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

H.R. 17783. 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.

H.R. 17868. An act making appropriations for the government of the States 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. STENGIS, Mr. BIBEL, Mr. EVAN, Mr. BANDY, 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 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. 17783) 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 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. 17788) 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”; requests 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. EAGLET, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. YEAR 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 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. 13686) entitled “An act to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;”

H.R. 13685. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13686. An act to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13687. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13688. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13689. An act to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13690. An act to authorize the disposal of rare earth grade uranium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13691. An act to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; H.R. 13692. An act to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile; H.R. 13693. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested: S. Res. 783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Martens;
APPOINTMENT OF CONFERENCE ON H.R. 17868, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Congressional Record of today (H.R. 17868) a section 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. There is objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conference: Messrs. Natcher, Chimento, Fattah, Pryor of Arkansas, Obey, Manion, Davis of Wisconsin, Riegel, 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 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 accountants of its own benefit nor indifferent 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 denied, but rather, the 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. 12558, DISPOSITION OF FUNDS AWARDED TO TLINGIT AND Haida INDIANS, ALASKA

Mr. HALEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12558), 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:

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with an unenviable problem of administering grant funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States, making it necessary to agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

We appreciate the efforts of the Administration in this matter.

The conference recommends the Senate recede from its amendment and agree to the bill in the form it passed the House. This is in keeping with the Senate's consistent practice adopted by the Congress when authorizing the use of other judgment funds by other tribes.

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 tragic example 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 about in the newspapers. Farmers do not need the stubbornness of this administration that refuses to pass 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
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The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, 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 'and' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and';

"(C) striking out '(3)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3)'; and"

(D) striking out immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'or' ; or

"(2) as annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, the existing suspension of duties on manganese ore-including ferruginous ore-and related products, for such month in addition to any annual increase in his monthly annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, the sum of the aid or assistance 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 in such month, by an amount equal to $4 of the 15-percent benefit increase enacted last December applies to railroad retirement recipients 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 other provisions)."

"(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) are applicable to the same sentence and are not inapplicable to him with respect to any month, any increase in the annuity or pension (referred to in clause (3)) 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 only to the extent of such increase in his monthly annuity or pension (as so referred to).'

(2) The heading to such section 1007 is amended by inserting "AMENDING RAILROAD RETIREMENT RECIPIENTS' IMMEDIATELY AFTER 'AMENDMENTS.'"

And 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?

Sirh, 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 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 and related products, and 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 to help us with the consideration of this important issue. The American Broadcasting Company, entitled "Straight from the Heartland." This is a one-half hour documentary film segment of ABC network's "Next to Nothing," which each Monday evening probes major issues of our society with in-depth reporting.

"Straight from the Heartland" was filmed recently in Grand Island, Neb., a community located in the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I represent. Grand Island is near the center of the state's farmlands 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 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.
by increasing their standards, used in determining eligibility under the program, 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. There is no 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 the attention of the House to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

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. 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 public hearing on 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 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 would 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 reduction of the $10 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. 17875 approving an appropriation of $450 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 uppered 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 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, H.R. 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 States and local governments for construction of correctional 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 appropriations—$268,000,000 for fiscal 1970—but the progress of the States and local governments in setting their planning underway on comprehensive crimefighting, as well as the magnitude of the problem 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 in crime and we will get 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 more will stop crime, we certainly are on the road toward doing it in this bill.

As I said some 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 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.

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

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 supplemen
tal 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.

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, 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.

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.

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.

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.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15838, RELEASE OF MANGANESE ORE, TYPE A, FROM STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15838) 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 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.

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.

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.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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 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.

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.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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 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.

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.

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.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1970.)
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. 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 bills that 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 remove all 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 those 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 House 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. KLEIEPPE. 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:

[Invisible text: Roll No. 192]
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. The 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 develop a comprehensive plan of law enforcement with the aid of Federal funds channeled through States, cities, municipalities, and counties. The money is allocated to States on a population basis. Within the guidance Congress has placed local governments to 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 from 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 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 Times recently provided for $656.4 million, and yet we spend, for example, less than 2 percent of all Government revenues on our justice processes, including all police, all courts, 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 attention to the problem. We can no longer be hesitant or optimistic on the crime problem. We must be active and resolute and determined as a rock. We cannot falter for the mere lack of funds. It is the high, the lofty, the grandiose, 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 a pocketbook. That is to say, if you do not have conscience, there is no objection.

Here is the public. The public must have a conscience. There is an old saying: It is not that money makes everything good; it is that money makes everything possible. We cannot be penurious. We have large sums, I admit, but they are not too large if we can make our streets safe and materially cure and prevent crime.

The 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. We庥 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, then must ride behind. When three men ride a horse, indeed, two 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. These are 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 in the first two years the 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 because: The mayors who appeared before us, the heads of local communities, bitterly complained. Trying to get help by contribution from the State was a losing proposition; they were deprived of the benefits, 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 provide the Federal share of 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 begging. 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 at least one-fourth, of the non-Federal funds, one-fourth of the amount that the localities must pay.

This is a 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. We curb the supply of many crimes that 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 institutions, prisons, and parole. This is logical and perhaps proper when it is realized that from fifty to seventy percent of those who leave our prisons go out and contribute to society's worst and more serious crime than those which brought them to prison in the first place.

In certain instances, 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 Satter, in the 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 asked the purpose, 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 necessary and desirable in view of the LEAA to support regional and national training programs, workshops, and seminars and in order to instruct and teach local law enforcement personnel advanced techniques and procedures.

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 study, have concluded are essential to strengthen the law enforcement assistance program.

The law enforcement assistance program establishes as early as two 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 develop an inclusive 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, the committee believes that LEAA 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 least at the same level. 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 framework of the program itself. Consequently, the bill abolishes the present three-man board which manages the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—and substitutes a single administrative director. The requirement of unanimous tripartite decisions, the committee concluded, placed an intolerable burden upon the single administrator. The bill also authorizes the designation 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 predicated upon the determination that areas of high crime incidence receive an adequate share of Federal assistance.

Third, a requirement that the States 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—25 percent—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 allocate funds to those based on a finding that areas of high crime incidence receive an adequate share of assistance.

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.

In the judgment 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 State and local courthouses, 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 are forced by severe fiscal burdens can expect some relief from provisions of the bill that require the States to defray a portion of the Federal share of the cost.

The bill requires that the States contribute a part—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 carry will level the field of Federal expenditure increases in preference to reducing or eliminating the matching requirements of existing law. This was done because the committee believes that matching requirements are desirable incentives to assure continuity of State and local support of innovative programs. Matching requirements also assure greater State and local support of planning and execution of such programs.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments to the law enforcement assistance program proposed in this bill, I believe, will 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 of local governments in the 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. I yield 1 minute.

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. CHAIRMAN. 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 State's own planning agency in Iowa in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to interrupt your remarks for 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?

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think that there would be any trouble in working this out through your State planning agency and the LEA. That is the working out of the problem. The question is raised.

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 applicable?

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time.

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. The report 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. 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 not really a system. It belonged to the States and not Federal. It belongs to State and local government. It is quite apparent that the efforts by State and local government have not been adequate to the challenge.
often imposed by State law. As one mayor testified, at page 676 of our hearings:

Local governments across the Nation . . . are coming under great pressure to change State-imposed restrictions preventing broadening of the local revenue base and increasing dependence on Federal aid. Even if a city is completely committed to action to control crime, the city may not be a free agent in making choices but may be forced to take guidance from Federal dictates . . . necessary resources to achieve this purpose.

Local revenue raising capability and, to some extent, local spending choices are severely circumscribed by 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 by resorting to illegal means. The financial crisis of local governments.

Since 1959, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been studying how these three levels of government in our system collaborate. Since 1964, this bipartisan and balanced Commission has recommended that the State pay at least one-half of the local matching requirements if the State ensures that the Federal share of the cost is borne entirely by the local government.


"The Commission has proposed that Federal funds for a particular purpose flow through the state, and only where, and only if, 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 chose not to meet these conditions, a Federal-local relationship should obtain with respect to the particular program.

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 local conditions 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 amendment would rectify that defect in the scheme of the act.

The amendment would require that the State pay at least one-half 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 $50,000. Locality A would pay $50,000, as would locality B. The State would pay $20,000, but $10,000 would have to be earmarked for each program to match the Federal funds and 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 may have a chance to have a program of riot control whereas another does not 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. 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 does not have the maximum flexibility in deciding to whom and when discretionary grants should be made, the matching requirement has been a double-edged sword 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 recognized by the committee. The partial relaxation with regard to block grants would not free the regular, operational personnel serving in any of the local courts, police, or corrections. The committee recognized that personnel costs consume a lion's share of State and local anti-crime 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 the 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 which is insufficient 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 the subsidies which would be an integral part of 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. The other amendment would be 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 distributed 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 the committee examine the matter closely and see that they do not take away from the anti-crime 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 uncompensated or underrepresented on regional planning units, to quote parts 727. The committee amendment to part B would cure this deficiency and require that regional planning units be representative of units of local government under the jurisdiction of the planning unit.

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 for the construction 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 not to postpone that task. If we spend billions to fight a potential threat thousands of miles away, why cannot we spend $650 million 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.
HON. EMANUEL CELLES,
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, as a 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 infirm 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 this year 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 Inquisitions of our law enforcement, the Department has become aware that the rights of the individual must be protected. The needs of our country at this time should be one of our top priorities. We must stop this wave of crime.

I heartily congratulate Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, ranking minority member Mr. Feighan, and my colleagues for the outstanding bill we are considering today. H.R. 17825, the law enforcement assistance amendments, is one of those that correspond 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 environments, they 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 community 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 Olmsted 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 50 percent.

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 government. 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 crime problems can be solved and improve our court system with the use of new and improved correctional institutions and with the help of police programs, and for staffing facilities with personnel meeting advanced standards of training and education.

In addition, the bill authorizes almost $350 million 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 fiscal year 1973.

It is my understanding that the authorization reflects the needs 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
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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 where 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 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 of provisions 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 States and local governments our battle against crime.

The thorough hearings conducted by subcommittee concerned the control of parole, narcotics, and court reform 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 for the Federal Government to make a larger effort to coordinate with the State and local governments our battle against crime.

In referring to budget cuts, there is one area where I have heard an increase rather than a cut—the requests of those agencies with which we are working. It is obvious to all observers that variations in crime within the same State are enormous. In the city of Cleveland, which has the ninth highest crime rate in the Nation, the police force has been increased to provide for assisting in the construction, renovation, and acquisition of correctional facilities and the development of improved correctional programs. I believe that such a program would lessen the probability that parolees released from prison, continue to engage in criminal activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable action on this bill.

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 needs, and 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 that "The war on crime must be carried into the streets of our cities.

In referring to budget cuts, there is one area where I have heard an increase rather than a cut—the requests of those agencies with which we are working. It is obvious to all observers that variations in crime within the same State are enormous. In the city of Cleveland, which has the ninth highest crime rate in the Nation, the police force has been increased to provide for assisting in the construction, renovation, and acquisition 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. The city police force has 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 $188,000. It is imperative that crime-ridden areas like Cleveland receive their fair share of Federal funds. The bill will enable the Federal Government 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 system: juvenile treatment, narcotic 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 correctional programs. I believe that such a program would lessen the probability that parolees released from prison, continue to engage in criminal activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable action on this bill.

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 needs, and 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 that "The war on crime must be carried into the streets of our cities.

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 more toward rehabilitation, the reduction of the need to produce 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 new 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 a National Institute would 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 testimony 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 brought to bear upon the problems of the Nation. This applies to innovative techniques, utilization of scientific advances, and training programs which are coordinated and 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 include research designed for apprehending hardened criminals. The National Institute has not, in my opinion, been fully understood, and its activities have been 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 be directed at research problems which can help produce answers to the complex problems of crime in our Nation.

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 the National Institute has not, in my opinion, been fully understood, and its activities have been 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.

The National Institute has not, in my opinion, been fully understood, and its activities have been 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 be directed at research problems which can help produce answers to the complex problems of crime in our Nation. All of these research studies appear to be directed at research problems which can help produce answers to the complex problems of crime in our Nation.
adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence. The bill also requires the LEAA to evaluate, coordinate and integrate the hundreds of different criminal justice agencies and their programs in each state.

We have seen in the states and the cities are utilizing federal funds in the broad range of functions which Congress intended—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 and the large 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 a new wave 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 by the Governor’s Conference on Law Enforcement 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 organizations 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 noted many successes in the initial stages of the block grants—especially the issues of the Safe Streets program—its successes and failures—with an openness and frankness 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 Administration for their extensive and helpful cooperation with the states in implementing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The Governor’s Conference applauds the LEAA in fostering the development of qualified staff at the state level, providing wide latitude to the states in spending the funds available to combat crime. Effective administration is essential. The committee has concluded that a three-man board requiring unanimous agreement is the best 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. Chair, I have only touched upon two aspects of this legislation. One other amendment proposed by the bill deserves your attention. This provision would abolish the present three-man management board which administers law enforcement assistance at the Federal level. It is the feeling of those who support the bill 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 unanimous agreement is the best method of allocating vast sums of Federal assistance. H.R. 17825, therefore, abolishes the present troika and substitutes in its place a single administrator.

We have concluded that LEAA, as it stands, will not yield the improvements needed to combat crime. Effective administration is essential. The committee has concluded that a three-man board requiring unanimous agreement is the best 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. Chair, I have only touched upon two aspects of this legislation. One other amendment proposed by the bill deserves your attention. This provision would abolish the present three-man management board which administers law enforcement assistance at the Federal level. It is the feeling of those who support the bill 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 unanimous agreement is the best method of allocating vast sums of Federal assistance. H.R. 17825, therefore, abolishes the present troika and substitutes in its place a single administrator.

We have concluded that LEAA, as it stands, will not yield the improvements needed to combat crime. Effective administration is essential. The committee has concluded that a three-man board requiring unanimous agreement is the best method of allocating vast sums of Federal assistance. H.R. 17825, therefore, abolishes the present troika and substitutes in its place a single administrator.
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 administer 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 utilizing funds obligated in 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 substantial period for the completion of the application and grant cycle. This situation has recurred in fiscal years 1970, since the appropriation was not enacted 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 would 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 grants. In this way, discretionary funds could be used to support programs and activities that have not received enough block grant funds or that local units of government need 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 and the enforcement of the provisions of the program and personnel standards of such institutions, and planning activities in the areas of correctional construction and personnel 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, those are a considerable factor in themselves in the generation of confirmed criminals. Because of the years of neglect, failure to replace obsolete structures and lack of support, where they are needed, a staggering requirement for construction has accumulated. This type of construction is typically 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 may not be able to finance new facilities. The job will not be done unless the Federal Government provides financial assistance on a massive scale.

Although this kind of construction is considered 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 of the Federal funds. At anticipated increased part C funding levels, the cost of necessary correctional construction and improvements will absorb virtually the entire 25 percent percentage of the Federal funds and 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 used 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 for the correctional construction and improvements will absorb virtually the entire 25 percent percentage of the Federal funds. The remaining funds would be available for direct discretionary grants by LEAA to States or to units of local government, consisting of some combination 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 the same as that of the block grants made under part C of the act. The bill also provides that the matching formula may not be applied to the funding of facilities where there are fixed, staggering requirements for construction has accumulated. I believe that the construction program authorized by this amendment will provide the funds to enable the States and local units to make significant inroads on the many problems created by the inmates 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 under part C of the act. However, under the bill, States and cities must pay 40 percent of the cost of most programs and projects funded under the block 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 no funds to contribute to the cost of LEAA programs designed to solve those problems.

This change is accomplished by section 301(c) of the act which recasts section 8 of the bill which inserts a new discretionary grant source from the block grant matching requirements, and section 8 of the bill which transfers the authority of discretionary grant funds to the Secretary. 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 be required to distribute 75 percent of the cost of such programs if it determined that the grant applicant could not provide any funds at all. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to prohibit the utilization of matching requirements or 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 enrolling in academic programs. These provisions, which were one of the most popular and successful of LEAA programs, provide that the LEAA Office of Academic Assistance, which administers the law enforcement education program, has some 730 schools making over 100,000 loans and grants by the close of the fiscal year. The LEAA Office of Academic Assistance, which administers the law enforcement education program has already received applications from more than 960 schools for funds under the bill.

While administering this program, LEAA has received numerous suggestions from participating institutions and from students who have been the beneficiaries of the academic assistance provisions which would increase the effectiveness of the program. The most meritorious of these changes are those that would improve the program, and recognize minor changes in the language of the academic assistance provisions which would increase the effectiveness of the program. The most meritorious of these changes is that the beneficiary, as described in this section and the loan section of the act.

The different language in these two sections has created a considerable
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amount of confusion on the part of many of the institutions participating in the law enforcement education program. The second, which changes the wording of the 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 scholarship grant programs for education purposes. 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 to improve the ability of State and local law enforcement personnel in improved methods of law enforcement. Such training programs would be designed to complement the training programs of State 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 programs for the 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 expanding LEAA's contribution to training in a wide range of substantive areas related to law enforcement. The amendment would enable LEAA to support such a training program and to authorize LEAA to fund training 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 expressly authorize grantmaking. It appears advisable, therefore, to clarify this ambiguity by appropriate amendments.

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 costs of individuals attending conferences or other assemblies, such as technical assistance conferences, notwithstanding the provisions of title 31, United States Code. Title 31, United States Code, section 561 provides that "unless specifically provided by law" no public funds appropriated for any purpose shall be used to defray the expenses of transportation to, any conven­tion or other form of assembly or gathering to be held in the District of Columbia or elsewhere—government employees with respect to travel outside the District, except for the annual report of the Department of Commerce, under section 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 perfection 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 currently faced with the problem of how 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 LEAA's activities for the fiscal 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 subcontractors and contractors who do not deal directly with LEAA, such as a subcontractor 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 which relied on a narrow reading of section 521 in support of their position.

On one occasion, an attorney representing 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 amend section 521 so that LEAA's auditors can point to a provision of law expressly authorizing them to have access to the books and records of contractors 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 15 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.

I hope that these 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. As the present act, as section 601 defines "law enforcement" to include "all activities pertaining to crime prevention or reduction and enforcement of the 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 considered 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 other terms 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 only include activities related to the administration of crime prevention and reduction. I support H.R. 17225, I am one of its coauthors, I support it because I think it is a well-balanced bill, one which I believe would enhance the national 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 administrative pace 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 the "pervasive administration of the program and called the agency among the best of Federal agencies administering grant-in-aid programs.

And 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 "Administrators," 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 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 concentrating decision making 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 on 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 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 "factors other than crime incidence will be taken into account in allocation among areas where major crime is most prevalent and interprets the amendment as requiring that each State shall generally correlate the benefits of anticrime efforts to the extent practicable with the crime problem in the area.

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 crime and population levels, and so forth. I favor methods of financing correctional facilities, and earmarks one-quarter of the entire appropriation for the purposes of correction. 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 for more votes? Or do they cut back on their commitments to correctional programs? Or do they fail to carry out the purposes of corrections?

Fourth, there is one troublesome provision in the amendment to section 530—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 the House-passed version of the bill, which provided for the LEAA to allocate funds to all local units. 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. CHAIRMAN, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFSTETTER, I yield 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 favor 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, will authorize substantial appropriations for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and I believe that, on balance, the bill will be a good bill. 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.
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Mr. CHAIRMAN, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFSTETTER, I yield 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 favor 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, will authorize substantial appropriations for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and I believe that, on balance, the bill will be a good bill. 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. CHAIRMAN, will the gentleman yield?
amounts to "cruel and unusual punishment." Inaerecution should be humane and the modern techniques of rehabilitation should be employed. I think it is archaic to lock a man in a case for a specified length of time and then unlock the case 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 helped through them. 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 society which must have psychiatric care, it is our prison population. In addition to psychiatric care, we must expend more effort to teach inmates new work skills 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 to 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 the Federal funds under this bill, applicants will be required to provide assurances that the design of facilities will be modern and innovative, that provisions will be made for on-the-job training 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 local and state governments. Therefore, it is appropriate that one-fourth of the funds appropriated for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration are required to be expended for correctional programs.

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 rather requires the States to assist those areas which have high crime incidence whether they be large or small.

There 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 be that when we shift 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 levels.

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 sometimes mandate services which must be performed and what people must be performed.

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. 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 40 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 this money and buy 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, and I think that's what the key is. We just need 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 hire the tools to do the job and not have to hire three and four clerks to type out seven or eight requests and then have 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. It's just as good 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 prudently 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. Raines).

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, in passing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the 90th Congress stated in title II of that act that "the Federal Government 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 extension and expansion 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 crimes which we 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 as close in proximity and hopefully understanding. Even if it were possible to establish a truly integrated, federalized 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. Our police departments, workers and secretaries in our own offices are living proof of such problems. It seems to me absolutely necessary that the States assume new responsibilities and begin to deal directly with 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 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 interstate cooperation. Upon receipt 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 pioneer 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 strong support of the criminal justice system. It is felt 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 600 municipalities with police departments, the need to make some comprehensive plan and order out of these that the 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 level of the State’s system of criminal justice. Under the commission are 36 regional planning units. The chairman of the ILEC is Arthur J. Bliek, who also directs the State’s 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 Chicago. The ILEC also demanded of the State a comprehensive 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 active in the field between the police and the people.

The greatest allocation of planning funds by ILEC has gone to the city of Chicago. The State has consistently extended assistance. Under the Illinois law enforcement act, Illinois was the first State whose legislature made a strong financial commitment to the program. The State appropriated over $5 million for the matching funds required. Based on this 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 progress Illinois has 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 the means 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 be in action at cross purposes with State efforts. It would deny to communities some of the essential 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 programs in Illinois are rooted in a high degree of local autonomy, coupled with effective statewide planning and assistance. Such an approach is oriented in community action, under local control.

And I would be less than candid with you if I did not tell you that we have created a workable system, a system that enjoys a high degree of support, a system that is getting the cooperation of the judiciary between State and local governments.

We have taken the hand you extended to us in 1969, and we have in turn extended our hand and our support 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, $8 million has been made available to a State Action Now program to quickly put into the hands of local police departments funds to have management studies of their departments. The Illinois State Police have been asked 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. The third, a $2 million 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 communities; fifth, a model curriculum for police recruit training was made possible by an 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 completion 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 $104,000 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. The immediate benefits 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 with minor 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's recommendations without adding any destructive or counterproductive amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, at the request of Mr. RAILEY, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the hearing

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 am further moved to 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 effectively targeted. 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 very careful indeed in the future. These 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 amount of LEAA funds is 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 monies from local sources. Many of the 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. And all the more rationally allocated will enable our beleaguered city central government agencies to more adequately cope with the inhumanly difficult problems they have called upon them to perform. And 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 of 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 the 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 growing problem of crime control. Though the present stringencies were probably well intended, it is clear that they have in many cases encouraged the purchase of the non-cost-effective-in-use 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 grants 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. Redecorating probably the most important and least favorable contributor to our rising crime rates, and unless something is done to ameliorate the scandalous situation in which 50 to 75 percent of persons in local penal 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 program practical.

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 the national and community under­standing of 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 personnel, and lack of the funds to individ­ual rights and compromise of judicial process may appear as less costly alternatives; but in my opinion they will not be, 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 Commissio­ners 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 unrelent­ ing effort of this magnitude is in the public interest and order is perfectly compatible with the development of higher levels of Justice and the preserva­tion of our democratic system of in­dividual liberty.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman. 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 personnel drain from that force. 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.

But, I am not sure how to go about this because in com­ference 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 has 100 m. officers. But, like most cities, Syracuse does not have this kind of money on hand. My suggestion would be that 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 be wasted.

This is not a national police force. Nor would these local units be responsible to the Federal Government. They would be responsible to the Federal Government. They would be responsibility 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 any 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 legislatures have a moral and political responsibility to as­sist in a substantial manner.

The community police reserves would act as supplementary manpower to our already beleaguered law enforcement personnel. They would free many of our cities, which are already understaffed, from the onerous duties of investigating individual rights and compromise of judicial process may appear as less costly alternatives; but in my opinion they will not be, 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 Commissio­ners 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 unrelent­ ing effort of this magnitude is in the public interest and order is perfectly compatible with the development of higher levels of Justice and the preserva­tion of our democratic system of in­dividual liberty.

But, I am not sure how to go about this because in com­ference 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 has 100 m. officers. But, like most cities, Syracuse
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.

My State of Iowa is one of those which is in an insurmountable 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 Iowa in which the Iowa General Assembly during this session or to call our legislature into special session, or to call our legislature into special 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.

I have had a very urgent telegram from the distinguished Governor of my State, Robert D. Ray, saying the cost of a special session is beyond what 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 can 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 one 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, 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 to Federal funding. 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 the information that the use of Iowa's share of 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? Can we 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 appropriations funds from the Federal Government
June 29, 1970

Mr. MAYNE. The grant comes in and said they want the money to go to the local communities where the problem exists.

Mr. MIKVA. The provisions of this bill go into effect immediately and if, in fact, funds have been earmarked for 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 a 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 in 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 crimes, we must provide substantial financial support 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 $350 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 $400 million for the fiscal year 1972.

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 by which the committee recommends for fiscal year 1971, the committee recommends expenditure of $1 billion and $1.3 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 the crime problem.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield again 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 share, 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 in crime, 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 purpose and the terms of this bill. The only State, really, that is left is Kentucky.

Most States have interim appropriations. They make appropriations for continuing 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 purpose and the terms of this bill. The only State, really, that is left is Kentucky.

Most States have interim appropriations. They make appropriations for continuing funds so that we can tackle and conquer this dreadful scourge, the crime which is besetting our Nation.
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 States contribute one-fourth be deferred for 1 year, because we believe it is impossible for many States to meet this 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 pernicious 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 do not want to feel that 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 the amendment is for Iowa's benefit. 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 yield the floor, thinking 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. The legislature has to meet in Ohio. I do not know exactly when the legislature in Ohio will meet. They have appropriated the money immediately thereafter to meet requirements which 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 have the benefit of what 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 Maryland (Mr. ADAMS).

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 Administrative funds 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, or was it under the supposition that the States do have areas of recognized high incidence of crime but have been unable for one reason or another to get State agencies to take any amendment of that character? Why should one 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 very much inadequately treated in that regard.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I compliment the chairman and his committee for taking the action they have taken on 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 Maryland (Mr. GUNS).

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I commend the very distinguished chairman of the committee for the 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 I do not think we have made any major expenditures in the 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.
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problem of student violence in higher education, and the special problems of an urban judicial system.

Mr. Celler. I must assume 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. The record shows that the money 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. Used properly, they should help provide 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 his kind words. 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 cooperation with the States have increased either by better administration or some of the groundwork for solid progress in the seventies.

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 his kind words. 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 cooperation with the States have increased either by better administration or some of the groundwork for solid progress in the seventies.

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. Many criminals hole up in the rural areas. In the past few years, under State allocation the lion's 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 a 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 appeal against 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 less responsive than it is 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 the 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 the offender. Certainly none of these activities by enforcement officials fit nicely into geographical boundaries.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, while H.R. 17825 needs some changes, it is most encouraging that the effort is being made to extend the present system of the Rehabilitation 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 in the fiscal year 1971. It should have been higher. Law enforcement should enjoy a very high priority among our expenditures; $1 billion for fiscal year 1973 is a figure considering the thousands of allocations for the use of these funds. While $1.5 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.
where the youngster might get a record which he will carry throughout his life. So there’s no question that it’s more serious 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 law enforcement agencies, we would stimulate them to carry out their duties and to enforce the law. I cannot conceive of anything that is more discouraging to the 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 and their service 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 level.

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 the police, and perhaps 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 level.

I know every morning when I leave the House of Representatives, I had several meetings with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GRANFPO) and other leaders. They included the Attorney General, representatives of the FBI, representatives of the Metropolitan Police and our own Police Department, and I have 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. These 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. As I have said, I speak for the 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 support.

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 same as the accused 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. ROZMAN).

Mr. ROZMAN. 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 their legislation in this area. Several 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 important. In New Jersey, with the small amount of action grant money—$850,000—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 police radio system coordinating emergency use and operating on the same frequency regardless of location, that implements a prime recommendation of 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 discrete radio system was being developed for the 12-month period beginning July 1, 1970, to extend the project. The grant will extend this emergency communications 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 23 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.

There is a currently 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 open society in which our people are not constantly terrified individuals scuttling in fear between work and home, and living behind locks and bars.
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. Hoagland, 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 forefront of efforts to improve the conditions that exist in New Jersey. Our efforts have been aimed at ensuring that the police have the necessary tools and resources to carry out their duties effectively. I understand why the minority groups believe that they are not getting the support they need, and I want to offer my support for this important legislation.

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 from New Jersey.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, I 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 there is a great deal of confusion and struggle toward the establishment of a government of men as distinguished from a government of laws. There are examples of tyranny that have lasted 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—do not realize that where law ceases tyranny starts. That is just the opposite of what mankind has been fighting for centuries—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 why we have been fighting for this legislation. 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-seated 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 adverse conditions. That is where...
we have the difficulty between the races and the difficulty between the different ethnic groups. We have conditions today within the Nation but is just a matter of judgment of policy any­
for 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 in­
ment in any manner as they should. But any blame for these practices. They are training, because without decent human
of policy but, rather, on the basis of money should be spent—in training, because without decent human
supervise, if you will,
portance of
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There is a Federal role, however, and it is critically significant. The Federal role is concerned with the allocation of funds to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and corrections facilities.
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 anti-crime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend $1.267 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdic­
tions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1968. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime­
fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief in our jails where everything, from fiscal difficulties.
Mr. MONDSON).
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 of short-term gains and quick fixes. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will re­quest. You can see that I 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 murder, muggings, strippings, 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 crime m­over 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 role is concerned with the allocation of funds to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and corrections facilities.
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 anti-crime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend $1.267 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdic­
tions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1968. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime­
fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief in our jails where everything, from fiscal difficulties.
Mr. MONDSON).
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 of short-term gains and quick fixes. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will re­quest. You can see that I 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 murder, muggings, strippings, 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 crime m­over 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 role is concerned with the allocation of funds to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and corrections facilities.
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 anti-crime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend $1.267 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdic­
tions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1968. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime­
fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief in our jails where everything, from fiscal difficulties.
Mr. MONDSON).
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 of short-term gains and quick fixes. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will re­quest. You can see that I 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 murder, muggings, strippings, 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 crime m­over 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 role is concerned with the allocation of funds to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and corrections facilities.
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 anti-crime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend $1.267 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdic­
tions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1968. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime­
fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief in our jails where everything, from fiscal difficulties.
Mr. MONDSON).
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 of short-term gains and quick fixes. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will re­quest. You can see that I 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 murder, muggings, strippings, 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 crime m­over 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 role is concerned with the allocation of funds to State and local police and courts. Increasingly and rightly so, more money is going to the States to help local governments beef up their police departments, courts and corrections facilities.
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 anti-crime expenditures have doubled. It is estimated the Federal Government will spend $1.267 billion on crime control during fiscal year 1971. Some 41 percent of that will go to State and local jurisdic­
tions, compared with 16 percent in fiscal 1968. By any standard, that is a very substantial commitment to local crime­
fighting efforts and undoubtedly a welcome relief in our jails where everything, from fiscal difficulties.
Mr. MONDSON).
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 of short-term gains and quick fixes. The increasing crime rate is a menacing cloud darkening the Nation. It takes many shapes, has many causes, and will re­quest. You can see that I 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 murder, muggings, strippings, rapes, rob­beries and other acts of violence. It is traditional in America that the task of controlling crime is the responsibility of
appropriations for training and equipping.

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 the bill. 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. 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.

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.
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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 national or 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 this Congress. 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 development 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 used for the development of correctional programs, 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, serving as a prosecutor and as a defense counsel. I became convinced through that experience that much of the time we are not really doing anything anything constructive as far as rehabilitation, 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 somehow developed the attitude of giving up on law enforcement. When I became more associated with the defense, particularly in the case of the defense of a young man or a person with a certain reputation, 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 for the development of a vigorous and productive 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 so often been said, ours is a society of laws and of men.

I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. Etacoi) and also our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCormack), for their efforts and the breadth of their vision. We have certain guidelines within which to govern ourselves as citizens in this country. Let us go clear back to Holy Scripture, to 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 ourselfs, 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 their state laws, the city and county pass ordinances, and all are passed as a framework within which society can exist.

Some of my colleagues know I have been a college administrator for 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 fan who know that if a better hits a ball down the sideline in 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 all our actions 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 anarchy. The philosophy is that we must first enact the laws; mere enactment will not do the job.

I heard one reference to college administration, 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 doing more work for 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 do-gooder” complex, and in trying to create an atmosphere of personal 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 gentlemen from Ohio for his statement. It is not surprising that 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 the Judges, Federal judges, are 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 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 concerned with a sentence upon a skyjacker, only 2 years, whereas the police who were involved there remark that the Judges, Federal judges, are 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 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 concerned with a sentence upon a skyjacker, only 2 years, whereas the police who were involved there.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This act is, in my view, a step toward 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, and I particularly point out that there is a move to go from four-fifths 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, put forth the slogan: “Gunners’ pigs” has turned this around. They have taken the letters of the word “pig” and transposed them into the sign of the hog, making it a symbol of respect, using the initials as “Pride, Integrity and Guts.”

I believe that applies to law-enforce-
will take time. It recognizes that the
criminal tide in this Nation cannot be
turned around overnight.

But, Mr. Chairman, however, this bill
recognizes that we must do more, that
our commitment must be strengthened
and our support must be increased. I am
pleased that the Senate has recommended considerably increased
funding for the law enforcement as­
stance administration for the coming 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of this Na­
tion 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
the effort to provide safe streets for the citizens of our State.

This bill has my strong support. With
the passage of this bill, we in the Con­
gress 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. OBRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in
support of the Law Enforcement Assist­
ance 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 and correctional programs
and facilities, and build better facilities, improve
the administration of justice—In short, to help
them do whatever needs to be done. The
1968 Amendments 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 facili­	ies and programs that was recom­
ended 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.

The level of present law enforcement expenditures goes for cor­
rections, and almost all of that meager sum is spent on custody, rather than
rehabilitation. The law authorizes grants
for corrections purposes, but competing
flows for these funds have left little
for the efforts of correctional programs
awarded to States in fiscal 1969, only
13.8 percent went for corrections.

These amendments should make pos­
ible the development of new correc­
tional facilities, the expansion of
community correctional programs, both of which are
long overdue.

The war on crime takes in prevention,
detection, rehabilitation, conviction,
conviction, and correction. These amend­
ments, and the special provision for new em­
phasis 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 solu­
tions to this awful situation.

Today, we are considering the Omni­
bus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970—a measure de­
signed to help combat crime. This act au­
thorizes a $3.2 billion outlay over the next
3 years to provide grants for research,
education, training, upgrading corre­
tional programs and other law en­
forcement purposes.

While this bill is certainly not perfect,
we feel it is a measure that will prove
beneficial to our law enforcement agen­
cies 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 streets at night. Organized
crime and narcotics are the big victors
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 1950 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
1961, and an all time high of 405.6 in 1969. While
most crime previously has been in poor
ghetto areas, the largest increase
now is in suburban and even rural areas.
The cost of crime zoomed past $31 bil­
lion in 1968. And one of the most heart­
rending statistics we have noted is that
75 percent of the serious crimes are com­
mitted 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 com­
bated by immediate action against those
who would act wantonly without regard
for the law. We have already passed 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. Chairman, let us hope this bill will
help solve some of our problems on crime
and law, and that those who demand and de­
mand the statement of Detroit's mayor before the Judiciary Committee well
demonstrate 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, De­
troit 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
in one time, our attempts to achieve an
equity produced an even greater ine­
quity.

I certainly do not call for the elimi­
nation of funds to lower crime areas—a
lower crime rate in some areas may be
achievable and 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 legis­
lation.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise
today in support of the Omnibus Crime
Control and Safe Streets Act Amend­

The war on crime has been, and
remains today, essentially a local respon­
sibility. 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 poten­
tial or real crimes against the Nation are
combated, but in the last analysis, it is
the citizens and the local enforcement
who have the burden of fighting 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 local law enforcement purposes 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 courts, or any other Federal law enforcement agency might
impose.

There could be no better time for pas­
sage 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 en­
able 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 of­

icer 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.

I am especially interested in the confron­
tation of judges at every level to uphold the convictions that make punishment of crime commen­
surate with the crimes committed. This
will make our streets all the more safe,
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. The 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 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 is the lack of encouragement in our modern correctional institutions and State and local correctional facilities. According to James V. Bennett, former Director of the American Correctional Association, all but a handful of county and city facilities and correctional institutions have been built with only one thing in mind, maximum security. According to Bennett, the entire system of our correctional institutions is anti-institutional 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-Burke Act in an attempt 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 facility provisions of my bill after my bill H.R. 13902, and previous legislation have sponsored and supported in this field. These improvements are long overdue.

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 provide new 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. Rather 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 law enforcement officials.

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 would be far lower. A recent study has shown that 50 to 70 percent of those once convicted and released later commit another crime. If more effort and emphasis were placed toward correction, this trend, perhaps, could be retarded.

This bill adds 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 inter-action of all sectors at all levels.

Finally, the requirement of partial State funding of local government programs will increase the involvement of State and local officials in the law enforcement program having the greatest impact.

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 a decade so that we may 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 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 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 hairline 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 distressing to see the weaknesses of some 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.

There must be a partnership between government and private citizens to wage an all-out war on crime and violence in America and to see that this war is extended 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 letter 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 nothing to improve the morale of those 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 year after year because bystandence and should be encouraged. It is far more crimes are committed than police seek to tear down what the majority of emphasis should be given to the public's role under the 1968 act, and the bill of society.

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 criminals. The stringency of our law, 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 The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is providing helpful funds under the 1968 act, and the bill before us would authorize appropriations for 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 too much a concept, and those who think money alone is my feeling that the The peaceful processes of society in freedom and liberty are far more important. But without peace within our Nation and among our people, and we have no business in the world. But, of course, American "firsts" in freedom and liberty are far more important. But without peace within our Nation and among our people, we could, in a dangerous state of being seriously threatened. We need and must have internal peace, free of irresponsible, foreboding, and destructive dissent. Of course, everyone in this country should, beyond any question—and does—have freedom of speech and should contribute to ensuring themselves openly, freely, and fully.

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 the development of a dangerous 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 a situation that has sparked after rioting and other forms of disorder, we could justifiably expect to see the turbulence of the times mirrored in the current reports of the Nation's police forces. An interesting fact is 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" is 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-faced 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 and greater men in history have been destroyed by their own people—often by the agressive action of a small minority and the indifference and complacency of a substantial "silent majority." And there are at least in large, such as the Chicago Seven, who have assumed for themselves just such a task.

These people are either ignoring or overestimating 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.
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to the fundamental Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded, and without which, it cannot continue to survive.

The 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 sort of symbolic gestures that the statement of the President 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 authorities 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 the smaller, local units help make 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 approve 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.

I wish 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 areas for all 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, the Federal Government has 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 an area. We must use the block grant approach only when we are dealing with 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 intention to support and encourage the LEAA to help solve a serious and perplexing crime problem.

I would like to comment on two particularly 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 recidivism rate. Unless we improve all aspects of our criminal justice system, no one aspect will be as effective as it should be. For that reason, I support section 804 which 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 do anything about the criminals moving through our criminal justice system, the best place to start is to improve our correctional facilities. I firmly believe that if we place 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 instrument of assistance. The present arrangement results in a stratification of the decision-making functions since anonymous action is 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 knowledge.

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 system 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 co-sponsor, amends title I of the present act, which established a Federal crime-fighting 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 resolves all those 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 assistance programs. 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 our law enforcement colleagues, then went on 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 police to experience the highest crimes and which are the hardest to combat, to receive sufficient amounts of money. A study undertaken by the National League of Cities, United States 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 vital to each city 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 problem. Instead, funds are dispersed 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 finding that in the criminal justice system. The States, in distributing funds entrusted to them under the present law, do not 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 assistance programs. 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 our law enforcement colleagues, then went on 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 police to experience the highest crimes and which are the hardest to combat, to receive sufficient amounts of money. A study undertaken by the National League of Cities, United States 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 vital to each city 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 problem. Instead, funds are dispersed 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 finding that in the criminal justice system. The States, in distributing funds entrusted to them under the present law, do not 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.
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 applications 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 each year, yet, given the enormous number of individuals affected, and the enormous role the correctional system can play in achieving rehabilitation of criminals, the President declares that the design 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 barren and futile, at worst unspeakably barren and futile," at worst unspeakably barren and futile.

The Commission's report describes local jails, which are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation, as follows:

"...Not only are those establishing a new grant program to improve correctional facilities, and requiring that 25 percent of all applications made for law enforcement assistance be committed to the purposes of correction activities."
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"(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 an additional amount made available by virtue of the application of the provisions of sections 509 and 509b of this title to the grants to the States, and the determination by the Administration, be allocated among the States for grants to State planning agencies, units of 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 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) The Administration determines, on the basis of information available to it during any fiscal year, that a portion of the funds shall be unavailable. If the Administration of the State or county fails 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.

TRAILING, EDUCATION, RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND SPECIAL GRANTS


(1) Section 905 is redesignated as part F and part G.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 906 is redesignated as subsection (b) of section 906.

(3) Subsection (b) of section 906 is redesignated as subsection (c) of section 906.

(4) Subsection (c) of section 906 is redesignated as subsection (d) of section 906.

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 the National Commission on Law Enforcement onoke and the Administration of Justice 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.

"(1) The term 'correctional institution or facility' means any place for the confinement of persons held for prosecution for violating Federal, State, and local law enforced personnel in improved methods of crime prevention and reduction and enforcement of local laws. Such activities shall be designed to supplement and improve, rather than supplant, the training programs of the State and local government, and shall not duplicate the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 404 of this title.

"Sec. 452. A grant may be awarded by the Administration to a local government for any of the purposes of this part if the Administration determines that the grant is necessary.

"(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 the National Commission on Law Enforcement onoke and the Administration of Justice 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.

"(1) The term 'correctional institution or facility' means any place for the confinement of persons held for prosecution for violating Federal, State, and local law enforced personnel in improved methods of crime prevention and reduction and enforcement of local laws. Such activities shall be designed to supplement and improve, rather than supplant, the training programs of the State and local government, and shall not duplicate the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 404 of this title.

"Sec. 452. A grant may be awarded by the Administration to a local government for any of the purposes of this part if the Administration determines that the grant is necessary.

"Sec. 455. (a) The funds appropriated each fiscal year for the purpose of carrying out part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall be allocated by the Administration as follows:

"(1) Eighty-five per centum of the funds shall be available for grants to State planning agencies.

2. The remaining five percent of the funds shall be used by the Administration to make 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 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. 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) 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.

"(c) Section 561 is amended by striking out the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Funds appropriated for the purpose of this section may be expended by grant or contract, as the Administration may determine to be appropriate.

"(d) Section 561(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 gatherings notwithstanding the provisions of the Joint Resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution providing for housing, feeding, or transporting conventions or meetings', approved February 2, 1959 (61 U.S.C. § 561')."

"(e) Section 561(b) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Funds appropriated for the purpose of this section may be expended by grant or contract, as the Administration may determine to be appropriate.

2. The Administration is authorized, 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 the performance of their duties, while attending meetings of the committee, 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, United States Code.

"(2) 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 the performance of their duties, while attending meetings of the committee, 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, United States Code.
by section 5703 of such title 3 for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and by section 519 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

There is a real danger, as I pointed out during general debate, that those States which do not have legislative bodies in session at the present time will not have time 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 this amendment which appears in subsection 4(6), lines 30 through 35, page 4 of the bill, there is a new requirement that any fiscal year funds may remain available for obligation until expended. Not less than 25 per centum of the amounts appropriated by the Congress for the activities of the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter, on or before August 31, 1968, and each fiscal year thereafter, "On or before December 31, each year".

There is authorized to be appropriated $966,000,000 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. The funds appropriated by the Congress for the activities of the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter, may be used to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of programs or projects funded under this title.

I believe that the Governors and the State planning agencies generally agree that the only way broad antcrime legislation and appropriations permitting a State contribution of 25 percent of local funds, adequate to cover the program requirements 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 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 possible, therefore, that they may not be able 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 in their chambers whose legislatures meet next year but do not pass appropriations for this purpose prior to July 1 could not qualify for receiving law enforcement assistant 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 condition that would have made the requirement flow instead into the general pool of funds which is distributed according to the discretion of the Administration, 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.

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 need to pass legislation to enact this bill which requires States to furnish one-fourth of the non-Federal funding. All that my amendment will do is to defer that particular requirement being imposed on the States during the fiscal year 1971 which begins on or after 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 legislative bodies in session at the present time will not have time 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 this amendment which appears in subsection 4(6), lines 30 through 35, page 4 of the bill, there is a new requirement that any fiscal year funds may remain available for obligation until expended. Not less than 25 per centum of the amounts appropriated by the Congress for the activities of the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter, "On or before December 31, each year."
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 cannot wait year after year. The cities are anxious to put up their allocated portion. The counties are willing to do the same thing. But the State legislatures, house meets another. 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 adversely affect 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 the 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 not given us advice 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 legislature of Iowa does meet—and I think the gentleman from Iowa has been so 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, for its 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 necessity there is 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 the House meets only a little bit or legislative sessions 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 fix up 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 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. This 25 percent appears to be a percentage contribution that is acquired 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 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 they 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 case, 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. McCLOY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. McCLOY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. There has been a lot of haggling 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, will the gentleman say that he approves the provision of this bill?

Mr. McCLOY. Yes, I believe they would.

Mr. KYL. In other words, whether the
Mr. POUNCEY. 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. POUNCEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has answered now quite consistently in the way I answered the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

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

Mr. POUNCEY. 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, this is the case. If this is not true, the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa is not an accurate response.

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 block grants to the States—which is something we want to retain—then what 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. SWACH. 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 State legislatures. I am convinced that we 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 people are 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. 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 States before the plan is adopted. There is no time constraint.

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 States before the plan is adopted. There is no time limit. Nothing is 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, offers its plan forward and offers its plan until September of this year, comes in 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 long.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, I believe that the LEA would ask from the State in that regard a pledge. The LEA would say, "Are you willing to defray one-quarter of these non-Federal funds?" If the State plan is adopted, then, I believe the LEA would be a shill 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 honor 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 legislature in advance.

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. KYL. Mr. Chairman, 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 the Federal Government would give 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 my attention to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York.

The State of Iowa is not in an unusual or out-of-the-ordinary 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.

There are two situations: 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 total 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 meets, have an 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. MIKVA. I say 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. Is that correct? Mr. KAZEN. We, 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’s say that the gentleman from Iowa has not reached the ultimate situation, more or less, now. There is no provision for using funds of this kind unless they are earmarked. There are no contingency funds. Mr. KYL. That was the gray area I have 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. Would 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. Is that correct? Mr. KAZEN. We, 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’s say that the gentleman from Iowa has not reached the ultimate situation, more or less, now. There is no provision for using funds of this kind unless they are earmarked. There are no contingency funds. Mr. KYL. That was the gray area I have 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. Regardless of how good their plan may be, they may have a plan, but I say to the gentleman, if a State has not 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 amendment.

Mr. KYL. Let me repeat what the gentleman said.

Mr. CELLER. Iowa must present a proper plan before it gets its proportion of funds under this bill.

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 a proper plan under which Iowa is participating, under the bill we are debating today?
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?

Mr. MIKVA. No, it did not. Many States will appropriate money just as the fiscal year draws near. In fiscal 1969, Iowa and other States would not have participated in the program if we had not come up with a State plan, that 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. We have the situation that we need that 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 all of the States, if 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 which 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 be available until the summer of 1971. Give consideration to our plight, and that of the other States, and adopt this amendment.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. 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 3, there are many questions which the States would be devastated. It would be virtually impossible for Iowa, and for many other States to meet the matching fund requirements this coming fiscal year, or perhaps, the following year.

It seems 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 faced with legislation of this type. This 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.
policeman or fireman in the United States who is killed or totally disabled in line of duty benefits under the Federal Employment 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 United States, on May 22, 1968, in 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 pointed 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 38 repeals all of the laws inconsistent with this law. Any amendment to the bill must be germane to this bill, in the opinion of the Chair, which is clearly and distinctly connected logically with the general scope and intent of the bill.

It is not the province of the Chair to pass on the merits or demerits of any amendment to a bill. It appears to the Chair that this amendment is clearly, distinctly, and logically connected with the general scope and intent of the bill. It authorizes the secretary, for the purpose of determining 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 encourage law enforcement efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective as a result.

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 to hold in one case to finish this amendment 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 bill, and I urge the Chair to conclude them if they fall in the battle against crime.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler) has raised a point of order on the grounds that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. Celler has studied the bill and the amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to assist State and local government to control crime and violence. It is a broad and important piece of legislation, with an administrative test for immigrants to a bill to regulate the immigration of aliens in the United States.

The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana proposes that upon a determination by the Secretary of Labor to make State and local police officers, 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 this committee for bringing out an outstanding piece of legislation. In addition to authorization for 3 years, which for planning purposes is essentially absolute 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 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCulloch) 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 and seminars to instruct State and local law enforcement personnel in improved methods of crime prevention, detection, and correction 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 think it shows that at some point in the future we would give special emphasis to the program now in the Department to provide for the training in combating organized crime, in training Federal prosecutors, so we will have training in the Department with respect to the training of Federal prosecutors in combating organized crime, in the techniques of enforcement, by recognizing the need to establish this program to provide for the increased training of Federal prosecutors in combating organized crime, in the techniques of enforcement, by recognizing the need to establish this program to provide for the increased training of Federal prosecutors.
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 consideration of H.R. 17825, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act Amendments, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of this committee and the members of the committee for their very great consideration which they gave me in connection with my legislative proposal pending before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Chairman, I join the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee in complimenting the gentleman in the well for the very fine statement he 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 CHAIRMAN. 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 29, 1970.

Mr. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Mr. DAVID H. FORD, Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1958, the Committee on Public Works of the House, having consulted with the Appropriations Committee on August 24, 1970, approved the following public building projects:

For Lauderdale, Florida: Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.


Honolulu, Hawaii: Post Office, Walkik Station.


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).
version was $500,000 the first year and
$750,000 for the next 3 years.
Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the conference
report retained this $500,000 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 ra­
ther than it is.
Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is
absolutely correct. The gentleman from
Iowa asked his question in terms of spe­
cific purposes. The gentleman from Michi­
gan (Mr. STEINER) is there any mandato­ry expenditure provision in this confer­ence report?
Mr. PERKINS. There is no manda­
tory 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 gentle­
man 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 gentle­
man from Kentucky?
There was no objection.
Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House today, the
conference report on the bill to es­
ablish a National Commission on Li­
braries 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 years to 11 days
on April 20, 1970.
In the legislation that passed the
House of Representatives the Com­
mission was established as a separate and
independent agency from any agency or
department of the Government.
In the Senate version of the legisla­
tion the Commission was to be identi­
ed and associated directly with the De­
partment of Health, Education, and Wel­
fare.
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 better one to deal with the
needs of the many agencies and libraries and library sci­
cence interests that were not connected
with the Department of Health, Educa­
tion, and Welfare.
Mr. BRADEMAS. The Library of Con­
gress, National Archives, National
Agricultural Library, Smithsonian Insti­
tution, and special libraries such as mu­
seums, and historical associations.
All of these do not come within the
pursuit 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 mea­
sure authorized the Commission to ac­
cept contributions and to disburse the
funds for the purposes of the Commiss­
ion.
The conference report contains this
provision.
In other aspects the resolution of dif­
ferences 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 confined the function to de­
veloping plans. The conference report
adopts the provision of the Senate bill.
Second. The Senate bill explicitly in­
cluded language relating to special li­
braries and information services in the
areas, while the House amendment did
not. The conference report adopts the
provision of the Senate bill.
Third. The Senate bill required an ap­
propriation of $500,000 for the first year
when the House amendment confined the
appropriation to resources. The confer­
ence report adopts the Senate provi­sion.
Fourth. The House amendment stated
that the Commission shall comply with
deficiencies of library and information
resources, as well as their adequacies,
while the Senate bill did not. The con­
ference report adopts the House provi­sion.
Fifth. The Senate bill required that
the Commission advise Federal, State,
and local agencies regarding libraries
and information services. 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 make such advice.
Sixth. The Senate bill required re­
porting through the Secretary to the
President and to Congress. The House
required reporting directly to the Pres­
ident 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 the composition and mem­bership of the Commission. The Senate
conference report contains the provi­sions of the Senate bill.
Seventh. The House amendment au­
thorized reports in addition to the an­
nual 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 Formation. They differed
in a number of respects and substan­
tively 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 each group be know­ledgeable with respect to the technologi­cal aspects of library services.
The conference report rewrites section
6 of 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 3 years, and four to serve ini­tially for 4 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 Senate amendment in contrast
provided 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 field of 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.
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
26 Members of both sides of the aisle, was
reported unanimously out of the Educa­
tion 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 while the House, an amendment in the
chairmanship of Douglas Knight, former
president of Duke University. In addi­tion to establishing the Commission, this
bill calls 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
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 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 would receive 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 nonprofit educational entity such as the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) 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 Fund (TIAA) would considerably lower the cost of pension programs. It is a unique plan that could be used throughout the country for collective bargaining purposes.

The national 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 Teams, the Teamsters and the Teamster Council, 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 Teamsters, could be a 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 the Teamster Council, 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 rest of the Teamster members. If the national contract has already been submitted to and ratified by the Teamster rank-and-file.

It 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 Teamster Council, Inc., the bargaining arm for the Nation's truckers, is resisting a higher settlement for fear the national contract would be reopened. It is the Teamster Council'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 major 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 a national pension plan. Pension bargaining and industrywide bargaining has lead us down the path to the present perilous predicament we are faced with. We, the Congress, should support and pass this national agreement which is so vital to the Nation's economy.
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call upon the President to use the powers granted him under Taft-Hartley to call an immediate conference 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 proposed settlement as it is and to go 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 rates? The public. The public 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. It is time to care for one whom 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 unions, and the frightening picture. There are approximately 450,000 Teamsters involved in this question and such a settlement would be overwhelming rejected if it is held out. An estimated total of 40,000 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 for higher wages. We have been demanding a raise of $1.65 an hour over 36 months.

This vote represents the feeling of the drivers throughout the area, and the area said Ray Schoessling, president of Chicago Teamsters Joint Council 29. This conflict will go on for some time unless the employers realize we are 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 for higher wages. We have been demanding a raise of $1.65 an hour over 36 months.

There are approximately 450,000 Teamsters involved in this question and such a settlement would be overwhelming rejected if it is held out. An estimated total of 40,000 drivers are idle now although 40,000 are involved in the dispute.

The strike has been a severe blow to Chicago area business and industry. Selective strikes were started April 6, and then the five major associations went out on strike as well.

Mr. Speaker, if 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 $1.65 an hour over 36 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 H. McNutt, acting Teamster Union president, and Ray F. Beagle, chief negotiator for Trucking Employers, Inc. Involving 40,000 drivers, the Chicago drivers rejected it.

The latest trucking industry offer here was for a 78-day strike of $1.65 an hour over 45 months. The local union leaders had recom-
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 a test program now being conducted in Omaha, Neb.; under this latest outrage against fundamental human values, young military 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 make Huxlean alpines such students from those identified as gamma. This may seem unbelievable; but, it is happening nonetheless.

Now, the rationale, or excuse, offered for this monstrous practice 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 school days. 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, prescribing only for those who really need it. 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 expect our national effort against drug abuse to have meaning when those in authority abuse drugs themselves? How can we convince a teenage that amphetamines, such as Dexedrine, 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 this energy, they are seeking to deaden it into abysmal regularity. And is this not the exact result we want to avoid in our efforts to protect our 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 and determining 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 only isolated instances. For instance, if all such operations are linked together, they seem to represent the most concerted attack on our basic humanity ever mounted in the history of the world. And it is only one of many. 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 Democracy, etc.

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, Ore., 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 colleagues and say that this great honor is richly deserved. He has sponsored more beneficial and constructive veterans' legislation than any other man in the history of the State of Texas. And I know my colleagues that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is the only Veterans' Affairs
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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. BRADEMAS 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 our Congress.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you very much. I certainly want to join in the commendation of my cousin, Olin, which is now chairman of the committee, 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 from the House 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 choosing Congressman Teague for the award, cited him for his service to the "nation, as both soldier and civilian, with dignity and honor." The Legion 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 NCA as having "worked diligently and consistently throughout his Congressional tenure, as Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, to bring equity and justice to the veterans' benefits programs."

In Europe during World War II, while commanding the 1st Battalion of the 314th T parachute Infantry, 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 1964. He also is the second ranking member of the Committee on Science and Aeronautics, established in the 90th Congress, and a 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 conduct a vote by electronic device.)

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.

Pew 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 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 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 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."
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 hitchhike to his first union convention held in South Bend. The local union he belonged to in Detroit had just 13 members. To keep his charter, it had to pay per capita dues on two members it claimed to have.

Reuther, jokingly, recalled the debate when it was decided he be entrusted with the entire union treasury. In vain he pleaded his expenses to attend the South Bend convention. The local's only woman member, the financial secretary, scoffed in derision, 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 do that bed all week.

In 1932, Reuther made a memorable appearance at the centennial celebration of the Studebaker plant. As the featured speaker, he said "When labor gets invited to a 100th birthday observance in honor of management, it's labor's turn to make the meal. I know of no place I should rather be invited to, than the 100th anniversary celebration of this union."

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 13, 1970]

WALTER REUTHER

The death of Walter Reuther In an airplane crash has taken a fighter from the American industrial scene.

Even his opponents said he had plenty, inside and outside the labor movement—honors 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. The 62-year-old veteran 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 and the growth of the giant automobile factories during the 1930's. His career was shaped by the concept of bigness that has helped to define industry. And to 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 inspiration had a vital role in furthering the concept.

From the moment he emerged on the national labor scene, Reuther never claimed as much. But his determination and inspiration had a vital role in furthering the concept.

As featured speaker, he said "I can still picture him in 1941 with that microphone in his hand, getting Ford to do things for workers like us," said Smith, a Local 3 member who has spent 22 years in the plant. "What he accomplished for the UAW was his legacy to the people he worked for."

The tragedy opened floodgates of grief and sorrow to thousands of mourners throughout the world, bringing together union and non-union workers, workers and their families, veterans and students. Many traveled to Detroit to pay their final respects.

At 8 a.m. on Wednesday, May 13, in a light drizzling 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.

Among the first in that reverential line were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Rydholm.

"We felt so close to him because of how much he enjoyed young people," Mr. Rydholm said. "He always called me "Uncle.""

"We felt he was just like a father to us," said Mrs. Rydholm, tears glistening in her eyes. "He was just like a father to us," she said, "and he and my husband attended "just about every meeting held in Detroit" at which we were asked to go."

In that sorrowful line walked rich and poor, black and white, young and old—even those who had not and never had the opportunity to be close to him, who had never known of his work outside the union. They knew him as Walter Reuther, as a labor leader, as a man of integrity, as a leader who never claimed as much.

He did not accomplish this alone, of course, and never claimed as much. But his determination and inspiration had a vital role in furthering the concept.

The tragedy opened floodgates of grief and sorrow to thousands of mourners throughout the world, bringing together union and non-union workers, workers and their families, veterans and students. Many traveled to Detroit to pay their final respects.

At 8 a.m. on Wednesday, May 13, in a light drizzling 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.

Among the first in that reverential line were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Rydholm.

"We felt so close to him because of how much he enjoyed young people," Mr. Rydholm said. "He always called me "Uncle.""

"We felt he was just like a father to us," said Mrs. Rydholm, tears glistening in her eyes. "He was just like a father to us," she said, "and he and my husband attended "just about every meeting held in Detroit" at which we were asked to go."

In that sorrowful line walked rich and poor, black and white, young and old—even those who had not and never had the opportunity to be close to him, who had never known of his work outside the union. They knew him as Walter Reuther, as a labor leader, as a man of integrity, as a leader who never claimed as much.
It was a whirlwind courtship. They were married March 18, 1936. After the ceremony there was a gay but short wedding dinner with friends and family. Walter Reuther later had to get to a union organizing meeting where Walter was speaking.

Walter Reuther was too young to have had any children when he met May. When they talked about having children, she said, "I have a job and I'm not going to give it up. I can't do that."

Despite their slight acquaintance, they had a lot to talk about. He was trying to organize workers in the steel mills, and she was an active member of the Teachers' Union and was trying to organize teachers.

They had fun trying to organize workers than the eight hours he worked in the shop. Fortunately, no one was hurt. The building was blown up in the alley back of the shop and had immediately joined the union movement that has always been dear to his heart.

When Walter Reuther was a young school teacher he had met on the Avenu plant of Briggs Manufacturing Co. He had a couple of months in nearly a year. May Reuther is the executive board of the UAW.
were overcoming the suspicion of the AFL.

fear.

and not more than "to

previous two or three years. And they had extraordinarily inept and almost disastrous election of their own officers, and was elected to the national AFL leadership, which had been known union activists and of physical violence in South Bend in 1898.

Then, at a very end of the year came the historic sitdown strike.

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 workers who needed him.

Yet hope and confidence was high among those active. One of the main targets of the Communist Party in union affairs was a plan to organize the unorganized industrial and service industries. The new union was severely tested not only by the immediate challenge from the merger itself. It soon became disenchanted with the failure of the AFL and the Teamsters to achieve a breakthrough for labor.

Reuther drew together a handful of active granted the union, and negotiating the union and pledging to recognize the reconstructed National Labor Relations Board as the exclusive agent.

In May, 1969, the AFL-CIO recognized the reconstructed UAW with its membership. Walter Reuther was the victim of another shotgun blast. His right eye was destroyed and his collar bone fractured.

The following year, Victor Reuther was also never found.

Walter Reuther was elected president of the AFL-CIO in 1935 to succeed the late Philip Murray. He was not just an officer, but as the new president of the AFL-CIO, he was a powerful force for achieving labor's organizing, economic and social objectives.

In the years that followed, Reuther's fellow UAW officers and most UAW members became disillusioned with the failure of the AFL-CIO to embrace the New Deal's liberal policies, and saw its move toward the conservative, pro-AFL wing of the AFL as a setback for labor's growth and strength.

Reuther 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.
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 protection, and generally improving the quality of American society.

Reuther and his associates were determined that their union and its members were entitled to all union members for redress of any grievances against the union itself and that justice, in such matters not be delayed by delay.

Thus, in 1967, the UAW Convention approved a recommendation by the International Assemblies for the establishment of a seven-man Public Review Board, composed of prominent citizens of unquestionable integrity. It was outside the ranks of labor, to which such cases can be referred. The FBK operates 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, organizing was not merely a call to his union. It was a call to men to get rid of the suffocating atmosphere that left them. Mr. Reuther had no use for the kind of leadership that was italy and stuffy shirt. Mr. Reuther sought to identify his union with the younger workers, the brave young people who are the poster children of this long-term labor movement.--Christian Science Monitor"

The infinite scope of Walter P. Reuther's impact on his times has been reflected in the editorial comments on his contributions to the labor movement, the nation and to mankind.

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 bright qualities. He was a great organizer. He was a great leader who dedicated his life to improving the condition of other men's lives... His death is a large loss to the nation, a loss in the struggle for peace and justice everywhere."—New York Post.

"Mr. Reuther was the liveliest, most far-sighted, most effective and effective men of the national black community could not be overestimated. The American labor movement, like many other labor leaders, is not black in its thoughts. It is a philosophy of color in the days of the 21st century, the 60's. Its potentiality is the color line in the days of the 21st century, the 60's. Its potentiality is the color line in the 60's. Walter Reuther fought for a better life for 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 leaders of his day. The Cincinnati Post and Times-Star.

"The impact of his loss on those of us in the national black community could not be overestimated. Our country lost a man of great power and leadership. The people of Israel will sorely miss a true and great leader and forces of progress in the world."—Christian Science Monitor.

"We have many crusaders in our midst today, but Walter Reuther was a giant in the crusade. He was one of a rare breed."—San Francisco Examiner.

"His impact on labor history is profound."—Philadelphia Post-Gazette.

"The death of Walter P. Reuther was an even more substantial loss for the nation than it is for the labor movement. Walter Reuther was 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: "I learned with distress the news of Walter Reuther's passing..."

Benjamin Benent, president, Ghana Trade Union Congress: "Condolences for the loss of a man who has done so much for all workers in the world..."

"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:

Charles 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 extraordinary executive advocate of labor's interest. His tough-minded dedication, his sense of social concern, his selflessness and devotion to every man, woman and child made him a unique and great figure in the development of modern industrial history."—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 struggles, the fight for cleaner air, and a legislative drive for low-cost health insurance."—Newsweek.

"We have many crusaders in our midst today, but Walter Reuther was one of a rare breed."—San Francisco Examiner.

"His impact on labor history is profound."—Philadelphia Post-Gazette.

"The death of Walter P. Reuther was an even more substantial loss for the nation than it is for the labor movement. Walter Reuther was one of the most compassionate and creative voices of our time."—Des Moines Register.

THE WORLD HAS LOST A GREAT LEADER
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movement and the nation will long remember him as a great and dedicated leader."  

Karl E. Scott, president of the AFL-CIO, said Mr. Reuther was a man of great stature and dedication. In his advocacy of modern industrial history, "the 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 his own movement, but also for the cause of collective bargaining and the entire American process."

WE ARE POOR 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 his own movement, but also for the cause of collective bargaining and the entire American process."

WE ARE POOR 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 his own movement, but also for the cause of collective bargaining and the entire American process."

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 his own movement, but also for the cause of collective bargaining and the entire American process."
He told the National CAP Advisory Council a story.

"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. We are in full stop on the one hand, with crimes, the Ford work there, and his wife said something much like this:

"We consider ourselves just ordinary people who will not interrupt the flow of dreams. His income will continue. The young couple can age together without fear."

When Solidarity interviewed the young family at the Columbus place, he heard, "When his Grapes of Wrath nudged the nation, Black Lake was preserved. Not a tree or shrub was touched without his permission."

Delegates to the many UAW Conventions which met at the center, during March and April were treated to a lovingly conducted tour by Reuther of every part of the center. Office workers, plant workers, students, and their wives, neighboring Black Lake. The center was built ... in Flint. He said in those pre-war days."

This is what he is about: make America true to itself."

"For years, the UAW longed for a center where they could determine their own destiny, to mold and shape the youth of our country."

"He was a man the world 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 room at last row for the first little girl. Years from now, when she's in school, I hope she tells her teacher that one day she found out she had to go on and see Mr. Reuther ..."
and faced the guns of sheriffs and their deputies alongside leaders of the strike, Cesar Chavez.

From that moment on, the Delano strike and the strike of migrant workers along the Rio Grande River in Texas had assumed the UAW's fullest support—and the nation came to know its shame.

And then last month, El Malariado, the vote of farm workers, confirmed for tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking Americans what had been transmitted to them: that Walter Reuther had gone. 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 Malariado, "went out to the suffering masses in every corner of the globe. He was a master of the things of life 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 flag of peace and of the United Nations . . .

And a young man said: "As we walked through the woods at Black Lake, I thought of those days which would follow in our footsteps . . ."

And a rabbi said: "Our hearts go out to Linda and Tessa, and all who 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 trade unionists throughout the world . . ."

And then a man who worked closely at his side said: "We knew that a better future for mankind had 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 fist at his side, that kind of gesture spread hand again, his words reaching for the conscience of men.

"And standing there as big as life. And principles they found . . ." 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 composition seemed to take over the mourners. Deep, sad thought and its accompanying emotion, and you were still there, feeling the body of the songwriter through his music and his words . . .

And how those daisies shimmered!

EULOGIES

Eleven men and women spoke as eulogists for memorial services at May and June 1970. Walter Reuther, of course, only. Their remarks here are excerpted:

Dave Miller

(Chairman of the National UAW Retired Workers Advisory Council)

Today the UAW is a leaner, more comfortable, more secure union . . . Walter Reuther was one 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 Detroit in 1937. We had found a room that could be rented for $10— $10 a month for a headquarters for the organization. It was in the Northside Hotel in Detroit. And between the three of us we didn't have $10.

I remember the inch-by-inch progress upward; 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 world for the workers in the plants . . .

He did not live to see the kind of world he envisioned. Perhaps one day the world we live in today was planned by an angel here on earth. . . .

But history will not forget that he was one of the first in the nation to begin talking about the war on poverty and its potential social priorities. When nearly everyone else was still complacent about a national priority system of social planning, he sensed 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 the war in Indochina ever muster the political muscle to shut it down, Walter Reuther's name will fill the pages of books about the war and they'll write this down about him: he was not a selfish man, that's why we have so much to imagine . . .

Dr. J. William Rau\n
(Professor 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 who were the age of 20 or 20 years of age—be dealt with as carriers of possible and that the thought 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 friend I ever had . . .

Whenever the sky was tough, Walter Reuther was with us . . . He was one of the first to help Cesar Chavez and the striking grape pickers in California . . . And whenever the poor and the oppressed needed him, Walter Reuther was there . . .

And I remember that the UAW paid union men were endangered so long as there were other workers who were jobless, whose chill-
The leaders of industry knew Walter Reuther in the heat of the bargaining room where his words were as decisive as the proverbial 'gun to the head.' He knew the importance of maintaining a climate where the bargaining process was directed not only to the better 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, Grandma Reuther's homemade wine from theirs...  

**Sam Brown**  
(National youth leader)

For many in journalism, our most direct contact with Walter Reuther was in the struggle for social justice.

I came out of hard bargaining sessions, broken by the late hours and the shouted battles that families could walk among the trees...  

The scope of Walter Reuther's dream became clear as I observed a society in which the just world of peace and 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. And we dare 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 Bialik, 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 ever be as generous as they have shared their parents' love with us.

There were moments, I am sure, in the past week of which I am not proud. But I am filled with hope and faith that after this week, my world will return to peace in a new, whose actions are guided by a vision of love, peace, brotherhood and justice.

Walter had faith that these voices will persist never truly at peace 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 summer year for foreign war and domestic unemployment.

In the history of the labor movement, the last of the Reuther Plans lay on the desks of U.S. senators in 1970, once again a deeply troubled world of battles abroad and laidoff workers at home.

In the 50 years between Walter P. Reuther and the nation, 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 might be a stranger in Congress, but members of Congress and the White House for his plans to improve the well-being of the nation. He battled the committee chairmen of the giant corporations to upgrade the living and working conditions of laboring men themselves.  

At first, Reuther's stolidly formed ideas were dismissed by scoffers as "crackpot" and "idle dreams." But his advice and counsel were sought by presidents and world leaders.

Ironically, the initial Reuther Plan showed the nation's love to convert its peacetime machinery to warplane production, while the last plan described how the nation could return to peace, 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. "If production were fully under way and the defense industries could be given the 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 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 a 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 "crazy talk" 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 be geared up to produce the modern fighting planes a day, if the idle machines and the idle men of the automotive industry could be mobilized and increased temporarily subordinated to the needs of this emergency.

"This plan is labor's answer to a crisis," said Reuther in unveiling his plan then 33 years old. "New plants cannot be built and put into operation in less than 18 months. In 18 months, the auto industry alone could be all but broken by the need to convert for all peace production, may be lost, and our own country left to face a totalitarian Europe alone."

President Franklin D. Delano Roosevelt received the plan at the White House. The document contained nearly 7,000 words of detail on national goals, program outline, aircraft designer plans, 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 facilities were to be converted for making airplane components.

Later, two congressional investigating committees upheld the auto industry's failure to convert its plants and its insistence on making profits by building cars while soaking up defense orders for warplanes.

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 the Senate Investigating Group's plan to convert to civilian production the defense industries supplying armament for the Viet Nam war.

Reuther recalled in his reconversion plan the bitter lesson of 1940, saying:

"Now, 50 years later, auto workers are essentially the same stubborn line taken by the pre-Pearl Harbor automobile industry. Having found a sheltered and hidden location resting on a dangerous assumption of perpetual confrontations 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 appearance on Oct. 30, 1969, he said: "There are millions ... in America who believe in them, not because the American people believe in them, not because the majority of the people in the Senate agree with that, but because under Rule 22 which allows unlimited debate (filibustering), with cloture requiring two-thirds of the Senate's membership, the 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 Banking and Currency 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 economic and political power."

"If the speed of a man's mind could be measured in the same way that rawplanes written in the New York Times Magazine: "Ideas have long 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 that rawplanes written in the New York Times Magazine: "Ideas have long 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."

By 1949, Reuther's unique ability to develop comprehensive, workable ways to solve the nation's major problems was acknowledged.

"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 (1964), 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 if the government supplied materials and suggested a guaranteed weekly wage. In this proposal, Reuther asked for the "initiation by government of a National Wage Policy whereby labor and capital would work together to employees who work less than 40 hours a week through no fault of their own," and, instead of paying wages for all industry wage stabilization policy and the creation of tripartite (government-management-labor) wage negotiations, he advocated the use of the UAW's collective bargaining power and sending the government a plan for dealing with the nation's labor relations problems.

In giving an analysis of the UAW's political responsibilities, Reuther explained: "The public's approval of union political activities is that we are deeply committed to the participation in American political activity and that 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 is the responsibility to help keep democracy's house."

Explaining the social consciousness of UAW, Reuther said:

"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."

"Government must make progress it can with the community and not at the expense of the community."

Reuther also 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 federal aid for highway production; federal aid to housing; federal aid to education and creation of an expanded foreign aid program.

Displaying his amazing foresightedness, in July 1946 Reuther told Congress of plans of his colleagues in the auto industry's production of needed railroad equipment.

In August 1951, he urged Congress to initiate a progressive spending tax "that will cut the wage gap's state of luxury before cutting the American standard of living."

During June 1961 testimony before the Senate Weakness 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 industry refuses to expand production capacity sufficiently to meet the nation's needs... then the government, at people must ... step in and fulfill that deficit."

In a blast at the poor showing of the steel industry in taking on new projects, he said, he needed their leadership for "... trying to drive our economic automobile down the road to the future with a rear-view mirror instead of being able to look 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 Senate's approval of Senate Rule 22 which allows unlimited debate (filibustering), with cloture requiring a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate.

Always fully documented and prepared for appearances, Reuther on numerous occasions 

... adequate debate should be
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Cooley, who was chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

"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 Farm Program in 1967, 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 and well-documented program, with a contribu-
tion 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."

"It was a pledge UAW has fulfilled time and time again at the behest of the hails of government where all the elderly could be helped.

"Fulfilled, in fact, far beyond the hopes of workers who were in the cold of Mil-
waukee's winter of 1949, cheered when their president cried out to the UAW-CIO educa-
tion 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 retire. You're still alive, but he's still young enough to live, and we're going to fight for the where-
withal so he can live as a decent American citizen.

"A frail woman of 63, Sadie Schuetzweiss, re-
membered and she came, as the nation paid tribute of
40-year Chrysler

"Mr. Walter Reuther, in his tenure as leader of
the union that hears the outcries of young people, said
fore the man who changed it all; the man
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 re-
cieved $1.5 billion in benefits.

"And many an oldtimer's eyes glistened with
mystery as he passed in final tribute be-
fore 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 re-
cieved $1.5 billion in benefits.

"We're enjoying benefits we never would have received without him," was the solemn tribute of the 40-year-old City of Our Dark, among the many thousands of retirees who joined those mourning the death of
Merle Hill.

"If it wasn't for him, we wouldn't be re-
tired now," agreed Local 51 retirees Regina Pea,
70, and Peter Krudzich, who stood as honor guards.

"On the grape boycott front, in petitions to Congress and in getting out the vote, the 'old


"Merle knew Walter Reuther as the leader of a union that hears the outcries of young America. He is dis-enchanted by a society they consider unjust.

"And Merle Hill, at 25, a rank-and-file member of the UAW, helps organize a place where youth can work for orderly change and improvements in society.
There is room in UAW for those with stars in their eyes, and alongside workers who are relatively content.

They had stars in their eyes—those men emerging from the Great Depression of the 1930s with a determination that there would be a union in the automobile industry.

Like the many young men then President Franklin Roosevelt, Walter Reuther had a vision of a better tomorrow when he came to Detroit as a 19-year-old union organizer.

On a trip that was to take them around the world, he and his younger brother, Vic­
tor, and a student group 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 that brought those unions into being."

To assure that his own union's inspiration doesn't die off with the dwindling number of union members, he early decided that Reuther and the union's executive board launched the most ambitious program of any union to assure the perpetuation of leadership for succeed­ing generations.

To a young local union editor at the union's convention two months ago, Reuther re­vealed his secret feelings about any "generation gap" within the union:

"Age is a matter of the spirit. I know you think that I was 23 when I was 24. 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 the things we need to do tonight.

"She 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 23-year-old Reuther's plan for converting auto assembly lines to warplane production.

He was a loving son to Eleanor Roose­velt. They worked together on many projects for humanity and their friendship covered a span of over 30 years.

President Harry S. Truman used his pro­posal on reconverting the automobile industry.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower considered him "the idea man" for labor.

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 Humphrey and Senator A. Alben Barkley, of Georgia, the UAW pres­ident invited his host and friend, Tage Er­lander, then Swedish prime minister, and the then West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, out for a brisk row around the lake.

He worked throughout his life with the few in power in the world, to strengthen the union power. He was their voice in high places.

Around the world, he worked at his dream.

Walter Philip Reuther's dream was a 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, fer­tilizer and seed for the hungry, engineers to make the kind of labor movement that will make the kind of world he would see better.

He gave voice to that dream in his first convention speech as president of the UAW when he said:

"We are building a labor 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 those who were there, that;

"People of all nations and of all tongues want the same things that we want. They want children to have...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 labor standards treaty designed to elim­inate the exploitation of workers.

Convention delegates also approved a re­convergence in 1949 of the General-based International Metalworkers Federation (IMF), which today represents 10 million metal workers.

That same year Reuther headed the CIO delegation, which with representatives of the APL 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.

Reuther and other UAW leaders worked closely with the ICFTU in establishing schools for organizers in the early '50s.

ICFTU was armed against the growing not only in the more highly developed countries of the world, 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 instrument—not only a democratic instrument—militant trade unionism—for realizing that hope.

ICFTU has worked 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 Venezeulian dictatorship.

CIO also provided legal aid for men and women under arrest in Africa in their strug­gle against apartheid, legal support for Ni­gerian trade union leaders and help which led to the inclusion of self-declared dissidents as alternation 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 it to end the war in Korea, to liberate prisoners of war, to overcome the defor­mate—men—and desperation is the ingre­dient that makes for war."

Increased expansion of overseas operations by the Big Three auto firms, International Harvester, and other corporations posed another formidable problem.

The UAW's 18th convention met this prob­lem on the shelves of the UAW Free World Labor Defense Fund in 1963.

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.

Reuther was the guiding spirit in the cre­ation of the World Auto Council in 1968 and the UAW delegation to the United Na­tions 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. At the same time, the world 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 Alton has warned that your escalatation of the war means the end of the Vietnam Peace Agreement.

"However this dangerous adventure turns out militarily, America has already suffered a serious and profound damage among the people of the world.

"You pledged to bring America together. Yet by your action you have driven the world community into a deeper and you have dan­gerously alienated millions of young Amer­i­cans. The bitter fruits of this growing aliena­tion and frustration may lead to a further and greater escalation.

"As 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 against the war.

"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.

"We can only speak the truth about the war while we escalate mass violence abroad.

"It is your responsibility to lead us out of the world that feeds and fights us home and abroad. We must mobilize for peace rather than for wider theaters of war.

"We ask you to explain and repudiate the actions of your government and to persuade your people to strive for peace at home and abroad. We must now move to statements of our hearts, hands and minds of our people to the fulfillment of America's unfinished agenda at home."
**TWO FRIENDS WHO PERISHED**

In the first-floor meeting room of the UAW's Memorial Fund, Oskar Stonorov has been eulogized as a renowned architect, a talented sculptor, and a "warm and compassionate" friend of the UAW who gave his life in a "deep devotion to the whole family of man."

The solemn salute to Stonorov was spoken by his daughter, Linda, and her brother, Vincent. Stonorov served as a memorial tribute to their late father, who had gathered in a memorial tribute to their late Mr. and Mrs. Earl F. Wolfman; four brothers, and co-worker on the day before he 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.

**REMEMBRANCE OF WALTER REUTHER**

The surviving daughters of the Reuthers, Linda, 27, and Lisa, 22, joined the Stonorov family in their pew during the services. Already in her seat was UAW Vice President Douglas Fraser and 31 others representing the unions and the builders of the facilities at the Family Education Center. Among those in attendance was Walter Reuther, who considered young William Wolfman, who 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 wreckage of the plane that left from the Mich. airport, of the chartered plane in which Walter and May Reuther and three other members of the family died.

The 32-year-old Wolfman, an ardent conservationist, was accompanying Walter Reuther on that trip, as he had on many others. A UAW member since 1958, Wolfman's widow came to UAW from a background of unionism that encompassed his lifetime. His wife and children were among the last to leave the plane.

Wolfman was the former president of Council 30 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union. One of his constant interests outside the UAW was a camp reservation area in Detroit for underprivileged children. Survivors include his widow, Martha; their 5-year-old son, Walter, and three older children, Mary, 11, and Maryanne, 10.

Burial was in Detroit's Roselawn Park Cemetery.

**TO DRY OUR EYES AND GO ON**

Frequently verging on tears as he spoke in somber tones, 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."

"We are not breaking the way of life that scatters, most families as the youth become adults, Vic said he and his deceased brothers, Wolfman and Walter, were "deeply blessed" because we have had the experience that few brothers in the world have shared.

"Ours has been a joy and the good fortune to have our people. The adult live together in the same cause, working in the harness together for the same organization."

"We have shared the 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."
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 level of misinformation: they 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 Al Aloup, a writer not always noted for liberal views. In that article, however, Mr. Aloup wrongly attributed to S. 30, the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969," two of the provisions simply 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. Aloup get his facts and his committee 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.

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 on noncriminal 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 when the grand jury prior to the filing of any report. Even if a report is filed and submitted by the grand jury to 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, an appeal is allowed as to the denial of bail 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 the filing of the appeal.


Mr. Speaker, I know this body is not going to let the biased views of uninformed news commentators influence our action on badly needed antitrust 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 are presently pending in the Congress, to provide 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.
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 here as a group of representatives in opposition to spending an additional $12.5 million to complete construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. It is 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 all varieties. If and when the Federal Government becomes involved in the promotion of this existing appreciation, it 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, and the arts and performing arts of all varieties are not at all inconsistent with my support for the program which we will consider tomorrow.

The support of the affiliate artists program by the National Endowment for the Arts, due not to their lack of appreciation but because of their lack of 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 the arts, that opera houses and firehouses can use the arts, that opera houses and firehouses can use the arts.

The person the neighborhood came to meet and come to know was an opera star, Miss Dorothy Krebbel, mezzo-soprano, whose distinguished cover credits include the Metropolitan Opera Company, the San Francisco Opera; the Chicago Lyric; and now engine house No. 2 in Beloit, Wis.

It was together with that gathering of people the seventy other similar gatherings this past year, in and around the community of Beloit, because of a program called affiliate artists, a program that brings performers and people together.

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 the arts, that opera houses and firehouses can use the arts.

The individual is the source of our Nation's strength. The local community is the place where this strength is exercised, and the arts and performing arts of all varieties are not at all inconsistent with my support for the program which we will consider tomorrow.

The support of the affiliate artists program by the National Endowment for 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, and the arts and performing arts of all varieties are not at all inconsistent with my support for the program which we will consider tomorrow.
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 could be non-dictive at this exercise control, nor stipulate appointments. They required only accountable stewardship of the funds and the maintenance of the character of the organization in helping performers and the people together.

Affiliate artists now have over 500 artists on file—singers, dancers, actors, and instrumentalists. More colleges, universities, art organizations, and towns have requested affiliate 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 brings the performers and the American people together.

I believe it. Last September, 30 of the affiliate artists went to the city of Beloit with a program that originated at a 3-day training conference and a 1-night “thank you” festival for the community and the college. Citizens and colleagues numbering 8,500, the largest gathering to take place intended 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 its 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 together. It is a time when the Federal Government cannot finance 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 having any success.

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 expenditure at a level that I think has operated in the past. I strongly believe that the program is too necessary to jeopardize by Federal funding at a level that would not 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 do so, too, and to oppose 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. Over the past 15 days responses have been computerized with the result that the majority of those citizens polled overwhelmingly support President Nixon move into Cambodia to clear out enemy sanctuaries.

The Cambodian operation drew an 81-percent favorable response. Seventy-five percent of those Illinoisans polled support this effort. Over the past 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 program 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 America’s young people showed a decreasing support for Federal agriculture support programs, I find a much narrower margin, with only 52 percent for the program and 48 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 55.4 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:

[poll results table]

1. Do you think President Nixon has charted a good course for ending the war in Viet Nam?
   Yes ______________________ 75.6
   No_________________________ 3.1
   No response________________ 18.1

2. Do you specifically favor the President’s decision to wipe out the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia?
   Yes ______________________ 61.6
   No_________________________ 13.2
   No response________________ 25.2

3. Do you favor continuation of draft deferments for college students?
   Yes ______________________ 80.6
   No_________________________ 7.8
   No response________________ 11.4

4. Should wage, price and credit controls be imposed across the board to stop inflation?
   Yes ______________________ 75.7
   No_________________________ 6.2
   No response________________ 18.0

5. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?
   Yes ______________________ 89.7
   No_________________________ 7.3
   No response________________ 1.9

6. Do you favor the automatic increase or decrease of social security benefits to reflect changes in the consumer price index?
   Yes ______________________ 48.7
   No_________________________ 23.3
   No response________________ 28.0

7. Do you think the Federal Government should subsidize families where the wages of fathers working full-time are below the pov­
   erty level?
   Yes ______________________ 37.1
   No_________________________ 55.0
   No response________________ 8.0

8. Do you feel you fully understand Presi­
   dent Nixon’s proposal for welfare reform?
   Yes ______________________ 45.0
   No_________________________ 37.4
   No response________________ 17.6

9. Should present farm programs be con­
   tinued as they are?
   Yes ______________________ 48.7
   No_________________________ 41.3
   No response________________ 10.0

10. Would you favor a five-year phase-out of Federal agriculture support programs?
   Yes ______________________ 61.9
   No_________________________ 22.2
   No response________________ 16.9
SENO RITY 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 1 minute.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CHARLES VANIX 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 any standing or select 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:


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 put before the committees who represent the views of the majority party, and of whom that party can be proud. Length of service in Congress is an important consideration, but it should no longer be the sole consideration.

Government by 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; etc.,” (Rule X, Section 3, Rules of the House of Representatives)

If adopted, this would be an advisory man­
date. 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 is not to the 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 de­
cided by each party, writing on the up­
coming reports of the Democratic Committee on Rules by Representative Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash.) and the Rep­

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 re­
garded 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 to the point of order 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 in­
stitution it is. These attacks and ensuing controversy continue to attract national news media.

Regrettably, too little is said of the good deeds and human success stories found in the Armed Forces. Contrary to the statements of America's professional critics, our professional soldiers are doing their best to defend our country, and 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 re­

The two letters which follow tell a very touching, human success story. They tell of a young man named Alan C. Day, by his acts and deeds personal critics, our professional soldiers know, that in addition to the hardships, they are many re­

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 fallings and failures, and he is a gentleman. 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 added him on many occa­sions and spent a lot of their free time with him. I think any of the many trainees, but as a Drill Sgt., I feel that the greatest satisfaction I have experienced was the pride I have in a soldier who successfully overcame those handicaps. He is very slow to grasp things, does not always understand his mission and does not understand the importance of a leader. A leader of all of this is his pride in himself that he has obtained something in his life which few of the people that committees are considering his mental capacity and his physical limitations. 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 obvi­

The letters follow:

FIRST SERGEANT: This letter is written in response to a request for personal comments to PVT. Frizzell and conditions that are prevalent to this man's characteristics and training. It is written as an aid to you and your cadre and not as any referral to pre­

The letters follow:

CHARTER SERVICES

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

CONTOOCOOK, N.H.,
April 19, 1970.
DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I met this young man ten years ago while he was serving in Vietnam. He had served in the Army for six years and was a good soldier. I recommended him for promotion to E-5 and he accepted. 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 R. DRESSER.

FORT DIX, N.J.,
July 1, 1969.
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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 execution of U.S. international aviation policy has been explicitly stated, and that, I quote, "charter services are a most valuable component of the international air transportation system, and they should be encouraged."

We in Congress recognized this fact about a decade ago when we passed legislation enabling the CAB to certificate the U.S. supplemental carriers, and again in 1964 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 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 operations, 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 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 postpone further consideration of these regulatory changes until Congress has had the opportunity to review the 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 world aviation policy. 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 "multilateral guidance and participation in the formulation of charter rules." These rules are, as you know, promulgated by the CAB and, at best, are difficult to understand. 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 these would never appear to be justified but they are particularly inappropriate at this time when the CAB has just directly and implicitly announced new rules. I would urge the CAB to postpone any further consideration of these measures until it has had time 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 Recce and to include extraneous matter. (By Guy Halverson)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have inserted into the Recce 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. I am talking about daily, total, indiscriminate slaughter in which its highways have been turned into a virtual battleground. Here a small group of drivers, either medical emergencies or people drinking, are driving head-on into the face of a stream of cars before being buried through a side door and down an embankment.

I am also indignant that the new policy which has been adopted to meet this situation is, in my opinion, a major legislative disaster. The grim fact is that the young driver—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. Throughout the nation, law-enforcement officials could recount thousands of similar episodes—a grim record of single- and multiple-vehicle collisions.

There was the Texas family killed in a head-on collision last December on one Sunday morning in 1969. And the Wisconsin mother and her eight-year-old son killed this past spring on July 29. Both 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 drivers, either medical emergencies or people drinking, are driving head-on into the face of a stream of cars before being buried through a side door and down an embankment.

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 highways is 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

"Uncool. It's a bad one, all right," the grimaced police officer next to me said as we skidded to a stop beside the twisted automobile, chunks of broken glass lying on the pavement. "Too much to smell. 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 smashed starkly against the dark Albuquerque sky. We 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 intersection of I-40 and I-25 was an unforgettable and heartbreaking explosion of tragedy.

The driver of the smashed vehicle—in his early 20's—had been observed by a police patrol car running a "red light" at the crowded New Mexico freeway at speeds approaching 100 miles an hour. As he sought to make the split-second turn, he lost control, jumped a deep ravine, and rolled onto a relatively new section of freeway in remembrance of dreams of cars before being buried through a side door and down an embankment.

Most miraculously, no other cars had become involved.

Liquer 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 is 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 easily be usual. Throughout the nation, law-enforcement officials could recount thousands of similar episodes—a grim record of single- and multiple-vehicle collisions.

There was the Texas family killed in a head-on collision last December on one Sunday morning in 1969. And the Wisconsin mother and her eight-year-old son killed this past spring on July 29. Both 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 drivers, either medical emergencies or people drinking, are driving head-on into the face of a stream of cars before being buried through a side door and down an embankment.

The neon parade of bars and package stores along the nation's highways provides corruption that adds to the problem with its 85-90 million drinkers—too often considers the bottle and the throttle acceptable combination.

In most states, indeed, statutory definitions of what constitutes "intoxicated driving" are an overlap.

WRONG WAY ON THE FREEWAY

Jan, an honor student, only shorty graduated from the University of Oklahoma, accepted the Thanksgiving Day, 1967, Carefully belted into the seat of his compan'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. Jack was killed instantly.

The pickup driver was drunk, an unopened liquor bottle on the seat beside him. He had repeatedly lost his driver's license and was well known for drinking.

"I've experienced tragedy many times in my family, but this was surely the shock of my life," has said, 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 17 million persons occupying these wagons were killed from February, 1968, to March, 1970. Of the 10,000 persons between the ages of 15 and 20 killed during these two years, 5,000 were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the accident. In the racing and those who use drugs.

Estimates vary widely, but the toll is enough to make one out of every two highway deaths is attributable to alcohol. Nevertheless, the health community may well be higher. Some authorities, in fact, fear that it may be as high as 70 percent.

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 of the accident. The report (based on blood samples taken from 507 drivers killed between February, 1968, and May, 1969) estimated that alcohol is a factor in 56 percent of all fatal accidents involving young people under 18.

State and local government officials, moreover, such as the State of Washington's 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," said William Howell, director of the Office of Alcoholic Countermeasures in the U.S. Department of Transportation. "Mass marketing of liquor is widely shared among safety experts. Ronald H. Inebriety, noted. "Fifteen percent of all fatalities are attributable to liquor. That astonishing figure attributed to liquor. That astonishing figure..."

In New Orleans, where the 1969 death toll of 108 fatalities was the highest since 1929, Dudley Andry, director of the Metropolitan Crime Commission, was speaking about the problem of drunk driving.

"There is a real sense of despair," he said quietly, deep, anguish mixed on his face.

"January, 1969, a white male doctor, 9:15 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 in denial and the capacity apparen at every level of society.

Despite an imaginative $18 million program sponsored by the National Highway and Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—Congress continues to spend little for highway safety.

Indeed, while Congress authorized some $297 million for the first three years of the National Safety Act, only $92 million has been spent. The recent estimates of the National Safety Council. At least 40 safety bills have been passed in the last few years, but the obstacles to them have received adequate financing.

State and local community programs fare no better. The liquor industry in many states is quietly seeking to enact legislation aimed at drunken drivers. For instance, the National Safety Council, a major program of the National Safety council, estimated that $4 million to the $7 to $8 billion the alcoholism treatment area is estimated at a percent of all fatalities.

Most experts say one reason the drunk driver is not being cured is that there is as yet no realistic hard-hitting attack on alcoholism in the U.S., such as he has had in Europe. In Europe, until the late 1930's, alcoholism was attached, new policies, an effective deterrent. Alcoholism in the states has been a type of alcoholism that was fatality, but the American Medical Association.

"We have a communication containing the history of alcohol and accidents occurring to automobile passengers in the 1944 Quarterly Journal of Inebriety, noted. "Fifteen percent of all fatalities are attributable to liquor. That astonishing figure attributed to liquor. That astonishing figure..."
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“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,
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, 1970, coal miners have been killed at a higher rate 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 the miners throughout the nation, as the President of the United States to enforce the law and protect the miners whose lives are at stake.

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 present last Saturday afternoon, June 27 at the dedication of the new McGhee Hall, chairman of the board of directors of Green Acres, Mrs. McGhee noted, "Not only has Green Acres 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 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 some long hours to make this dream a reality.

In addition to the article in the June 28 issue of the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Examiner concerning this ceremony, I would also like to note that McGhee 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 29, 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 facilities for the handicapped. Nearly 160,000 coal miners throughout the nation eagerly await your decision.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.
How did all this happen? According to officials at the National Institute of Mental Health, the three-year plan, Dr. Nenno said, “initiated” the process.

A group going supporting us on the project, Dr. Nenno said.

But economic fluctuation had its effects. It was Federal policy to hold down Federal expenditures on this kind of program. By the end of the fiscal year 1970, which ends tomorrow, March 31, the mental health institute was allowed to spend about half of what it had been promised and had already obligated. It had to meet expenditures for the two existing centers, and had to find additional centers.

In the fiscal year 1970, 125 new grants were requested by a reviewing committee at the institute. The committee considered only whether the community projects were ready to go under way. But the $193.5 million would fund only 65 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 65 projects that will be funded, 28 have already been notified. Thus 38 “winners” and 62 “losers” are still waiting to be informed of their fate.

According to officials at the institute, decisions on which projects would receive funds were based on whether the projects would be able to get community approval. In model cities programs (affiliated centers were given priority) and need as determined by state and community 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. The institute had requested $80.1 million for staffing grants.

Thus at first glance it would seem that the institute had made a mistake 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 the institute (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, made it clear that he thought it would raise false hopes and that Congress could not be expected to appropriate the additional expenses.

The President’s budget request of $60.1 million is now before committees in both the House and Senate. Information sources at the institute say that Congress will increase their appropriations despite the President’s objections.

But what the Senate 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 quas-criminal,” Mr. Otlowski said, “to do a job and then to stop the building and then have it stand there like some monument for pigeons.”
Along 90 miles of Chicago Freeway—Cleaning Up Chicago's freeways 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 roadways: A transistor radio (pulled from the dashboard of a car); a one-legged doctor's stethoscope; a case of beer; a trombone and an artificial leg. Someone really had a party! 2. Water—What have we done to our water? Our State of Minnesota is an example: Minnesota, the “land of sky blue waters,” has in recent years lost 3,000 acres of lakes and holds 50,000 miles of drainage ditches. The Mississippi, laden with silt, 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 an unknown cause. The Ohio River has an estimated 150 miles of Chicago Freeway where one half billion dollars a year is picked up. Air Pollution.—Has it cost you and I (also known as the public) anything, including our health? Wastewater.—The Hudson River was so polluted that the water in some areas is weak! There have been cases of deaths reported from ropes, painted their names in foot and hand and, in one of its rare instances, an artificial leg. We 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 access to every man, woman and child that conservation is not a farfetched something involving shooting a duck or fishing a fish. Conservation is not an obsession with dollar returns is too often at the expense of our outdoor heritage. We have radically altered the face of our earth both quarter-century from now and beyond.

From the standpoint of the conservationist, we are inspired and to 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 the wealth that modern and more rapid means of transportation, increasing income, leisure time and development of new natural resources. 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 proposed Nottawasaga National Park, in the Redwoods; in Big Walnut Valley; the Cascades, the Allegha; the Wild Rivers, the Adirondacks. The increasing demand for increased supplies for the future; by the mounting pressures occasioned by water, new urban centers, the expansion of industry 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 neighbors and other priceless information on rock formations, bridges, statues, etc.

We 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 frontiers. 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 ruination; we have left litter here, there and everywhere, without regard to what our national government and other priceless information on rock formations, carves love notes on trees, etc.

Specifically:

Litter—Caused by Ness Family.—Carelessness in cleaning up the campgrounds has resulted in huge amounts of garbage, and the fragments tossed into the waterways.

At Yellowstone Park—Visitors managed to upset the natural mechanism of the park. People always 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.

Clown Indians Close Beach Strip in Northern Washington because of the litter and misuse of the area by the public.

We hold enough tree seeds to reforest 40 acres—In other words, I am holding the potential of acres of forest in my hands. Just as we hold the future of the forest in our minds, so do the future of other forest products (and there are over 5,000) it might control erosion; it might provide the future of all resources in our hands. This generation is the first in history to have radial forest, as the seeds would sprout and grow into mature trees, in other words, I am holding the potential of acres of forest in my hands. The future holds a considerable increase.

In the past, as you well realize, our predecessors and ourselves have been careless neighbors and other priceless information on rock formations, carve love notes on trees, etc.

At Yellowstone Park—Visitors managed to upset the natural mechanism of the park. People always 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.

Clown Indians Close Beach Strip in Northern Washington because of the litter and misuse of the area by the public.

We hold enough tree seeds to reforest 40 acres—In other words, I am holding the potential of acres of forest in my hands. Just as we hold the future of the forest in our minds, so do the future of other forest products (and there are over 5,000) it might control erosion; it might provide the future of all resources in our hands. This generation is the first in history to have radial forest, as the seeds would sprout and grow into mature trees, in other words, I am holding the potential of acres of forest in my hands. The future holds a considerable increase.
when his very world is closed in by gloom in the afternoons.

How can a child know that the roof over his head, the metal in his set of wheels, the plastics of his possessions, the glass fibers that keep his 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 younger know, when urban planning and land use with no consideration for open space, with saving the small wood... with saving the marsh... how can he know the song of a bird, when built into our suburbs the identical conditions we flee from when we leave the heartland of metropolis. How can he be a conservation-minded adult when we fail to provide a good example. How can he be a steward if we are not?

To compound our problems, we are confronted by a population explosion on this planet which is staggering in its implications.

Every minute or every day—24 hours around the clock—we lose 3 to 5 acres of green space, highways, shopping centers, housing tracts, urbanized area... and a good share of this green space is representative of some of the most productive land... land once reserved for the nation's before and after 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 world's first billion people. Now the third billion was reached in 1960 after only 36 years.

(2) The second billion people took about 75 years to produce.

(3) The third billion was reached in 1960 after only 36 years.

(4) The fourth billion will appear on this planet in only 7 years.

(5) The fourth billion was reached in 1960 after only 36 years.

In other words, today's population which was taken since the beginning of time—will double in 30 more years.

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 it, but the world's total water, the total supply of water, the 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 areas—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 resources because of it.

Proper management and use is necessary to retain a quality supply of water for our generation and the next generation.

II. Improved Wildlife Resources... Game and fish are valued by the hunter, fisherman, sightseer, photographer, student, trapper and, in fact, by all of us. game and fish management techniques, research and enforcement of game and fish laws are essential to assure maximum production in the future. A special effort is needed in this field to maintain and improve these resources for neither the individual nor the nation as a whole.

III. Urban Development and its Effect on and industrial development with care to natural resources. Planned urbanization.

minimize adverse effects on the environment and maximize benefits. With our increasing population, a reduced supply of natural resources, new uses, more free time, it holds that more effort is needed to develop wise land and water use.

IV. Aesthetics... The beauty of our countryside, urban areas and metropolitan centers is essential for the enjoyment of life by our citizens. Pleasing architecture, proper design of roads, antilitter, land management, preservation of open space, providing for outdoor recreation, and the controlled development of scenic areas are major factors 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 solution are:

Air and Water Pollution

Invasion of our Estuaries

Urban合影, 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 of us has a common interest and concern for baselines—waster, air, food, fibre.

Just this past November, a UNESCO conference was held in San Francisco, 1972—several 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 Congress for funding the following:

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 legislation. Not only recognition, but a heavier weighing of these values in the decision-making process.

5. National program of environmental conservation education. All citizens need an understanding and an appreciation of our environment. Environmental 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 environments.


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 in order to develop testable and desirable performance parameters for all forms of waste treatment systems should be established.

14. Tax structures for industry—environmental appreciation incentive. Agencies need to make "multiple use" work better. More application of technology and capital investment must be applied to secondary and tertiary development.

16. Joint management plans should be developed by both federal and state agencies for wetlands in a state. (Other resource areas could be handled similarly.)

17. Intensify effort to stimulate youth thinking and action by creating awareness 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 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 would say the administrative effort to develop an all-out effort to maintain and improve quality of life for mankind. In our world as an example of actions were adopted by governments and citizens need to make the decision for environmental quality.

CONCLUSION

In the end.

There was Earth, and it was with form and beauty.

And man saw himself, and destroy those lest they destroy

And man said, "We will 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 second day, man looked upon the waters of the Earth.

And man said, "Let us our wastes in the waters that the dirt will be washed away.

And man did.

And the trees were gone.

And man said, "It is good.

On the third day, man looked upon the forests of the Earth and saw they were

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 said,

"Let us to some universe and the resources of all our 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.

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 trends continue. We are noble and the name callers and the sleepers had better wake up—or they won't I say, thank God for the Izaak Walton League, and the individuals that are concerned for the future of humanity.

What worries me and many others—those that are blind or indifferent.

As a nation, we have just recently landed men on the moon. This is a feat we are proud of. This goal has cost our nation billions of dollars. Compare our Space expenditures to our Conservation expenditures.

Our philosophy has many benefits. However, now that we have reached the moon. It appears to be an environment not concerned to the type of life we have. It doesn't foresee many of our people moving to the moon. Most of us and future generations will stay here on earth. Now, could we harness this same type of emphasis, this same type of technical ability, this same type of expenditure, this same type of philosophy to solve the conservation problems of the place where we do live—the earth's environment? Could there have been given dominion and superior intelligence over this earth to take care of the resources we are dependent on for our survival?

We must have the spirit of "Environmental Quality" in our thinking. We must have the "future" in our thinking, and proceed from that foundation. Is our survival at hand? Is our future at hand? Is our obligation?

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 their preservation, development, and protection.

A strong and effective environmental conservation education program needs to be carried out. Other conservation organizations; and our schools; 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 require 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 Outstanding-American-Boy Scout-Arthur Wilson—on "Listening Point", the object of one of his outstanding books. As we reminisced about Mr. Wilson, Sig reflected 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"; "Dream predictors"; "Furists"; "Puddy 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.

First, 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 ½ 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 and other uses of water to a water ½ 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 and other uses of water to a water ½ the acreage of what it was when the white man first came.

Outdoor Recreation demands will probably quadruple by the year 2000. Fishing demands for increased population will accelerate at an alarming rate. Presently, ½ of the world's population exist on nutritionally inadequate diets. It appears that this problem will become increasingly acute in the years ahead.

SAY OUR SURVIVAL IS AT STAKE: LEAGUE TO ACT ON RESOLUTIONS URGING ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Noting that "conservation today involves a new, imposing 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 the water pollution and from birth control to severance taxes.

Some of the major proposed resolutions on which the delegates will vote are: the West Virginia Legislature adopt legislation creating a severance tax on natural resources, especially on coal; that a portion of severance tax 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, maintain, and improve 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 as so 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, be prohibited in areas where the surface to be disturbed exceeds 20 degrees in slope.

That the supersonic transport, the CROS-
Florida Barge Canal, the Salem Church Dam in Virginia, and dozens of other 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 regulations, . . . bringing about the stabilization of the population.

Other resolutions deal with stricter pollution controls, the promotion of forested, non-mined land, greater financial support of the State Department of Natural Resources to enable it to better enforce existing laws, and a program of conservation education in West Virginia.

Three other resolutions deal with timber and forest management practices on the national forests.

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) support and encourage the acquisition of the H.R. 17774 and S. 3937 declaring wilderness status . . . for Dolly Sods in West Virginia and the Cranberry (State) (totaling some 81,000 acres in Monongahela National Forest).

That the U.S. Forest Service commend the legislators of this state for their evaluation of the timber management practices on the Monongahela National Forest and that the Forest Service provide a detailed study of these practices.

NIXON'S ORDER TO INCREASE PRODUCTION OF TIMBER UNWISE, SAYS WILSON LEADER

The national executive director of the Issac Walton League Saturday night termed "unwise" an order President Nixon issued last week to increase 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. The order, he said, is an attack on the people and the legislators who represent them, only to add any distrust that may exist and that the country may have experienced 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 passed the "National Conservation 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 years ago.

He hailed the West Virginia Division's battle against excessive timbering practices on Monongahela National Forest, particularly its fight against "Clearcutting," that by-passing the people and the legislators who represent them, enabling them to add any distrust that may exist and that the country may have experienced that the decade of the 70's will be one that sees a reversal of the abuses to our environment.

Mr. Herbst also discussed strip mining, saying, "The worst degradation 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 so we, the people of the nation, have for centuries allowed the activity we somehow excuse ourselves from the ravages that it takes to supply this luxury to our fellow citizens."

Mr. Herbst criticized President Nixon's 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 lessen the damage to the forest on steep mountain slopes and this, in our opinion, is the only answer to the present situation in this battle against excessive timbering practices.

Discussing the Ohio River, he said: "The time has come for us to call a spade, a spade. The Ohio is a fetid 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 industries that are now dragging their feet will exert more effort to clean up their waste; pollution can be stopped at its source."

Addressing Saturday evening's banquet session was Mr. S. Latimer, director of the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources. Discussing "even aged management"—clearcutting—of forest lands, Mr. Latimer said the procedure "should be used only as one of many tools necessary to achieve forest timber regeneration of the public lands.

Mr. Latimer also noted that clearcutting is not being undertaken on state-owned forests. "This rumor is false," he declared. "A state-wide forest timber management plan is now being completed but it includes any management cuttings only.

Noting the problem of coal interests owning the mineral rights under 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 U.S. Forest Service to clearcut or alter the procedure 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 industrial waste in the lower Kanawha Basin.

Serving as master of ceremonies at the banquet was Grover G. "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 to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased last week to hear the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce Stans before the Ways and Means Committee endorsing the principles of H.R. 16920, the bill to provide for reasonable controls on 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 Conner to prevent the prohibitive str, 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 emphasize that it was Senator McGovern'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 in achieving voluntary agreements without the necessity for legislation. The breakdown of the long negotiations announced today is a case of defeat by failure of effort upon the part of the U.S. Government.

During the past 2 months, I have concluded that the possibility of acceptance of agreements is remote. Regrettably 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 policy, other than a majority of the Members of the House have joined with Congressman Wilbur Mills in cosponsoring H.R. 16920. It is the view of the House that this bill 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 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 the country's birth, 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. L. Waldrep of Castonia, 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 human life. They fought and died, both in our own land and in foreign lands, to defend the principles and beliefs their forebears gave them, and to pass on to the younger generation what they had so dearly won. America has been blessed by God where every man would have his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness secured. Our country has protections for women and minorities. Our constitution and our Bill of Rights, as they are written, will forever guarantee the rights of the people of this country. America is a land blessed by God where every man would have his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness secured. Our country has protections for women and minorities. Our constitution and our Bill of Rights, as they are written, will forever guarantee the rights of the people of this country.

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 that my forefathers possessed. As a Marine, I live in a truly great country and am fortunate to wear the uniform of one of its defenders. America may give me her uniform 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 who know it to better work which would call themselves Americans. At times, patriotism has demanded great sacrifice on the part of those who love it most. No one would pretend, 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, how apt it is to call for the protection of its interests and to look 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 love it most. No one would pretend, however, is too great for this country!

Sometimes, patriotism requires me to love my country and protect its interests whenever and wherever it 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. WALSHREE

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. ROOKEFIELD (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 Alabama (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) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. STEICHER of Arizona, for 20 minutes, on June 30.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHAEFER, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. MICHIE, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. HALFEN, 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. REUS, 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. MOEKEN.
Mr. PELLY.
Mr. ROBINSON in two instances.
Mr. BELCHER in two instances.
Mr. SCHNEEBELL.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. BOLDI in three instances.
Mr. CARTER in three instances.
Mr. GROSS.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. WINTERTON.
Mr. WINDALL.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. GOLDWATER.
Mr. ZWARTZ.
Mr. ASHBUCK.
Mr. WYATT.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. QuILLENN in four instances.
Mr. Herrera of Illinois.
Mr. Dwyer in three instances.
Mr. LANG.
Mr. King in two instances.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. BLACKBURN in four instances.
Mr. GUD.
Mr. LYNCH.
Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. LANDCREBE.
Mr. FOREMAN.
Mr. MIZEELL 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. FARET,
Mr. RABICK.
Mr. PODELL.
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.
Mr. CARROLL in two instances.
Mr. COHLEN in five instances.
Mr. PICKLE in five instances.
Mr. ROYBAL in five instances.
Mr. FLOOD in five instances.
Mr. McURDY in five 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. MCBRIDE in four instances.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
Mr. KUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. HOUNDAY 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. 783. An act for the relief of Wanda Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 1187. An act for the relief of Marcos Bojes Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 1428. 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 Airline Loader and Maurice Leader, to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 2361. An act for the relief of Kathryn Talbot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 2016. An act to establish the Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 3172. An act establishing the 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 Pierrotti Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 3265. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Ordillias; 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 Mr. Amado G. Chanco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 3478. 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 C. Smith, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to consent to an agreement into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission in 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 the committee voted to enroll and sign the following bills of the House, which were thenupon signed by the Speaker:
H.R. 1695. An act for the relief of Alfredo Caprara.
H.R. 1698. An act for the relief of Jocel Kuncen.
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. 8906. For the relief of Elizabeth B. Borgnine.

H.R. 8512. To suspend for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dops; and

H.R. 3900. To authorize the release of magnesium from the national stockpile.

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. 2338(a); 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 Dockers No. 366, 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 of the Comptroller General of the Merchant ship Savannah, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

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 of H.R. 2043 (Rept. No. 91-1241). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 1118. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 16327, a bill to authorize the release of certain Indian-owned private property and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1249). 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. 91-1248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency, House Joint Resolution 1234. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the National Commission on the Cities' Financial Plan for 1970. 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(3)(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, H.R. 16291. An act to authorize the disposal of Surinam-type bulbs, the property of the General of the Pacific Islands, Department of the Interior; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture, H.R. 16290. A bill to authorize the release of certain Indian-owned private property 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, H.R. 16297, a bill for the relief of Eliza­

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H.R. 17388, A bill to extend for 1 year the act of September 30, 1965, relating to high-speed ground trans­

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. MERRILL: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 4292. A bill for the relief of...
of Keum Jo Kim; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CORMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4670. A bill for the relief of Low Yia (also known as Low Ying): with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CORMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Tse Pung Hills; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 18246. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Guadalupe Esperanza Montoya; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESSKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13065. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cip, Frank J. Krec (Rept. No. 91–1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESSKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13997. A bill to confer citizenship of Guam; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1299). 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. CLELLER:
H.R. 18246. A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as revised, 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 more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:
H.R. 18248. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:
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. JOHNSEN 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. SCHNEEBEELI (for himself and other Senators from California):
H.R. 18251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in the case of certain uses of bread rubber, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. BAKING, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DENNET, Mr. DUNN, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HICKELS of Massachusetts, Mr. HERSHORN, Mr. PICKENS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYAL, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SEWALL, Mr. WATSON of California, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. FASCHELL):
H.R. 18252. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, as revised, to require_immediate medical attention for local 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. BAKING, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROYAL, 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 mortgage 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, Judges and Justices 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 members of the Cabinet, and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency, of their positions 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. HILLIS:
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. HILLIS:
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.

H. Res. 1120. A resolution to set an expenditure 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 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. BURT of California:
H.R. 12926. A bill for the relief of Antonio Wong Campoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12927. A bill for the relief of Cicira G. Devir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12928. A bill for the relief of Lim Yae Kung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:
H.R. 12929. 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 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.