in establishing schools for organizers in the early '50s.

ICFTU, Reuther reported, "is growing not only in the more highly developed countries of the west, but also in the vast reaches of Asia and Africa where the inhuman exploitation of labor is a perpetual source of trouble and weakness for the free world and a ready source of strength for communism."

"We are building up a cadre of leaders who can keep the millions of workers of Africa and the Far East from communism by giving them a democratic hope and a democratic instrument—militant trade unionism—for realizing that hope."

ICFTU and UAW, in cooperation with the Metalworkers Federation, raised funds for extensive organizing drives on the plantations of Malaya, Ceylon and the Southern Cameroons. Offices were also established in Bangkok, New Delhi, Bombay, Jakarta, Singapore and Tokyo.

Financial aid was provided for union escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, victims of Soviet aggression in Hungary, Poland and East Berlin, Algerian and Spanish trade union refugees and those from the then Venezuelan dictatorship.

UAW also provided legal aid for men and women jailed in South Africa in their struggle against apartheid, legal support for Nigerian trade union leaders and help which resulted in the achievement of self-determination for trade union members in Cyprus.

"We are involved in the struggle for peace because peace has become a condition of human survival," Reuther explained. "What good is a wage increase, or a better pension plan, or an improved seniority agreement if the world winds up as a rubble of radioactive ashes?" He saw hungry men as desperate men—and desperation is the ingredient that makes for wars.

Increased expansion of overseas operations

by the Big Three auto firms, International Harvester and hundreds of other corporations posed another formidable problem.

The UAW's 18th convention met this problem head-on by establishing the UAW Free World Labor Defense Fund in 1962.

That same year, the UAW helped the four Japanese labor federations establish an International Labor Wage Research Center where wage earners could get economic data pertinent to their collective bargaining problems.

Reuther was the guiding spirit in the creation of the World Auto Council in 1966 and the World Agricultural Implement Council in 1967. He was president of both groups.

HIS LAST MESSAGE: A CALL FOR PEACE

Just two days before his death, UAW President Walter P. Reuther sent a telegram to the President of the United States, deploring the invasion of Cambodia and the needless killing of students at Kent State University.

It was to be his last public pronouncement. Characteristically, it was a plea for peace at home and abroad.

Following is the complete text of that telegram:

"On behalf of the UAW, I wish to convey to you our deep concern and distress over your action authorizing the use of United States forces and material in a broadening of the war in Indochina.

"Your decision to invade the territory of Cambodia can only increase the enormity of the tragedy in which our nation is already deeply and unfortunately involved in that region.

"Your action must stand as a repudiation of your oft repeated pledge to bring this tragic war to an end and not to escalate it.

"Widening the war at this point in time once again merely re-enforces the bankruptcy of our policy of force and violence in Vietnam.

"Your action taken without the consultation or authorization by the Congress has created a serious Constitutional crisis at a time when there is growing division in our nation. Many Senators are understandably aroused. Senator Cooper has clearly pointed out that your action represents a turnabout in your policy and Senator Aiken has warned that your escalation of the war means the end of the Vietnamization policy.

"However this dangerous adventure turns out militarily, America has already suffered a moral defeat beyond measure among the people of the world.

"You pledged to bring America together. Yet by your action you have driven the wedge of division deeper and you have dangerously alienated millions of young Americans. The bitter fruits of this growing alienation and frustration among America's youth have been harvested on the campus of Kent State University where the lives of four students involved only in an emotional protest against the war were ended by the needless and inexcusable use of military force.

"At no time in the history of our free society have so many troops been sent to so many campuses to suppress the voice of protest by so many young Americans.

"With the exception of a small minority, the American people, including our young people, reject violence in all its forms as morally repugnant and counter-productive. The problem, Mr. President, is that we cannot successfully preach nonviolence at home while we escalate mass violence abroad.

"It is your responsibility to lead us out of the Southeast Asian War—to peace at home and abroad. We must mobilize for peace rather than for wider theaters of war in order to turn our resources and the hearts, hands and minds of our people to the fulfillment of America's unfinished agenda at home."

TWO FRIENDS WHO PERISHED

In the hush of a timeworn Quaker meeting house, Oskar Stonorov has been eulogized as a renowned architect, a talented sculptor and a "warm and compassionate" friend of the UAW who held a "deep devotion to the whole family of man."

The solemn salute to Stonorov was spoken by Victor Reuther and five other prominent men during a memorial service May 16 in the more-than-a-century-old Friends Meeting House in Philadelphia. Just 24 hours earlier memorial services had been held in Detroit for Mr. and Mrs. Walter Reuther.

Stonorov, 64, the designer of UAW's Family Education Center, was killed in the May 9 plane crash.

Among the mourners was Stonorov's widow, Betty; their daughters, Tasha, Andrea and Katrina; son, Erik, and his wife, Molly, and Stonorov's sister, Anna Jordan.

The surviving daughters of the Reuthers, Linda, 27, and Lisa, 22, joined the Stonorov family in their pew during the services.

Also attending the services were UAW Vice President Douglas Fraser and 21 others representing the union and the builders of the facilities at the Family Education Center.

Just as UAW President Walter P. Reuther did, young William Wolfman, too, loved Black Lake—its woods and trails, its clear and placid lake, its opportunities for hiking and conversing and learning.

It was near there that he died in the flaming crash, a mile or two from the Pellston, Mich. airport, of the chartered plane in which Walter and May Reuther and three others also lost their lives.

The 29-year old Wolfman, an ardent conservationist, was accompanying Walter Reuther on that trip, as he had on many others. A UAW staff member since 1968, Bill Wolfman came to UAW from a background of unionism that encompassed his lifetime.

His father, Earl, has been the longtime president of Council 30 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union.

One of his constant interests outside the UAW was a camp-recreation area in Detroit for underprivileged children.

Survivors include his widow, Martha; a daughter, Dianne; a son, Dean; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl F. Wolfman; four brothers, Dr. Earl F. Wolfman, Jr., John Edward, and Herbert Parrott, and a sister, Mrs. Beverly Bitner.

Burial was in Detroit's Roseland Park Cemetery.

TO DRY OUR EYES AND GO ON

Frequently verging on tears as he spoke in somber tones, Victor Reuther had a "family chat" with UAW Solidarity House workers gathered in a memorial tribute to their late president and co-worker on the day before his funeral. He told them:

"We gather not just to mourn and to give comfort to one another, but to take strength from the knowledge that we are not alone . . . because, in a very real sense, you have always been an extension of the family."

Referring to the modern way of life that scatters most families as the youth become adults, Vic said he and his deceased brothers, Walter and Roy, "have been most blessed because we have had an experience that few brothers in the world have sared.

"Ours has been a joy and the good fortune to have spent our whole adult lives together in the same cause, working in the harness together for the same organization.

"We have known great moments of joy and great moments of sadness," he reflected. "It is part of all of us that we learn to dry our eyes and go on."

MEMORIAL FUND

"I want to do something to show how much they meant to me," said the tearful little woman beside Walter and May Reuther's caskets at Veterans Memorial Build-

ing. She had an envelope in her hand. "Can I give some money?"

In response to her plea, and those of hundreds of other mourners, the UAW has established The Walter and May Reuther Memorial Fund. Donations will be used for charitable and educational purposes in the causes for which the Reuthers worked: for labor, for human rights and for the betterment of mankind.

Trustees of the Memorial Fund are Linda and Lisa Reuther, Irving Bluestone and Frank Winn, assistants to Walter P. Reuther. Donations, which are tax deductible, may be mailed to The Walter and May Reuther Memorial Fund, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48214.

LEONARD WOODCOCK BEGINS LEADING THE UAW

Though our loss is irreparable, Walter Reuther's work will be carried on.

That was the first message newly elected UAW President Leonard Woodcock had for the membership and for the public at large.

We have a united union whose direction will not be changed and whose ability to carry on the collective bargaining program adopted in April should not be doubted for one moment. That, too, was part of Woodcock's message.

His election to the presidency by unanimous vote of the International Executive Board was announced on May 22 by Secretary Treasurer Emil Mazey who served as acting president since the tragic air crash.

To underscore the UAW's continuing commitment to all the great causes of our society, he announced—at a press conference called minutes after his election—that he would lead a UAW delegation leaving that evening for Georgia to join the "March Against Repression" organized by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"I will be there in Walter's stead because he would have been there," said Woodcock. "And I will also be there to signify that our alliance with the progressive institutions in this country . . . has not only not changed, but that, because of the tragic loss we have had, (we are) doubly dedicated to that type of activity."

Regarding the union's collective bargaining responsibilities, the new president said:

"There has been speculation that the loss of Walter Reuther will significantly weaken our ability to carry forward the collective bargaining program of this union. Of course, Walter made a contribution that was beyond measure," he noted, but the UAW leadership always worked as a team, "and we will (now) have a greater determination than we might otherwise have had" at the bargaining table.

"We have a united union. Our slogan of 'teamwork in the leadership and solidarity in the ranks' is not just words on paper," Woodcock asserted with great feeling. "It is something with depth and meaning and we have shown that this week. We will show it in the weeks and months ahead and we are determined to win a contract settlement that will get equity for our members and of which Walter Reuther would have been proud."

Woodcock is a veteran of the labor movement who joined his first union in 1933—at the age of 22—when being a union member often meant losing your job.

He became a member of the UAW when that union was being organized and, at age of 59, was the union's senior vice president.

As head of the UAW's General Motors Dept. since 1955, he has had plenty of experience bargaining with the world's largest and most powerful corporation. He has also for many years represented aerospace workers in bargaining with their influential employers. During those years, he built a reputation as a shrewd bargainer and a tough adversary in negotiations.

In GM negotiations, Woodcock scored a first in 1958 by establishing the legal right to

negotiate local agreements—in addition to the national master contract—to broaden benefits for UAW members. The right to strike over local agreements also was established. In 1961, the first union contract clause barring discriminatory employment practices was written into the GM agreement and relief time for workers was established as a matter of right.

HE WAS THE HEART AND SOUL OF OUR UNION

Badly shaken, sleepless and grief-stricken, at mid-afternoon, Sunday, May 10, top officers of the UAW drafted this statement for newsmen—hope gone that Walter and May Reuther just might not have been on that plane:

"We cannot at this moment adequately express in words our grief at the loss of Walter Philip Reuther. The shock is too sudden and too overwhelming.

"He was an inspired leader of our union; he symbolized its conscience, its heartbeat, its soul. But he was also a teacher, an educator, a man of deep wisdom who sought greater wisdom for himself and all who came in contact with him. We grieve for him and his family, for ourselves and for every man and woman of the UAW and their families.

"We grieve, too, for men and women outside the ranks of this union because Walter Reuther belonged to every man of good will. He belonged to the poor, the deprived, the oppressed of this world—and today they are poorer, as are we.

"He belonged to our older citizens because he brought them dignity and a greater measure of security.

"He belonged to the young because he demanded that they be heard.

"He belonged to millions across the seas because of his devotion to the cause of peace and to the cause of improving the quality of life for all the world's people.

"He was deeply and constantly committed to the cause of justice throughout the world. He measured goodness and righteousness only in terms of human beings and their dreams for a better world—and we measured him by his unselfish devotion to the cause of people.

"We grieve, too, for his life's companion, May Reuther, his wife of 34 years, and share our grief with their daughters, Linda and Lisa.

"Walter Reuther was a great American, a great world leader for justice and peace. To us he was also a warm, generous human being, our close personal friend, our brother.

"We call upon all our UAW brothers and sisters to observe with us a week of mourning in his memory."

IS THE CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY WORKING FOR ORGANIZED CRIME?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been a campaign conducted by the liberal press and others to undermine items in President Nixon's anticrime legislative program by printing confusing, erroneous, and misleading information about a number of pending bills, attempting to lump all of the proposals into one overall indiscriminate category: "Oppressive."

For the most part, such liberal commentators and editors try to stick mainly to vague, ominous generalities and half-truths. Such is the tenor of an article appearing in the Washington Star on

June 21, 1970, under the byline of Carl T. Rowan. Mr. Rowan's main ploy is half-truths, but he also makes a number of misleading statements, apparently motivated by emotionalism and personal bias.

Occasionally, some of these newswriters have attempted to rise above the usual innuendo and insinuation and have actually discussed the provisions of various pending crime bills. Such was the case in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post on June 17, 1970, under the byline of Joseph Alsop, a writer not always noted for liberal views. In that article, however, Mr. Alsop wrongly attributed to S. 30, the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969," two of the provisions contained in the House-passed District of Columbia crime bill—no-knock and preventive detention—and stated that this was the reason the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, where S. 30 is pending, did not want the bill reported out of committee. Not only did Mr. Alsop get his bills and his committees confused; he erroneously reported the vote by which S. 30 passed the Senate; the vote was 73 to 1, not 76 to 1. His inability to get his facts straight, of course, casts serious doubt on the validity of his opinions.

A similar piece appeared in the editorial section of the New York Times on June 22, 1970, in an editorial entitled "Against the Law." While discussing S. 30, the editorial lists several flaws in the bill which allegedly will "confuse or overturn the rights of citizens in the pre-trial, trial, and appeals stage" as follows:

Grand juries could publicly accuse an official of misconduct without an opportunity to reply; a grand jury witness could be jailed for three years without trial or bail for not testifying; evidence illegally obtained (by home and office searches or electronic bugging) would no longer be disclosed to a challenging defendant—as the Supreme Court ruled last year was necessary; a judge could throw a man in jail for thirty years, even if a crime called for a short term, on evidence inadmissible at trial.

Mr. Speaker, these inaccurate descriptions of provisions contained in S. 30 were obviously cribbed from an inaccurate and misleading article on the bill which appeared in the June 5, 1970, edition of Congressional Quarterly at page 1499. The pertinent parts of the Congressional Quarterly article appear as follows:

Grand juries could publicly accuse an official of misconduct without filing an indictment or furnishing an opportunity for the official to refute the charges.

A grand jury witness refusing to testify could be imprisoned for contempt for as long as three years without trial or bail.

All illegally obtained evidence (by illegal electronic surveillance, compelled testimony or illegal searches) no longer would be disclosed to a defendant challenging its use, as the Supreme Court ruled in 1969. Instead, after enactment of S. 30, a court could disclose only that part of the evidence which it adjudged relevant and "in the interest of justice."

A judge could impose a 30-year special offender sentence upon a man convicted of a felony with a maximum two-year penalty as well as upon a convicted bank robber who could receive a 25-year sentence.

This sort of secondhand editorial writing is similar to a lazy student pla-

giarizing a term paper. In this case, however, the plagiarized information was taken from an erroneous source.

Mr. Speaker, of similar import to the New York Times editorial is an article appearing in the Washington Star on June 20, 1970, under the byline of Clayton Fritchey. In this article, in which he discusses S. 30 and the District of Columbia crime bill, Mr. Fritchey uses the usual number of half-truths and innuendos. But additionally, Mr. Fritchey makes an attempt to list the most dangerous provisions of S. 30. From a reading of these provisions, it is apparent that Mr. Fritchey also got his hands on a copy of the June 5, 1970, Congressional Quarterly. Mr. Fritchey is, however, a little more subtle in his approach to plagiarism than the editorial writers for the New York Times. He has changed the sentence structure a little more, and used different words to better advantage—but the meaning is the same, and it is obvious where both writers obtained their information.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be appropriate for me, therefore, to point out briefly the mistakes in the Congressional Quarterly summaries which would, of course, also apply to the various columns and the New York Times editorial, and suggest that, in the future, our editorial pundits would do better to read the legislation and not secondhand summaries.

TITLE I

Under title I of S. 30, the grand jury is authorized to submit to the court, not the public, a report commenting on non-criminal misconduct of a public officer. Contrary to the information contained in the Congressional Quarterly and its New York Times byproduct, such a public official has ample opportunity to refute any charges with the assistance of counsel by designating witnesses to testify on his behalf before the grand jury prior to the filing of any report. Even if a report critical of a public official is accepted by the court, such report is not made public until such official has had an opportunity to appeal and refute in writing a court order authorizing the publication of the report.

TITLE III

The Congressional Quarterly article stated:

A grand jury witness refusing to testify could be imprisoned for contempt for as long as three years without trial or bail.

This is another inaccurate statement. Under S. 30 a witness, after being held in contempt, could be incarcerated for the term of the grand jury if he persists in his refusal to comply with the court order which, in some cases, could amount to 3 years. As soon as the witness complies with the court order to testify, however, he is released. Additionally, such a witness has the right to appeal and to bail pending the determination of the appeal if there is a substantial possibility of reversal. All appeals are disposed of as soon as practicable but not later than 30 days from the filing of the appeal. The provision is fully in accord with present practice. See *Shillitani v. United States*, 384 U.S. 364, 371 (1966).

TITLE VII

S. 30 provides that disclosure of information for a determination if evidence is inadmissible is required when such information may be relevant to a pending claim of such inadmissibility and such disclosure is in the interest of justice. The phrase "may be relevant" is lower as a standard than "relevance." It provides for disclosure where only a reasonable likelihood of relevance is required. It is, therefore, inaccurate to suggest that "relevance" must be shown.

TITLE X

Before an individual can be sentenced as a "special" offender, it must be proved to the court during a hearing at which the defendant is entitled to assistance of counsel, compulsory process, and cross-examination of witnesses that the defendant has: first, on two or more previous occasions been convicted of an offense punishable by death or imprisonment for more than one year, and has been imprisoned for one or more of such convictions; second, committed such felony as part of a pattern of criminal conduct which constituted a substantial source of his income, and in which he manifested special skill or expertise; or third, committed such felony in furtherance of a conspiracy with three or more other persons to engage in a pattern of criminal conduct, and the defendant did, or agreed that he would, initiate, organize, plan, finance, direct, manage, or supervise all or part of such conspiracy or conduct, or give or receive a bribe or use force as part of such conduct. In addition, he must be found too "dangerous"; that is, likely to commit further offenses. It is true that evidence not available at trial could be used in the hearings, but this does no more than reflect present law. See *Williams v. New York*, 337 U.S. 241, 247 (1949).

Mr. Speaker, I know this body is not going to let the biased views of uninformed news commentators influence our action on badly needed anticrime legislation. One unfortunate aspect of these recent crime commentaries, however, is the misinformation that the public is subjected to. A writer who expresses an opinion about something he has not read is expressing a worthless, and sometimes dangerous, opinion. A number of administration crime bills presently pending in the Congress comprise urgently needed legislation if we are to make real headway in controlling our ever increasing crime rate. I would hope that the Congress will act on a number of these measures this session and that the press will live up to its obligation to the public by commenting honestly and fairly about the content.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this opportunity to address the House on legislation scheduled to

come to the floor tomorrow. I refer to H.R. 16065, a bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. I am in support of this program and would like to share with my colleagues, some of whom have expressed reservations about the program itself, the reasons behind my support.

Mr. Speaker, last year I took to the floor of the House of Representatives in opposition to spending an additional \$12.5 million to complete construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. My reasons for so doing are not at all inconsistent with my support for the program which we will consider tomorrow.

The American people are a cultured people who have a deep appreciation of the arts. We have a long and deep background in the arts and humanities. We spend enormous sums for paintings, records and books, and spend millions of dollars for tickets for performances of performing arts of all varieties. If and when the Federal Government becomes involved in the promotion of this existing appreciation, I believe our involvement must be in a way that gives expression to the feelings of the 97 percent of America who do not attend performances of the arts, due not to their lack of appreciation, but because of their lack of opportunity to advance their appreciation.

The individual is the source of our Nation's strength. The local community is the place where this strength is exercised. Federal funding of the arts should respond to the individual initiatives and the community accomplishments. I object strongly to spending Federal tax moneys, which come from the people, on programs designed to benefit only a few, and not the people. But where the individual expressions in the area of the arts already exists, and where Federal funding will provide the necessary catalyst to bring the arts to the people, I believe we have an obligation to be of assistance.

When the Kennedy Center was being debated, I objected to continuing Federal funds because I could not justify spending the people's tax moneys for a building which would be used only by an elite few who live in and around Washington and who can afford the high prices for the type of performances expected to be given in the building. I have also voted against Federal programs which call for the Federal Government to support individuals and individual plays and works of art on the ground that the Federal Government must not dictate to mid-America its cultural tastes, at the expense of the people's Federal dollars.

The National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities is another story. From my personal contact with the Wisconsin Arts Foundation and Council, and from an organization known as Affiliate Artists, Inc., which originated in my district, I have come to realize that this program does not dictate cultural tastes, but responds to community accomplishments in order to bring the arts to the people who wish to enjoy cultural performances in their home towns.

I would like to share with you and my colleagues an example of this community response and expression, and there-

by explain my support for Federal involvement in a program which I believe necessary to provide the stimulus for businesses to earmark more than one-half of 1 percent of their allowable deductions for cultural activities, and to provide for the continuance of organizations designed to bring the arts to the people.

On Tuesday of last week, June 23, an unusual event took place in the community of Beloit, Wis. The firemen in engine house No. 2 had invited their neighborhood to visit their station late in the evening. Parents, children, relatives, and friends responded. A picnic supper was shared and then the feature event took place. The featured individual was not a magician, a politician, nor a ballplayer. The person the neighborhood came to meet and come to know was an opera star, Miss Dorothy Krebill, mezzo-soprano, whose distinguished cover credits include Geneva, Switzerland; the Metropolitan Opera Co.; the San Francisco Opera; the Chicago Lyric; and now engine house No. 2 in Beloit, Wis.

She was together with that gathering of people, and some seventy other similar gatherings this past year, in and around the community of Beloit, because of a program called affiliate artists, a program that exists to bring performers and people together.

Miss Krebill and her 38 fellow affiliate artists have visited with thousands—literally hundreds of thousands—of people across America this year, performing for them and talking with them in their clubs, churches, schools, union and grange halls, college classrooms, and neighborhood firehouses. She and her associates are visiting with the 97 percent of the American public which does not have the opportunity to attend a performing arts concert each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the critical support the affiliate artists program once received from the National Endowment for the Arts section of the National Foundation, and because the Endowment contributed cooperation in establishing the program, that I speak in behalf of the Endowment. A Federal arts agency which has enough sense to understand that opera houses and firehouses can use each other is an agency I like.

The support of the affiliate artists program by the National Endowment shows that their intent is to recognize the right and privilege of all Americans to participate in the activities of the arts.

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the program of the affiliate artists which originated in the First District of Wisconsin. I would like to explain the developments behind this marvelous program.

The individual initiative of two Presbyterian clergymen and a young Ohio farmer, the entrepreneurial courage of Miller Upton, president of Beloit College, and the early sustenance given by the citizens of Beloit, made what was but a dream 5 years ago into what must be described today as one of the most significant arts organizations in the United States.

The program's beginning in Beloit set its continuing character. A concert by a

young performer, Mr. Edward Warner, was snowed out in a March blizzard. Instead of a star's pout, this young man not only performed for the 30 people who made the concert, he left the rostrum of the First Presbyterian Church, came down front and talked with his audience. He told about himself, spoke of his art and described its relation to and meaning for other lives. This was the first of what is now called an "enformance," a performer with people, giving what the academy knows as a lecture-demonstration, what children and parents know as a "show-and-tell." Next year there will be as many as 60 affiliate artists visiting with citizens across the country in the manner as Mr. Warner did a few years ago.

Specifically, an affiliate artist is a young professional performer employed, and I repeat the word "employed," to build new audiences for America's performing artists. He does this, as I mentioned, by going to the people where they already exist as audiences. It is a sad fact that very few can go to the concert halls. But it is an undisputed fact that ready-made audiences exist outside of the concert halls in the schools, clubs, churches, and colleges. And it is an exciting fact that those who cannot drive to another city to a recital can and will drive to a firehouse for an affiliate artist "informant."

An affiliate artist is an employee. Sponsored by a corporation, a foundation, a church, or a group of individuals, the affiliate artist is an employee of one of the few full-time employment systems for American performers. The performer is presented in a community by a local institution. He is in that community or its region for 56 days a year for 3 years. He in truth becomes a part of the community. His sponsor pays \$8,000, \$6,500, including insurance, taxes, and so forth, of which goes to the artist in monthly increments, and \$1,500 of which goes to the artist in escrow for travel.

There are affiliate artists found in such diverse places as the Los Angeles Arts Center, the Military Academy at West Point, the University of Puerto Rico, and the Seattle Opera Association.

The presenting institutions, which are primarily colleges, universities, and art organizations, pay Affiliate Artists, Inc., a nonprofit tax-exempt, Wisconsin corporation, \$2,000 a year. Listen to the groups who have joined in partnership to make this unique program available to the American people: in addition to the entrepreneurial investment of Beloit College and the citizens of Beloit, sponsorship from the United Church of Christ, the United Presbyterian Church, the Lutheran Church of America, Standard Oil of New Jersey, with major grants from the Danforth Foundation, the Paul Bruney Foundation, the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund, the Kettering Family Fund, the Johnson and the Ford Foundation. And, of course, the National Foundation for the Arts.

In 1968, a critically needed grant of \$50,000 for administration and development was made by the National Foundation for the Arts. In the current year, a

matching grant in cooperation with Sears-Roebuck Foundation has meant the joint sponsorship of 16 affiliate artist appointments.

The National Endowment responded to initiative and achievement already demonstrated. It became a partner with the program and, most importantly, a partner that did not dictate terms, or exercise control, nor stipulate appointments. They required only accountable stewardship of the funds and the maintenance of the character of the organization in bringing performers and the people together.

Affiliate artists now have over 500 artists on file—singers, dancers, actors, and instrumentalists. More than 300 colleges, universities, art organizations, and towns have requested affiliate artists appointments. There are now conversations going on with 50 major corporations and company foundations for sponsorship of appointments. It could well be that in 4 to 6 years America's performing arts will reach the people because of a program that brought 300 performers and the American people together.

I believe it. Last September, 30 of the affiliate artists went to the city of Beloit where the program originated for a 3-day training conference and a 1-night "thank you" festival for the community and the college. Citizens and collegians numbering 8,500, the largest gathering to take place in Beloit, attended that festival night in response to the 30 performers who had been with them for 4 days. This year, the festival will be a 2-day event, will start its reputation as an annual event supporting the love that the American people have of the performing arts.

Art has a power that politics, economics, ideologies know of—a power to heal by allowing people to celebrate and enjoy. The National Endowment for the Arts, in supporting such programs as the Affiliate Artists, Inc., has in turn justified our support.

I would be remiss in closing if I did not state an objection that people, and I, have to the program, and one which I hope that we will be able to overcome tomorrow. At a time when the Federal Government cannot finish 35 hospitals in this country, and when it does not spend enough money for sewer treatment plants, and at a time when inflation is rampant as a result of increased Federal expenditures, there is the strong possibility that the proposed \$40 million in expenditures will prevent the program from being enacted.

There is no question in my mind that the National Endowment is a good program and deserves our support. But I hope that efforts will be made to reduce the expenditures to a level at which it has operated in the past. I strongly believe that the program is too necessary to jeopardize by Federal funding at a level which may be prohibitive at this time. I plan to support the program and will vote for it in its proposed funding level. But I hope that the level will be reduced in order that others will be able to support the program and continue the successes which the National Endowment has shown in the past.

RESULTS OF A POLL IN THE 18TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of a recently conducted poll in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. To date, nearly 18,000 responses have been computerized with the result that the majority of those citizens polled overwhelmingly support President Nixon's move into Cambodia to clear out enemy sanctuaries.

The Cambodian operation drew an 81-percent favorable response. Seventy-five percent of those Illinoisans polled supported the President's plan for ending the war in Southeast Asia.

Two questions directly relating to America's young people showed a decided sentiment in favor of eliminating college draft deferments and against lowering the voting age to 18. Of particular note is the fact that over 55 percent of those persons in the lower age bracket of 20-35 are also opposed to lowering the age to 18. The percentage becomes progressively higher for those in the older age groups.

Although the 18th District of Illinois is basically conservative, nearly 60 percent of its citizens polled feel that wage, price, and credit controls should be imposed as a means for combating inflation. This indicates vividly to me that the inflation issue is of paramount importance on the domestic front.

We in Congress have certainly got to be doing a better job of holding down Federal spending as our contribution to this effort. Over the last several days the actions of the majority have certainly not been directed toward this goal.

I am pleased to report that the vast majority of the responses from my district are in support of the proposal which I introduced in 1966 to tie future social security benefits to the cost of living index. This proposition, as you recall, was incorporated in the recently passed amendments to the Social Security Act.

On the issue of the Federal Government subsidizing incomes, the vote was 55 percent against such a move and 37 percent in favor. On the specific question of whether Americans fully understand President Nixon's welfare reform proposal, it is quite obvious they do not understand it, as indicated by their negative vote of over 77 percent. While I had intended to support the original proposal which was designed to get persons off the welfare rolls and onto the work rolls, I was very distressed to see the legislation so emasculated in the House of Representatives, with no accounting for free food stamps, subsidized rental payments and all the other things, that I was forced to oppose it in the final analysis. At present, it looks like the bill will die in the Senate because of the many fears that have been raised.

On the farm front, taking into account only those returns received from identified farmers, I find 63.1 percent opposed to the present farm program, with 31.6 percent in favor and 5.4 per-

cent undecided. On the question of a 5-year phaseout of Federal agriculture support programs, I find a much narrower margin, with only 52 percent for such a phaseout, and 41 percent opposed. With the current agriculture act expiring at the end of this year, Congress will have to enact new legislation sometime before the end of the current session, and it is obvious from the responses I have had thus far that the agricultural community wants some changes made.

Finally, it would appear that my constituents are wholeheartedly in favor of a constitutional amendment I introduced several years ago calling for the reappointment and reconfirmation of all Federal judges every 10 or 15 years, with a whopping 85.4 percent in favor and only 9.2 percent against.

Mr. Speaker, I include the composite results of the questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

[In percent]

1. Do you think President Nixon has charted a good course for ending the war in Viet Nam?

Yes 75.5
No 18.1
No response 6.4

2. Do you specifically favor the President's decision to wipe out the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia?

Yes 81.6
No 13.2
No response 5.2

3. Do you favor continuation of draft deferments for college students?

Yes 30.8
No 63.3
No response 5.9

4. Should wage, price and credit controls be imposed across the board to stop inflation?

Yes 59.7
No 30.9
No response 9.5

5. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?

Yes 26.7
No 69.0
No response 4.3

6. Do you favor the automatic increase or decrease of social security benefits to reflect changes in the consumer price index?

Yes 67.9
No 25.1
No response 7.0

7. Do you think the Federal Government should subsidize families where the wages of fathers working full-time are below the poverty level?

Yes 37.1
No 55.0
No response 8.0

8. Do you feel you fully understand President Nixon's proposal for welfare reform?

Yes 16.0
No 77.4
No response 6.6

9. Should present farm programs be continued as they are?

Yes 18.7
No 65.4
No response 16.0

10. Would you favor a five-year phaseout of Federal agriculture support programs?

Yes 61.9
No 22.2
No response 15.9

11. Do you think that all Federal judges now receiving lifetime appointments should be limited to a 10 or 15-year term that would require reappointment and reconfirmation at the end of that term?

Yes ----- 85.4
 No ----- 9.2
 No response ----- 5.4

SENIORITY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CHARLES VANIK and I intend to offer an amendment to the upcoming Legislative Reorganization Act which, if passed, would put the House on record in favor of a change in the seniority system. Our amendment would modify the Rules of the House to provide explicitly that the chairman of each standing committee "need not be the member with the longest consecutive service on the committee."

The Rules of the House are now silent on the matter of seniority. Our amendment would break this silence, and indicate to the American people and to the informal Democratic and Republican committees now considering reforms in the seniority system that the House stands ready to modify the way it selects its committee chairmen.

I include a statement explaining our proposed amendment at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMEN CHARLES A. VANIK AND HENRY REUSS ON SENIORITY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 27, 1970

We believe the time has come for the House of Representatives to declare that the threadbare old principle of seniority for picking committee chairmen is a luxury the Nation can no longer afford. Whichever party controls Congress, that party owes it to the Nation to present committee chairmen who represent the views of the majority party, and of whom that party can be proud. Length of service on the committee is surely an important consideration, but it should no longer be the sole consideration.

Accordingly, when the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 comes before the House in July, we intend to offer an amendment adding the following underlined language to the present Rule X of the House of Representatives:

"At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof, who need not be the Member with the longest consecutive service on the Committee; . . ." (Rule X, Section 3, Rules of the House of Representatives)

If adopted, this would be an advisory mandate from the whole House to whichever party is in the majority next January that seniority is not to be the sole determinant in the selection of committee chairmen. It leaves it to each party to determine its own method of selection—for example, by vote of the party caucus, with nominations from the Speaker-elect or from the floor, or each committee could select its own chairman. The possibilities are many.

These questions can and should be decided by each party, drawing on the upcoming reports of the Democratic Committee on Organization headed by Representative Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash.) and the Republican Task Force on Seniority headed by Representative Barber Conable (R-N.Y.).

What is vital, however, is that the House give some assurance to the American people now that the seniority system will be changed. It is not enough for Members to tell the people that committees are considering the issue and that a decision will be made after November.

The public has an interest in this, too. It has a right to know how Members stand. The issue of seniority is too important to be regarded as solely an internal party matter.

SP4C. W. ROBERT FRIZZELL: AN UNHERALDED MILITARY SUCCESS STORY

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, it has become fashionable in some circles to criticize, deride, and heap scorn upon our Armed Forces. These critics look for opportunities to find fault with the military, so that they can show what an inhuman and bureaucratic institution it is. These attacks and ensuing controversy are given full and often sympathetic coverage by much of the national news media.

Regrettably, too little is said of the good deeds and human success stories found among our Nation's defenders. Contrary to the statements of America's professional critics, our professional soldiers are doing their best to defend our country against its enemies. These men are motivated by patriotism of the highest order to commit their lives to service to America. Those of us who have been in the Armed Forces know, that in addition to the hardships, there are many rewarding experiences to be found in the service.

The two letters which follow tell a very touching, human success story. They tell of a man who realistically faced up to his own limitations and handicaps, and, with the help of friends such as my thoughtful constituent Alan C. Day, and much hard work on his own part, successfully overcame those handicaps. Sp4c. W. Robert Frizzell did not have the world handed to him, like so many people do. He has had to work hard for his success, and deserves commendation for it. As the two letters show, Sergeant Rees is a professional soldier who obviously is interested in and devoted to his work. The sergeant to his credit, and better than most critics of the military, really understands human nature. My constituent, Alan C. Day, by his acts and on the record, has put them to shame.

In these times when the doubters receive so much attention, we would do well to remember men like Robert Frizzell, Sergeant Rees, and Alan C. Day, who are defending our country and the cause of freedom against aggression, each in his own way.

The letters follow:

PORT DIX, N.J.,
 July 1, 1969.

FIRST SERGEANT: This letter is written in reference to Pvt. Frizzell and conditions that are prevalent to this man's character and training. It is meant as an aid to you and your cadre and not as any referral to preference or influence in his relationship to your control.

I have been his field first since his arrival

in the reception station up and to graduation, I have spent considerable time interviewing and counseling this man. He entered the army finally after trying unsuccessfully to enlist for a period of ten years. His mental category was the block in his earlier attempts. As you can see by his records, this man barely passed all phases of basic training. It took considerable effort on the part of all my field cadre to bring this man through.

The point I am trying to make here is that this man (31 years of age) is probably the most respectful and courteous member of this cycle. He fully realized his failings and inadequacies, and continually strived to understand and learn. He studied many hours on his own and practiced all of the performance requirements every possible chance. He volunteered many times to act as demonstrator so that he would have more on the spot corrections and be able to perform all his requirements.

At first he was the target of many laughs and ridicule on the part of trainees and cadre alike. But after both parties realized his seriousness and intent, they got fully behind him and aided him on many occasions and spent a lot of their free time assisting him. I have put through many trainees, but as a Drill Sgt., I feel that the greatest satisfaction I have experienced was this man's successful completion of basic training. He is very slow to grasp things, does not always understand his mission and does many things awkwardly. But overshadowing all of this is his great pride in himself that he has attained something in his life worthwhile. He takes the job of being a good soldier seriously, something today that is taken lightly. Also his realization that he belongs to something that requires hard work and training has given him cause to keep learning and trying to improve himself. The most prized possession he owns or has ever owned, is his Army uniform. On those basis I recommended this man for promotion to E-2, which he received. I am sure with proper supervision and some understanding, you will be equally proud of this man, as I, and all of the company are, at the end of his tour of duty with your organization.

Sincerely,

S. Sgt. WARREN D. REES.

CONTOOCOOK, N.H.,
 April 19, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I met this young man ten years ago by chance and I took an interest in him. He has been a state charge all his life with no parents or family, withdrawn and somewhat handicapped due to his background but basically a kind, good person and somehow I was determined to help him in some small way. He is here now for a few days before being shipped out to Viet Nam, for which I am sorry to see him go over there but I wanted to call this man to your attention and also am enclosing a xerox copy of a letter his drill sergeant gave him after his basic training. I think the sergeant's letter should be in the Congressional Record. We read every day about how bad the military is, well I think everybody should have a chance to read this sergeant's letter as I think it is the most personal and touching letter I have read in a long time and the sergeant should be commended as he is truly a credit to the military and should restore one's faith, if it is needed, in the kind of leadership we have in our armed services.

Sincerely,

ALAN C. DAY.

CHARTER SERVICES

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

Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. Speaker, last Monday, the White House released a statement of international aviation policy, carefully formulated on the basis of a review begun 12 months ago by a distinguished interagency committee. One of the major points in this statement is that for the first time, the executive branch has officially recognized that, and I quote, "charter services are a most valuable component of the international air transportation system, and they should be encouraged."

We in the Congress recognized this fact about a decade ago when we passed legislation enabling the CAB to certificate the U.S. supplemental air carriers, and again in 1968 when we passed legislation permitting inclusive tour charters, so this statement merely reaffirms our faith in low cost air transportation via charters. There is, however, a cloud on the horizon in the form of Economic Draft Regulation No. 183, released by the CAB on May 8. This regulation, if adopted, would substantially restrict the availability of charters by limiting the frequency of charter flights, by limiting the permissible size of chartering organizations, and by other more indirect methods. Even contemplating such proposals at this time flies in the face of the policy statement, and I would urge the CAB to postpone further consideration of these regulatory changes until Congress has had the opportunity to review the policy statement and act upon it.

The policies followed by the United States with regard to international air transportation have been fixed by a study conducted in 1963—that is, until June 22—when the White House released a new policy statement based on the results of a study begun last August. A primary point of the new policy is that the United States take an affirmative role in the development of charter services, a major change from the 1963 statement which did not even mention charters. One of the ways the policy statement anticipates that this can be done is through "additional uniformity and simplification of charter rules." These rules are, as you know, promulgated by the CAB and, at best, they are difficult to understand. Nevertheless, on May 8, the CAB proposed new regulations that would virtually strangle the charter market by such measures as prohibiting charters to any organization with more than 20,000 members and controlling the frequency of charter flights. Rules such as this would never appear to be justified but they are particularly inappropriate at this time because they directly contradict a newly announced U.S. policy. I again respectfully suggest that the CAB delay any further consideration of these and similar rule proposals until both it and the Congress have had time to evaluate the new policy.

Without charters, millions of U.S. citizens would be unable to travel by air. Without charters, hundreds of thousands of Europeans would never see this country. Without charters, many of the airlift needs of the military would go unmet. The Congress has consistently recognized this, and we, in fact, created a class of air carriers—the U.S. supple-

mentals—to serve as charter specialists. On July 22, our views were reaffirmed by the White House which announced a new U.S. international air transportation policy encouraging the development of charter services with minimum restrictions and giving charter services by U.S. carriers the full protection of the U.S. flag. This policy is, however, undercut by proposed regulations announced by the CAB last May in EDR-183, regulations which, if adopted, would limit the frequency of charter flights and make it extremely difficult for most organizations, and thereby most people, to qualify for charter flights. In view of the new policy, and in consideration of the Presidential request that this new policy provide guidance to all branches of the Government in dealing with international aviation problems, I would urge the CAB to suspend its proposals and to examine, in concert with us, the new directions in which this policy leads.

BEHIND THE WHEEL OF EVERY 50TH CAR

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have inserted into the RECORD a number of articles about the appalling slaughter which is taking place on our highways. While national attention and interest have been focused on the war in Vietnam, the highways have become a battleground far more deadly than Vietnam. It seems that almost daily indignant speeches are given and indignant articles are written about the slaughter in Vietnam. Yet how seldom do we hear the cries of indignation about the murder and mayhem on our roads, streets, and highways?

The Christian Science Monitor on June 25 began a 10-part series on highway safety with an article on drunken drivers, and the estimated 28,000 people a year they are killing. My view of America's reaction to the horrible death, disfigurement, and destruction of resources on our streets, is well summarized by a quote from the article:

Since the beginning of this century, traffic accidents have killed more than 1.7 million people—more than the combined death toll of all military personnel in every major war from the American Revolution to Vietnam.

I commend this thought-provoking article to the attention of my colleagues:

BEHIND THE WHEEL OF EVERY 50TH CAR (By Guy Halverson)

CHICAGO.—It's a bad one, all right," the grimfaced police officer next to me said as we skidded to a stop alongside the twisted automobile. Chunks of jagged broken glass lay scattered across the freeway. "Ten to one says liquor was a factor," he shrugged. "It usually is."

Ahead of us were the red and white flashing lights of squad cars and a fire truck, the vehicles silhouetted starkly against the dark Albuquerque sky. Four men in white, carrying a large respirator, were jumping from an ambulance and running down a steep hillside.

For Deputy Chief M. Fred Johnson, a 35-year veteran of the Albuquerque, N.M., Police Department, as well as this reporter, what we

witnessed that chill April night at the interchange of I-40 and I-25 was an unforgettable and heartbreaking scene.

The driver of the smashed vehicle—in his early 20's—had been observed by a police spotter hurtling in and out of traffic along the crowded New Mexico freeway at speeds approaching 100 miles an hour. As he sought to maneuver the sharp interchange, he lost control, jumped a deep ravine, and rolled onto a completely new section of freeway in front of a stream of cars before being hurled through a side door and down an embankment.

Almost miraculously, no other cars had become involved.

LIQUOR NEVER MENTIONED

Despite interviews by reporters with police and relatives, neither of the next day's local newspaper reports mentioned alcohol. Yet the grim fact was that the young driver—who had narrowly missed smashing into other cars—had been drinking heavily prior to the accident. Moreover, he had been driving without a valid operator's license.

That gloomy, wind-swept night in Albuquerque could hardly be called unusual. Throughout the nation, law-enforcement officials could recount thousands of similar episodes—grim records of single- and multiple-vehicle collisions.

There was the Texas family killed in a head-on collision with a drunk driver one Sunday morning in 1969. And the Wisconsin mother and her eight-year-old son killed this year in front of their home when they were returning from a concert. And the three people killed in Louisiana not so long ago when a pickup truck driven by a problem drinker crossed a dividing line and smashed into them head-on.

The United States is in the midst of an undeclared—and almost unrecognized—war in which its highways have been turned into a virtual battleground. Here a small group of social and problem drinkers are yearly killing up to 28,000 people, causing 800,000 accidents, and accounting for economic losses conservatively estimated at between \$7 and \$8 billion.

Many insurance companies are being forced to tighten automobile underwriting and to post sizable rate increases because of mounting highway losses involving drinking drivers.

"HIGHWAY COMMANDOS" IN MILLIONS

No one knows how many of these "highway commandos" there are. But they number in the millions. Allstate Insurance Company estimates that 1 out of every 50 cars coming at you on the highway is driven by a drunk driver. One prominent police-science expert more conservatively figures one out of every 90 cars.

Traditional sanctions are not halting these highway killers. They drive with or without a license, despite radio and TV warnings, despite fines and jail sentences.

According to Dr. Robert F. Borkestein, chairman of the Department of Forensic Studies at Indiana University and a leading expert in breath testing, there is virtually no place in the United States where drinking driving is totally prohibited.

The neon parade of bars and package stores along the nation's highways provides corroboration that auto-oriented America—with its 85-90 million drinkers—too often considers the bottle and the throttle acceptable companions.

In most states, indeed, statutory definitions of what constitutes "intoxicated driving" remain at dangerously liberal levels.

WRONG WAY ONTO THE FREEWAY

Jan, an honor student, only shortly graduated from the University of Oklahoma, accepted a date on Thanksgiving Day, 1967. Carefully belted into the seats of her companion's new, low sports car, the two young people were suddenly struck by a large pickup

truck coming the wrong way on a freeway exit. Jan was killed.

The pickup driver was drunk, an uncapped liquor bottle on the seat beside him. He had repeatedly lost his driver's license and was without auto insurance.

"I've experienced tragedy many times in my family, but this was surely the shock of my life," the girl's aunt, who had raised her from a child, told me. "It was so unnecessary, so senseless. It could have been prevented."

Since the beginning of this century, traffic accidents have killed more than 1.7 million people—more than the combined death toll of all military personnel in every major war from the American Revolution to Vietnam. During the past five years alone, the highway roster included at least 134,000 men, women, and children, according to National Safety Council estimates.

The toll continues. About 150 people a day.

The strong correlation between highway deaths and liquor has never really been hidden to researchers. "We have received a communication containing the history of 25 alcohol-related accidents occurring to automobile wagons," an article in the 1904 Quarterly Journal of Inebriety, noted. "Fifteen persons occupying these wagons were killed outright, five more died two days later. . . . Fourteen persons were injured, some seriously. A careful inquiry showed that in 19 of these accidents, the drivers had used spirits within an hour or more of the disaster. . . ."

ESTIMATES VARY WIDELY

Back in 1946 the National Safety Council estimated that drunk drivers triggered about 18 percent of all fatal accidents. Today, in 1970, one out of every two highway deaths is attributed to liquor. That astonishing figure may well even be higher. Some authorities, in fact, fear that it may be as high as 70 percent of all fatalities.

One recent study undertaken by the State Laboratory of Hygiene and the University of Wisconsin's Department of Preventive Medicine suggests that almost two-thirds of Wisconsin drivers killed in traffic accidents were under the influence of alcohol at the time. Equally as ominous, the report (based on blood samples taken from 507 drivers killed between February, 1968, and May, 1969) indicates that alcohol is a factor in 56 percent of all fatal accidents involving young people under 18.

Many law-enforcement departments, moreover, such as the State of Washington Department of Motor Vehicles, have clearly established that there is a high correlation between individuals who drive while drinking and those who use drugs.

"We're deeply concerned about the role of the drinking driver," says Willard Howell, director of the Office of Alcohol Countermeasures in the U.S. Department of Transportation. Mr. Howell's anguish is widely shared among safety experts. Ronald H. Parsons, stocky Sheriff of Kent County, Mich. (encompassing Grand Rapids) told me he thought alcohol was probably a factor in between 50 and 60 percent of all fatalities handled by his department.

PICTURE "BLEAK AND DISMAL"

In New Orleans, where the 1969 death toll of 108 fatalities was the highest since 1929, Dudley Andry, director of the Metropolitan New Orleans Safety Council, admits being depressed by the constantly spiraling statistics. "The picture here is bleak and dismal," he said one day in late March of this year. On the small table in front of him was a chronological rundown of fatalities in New Orleans for the past year.

The hefty volume resembled a telephone directory in size.

"Look at them," he said quietly, deep anguish mirrored on his face.

"January, 1969, a white male doctor, 8:15 p.m., alcohol blood concentration .10 percent."

"22-year-old woman, alcohol concentration, .12 percent."

He flipped the page.

"White male, age 54, killed by liquor."

"How do we stop it?"

How do we stop it?

The research that has gone into this 10-part series indicates that it is not being stopped largely because the American public remains puzzlingly apathetic. That apathy is apparent at every level of society.

Despite an imaginative \$18 million program under way at the Department of Transportation (to be discussed in a subsequent article), there is virtually no long-range, coordinated federal and state program to deal with the drunk driver. Leadership from Washington is desperately lacking.

LOCAL PROBLEMS ABOUND

Despite two landmark laws—the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—Congress continues to spend little for highway safety.

Indeed, while Congress authorized some \$267 million for the first three years of the National Safety Act, only \$92 million has been released for obligation, according to the National Safety Council. At least 40 safety bills have been passed in the last few years, but none of them has received adequate financing.

State and local community programs fare no better. The liquor industry in many states is quietly sabotaging legislative efforts to enact legislation aimed at drunken drivers. In over two dozen states it's possible to renew drivers' licenses by mail. The safety council of one major Southern town of over 300,000 people is operating on a shoestring budget out of an office that reminds one of the dreary setting for a 1940's private detective film. The punitive legal approach in most communities is strictly out of the 1940's, too. Fines and license revocations seldom deter problem drinkers, who desperately need clinical or therapeutic aid.

Paradoxically, courts and juries are loath to convict known drunk drivers, even when the evidence is overwhelming. One magistrate north of Seattle often deliberately defers findings on drunk-driver cases so that a lesser charge can be given. (This practice has triggered the ire of the Washington State Patrol.)

Out of one group of 1,000 drivers in California who killed someone while driving under the influence of liquor, only one-fourth receive felony convictions for drunk driving. Less than 5 percent ever went to jail.

Last year a Midland, Mich., woman, whose car was hit by a drunken driver while driving along an interstate highway, found on checking state records that he had garnered five previous convictions for drunk driving and had rung up an extra 15 points against his record within a two-year period. At his last trial—the one involving the Midland woman—the judge fined the drunken driver only \$30, plus \$70 court costs and suspended his license for 90 days, the woman told me. (The license suspension was subsequently extended to one year by the Michigan Secretary of State.)

State motor vehicle licensing record systems are too often tangled monstrosities. Recordings of sentences, fines, and license revocations are either not entered at all, entered erroneously, or disappear through peculiar circumstances at a later time. Indeed, the lack of effective coordination within and between the records people of the different states is matched only by the deep-seated rivalries and lack of coordination between many of the highway safety specialists and alcoholism-treatment experts themselves.

"NONRECORD" CLEARS EXECUTIVE

Several years ago a highly respected, \$20,000-a-year Midwest executive with a well-known corporation ran his rented car off a 30-foot embankment on a California expressway. He was arrested and booked for driving while intoxicated. He engaged a lawyer at an extremely high fee. The lawyer had the case delayed until such time as it would be cleared from the docket. Within three months the whole episode had been forgotten with no record of the accident.

This reporter's research indicates there are thousands of "nonrecords."

Law-enforcement departments—too often understrengthened, underpaid, overworked—frankly concede that they find less and less time to deal with highway safety, especially now that "rising crime" is so firmly etched in the public consciousness (even though serious crime statistics lag far behind motor-vehicle accident statistics).

In one major Texas city I spent an evening "riding shotgun" with an officer who admitted that in over a year of patrolling a beat (in the area of heaviest concentration of bars in that city) he had not given out one ticket for drunk driving. He was no exception. I found that true almost everywhere I went—Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, Washington, D.C.

NO NATIONAL PROGRAM EXISTS

Most experts say one reason the drunk driver is not being curbed is that there is as yet no realistic hard-headed attack on alcoholism in the U.S., such as has been the case in most European countries. Until the deeper question of alcoholism is attacked, new police equipment, stiffer court sentences, and millions of license revocations won't really resolve the problem.

The Monitor has learned through a Department of Transportation source that a confidential special task force report on highway safety prepared for the President has severely criticized the entire punitive approach in dealing with the drunk drivers. This is a conclusion shared by most rehabilitation experts.

Testimony last year before a special subcommittee on alcoholism and narcotics, headed up by Iowa Sen. Harold Hughes (himself a reformed alcoholic), clearly indicated that there is no comprehensive federal program in this area, even though the United States now leads the world in the number of alcoholics.

The entire federal expenditure in the alcoholism treatment area is estimated at a minuscule \$4 million annually.

Compare that \$4 million to the estimated \$8.2 billion in tax revenue that government at all levels—local, state, federal—collects from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

Compare that \$4 million to the \$7 to \$8 billion in economic losses caused on American highways annually by drinking drivers.

"NO SAFETY CONSTITUENCY"

"There just is no highway safety constituency," laments Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council. Mr. Pyle, leaning back in a chair in his large office at NSC headquarters in Chicago, recalls that in his four years as governor of Arizona, back in the 1950's, only one person ever bothered to come into his office to discuss road safety. And until the recently stepped-up advertising campaign against drunk drivers by the council and private insurance companies, Mr. Pyle doubts that the situation had changed very much.

Mr. Pyle concedes that the NSC has been trying to get a coordinated national attack against drunk drivers under way for "about three years." He says, "We thought we would be stronger if we had widespread support. But the only major group that we've been able to get with us so far is the American Medical Association."

"Ninety million Americans drink—and they just don't like the privilege abridged. That's what you call a constituency in reverse."

MINE SAFETY LAW NOT BEING ENFORCED

(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, 6 months ago the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act was signed by the President. The safety features of the new law became effective on April 1, 1970. Following the tragedy at Farmington, W. Va., which took the lives of 78 coal miners, the Nation demanded action to protect those who dig out the coal in America's most hazardous occupation. A new public policy was given effect in the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

It is tragic that this new act is not being enforced in a proper fashion by the Bureau of Mines. I have written the following letter to the President to underline serious deficiencies in the enforcement of the law:

JUNE 26, 1970.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act went into effect on April 1, more coal miners have been killed than during a comparable period last year. It is clear that these deaths are the result of a failure by the Bureau of Mines to enforce the law.

I appeal to you as the Chief Executive, sharing my concern for law and order, to see that the letter and the spirit of the law are enforced. I appeal to you to give positive meaning to your eloquent support of coal mine safety, in your special message to the Congress on March 4, 1969, when you so well stated: "Acceptance of the possibility of death in the mines has become almost as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels. The time has come to replace this fatalism with hope by substituting action for words. Catastrophes in the coal mines are not inevitable. They can be prevented, and they must be prevented."

I appeal to you to end the "benign neglect" which has apparently gripped those charged with enforcing the mine safety law. The coal miners of the nation are once again trapped by the system, as the goal of production outweighs protection. The one agency charged with protecting the public interest has lost its backbone, its will, and even brushes aside its express authority granted by Congress to protect those human beings who labor in the coal pits of the nation.

Perhaps the most flagrant violation of the law which Congress passed and you signed on December 30, 1969, is the requirement for one spot inspection per week of coal mines with a history of hazardous conditions. This provision covers some 200 mines throughout the nation, but instead of 200 inspections per week since the safety provisions became effective, there have been an average of scarcely 20 per week. Coal miners have gone to their deaths in many uninspected mines. The record of injuries is mounting.

As a Representative of one of the largest coal-producing counties in the nation, I can report to you that the coal miners in my area are angry, restless and bitter over this benign neglect. Their hopes were raised after the Farmington disaster of November 20, 1968,

when a shocked nation demanded that positive steps must be taken to protect those working in the mines. The Congress acted, and declared as national public policy that "the first priority and concern of all in the coal mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner."

Please, Mr. President, don't let this dangerous situation get completely out of hand. The rumblings of revolt in the coal fields are real. Right now the coal industry is mounting heavy pressure to revise and weaken the law in order to put even greater emphasis on production rather than protection. The Bureau of Mines has adopted a posture of complete neutrality, bending to the pressure for production instead of aggressively moving to enforce the law and protect the miners who have little voice.

In this crisis, it is my feeling that only the President of the United States can effectively step in and insist that the law be enforced for the protection of the coal miners of the nation. When you signed the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act on December 30, 1969, you stated: "It represents a crucially needed step forward in the protection of America's coal miners." Nearly 150,000 coal miners throughout the nation eagerly await your decision.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

WE HAVE CHOSEN THE WAY OF ATHENS

(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, it was an honor for me to be present last Saturday afternoon, June 27 at the dedication of the new McGhee Hall residential unit on the banks of the Ohio River at the Green Acres Center for the Mentally Retarded. The hall is named in honor of Mrs. O. W. "Sadie" McGhee, chairman of the board of directors of Green Acres, who has worked many long hours to make this dream come true.

The main speaker on the program was West Virginia's mental health director, Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman. She very aptly pointed out that in choosing the "way of Athens," we like the Athenians have considered the physical body, regardless of its handicaps, as "the temple of the soul."

The dedication of McGhee Hall in reality exemplifies the dedication which many devoted people like Sadie McGhee have shown. These loyal individuals worked closely together to overcome red tape, frustration, lack of funds and countless other obstacles so that they might provide the highest quality of care for the handicapped of the area.

The list of hard-working individuals and organizations who worked to bring this dream to reality is a long one, and I will not attempt to name all of those who took part. But we should not overlook the many hours of free time donated by Steelworkers Local No. 40, the Beverly Hills Women's Club, the Huntington Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Junior Women's Club, the Pilot Club, the Cabell County Board of Education, and the Cabell, Mason, and Wayne County Courts.

In addition to the article in the June 28 issue of the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser concerning this ceremony, I would also like to include an item which appeared in the June 29 New York Times concerning the shortage in funds for mental health centers. This Congress must be alert to the serious needs in this area.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Examiner, June 28, 1970]

GREEN ACRES CENTER DEDICATES "MCGHEE HALL"

"We have chosen the way of Athens," West Virginia Mental Health Director Mildred Mitchell-Bateman declared Saturday as she dedicated the new McGhee Hall residential unit at the Green Acres Center for the Mentally Retarded at Lesage.

Dr. Bateman explained her remark by pointing out that the people of Sparta "managed to find ways of doing away with their handicapped people." On the other hand, she noted, the Athenians considered the physical body, regardless of its handicaps, as the temple of the soul, and they developed ways to care for their handicapped. Thus, she said "We have chosen the way of Athens in developing facilities such as Green Acres."

A crowd of nearly 200 turned out in threatening weather for the dedication of the new unit, named in honor of Mrs. O. W. McGhee, chairman of the Green Acres board of directors and a leader in the development of the center.

Mrs. McGhee declared, "This is the most wonderful day of my life. It's like going downstairs on Christmas morning and finding on the Christmas tree the gift you've dreamed of having for so many years."

While visibly touched and pleased with the new McGhee Hall, Mrs. McGhee noted that much remains to be accomplished in the development of Green Acres. "We must have the will to set out body on this venture," she said. "This is only the first step, the first chord of a symphony."

Dr. Bateman was introduced by Dr. Allen Blumberg, former coordinator for the West Virginia Commission on Mental Retardation and another of the key figures in the establishment of Green Acres. The Green Acres board voted June 17 to recognize his contribution to the program by naming the new administration building in his honor.

Also speaking during the brief ceremony was David H. McGinnis, former chairman of the Green Acres board, who stressed that Green Acres was a community effort, pointing out the many organizations and individuals in the area which have made the center a reality.

Dr. Bateman too stressed the role of the community. "The state has planned well and we have a good foundation on which to build," she said, noting that the programs for the mentally ill and mentally retarded will proceed, however, "only to the extent that volunteers such as those who have built Green Acres make these plans work."

She pointed out the many frustrations and the massive amounts of work that go into the development of such facilities. Holding her hand above her head, she remarked, "I'll bet if we assembled all the papers that have gone into developing Green Acres alone, the stack would be this high." On the other hand, she said "It's all worth while. It's worth all that needs to be done."

Dr. Blumberg presented her with a serving tray manufactured by the Green Acres workshop, commenting: "You can use this for the next stack of papers for Green Acres."

The center currently is serving more than 90 mentally retarded children and young adults in several programs geared to their various needs and capacities.

The invocation was given by Rev. B. R. Kincaid, pastor of the Wesleyan Church at

Lesage, and the benediction by Rev. E. E. Frye, pastor of the Rock of Ages Baptist Church of Guyandotte.

The Pilot Club of Huntington served refreshments during the open house following the dedication ceremonies.

[From the New York Times, June 29, 1970]

SIXTY-TWO MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS, BUILT OR EXPANDED WITH FEDERAL APPROVAL, FACE DENIAL OF PROMISED FUNDS

(By Sandra Blakeslee)

Citizens' groups interested in mental health in 100 communities around the country are waiting in suspense to hear from the Federal Government in the next few days whether years of painstaking work will end in disappointment.

Each community has either just built a new neighborhood mental health center or has made plans to expand an existing one. Each has had its project approved for staffing funds by the National Institute of Mental Health. Each has raised the necessary matching local money.

But interviews with local and Federal officials in recent days have disclosed that only 38 of the projects will receive the promised Federal grants.

The 62 others, the Government has decided, will be left to dispose of what they have done as best they can. In some cases that will mean abandoning the projects altogether.

The financial dilemma facing these community groups and the officials in Washington who encouraged them demonstrates the complexities and frustration at a time of economic fluctuation.

TWO FEDERAL POLICIES

It is Federal policy to promote local initiatives. It is also Federal policy to hold down Government spending. The new mental health projects were caught in between.

One of them, the Raritan Bay Mental Health Center at Perth Amboy, N.J., has generated wide community approval.

"We have had every community action group going supporting us on this thing," said Dr. Robert P. Nenko, interim director of the center. "We've covered every angle we could think of in terms of supplying the mental health needs of the people in the community."

The new center, constructed at Federal expense and meant to serve 200,000 people from South Amboy, Woodbridge and Cartaret as well as Perth Amboy, has taken four years to plan, Dr. Nenko said.

The center is to provide a day hospital program; two classrooms for disturbed children; a children's clinic; an adult clinic; clinic for drug addicts and alcoholism; six poverty-area centers; a 24-bed inpatient ward at a nearby hospital; a 24-hour crisis walk-in clinic; a crisis intervention telephone service; an aftercare clinic for patients released from state mental hospitals, and family planning, immunization and prenatal care services.

\$592,000 IN LOCAL FUNDS

The price to the community for these mental health services is \$592,000 for the first year. The money has been raised. Some people have been hired, others have been promised jobs. But now the Federal contribution, \$808,000, is in doubt.

"We're in the ridiculous and disgraceful position of having a building and maybe not being given the operating money that was promised," said George Otlowski, supervisor of Middlesex County.

If the Raritan Bay Mental Health Center does not get the Federal grant, Mr. Otlowski said, the new two-story building with its polished halls and brick facade may be turned over to the police for use as a training academy.

How did all this happen? According to officials at the National Institute of Mental Health and at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the answer is a case study in the pull and haul of Federal budget-making.

In the fiscal year 1970, which ends tomorrow, the mental health institute was allocated about \$47.5-million in staffing grants to mete out to both continuing centers that had been guaranteed aid and to new or expanding centers that had only been promised aid. After the continuing programs were accommodated, \$19.3-million was left.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY FIVE NEW REQUESTS

During the fiscal year, 125 new grant requests were made and approved by a reviewing committee at the institute. The committee considered only whether the community projects were ready to get under way.

But the \$19.3-million would fund only 63 of these projects. To pay for all 125, the institute said, an additional \$20-million would have been necessary. In the past the extra money might have been advanced from the next fiscal budget, but this time no funds were available.

Of the 63 projects that will be funded, 25 have already been notified. Thus 38 "winners" and 62 "losers" are still waiting to be told.

According to officials at the institute, decisions on which projects would receive funds were based on such factors as participation in model cities programs (affiliated centers were given priority) and need as determined by state recommendations. An attempt was made to give each state at least one grant, officials said. Politics, they said, played no part in the choices.

In his 1971 budget message last January, President Nixon asked for no new construction funds for community mental health centers but he did request \$60.1-million for staffing grants.

Thus at first glance it would seem that the institute had money in the new fiscal budget to pay for new staffing grants. But that is not the case. The funds will go to continuing programs, which the institute is obligated to support.

ACTION BY CONGRESS

As another complicating factor, Congress has amended the Community Mental Health Act to authorize increased spending (As distinct from appropriating increased funds) for construction and staffing of neighborhood mental health centers.

Despite the tight budget, institute officials say, Congress has thus encouraged communities to keep planning, building and expanding mental health centers.

The authorized funds have not and may not ever come through, the officials say, but they are now obligated to make provisions for grants at the new, more expensive levels.

President Nixon, as he signed the legislation last March, voiced reservations, saying he thought that it would raise false hopes and that Congress could not be expected to appropriate the authorized funds.

The President's budget request of \$60.1-million is now before committees in both the House and Senate. Informed sources at the institute are hopeful that Congress will increase their appropriations despite the President's objections.

But what Congress appropriates and what the Bureau of the Budget ultimately allocates, they say, may be two quite different figures.

Meanwhile, in Perth Amboy and presumably other communities awaiting word on the fate of their mental health projects, suspense is beginning to be colored by bitterness.

"It is quasi-criminal," Mr. Otlowski said, "to give people this kind of hope, to put up the building and then have it stand there like some monument for pigeons."

THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY

(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, last Saturday night proved to be one of the most enjoyable evenings I have ever experienced, attending the West Virginia State convention of the Izaak Walton League in Huntington. We were treated to a brilliant address by Robert L. Herbst, national executive director of the Izaak Walton League, the text of which follows. Also are the news articles on Saturday's meetings which appeared in the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser:

THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY

(Address by Robert L. Herbst)

The decade of the 1960's was really the "decade of space". We proudly landed men on the moon and brought them safely back. This planet visited another. Now, we are entering a new decade—perhaps the most important decade in the history of man. The 1970's will be a decade of "Environmental Decision". Either this nation, and indeed the world, makes a total commitment to maintain and improve our quality of life, or we will go the way of poverty, degradation, and decay—threatening the existence of the human race itself. I would strongly emphasize that whether or not the 1970's are named "The decade of environmental decision" makes no difference—it will be!

The future of humanity will rest on the interest and action of man to provide a quality environment.

Listen to this challenge: Let us today focus our attention on man's beginning—and the obligations that have been entrusted to our race.

The very first sentence of the bible states "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth".

Yes, we have been given the earth and its riches. We have been given dominion over these riches and charged as wise stewards of the earth—the sea—and all living things. I would like to share with you the definition of Stewardship as written by Robert Hatch.

STEWARDSHIP

"The earth is the Lord's, says the Psalmist, and all that therein is. The trackless forests, the rivers that wind across our continent, the marsh lands, the prairies and the deserts—all were made by Him.

"Man did not create the riches that are spread before him. All of these have been loaned to him as a trust. None of it really belongs to him. His days are as grass and when the span of life is over he is the owner of nothing on earth. For a time he is called to be a steward of the riches of the earth leaving them as a goodly inheritance to his children. He is given dominion over the works of his Creator, but such dominion is a frightening responsibility. One look at a dust bowl, or at a poisoned stream, or a landscape blackened by fire shows how grave the responsibility can be.

"Conservation teaches the principles of wise stewardship. It counsels foresight in place of selfishness, vision in place of greed, reverence in place of destructiveness. Conservation involves concern for other generations. It sees beyond the immediate and the temporary. It takes into consideration not only our own generation, but future generations as well. It recognizes the rights of people who are not yet born, citizens who will inherit this land a thousand years from now. It reminds us that they too have the right to enjoy what we enjoy, to profit

from the same things, to be inspired by them as we are inspired and to love them as we love them today. Conservation is designed to preserve the riches of the earth for human happiness and welfare to the end of time."

Natural resources are the foundation of our world economy and provide us with much of our recreation. The manner in which we develop, protect and use our natural resources is extremely important. The well-being of our citizens and our standard of living is directly involved.

To put it bluntly: Our standard of living can be no higher than the standard of our natural resources.

Natural resources supplies are, for the most part, on the decrease. Add to this factor an expanding population, modern and more rapid means of transportation, increasing income, leisure time and development of new natural resource uses. It is obvious that the demands on our natural resources are accelerating at an alarming rate.

The competition of conflicting demands is also evident. The inherent controversy in land and water use is illustrated in Minnesota's Boundary Waters Canoe Area; in The Everglades; in the proposed Voyageurs National Park; in the Redwoods; in Big Walnut Valley; the Cascades, the Allagash; the Wild Rivers; by the timber industries need for increased supplies for the future; by the mounting pressures occasioned by water use; new mineral discoveries; space technology; and the advent of machinery that can go anywhere.

I have found the interest in natural resources intense, the demands for their use heavy and accelerating, and the need for a proper balance of use consistent with a minimum of adverse effects critical.

In the past, as you well realize, our predecessors and ourselves have been careless with the care of our natural resources. We have excessively harvested much of our forest land; we have thoughtlessly burned our grass, brush, and forest areas; we have slaughtered some of our wildlife species, several to the point of extinction; we have tendered the care of our soils poorly, which in some cases had led to economic disaster; we have wasted our water and in many cases disposed of it with no thought of future consequences; we have mined and left areas in scenic ruin; we have left litter here, there and everywhere; we have painted our name and other priceless information on rock formations, bridges, statues, etc.

I would like to cite a few misuses of our environment to illustrate our lack of concern:

1. *Litter & unsightliness* is a national disgrace—an "ugly blot" on our landscape. We thoughtlessly leave our garbage next to roads, scatter pop bottles on our beaches, leave wrappers here and there and everywhere, shoot up highway markers, scribble our name and other priceless information on rock formations, carve love notes on trees, etc.

Specifically:

Litter—Caused by Ness Family—Carelessness! Selfish-ness! Malicious-ness!—costs to pick up one-half billion dollars a year.

At Yellowstone Park—Visitors managed to upset the natural mechanism of geysers. Park rangers even went so far as to sweep up pebbles so there would be no more to throw into the geyser. But, without pebbles, the blacktop path was torn up by visitors and the fragments tossed into the geyser.

At Moran Point in the Grand Canyon—Adventuresome teenagers, dangling precariously from ropes, painted their names in foot and a half high letters. They paid \$150 in fines. But, it cost you and I (also known as the taxpayer) far more to erase the damage.

Quinalt Indians Close Beach Strip in Northern Washington because of the litter and misuse of the area by the public.

Along 90 miles of Chicago Freeway—Cleanup yielded 50 dead animals in one month alone. Among the animals picked up were several crates of chickens and a sack of kittens.

In Texas—Highway officials listed the following oddities picked up along roadsides: A transistor radio (playing); a loaded revolver; a fully-equipped doctor's satchel; a case of beer; a trombone and an artificial leg. Somebody really had a party!

2. *Water*.—Look what we have done to our water! Our State of Minnesota is an example: Minnesota, the "land of sky blue waters" is water rich. But are we? In recent history over 3,000 of Minnesota's lakes have disappeared, approximately 100,000 pot holes have been drained and over ten million acres of land has received some form of drainage from 50,000 miles of drainage ditches. The Mississippi River is laden with sickening pollution, famed Lake Minnetonka is now green, and the largest fresh water lake in the world—Lake Superior—is starting to show effects from waste disposal.

Just Recently—Many fish in the Rhine River system in Europe turned up dead from chemical pollution.

Permanent closing of Chicago Beaches by the summer of 1971 is a possibility because of increasing pollution on Lake Michigan.

According to the World Health Organization, one of every four hospital beds throughout the world is occupied by a patient suffering from a water or filth borne disease. (Medical News August 1, 1969)

Only one of seven in the world today enjoys water from a faucet.

3. *Chemical Pollution*.—The chemical field is certainly one where our technical ability is overshadowing our foresight. Many chemicals are on the market and in use today for which environmental effects are unknown or little known.

The case against the "hard herbicide and pesticides" is strong. Thousands of pages, research, testimony, and examples show that the trend is one of "poisoning" our earth. It is true that many of these chemicals have been beneficial and in some cases been proclaimed "Miracles." But it's also true that they remain toxic for many years and post critical environmental implications. Even Penguins at the South Pole are carrying DDT in their bodies.

This generation is the first in history to have radioactive strontium 90 in their bones, DDT in their fat, asbestos in their lungs, and radioactive iodine in their thyroids.

4. *Land Filling*.—Is a creeping destruction of all estuarine areas in the United States. It is a practice that results in pollution, fisheries effects, wildlife habitat destruction, erosion of aesthetic values, etc. One example is the bay and estuaries of California: One fourth has been filled in during the past 100 years.

5. *Air Pollution*.—Has become a serious problem not only in individual areas but throughout the United States. This problem is affecting our Nation's health, airline safety, and many other values. One example of the fact that high concentrations of air pollution are affecting health and human life is in New York City. According to "Pennsylvania Health—Summer of 1969" in November of 1953 between 160 and 220 excess deaths were attributed to pollution. In 1963 more than 400 excess deaths reportedly took place during a 15-day period of extremely high pollution levels. In London, England thousands of deaths have been attributed to air pollution.

6. *Solid Waste*.—The comment that we may become knee deep in garbage is not too far fetched. Every day—each of us generates about 4½ pounds of solid waste. This means something like 800,000,000 to a billion pounds a day in the United States—and the future will hold a considerable increase.

It is true—man holds the fate, and future

benefits, of all resources in his hand. Which, in turn, means he controls the future of his own race.

An example of this responsibility can be illustrated by the bottle I hold in my hand. I hold enough tree seeds to reforest 40 acres—in other words, I am holding the potential of a 40-acre forest in my hand—just as we hold the future of all resources in our hands. This potential forest, as the seeds would sprout and grow into mature trees, can provide many things for us. It might provide one or several forest products (and there are over 5,000); it might control erosion; it might provide food and cover for wildlife; it might store precious water; it might provide many recreational opportunities; and it will be esthetically beautiful. All, if we do what?—Practice conservation!

Conservation today can be defined as "the wise use of our total environment of which we are an integral part". In order to maintain and increase the benefits from our natural resource supply, we must continually identify problems and accelerate our conservation efforts.

During these times of unprecedented change, it has become increasingly apparent that man must have a greater understanding of his environment. Technology has out-paced man's understanding of environmental implications, his cleverness and greed has grown faster than his wisdom. Our preoccupation with material gain, and our American obsession with dollar returns is too often at the expense of our outdoor heritage. We have radically altered the face of our earth both quantitatively and qualitatively.

If we are to coexist in our environment rather than exist, we must gain an understanding and an appreciation of our environment.

Looking to the future, I would conclude that the natural resource challenges confronting us are, in a very real sense, frightening to contemplate. We cannot afford a selfish, narrow field of vision. We simply cannot afford to be wrong. It is my conviction that *the future of humanity itself is at stake*.

The greatest crisis of our time is to be found in our environment. It is to be found in the quality of our environment—or in the lack of it. And the greatest challenge of today is to confront the crisis. And to do something about it—*Right now!*

Our job is to get across to every man, woman and child that conservation is not a superficial something involving shooting a duck or catching a fish. Conservation is not something out there—*outside* the cities—out in the rural areas.

Conservation concerns, in addition to rural areas, go to the very heart of our cities. Conservation is concerned with the slums, the ghettos, the islands of despair in our metropolitan areas.

The broad conservation concern is the ecological ethic—man and his interrelationships with his environment. We have been saying that conservation is the wise management of our natural resources. But we must say more!

We must insist that conservation is the wise management of our total environment. And we must insist that the root of environmental concern; the root of activation long past due—the *root of action is in conservation education*.

What has education to do with conservation? Everything!

How can a child know the joy of fishing, or swimming, or boating when he is confronted by a Mississippi River, laden with sickening pollution? What yardstick does he acquire to measure wholesomeness, and cleanness, and purity and clarity when he must contemplate the blackness of man's effluents?

How can a child know the exhilaration of blue sky and sunlight and good health when the heavens are shrouded with smog,

when his very world is closed in by gloom in the air and in his lungs?

How can a child know that the roof over his head, the metal in his set of wheels, the plastics of his possessions—the very food and fiber which determines the level of the quality of his life. How can he know these things are the by-products of natural resources when he is fenced in by freeways and concrete and steel.

How can the youngster know, when urban planning takes place with no consideration for open space, with saving the small woodland . . . with saving the marsh? . . . how can he know a feeling for the earth, or for the song of a bird, when built into our suburbs the identical conditions we flee from when we leave the heartland of metropolises. How can he become a conservation-minded adult when we fail to provide a good example. How can he be a steward if we are not.

And to compound our problems, we are confronted by a population explosion on this planet which is staggering in its implications:

Every minute of every day—24 hours around the clock—we lose 3 to 5 acres of green space to highways, shopping centers, housing, factories, urban spread . . . and a good share of this green space is representative of some of the most productive land—land which produces our food and fiber and our outdoor recreation—in the United States.

We can see the enormity of the problem when we look at the cold statistics.

(1) Thousands of years were required to produce the first billion people on earth.

(2) The second billion people took about 75 years to produce.

(3) The third billion was reached in 1960 after only 35 years.

(4) The fourth billion will appear on this planet in only 7 years.

(5) By the year 2000, according to United Nation's census experts, we will have doubled our present population—and the population of this earth will probably exceed 7 billion!

In other words, today's population which was taken since the beginning of time—will double in 30 more years.

With these types of pressures and needs it holds that we must do everything possible to conserve and properly develop all elements of our environment.

However, it seems that four environmental areas call for special attention at the present time.

I. Water.—The vital resource which is the basis of all life: This earth has been blessed with an abundance of water. The world's total supply of water has been estimated to be about 322 million cubic miles. The same glass of water we drink today has been with us since the beginning of time—just used, reused, and a little lost in the process. We add no new water to our world supply.

Despite an abundance of water in many forms—its distribution is not uniform and we are, in addition, continuing to waste and pollute. Not only are we a nation faced with the threat of thirst in some areas but we are losing, and will continue to lose, some of our other uses of water—such as recreation.

Proper management and use is necessary to retain a quality supply of water for our generation and future generations.

II. Improved Wildlife Resources.—Game and fish are valued by the hunter, fisherman, sightseer, photographer, student, trapper and, in fact—all. Up-to-date game and fish management techniques, research and enforcement of game and fish laws are essential to assure a continuing supply of these resources.

A special effort is needed in this field to maintain and improve these resources for aesthetic and financial benefit to our states and our Nation as a whole.

III. Urban Development and Its Effect on Industrial Development with care to Natural Resources.—Planned urbanization

minimize adverse effects on the environment is extremely important. With our mushrooming population, a reduced supply of natural resources, new uses, more free time, it holds that more effort will be needed to develop wise land and water use.

IV. Aesthetics.—The beauty of our countryside, urban areas and metropolitan centers is important for industry, tourism, and the enjoyment of life by our citizens. Pleasing architecture, proper design of roads, anti-litter, landscaping, preservation of open space, providing for outdoor recreation, and the controlled development of scenic areas are most important to our quality of life.

Within these four critical environmental areas are many current crises—among the most important for us to place high priority for action on, are:

Air and Water Pollution.
Invasion of our Estuaries.
Landscape Preservation and Reclamation.
Urban Threats—Atomic Generation, Airport Location, etc.

What needs to be done—The nations of the world must get together on protecting the environment. It is vital to the security of all. Each nation shares with all others a common interest and concern for basics—water, air, food, fibre.

Just this past November, a UNESCO Conference was held in San Francisco. 1972—all nations through the U.N. will be meeting to discuss our environment in Stockholm, Sweden.

As an example of some of the things that need doing, I would cite my recommendations to the President of this country. Similar areas for study and action exist in other countries.

1. Federal agencies centralization needed. Cabinet level coordination needed. Agencies having dual role of promotion and regulation should be closely examined. (This is the wearing of "Two hats".)

2. Pesticides, herbicides and other chemical regulation.

3. Urban expansion. Encouragement of new cities—separate from existing. Federal assistance to increase mass transit and reduce number of cars in use. Proper land and water planning—taking into account the need for open space in urban planning.

4. Recognition of esthetic and ecological factors in public works planning. Not only recognition, but a heavier weighing of these values in the decisionmaking process.

5. National commitment to environmental conservation education. All citizens need an understanding and an appreciation of our environment. "Leisure Time" education is important. Encouragement for the training of specialists in the conservation field.

6. A system of program evaluation needs to be developed.

7. A new system to measure economic progress is needed—a measuring stick for non-tangible areas.

8. Federal role in air and water pollution—National and regional regulatory effort is needed as problems do not stop at municipal or state borders.

9. Consumer protection is needed for environmental threats.

10. Federal appropriations: Pollution construction grants. Land and water conservation fund. Yet, unauthorized federal recreation areas.

11. Mining laws need complete revamping.
12. Airport location—Environmental effects need close examination and weighing in the site selection process.

13. Environmental technology research branch or agency which can set forth desirable performance parameters for all forms of waste treatment systems should be established.

14. Tax structures for industry—environmental appreciation incentive.

15. Agencies need to make "multiple use" work better. More application of technology

and capital investment must be applied to secondary demands.

16. Joint management plans should be developed by both federal and state agencies for wetlands in a state. (Other resource areas could also be handled similarly.)

17. Intensify efforts to stimulate youth thinking and action by creating awareness in them individually and in their organizations to the end that they become directly involved in the critical environmental issues of our time. The nation is becoming younger.

18. Encouragement of states to adopt—flood plain zoning—lake shore zoning—public water use zoning.

19. Encouragement in the area of "waste utilization".

20. Outer Continental Shelf—areas of social and biological values need to be identified and preserved. Shelf itself needs firm identification.

21. Study and action—to provide optimum population levels—and location.

I stressed that these and other areas need examination and action. However, *in total—I urged the administration to develop an all-out effort to maintain and improve quality of life for mankind.* In our world as a whole—all governments, industries, and citizens need to make the decision for environmental quality.

IN CONCLUSION

In the end,

There was Earth, and it was with form and beauty.

And men dwelt upon the lands of the Earth, the meadows and trees, and he said

"Let us build our dwellings in this place of beauty."

And he built cities and covered the Earth with concrete and steel.

And the meadows were gone.

And man said, "It is good."

On the second day, man looked upon the waters of the Earth.

And man said, "Let us put our wastes in the waters that the dirt will be washed away."

And man did.

And the waters became polluted and foul in their smell.

And man said, "It is good."

On the third day, man looked upon the forests of the Earth and saw they were beautiful.

And man said, "Let us cut the timber for our homes and grind the wood for our use."

And man did. And the lands became barren and the trees were gone.

And man said, "It is good."

On the fourth day, man saw that animals were in abundance and ran in the fields and played in the sun. And man said, "Let us cage these animals for our amusement and kill them for our sport."

And man did. And there were no more animals on the face of the Earth.

And man said, "It is good."

On the fifth day, man breathed the air of the Earth. And man said,

"Let us dispose of our wastes into the air for the winds to blow them away."

And man did. And the air became heavy with dust and choked and burned.

And man said, "It is good."

On the sixth day, man saw himself, and seeing the many languages and tongues, he feared and hated. And man said, "Let us build great machines and destroy those lest they destroy us." And man built great machines and the Earth was fired with the rage of great wars.

And man said, "It is good."

On the seventh day, man rested from his labors and the Earth was still, for man no longer dwelt upon the earth. And it was good.

—Kenneth Ross.

Upper Moreland High School Pennsylvania. This thought, written by a high school lad, isn't exactly the case as our care of natural resources isn't all negative. In fact, we have many positive conservation efforts to be proud of. Also, methods of using our resources such as logging, fishing, and hunting can be beneficial to the resource when properly done.

But, again, we are reminded that individually and collectively man is responsible for the condition of his own environment. And we are reminded that nature will react when natural resources are over-used.

Is man an endangered species? Not if you and I become concerned and do something about our environment and the environment we leave for our children and their children. Not if we enlist the active support of many others to join with us as members of a conservation organization such as the Izaak Walton League. Not if we all become involved and active—as good citizens of this United States of America.

If we as American citizens are to continue our leadership in world affairs; if other nations are to continue to look to us for leadership, inspiration and hope, it holds that we must explore every means of conserving and developing our bounty.

Looking ahead, it is essential that every citizen have a basic understanding of the natural resources, their benefits, their problems, and the management practices needed for wise use, development, and protection. A strong and effective environmental conservation education program needs to be carried out by our League; other conservation organizations; and our schools; churches; conservation agencies; and news media.

Individually, and collectively, man is responsible for the condition of his environment. Providing a quality environment for our generation and future generations will rest on the interest of man to do so and the tools with which he has to do the job.

CONSERVATION IS NOT A LAUGHING MATTER

I recently had the opportunity to chat with our Wilderness Consultant—Author, Sig Olson—on "Listening Point", the object of one of his outstanding books. As we reminisced about conservation matters, Sig related that he had once been called a member of the "daffodil set of conservationists".

As conservationists, we have sometimes been called: "Old ladies with tennis shoes"; "Extremists"; "Doom predictors"; "Purists"; "Fuddy Duddies"; "Overly concerned"; "cricket chasers"; "butterfly chasers"; etc.

But, are we? I think not! Reflect for a moment on what has and is happening to our natural resources—our woods—water—wildlife—soil—and air. We have radically altered the face of our earth both qualitatively and quantitatively.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

World population will double in 25-30 years.

Forestry experts predict a doubling of demand for wood fiber in the United States by the year 2000. Apply this pressure and other uses of forests to a forest $\frac{2}{3}$ the acreage of what it was when the white man first came.

Water experts guess that the needs for water will triple by the year 2000. Apply this pressure to a resource which is constantly being reduced in quality.

Outdoor Recreation demands will probably quadruple by the year 2000.

Food needs for increased population will accelerate at an alarming rate. Presently, $\frac{2}{3}$ of the world's population exist on nutritionally inadequate diets. It appears that this problem will become increasingly acute in the years ahead.

Air—Cough! Cough! We presently replace only 60% of the oxygen in the United States that we use. Some scientists have made dire predictions for the human race if present trend continues.

We are in trouble and the name callers and the sleepers had better wake up—or they won't I say, thank God for the Izaak Walton League, other conservation groups, and the individuals that are concerned for the future of humanity.

What bothers me and many others is—those that are blind or indifferent.

As a nation, we have just recently landed men on the moon. This is a feat we are all proud of. This goal has cost our nation billions of dollars. Compare our Space expenditures to our Conservation expenditures.

Our Space Program has had many benefits. However, now that we have reached the moon, it appears to be an environment not conducive to the type of life as we know it. I don't foresee many of our people moving to the moon. Most of us and future generations will stay here on earth.

Now, couldn't we harness this same type of emphasis, this same type of technical ability, this same type of expenditure, this same type of national pride to solve the conservation problems of the place where we do live—the earth's environment?

Couldn't we who have been given dominion and superior intelligence over this earth take care of the resources we are dependent on for our existence?

We must have the spirit of "Environmental Quality" in our thinking. We must have the "future" in our thinking, and proceed from there. This is our challenge! This is our obligation! We must reach people!

Numbers and habits of people are our problem. The solution to both benefits people and, perhaps, determines whether or not we will have people!

We can't put a glass box around the world and look at our planet in a pure wilderness condition—because people must live—economic progress must take place—so we will have to effect the environment. But, on the other hand, these effects must be minimal because, in a sense, the world really is enclosed by a box and we are on the inside. All the resources we have are all we have!

What is the Izaak Walton League doing to preserve our environment?

PLENTY

We've had thousands of projects to better outdoor America. Let's just review a few of our recent activities:

Increased Anti-Litter program.
Co-Petitioner to ban DDT—Wisconsin.
Legal suit in Washington, D.C. to decertify DDT.

Law Suit to stop mining in Boundary Waters Canoe Area of Northern Minnesota.

Legal efforts in Maryland on Wetland filing leading to wetlands legislation.

Effort to stop wetland destruction in New Jersey.

Hunt America Time Program.
New T.V. Film (60 T.V. Stations).

Appearances by self and others throughout United States on radio, TV and before hundreds of meetings on conservation. I've been from one corner of the United States to the other. From the school to the Izaak Walton League chapter to the radio mike to the White House to the ears of many citizens, public officials, media people, etc.

Youth education. School information sheets in the works and proposed education study. Assist in development of conservation legislation.

Citizens' Crusade Clean Water (Increased appropriation from \$214 million to \$800 million).

Fishing Pier—Los Angeles.
Conservation-Education coordinated in several states.

Work with Boy Scouts of America to de-

velop their 1971 Good Turn Project on Conservation.

New brochures on major issues. Plan on several new general type-color for the League. Air hearing testimony throughout the Nation.

Analysis of major resource areas such as the Bridger and Monongahela National Forests.

Setting aside of important conservation areas (Hennepin Canal-Illinois, Goose Lake Prairie-Illinois, Wildlife Area—Los Angeles.)

Work to save wildlife such as Purple Fever Project in Kansas.

Regular mailings to officers, state presidents, etc.

Considerable work with national magazines, news media, etc.

Testimony in many conservation bills such as Golden Eagle Passport, appropriations, timber supply act, and state legislation.

United States broken into five regions for League work. (Will hire two regional representatives this year.)

Work with groups such as Kiwanis International to develop Conservation Act.

Encouragement of churches to become involved in environmental issues.

Task Force member St. Croix River donation.

Financial condition improved—1969 saw surplus of income over expenses.

Membership up.
Thousands of mailings to students and teachers on conservation.

Advisor to White House.
Conservation is on the move! The Izaak Walton League is on the move!

Let's shift gears and keep moving to provide a quality of life for our generation and future generations.

Thank you,

ROBERT L. HERBST.

SAY OUR SURVIVAL IS AT STAKE: LEAGUE TO ACT ON RESOLUTIONS URGING ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION

Noting that "conservation today involves a new, impelling dimension—the very question of survival," the Resolutions Committee of the West Virginia Division of the Izaak Walton League this afternoon will present resolutions dealing with environmental issues ranging from the supersonic transport to Ohio River pollution and from birth control to severance taxes.

Some of the major proposed resolutions on which the delegates will vote:

That the West Virginia Legislature adopt legislation creating a severance tax on natural resources, especially on coal; that a portion of such monies be earmarked for the purchase of mineral rights relevant to the Dolly Sods, Otter Creek and Cranberry Back Country areas and such rights be held in abeyance until such time as required for the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation necessary for federal purchases of such rights.

That the President and the Congress declare as a failure present interstate cooperation to save the Ohio River from pollution. And that the Secretary of the Interior be empowered with all rights and funds to establish a task force that will establish (a) water quality standards that provide for water that enhances the opportunity for water contact recreation, safe and palatable drinking water, and water that enhances the growth and reproduction of aquatic life, and (b) assist local and state governments in planning and implementing programs of zoning and land acquisition so as to provide parks and other recreation areas and clean, attractive shore lines.

That the practice of strip mining in the coal fields of Appalachia, and particularly West Virginia and eastern Kentucky, be prohibited in areas where the surface to be disturbed exceeds 20 degrees in slope.

That the supersonic transport, the Cross-

Florida Barge Canal, the Salem Church Dam in Virginia, and similar public projects which result in severe environmental damage, be repudiated as misallocations of natural resources.

That the nation undertake scientific research and encourage and implement the necessary policies, attitudes, social standards and programs which will . . . bring about the stabilization of the population.

Other resolutions deal with stricter pollution laws, reclamation of "orphan" strip-mined land, greater financial support of the State Department of Natural Resources to enable it to better enforce existing laws, and for a program of conservation education in West Virginia.

Three other resolutions deal with timber and the controversy over timbering practices in Monongahela National Forest:

That the State Legislature recognize the concern of the people . . . for their forest lands, whether it be public or private lands in question, and that a "Timber Management Practice Act" be adopted whereby ALL values of all the forests, including aesthetics, shall have equal consideration.

That (the state's congressional delegation), exert every effort and influence to assure the adoption of H.R. 17774 and S. 3937 declaring wilderness status . . . for Dolly Sods, Otter Creek and the Cranberry Back Country (totaling some 81,000 acres in Monongahela National Forest).

That the West Virginia Division commends the legislators of this state for their evaluation of the timber management practices on the Monongahela National Forest and subsequent action of a commission to provide a detailed study of these practices.

NIXON'S ORDER TO INCREASE PRODUCTION OF TIMBER UNWISE, SAYS WALTON LEADER

The national executive director of the Isaac Walton League Saturday night termed "unwise" President Nixon's order for increased timber production from the national forests of the United States.

Addressing the 23rd annual convention of the West Virginia Division of the Walton League, meeting in Huntington, Robert L. Herbst urged that the President retract the order "and recognize that by-passing the people and the legislators who represent them can only add to any distrust that may exist concerning his previous commitments that the decade of the 70's will be one that sees a reversal of the abuses to our environment."

The Chicagoan noted that conservationists were able earlier to stop "a raid on our national forests" when the U.S. House of Representatives defeated "the National Timber Supply Act" several weeks ago. He termed President Nixon's order last week to increase timber production on the national forests "a means of circumventing the victory won by conservationists and the public just a few short weeks ago."

He hailed the West Virginia Division's battle against excessive timbering practices on Monongahela National Forest, particularly clearcutting. "We feel that only true multiple use of our public lands can resolve the controversy that exists, not only in West Virginia but throughout the public lands domain across this country."

Mr. Herbst also discussed strip mining, saying: "The devastation that is taking place on Appalachia's beautiful mountain slopes is an environmental tragedy. It is a blight on the conscience of our society for as we, the people, place more demands for cheaper electricity we somehow excuse ourselves from the ravages that it takes to supply this luxury. We are, in effect, destroying a beautiful region and rendering unto its inhabitants an environment unfit for human beings."

Mr. Herbst praised West Virginia for its recent strip mine legislation, however, terming it one of the strongest in the nation. He

said the Walton League will discuss strip mining during its national convention and will ask that the permissible degree of slope be reduced for contour mining. "We feel this will lead to the prohibition of strip mining on steep mountain slopes—and this, in our opinion, is the only answer to the present intolerable situation."

Discussing the Ohio River, he said: "The time has come for us to call a spade, a spade. The Ohio is a filthy river . . . in one instance it has been rated as the most polluted river in our nation . . . this trend of pollution must be stopped. It can be stopped if some of the states that are now dragging their feet will exert more effort to crack down on polluters and stop pollution at its source. 'Flushing' our waste on downstream is not the answer—our neighbors do not appreciate this so-called remedy."

Also addressing Saturday evening's banquet session was Ira S. Latimer, director of the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources. Discussing the controversy over "even aged management"—clearcutting—of forest lands, Mr. Latimer said the procedure "should be used only as one of many tools of modern forest management." Conservationists are opposing clearcutting on the Monongahela as the primary timber harvesting policy.

Mr. Latimer also noted that clearcutting is not being undertaken on state-owned forests. "This rumor is false," he declared. "A state forest timber management plan is now being completed but it includes even age management only as a tool."

Noting the problem of coal interests owning the mineral rights under national forest lands, he said he strongly favors acquisition by the U.S. Forest Service of mineral rights in the forests.

Turning to the water pollution problem, Mr. Latimer said his Water Resources Division—hampered by a limited staff—is doing an outstanding job. "A primary objective before the next session of the State Legislature will be to seek additional funding so we can do a better job in this field."

He termed as West Virginia's three major water pollution problems acid mine drainage, municipal sewage, and the industrial waste in the lower Kanawha Basin.

Serving as master of ceremonies at the banquet was Grover C. "Zip" Little Jr. of Kenova, national vice president of the League.

Entertainment was provided by the Ceredo-Kenova High School Dixieland Band, directed by Charles Oshel.

CONTROL OF TEXTILE AND APPAREL IMPORTS

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased last week to hear the testimony of Secretary of Commerce Stans before the Ways and Means Committee endorsing the principles of H.R. 16920, the bill to provide for reasonable controls of textile and apparel imports into the United States.

For the last 18 months, I have been privileged to observe the patient and determined efforts by President Nixon and Secretary Stans to negotiate an orderly textile import policy which would halt the eroding away of jobs in this major American industry. I wish to comment upon the sincerity of these efforts and to assure the Congress of President Nixon's personal commitment to a fair solution of the textile import problem. He is

to be commended for his understanding of the massive threat involved in this issue and for his perseverance toward achieving voluntary agreements without the necessity for legislation. The breakdown of the long negotiations announced last week is in no way a failure of effort upon the part of the U.S. Government.

During the past 2 months, I have concluded that the possibility of acceptable agreements was unlikely. Regrettable as this may be, we must now enact legislation providing reasonable protection for our domestic industry.

The growth of textile imports into the United States from low-wage-rate countries in Asia during the past 3 years is alarming and poses a threat we must meet.

Mr. Stans concluded in his testimony to the committee that without the passage of import quota legislation, he foresees an even greater flood of imports. The warning is clear and the hour is late. In a rare coalition of support for any single measure, considerably more than a majority of the Members of the House have joined with Congressman WILBUR MILLS in cosponsoring H.R. 16920. It is my hope that this measure can be brought to the floor within the near future so that the Congress can now work its will on this urgently needed legislation.

FOURTH OF JULY LETTER FROM A MARINE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we hear much in the news about Southeast Asia and our country's involvement in that part of the world. As the Fourth of July, the anniversary of our country's independence, approaches, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from one of my constituents serving with the 1st Marine Division in Vietnam, 1st Sgt. C. L. Waldrep of Gastonia, N.C., shares his thoughts on patriotism:

Fourth of July—the birth of America! What does this mean to you, Mr. Citizen? Do you love and appreciate your country and know what it represents, or are you one of the many pragmatists, interested only in your own self-gain? Think about it!

Our forefathers had a firm and unyielding belief in God and in the intrinsic worth of the individual. Through hardship and even death they defended these principles and passed down their heritage to our present generation. They offered their prayers and lives for a better future America, an America blessed by God where every man would have dignity and proudly echo the voice of freedom and democracy.

On this Fourth of July, commemorative of so much that is American, I, one citizen among millions, dedicate myself to the ideals and freedoms for which America stands. My faith in America and her future is the same as was espoused two hundred years ago. I live in a truly great country and am fortunate to wear the uniform of one of its defenders. My profession may speak for itself but it does not express how I feel about America. I am an active supporter of

patriotism. By patriotism I define a love for and a loyalty towards America, a determination to protect its interests and a devotion to its welfare. Patriotism is a challenge which calls all to her ranks who would call themselves Americans. At times, patriotism has demanded great sacrifice on the part of those who accept its definition. No sacrifice, however, is too great for this country!

As a citizen of this nation, under God, I have enjoyed privileges which are priceless. Sometimes I have taken them for granted, because they were given to me at birth. Seeing the misery of people in other countries, however, has reminded me how lucky I am to be an American. All over the world men are dying for these freedoms. America has assisted several countries in this end. As patriotism requires me to love my country and protect its interests whenever and wherever is deemed appropriate in the best judgment of its elected leaders, I am a loyal subject. I believe in the democratic process and in the wisdom of our elected officials and leaders.

On this Fourth of July, my life revolves around my God, my country, my family, and my Marine Corps—and in that order. I ask of you today to reflect on what has meaning to you.

Sincerely,

C. L. WALDREP.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 2 through July 16, on account of official business as U.S. adviser to Arms Control Conference and to attend SALT meetings and confer with U.S. representative at Paris Peace Conference.

Mr. DENNEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 29 through June 30, on account of official business as member of House Committee on Crime conducting hearings in New York.

Mr. FREY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 9, on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 9, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and balance of week, on account of family illness.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and Tuesday, June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 13, on account of official business.

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. HANNA, for 30 minutes, on June 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, for 20 minutes, on June 29.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, on June 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include there-in extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN, to revise and extend his remarks with respect to the conference reports agreed to today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. ROBISON in two instances.

Mr. BELCHER in two instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. CARTER in three instances.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mrs. DWYER in three instances.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. KING in two instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN in four instances.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. MIZELL in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARSTEIN.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. CABELL in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in five instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in five instances.

Mr. FLOOD in five instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. DIGGS in four instances.

Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 737. An act for the relief of Konrad Ludwig Staudinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Martens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1187. An act for the relief of Marcos Rojas Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1628. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, and related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2514. An act for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2661. An act for the relief of Kathryn Talbot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2916. An act to establish the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3122. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the Southern Division of the Southern District of Mississippi at Gulfport, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3167. An act for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3212. An act for the relief of Curtis Nolan Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3263. An act for the relief of Maria Pietrotti Lencl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3265. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Ordillas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3364. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Raul Jose Bruno Martorell y Fernandez (Jorge R. Martorell); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3461. An act for the relief of Dr. Amado G. Chanco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3675. An act for the relief of Ming Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3994. An act for the relief of 1st Sgt. Albert F. Thompson, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to extend the reporting date of the National Commission on Consumer Finance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1695. An act for the relief of Alfredo Caprara;

H.R. 1698. An act for the relief of Joeck Kuncek;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.;

H.R. 2315. An act for the relief of Jose-fina Policar Abutan Fullar;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Borgnino;

H.R. 4246. An act to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees;

H.R. 4247. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress and to provide equivalent authority for administrative settlement and payment of claims under section 2733 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, United States Code;

H.R. 4574. An act to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands;

H.R. 8512. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa;

H.R. 12941. An act to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13407. An act to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact;

H.R. 13740. An act for the relief of Kimball Bro. Lumber Co.;

H.R. 15021. An act to authorize the release of 40,200,000 pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15831. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15832. An act to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15833. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15835. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15836. An act to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

H.R. 15837. An act to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15838. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile.

H.R. 15839. An act to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15998. An act to authorize the disposal of Surinam-type metallurgical grade bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16289. An act to authorize the disposal of natural Ceylon amorphous lump graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16290. An act to authorize the disposal of refractory grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16291. An act to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16292. An act to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 16295. An act to authorize the disposal of natural battery grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16297. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 17399. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1259. Joint resolution to extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to July 30, 1970.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 26, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3908. For the relief of Elizabeth B. Borgnino;

H.R. 8512. To suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa; and

H.J. Res. 1259. To extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to June 30, 1970.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 30, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2155. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2156. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final conclusion of judicial proceedings in Docket No. 266, *The Pueblo de Acoma, plaintiff 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.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2157. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the costs of operating the nuclear merchant ship *Savannah*, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2158. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvement needed in the financial management system of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Department of the Interior; 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:

Mr. HALEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 12858 (Rept. No. 91-1241). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1118. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16065, a bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended (Rept. No. 91-1242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1119. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16327, a bill to amend the

Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 1238. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the National Commission on Consumer Finance (Rept. No. 91-1244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 15118. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ohio Northern University (Rept. No. 91-1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1455. An act to amend section 8c(2)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for marketing orders for apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio (Rept. No. 91-1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3598. An act to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as re-enacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11547. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to increase the loan limitation on certain loans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13978. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 17538. A bill to extend for 1 year the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 17809. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2043. A bill for the relief

of Keum Jo Kim; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4670. A bill for the relief of Ok Yon (Mrs. Charles G.) Kirsch; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5655. A bill for the relief of Low Yin (also known as Low Ying); with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAYNE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Tae Pung Hills; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12446. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Guadalupe Esparza-Montoya; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13265. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Frank J. Krec (Rept. No. 91-1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13997. A bill to confer citizenship to S. Sgt. Ryuzo Somma, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1259). 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. CELLER:

H.R. 18246. A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 18247. A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 18248. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18249. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 18250. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the Squaw Valley, Calif., to the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 18251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in the case of certain uses of tread rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. BARING, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DORN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 18252. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. BARING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 18253. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 18254. A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives, Members of the U.S. Senate, Justices and judges of the U.S. courts, and policymaking officials of the executive branch as designated by the Civil Service Commission, but including the President, Vice President, and Cabinet members; and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency; and to give the House Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the Attorney General of the United States appropriate jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 18255. A bill to reduce the pay of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 1281. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 1282. Joint resolution to proclaim the second week in July as National Salesmen's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1283. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Con. Res. 670. Concurrent resolution terminating the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, relating to the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Res. 1120. A resolution to set an expen-

diture limitation to the end that U.S. military forces be withdrawn from South Vietnam by June 30, 1971, and to express the sense of the House of Representatives that U.S. military forces should not be inserted into any nation where such forces are not now located unless specifically approved by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18256. A bill for the relief of Antonio Wong Campoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18257. A bill for the relief of Ciriaca G. David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18258. A bill for the relief of Lim Yue Kung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 18259. A bill for the relief of Charles Ahnert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

413. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, inviting the Honorable Wayne Aspinall and the Honorable John Saylor to address the Legislature of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

414. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the appropriation of funds for cancer research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

415. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to minimizing aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

416. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment of high-speed rail-service between the cities of Boston and New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

529. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Marine Corps League, Department of Florida, relative to Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

530. Also, petition of the Legislature of Erie County, New York, relative to the appropriation of funds for cancer research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

531. Also, petition of the Common Council, Lockport, N.Y., relative to the appropriation of funds for cancer research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE—Monday, June 29, 1970

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of every day and every week, we offer Thee the love of our hearts and the service of our minds for the duration of this Congress. Be with us to guide us and bless us until the last problem is solved and the last prayer is said. Use

us as ministers of hope and as emancipators of men imprisoned by superstition, or in slavery to evil passions, or in bondage to fear and injustice. Give us composure of soul and such inner certitude that we turn not back from the holy