

Goepfert, Eric Richard
Hogg, Royal Thomas, Jr.
Hufnagel, Karl Richard
Johannesmeyer, Charles Alan
Keith, Donald Rae
Marshall, Peter Wayne
Miller, Ronald Lee
Rampe, Thomas Raymond
Sholders, Michael Verne
Stearns, Carl David
Stevenson, Herbert Scott

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Aliff, William Ray
Aulls, John Griswold
Bentley, William Sturges
Blackford, James Michael
Bolshazy, Robert Stephen
Bransford, Charles Duane
Bruder, Paul Theodore
Cannon, James Robert
Chappell, Wendell Leo
Coleman, Loren Marion
Davis, Gary Thayne
Dun, Marshall Sol
Armstrong, Carl Andrew, Jr.
Bartlett, Jack Wallace
Berry, Wayne Harold
Blaylock, James Donald
Braitsch, Ted Alan
Brown, David William
Campbell, Paul Ernest
Chandler, Donald Ray
Chegash, Thomas John
Cornejo, Hector

Dould, Philip Edward
Ebersole, Richard Wilson
Edgerton, Owen Lee
Foskey, Leslie Thomas
Harrell, James Howard
Hayes, Elbert Chartrand
Iczkowski, Marcel Dennis
Kelley, Charles Anderson
Knodle, Edward Maurice
Legg, Robert Paul
Logan, Robert Stanley
McCarty, James Edwin, Jr.
McKinney, Arthur Paul
Meaney, Maurice Terrance
Miller, Fenton Crockett
Montgomery, Charles Ernest
Moyer, Kenneth Edwin, Jr.
Norvell, Robert Dayton
Olen, Eldor Roger
Parker, Cloyd Joseph
Prigmore, Marvin Earnest
Rayno, Robert Henry
Roberson, Walter Edward
Russnogle, Robert Lewis
Shaffer, Kenneth Wayne
Sixsmith, Howard Thomas, Jr.
Snyder, James Edward
Springfield, Robert Lynn
Stovall, Gary Hudson
Taylor, Robert Beck
Truran, Paul Frederick, Jr.
Waldroupe, Derrel Lee
White, Daniel Ellsworth
Windham, George Scott
Yates, Harold, Jr.

Finley, Clemeth Wallace
Hanson, Eugene Charles
Haws, Virtus Paul, Jr.
Hess, Stuart Allan
Ishmael, Rex Harlan
Kern, Monte James
Lanerie, George Ray
Lekvold, William Dean
Marks, Richard Charles
McClannahan, William M.
McKinzie, Louis Eugene
Merkel, Frederick Joseph
Mock, Leonard Ralph
Moore, Robert Louis
New, James Caudell
Ohnemus, Francis William
Panas, Bruce Richard
Pelphrey, James Henry
Pulvermacher, Harold Edward
Reed, Paul John
Rush, Elvia Dale
Sessions, Nathan Mansfield
Shannon, Albert Francis
Smith, Jerauld Homer
Solmen, James David
Stemple, Todd Ralph
Stratton, William Frederick
Thomas, Dennis Merrill
Tyndall, John Bard
Wenrick, David Lowell
Wigle, Earl Clinton
Wooldridge, Robert Landon

NURSE CORPS

Caruso, Teresa

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 9, 1970

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

Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.—John 8:32.

Eternal God, our Father, we come to Thee in this quiet moment praying that Thy spirit may shine into our hearts darkened so often by doubt and fear. Strengthen and guide us as we seek sincerely to lead our Nation in right paths, along peaceful roads, and make plain the ways we should take.

Help us to realize that freedom must be won by every generation. With Thy spirit may we keep the flag of the free flying in our land and ultimately, we pray, in our world.

Grant that all threats to liberty be met with courage and with confidence, assured that Thy power undergirds the struggle for freedom.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 17, 1970:

H.R. 12619. An act to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950, entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."

On June 19, 1970:

H.R. 10184. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

H.R. 14306. An act to amend the tobacco marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.R. 15166. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes.

On June 22, 1970:

H.R. 4249. An act to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests, and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1970:

H.R. 2012. An act to amend the act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson;

H.R. 9854. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12860. An act to establish the Ford's Theatre National Historical Site, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14300. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation; to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1970:

H.R. 4204. An act to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1970:

H.R. 14810. An act to amend section 2(3) and section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to

authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs.

On June 29, 1970:

H.J. Res. 1264. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

On June 30, 1970:

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

H.R. 16731. An act to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended;

H.R. 17138. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17241. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; and

H.R. 17802. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On July 2, 1970:

H.R. 16516. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16298. An act to amend section 703 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

On July 6, 1970:

H.R. 14720. 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;

H.R. 15712. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971; and

H.R. 17399. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1970:

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

On July 9, 1970:

H.R. 5554. An act to provide a special milk program for children, became law without signature by the President. The 10th day for consideration by the President under the Constitution was June 29, 1970.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2036. An act to remove a cloud on the titles of certain property located in Malin, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3215) entitled "An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 3728. An act to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1411-1418) and the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1421-1427).

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, JULY 10

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMillan), I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Friday, July 10, to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION AND RECORDING OF TELLER VOTES

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I should like to commend the bipartisan group which has announced that when on next week we consider the reorganization bill that an amendment will be offered making teller votes in the House of Representatives public.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great many reasons for supporting this amendment. The first one is that it is right. The idea that votes of great public consequence should not be a matter of public record is one which I think is an anachronism.

I think the American people have every

right to know how Members of this body stand on important issues. Certainly, and more practically, I have observed as majority whip and deputy whip of this body for the past 15 years that I find myself spending at least half the time that I should be spending on legislative matters trying to get Members to come to the floor of the House to do their duty to vote on important legislative matters. When they know their names are going to be recorded, they will be here.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment wholeheartedly.

THE FLIGHT OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to the Kingsbridge Hospital in New York, I learned that the meal allotment per patient was \$1.20 per day. This comes out to 20 cents for breakfast, 40 cents for lunch and 60 cents for dinner. This could not buy subsistence food at today's prices but VA hospitals often have to meet patients' needs on this money.

The word "subsistence" should raise one's ire. It means a level just above starvation. Should sick men have just enough food to prevent starvation?

Moreover, the meager allowance is actually less than a welfare recipient receives for food. Sick patients receive less than healthy citizens.

In addition, the meager allowance does not permit a variety of foods, although many patients must be on special diets.

Whom do we think we are fooling? The patient knows the truth. When will we face up to our responsibility?

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS UNTIL MIDNIGHT JULY 10

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia who so desire be allowed until midnight July 10 to submit supplemental views to be included with the report.

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

There was no objection.

NIXON TV DIPLOMACY

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in his recent television interview, demonstrated the danger of conducting foreign affairs in a goldfish bowl. In his unvarnished comments on the actions of Middle Eastern countries he may have affected the success of the delicate negotiations which his own Secretary of State is carrying on in an attempt to

solve this difficult and dangerous problem.

In his discussion of the George Ball article, he showed failure to understand the implications of the article and a lack of knowledge of Secretary Ball's questioning role in the escalation of the Vietnam war.

I am not voicing criticism of President Nixon's opinions as such at this time, but I do take this interview as an object lesson in the desirability of keeping Presidential opinions and policies reasonably confidential in this field. Under the stress of an interview based upon free questioning, a President can make statements which are subject to misinterpretation or which can cause future serious trouble for the United States. There are some who believe that the President should submit himself to regular examinations of this type, but the dangers seem to me to outweigh the advantages.

While the main outlines of our foreign policy should be made clear and subject to review and question, nevertheless, the President should retain some room for maneuver and the capacity to exercise some variety of choices.

While Mr. Nixon's interview may have helped him with the uninitiated in a general political sense, it did nothing to forward the cause of American policy and, because this danger will persist, future interviews on these delicate and dangerous subjects should be avoided.

COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

(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, as long as the welfare and security of our troops is conditioned or affected by hostilities in Indochina which includes Cambodia, I am not in favor of the Cooper-Church amendment.

Since we have suffered a great number of casualties during the past 3 years, because of the Cambodian sanctuary, I am relieved that our recent Cambodian military operation has been a success, and I sincerely hope there will be no further threat in this area. But since we are conducting a withdrawal from Vietnam, until this is accomplished, I do not believe in limiting our tactical courses of action in Cambodia, until our casualties are reduced, and our boys returned home.

Furthermore, the amendment in its present form provides more grist for the propaganda mills of Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi. I recall how the propaganda machine of our adversary smeared the image of President Johnson over the Vietnam hostilities. They called him a "running dog for imperialism." They are doing the same to President Nixon. This amendment in its present form shows weakness in America's role abroad, and Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi are ready to exploit this weakness.

PERMISSION FOR THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION TO SIT THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Select

Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit this afternoon on pending business.

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

There was no objection.

PINE STATE KNITWEAR CO., OF MOUNT AIRY, N.C., RECEIVES THE "SYMBOL OF EXCELLENCE" AWARD

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleagues know, quality in any form is worthy of praise, whether it be quality in a product or the quality of a man's life.

It is an honor for me to announce to my colleagues today that the Pine State Knitwear Co., of Mount Airy, N.C., has been selected for the third consecutive year to receive the "Symbol of Excellence" award from Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Pine State Knitwear, a division of Hanes Corp., is one of only 319 companies in the Nation to have earned this award in 1970, and one of only 63 to have received the award for the third time.

The award is presented annually by Sears, Roebuck & Co., to a limited number of its 13,000 regular suppliers for superior performance in production of quality merchandise.

I commend Pine State Knitwear Co. for its achievement, and I hope that its commitment to quality will serve as a model for other members of this Nation's free enterprise system.

SENATE VOTES TO LIMIT FARM SUBSIDY PAYMENTS TO \$20,000 PER PRODUCER

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to advise my colleagues of a most heartening development that took place in the other body yesterday. By a vote of 40 to 35 an amendment was adopted to the agriculture appropriations bill to limit farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 per producer.

This is the same amendment which I have twice offered that has twice passed the House only to be rejected by the other body.

Today's action is a great step forward; for the first time now the other body has adopted a limitation.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have fought for this reform must realize that the battle is not yet over. As I said on the floor a month ago the most suitable place to attach a limitation of this kind is on the farm bill itself. Only then will we be able to extend the limitation for the entire life of new farm legislation. Only then will we be able to enact a more comprehensive amendment to prevent evasion of the intent of this amendment by such devices as farm-splitting.

It was for these reasons that on June 9, 1970, 1 month ago today, I opposed the

efforts to place a limitation on the agriculture appropriation bill. Before that time and since then, I have met with Secretary Hardin and members of the Agriculture Committee to see if we could reach agreement on an acceptable payment limitation. Despite these efforts, however, there has been no indication that the committee is any closer to an agreement on this question. In view of this, I must now reconsider whether or not to support a motion to instruct our conferees to accept the Senate action.

Unless the committee takes prompt action to report a farm bill with an effective payment limitation provision at a reasonable level, I may be forced to support the efforts to adopt a limitation through the appropriations process. Perhaps this is the only way to secure the reform which this House has so long supported.

GEN. GEORGE CASEY

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today, I was with General George Casey at his command headquarters in South Vietnam. To hear that he is now missing somewhere in the jungle of Vietnam is difficult to contemplate.

In my conversations with General Casey, who is from North Scituate in my district, I found him to be more than just a military man, more than just a division commander or a tactician. I found him to be a man interested in the far broader aspects of foreign policy than just the limited part played by military action.

General Casey holds a master's degree in international affairs from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and studied for over a year at Harvard University's School of International Studies. He also holds a master's degree in business administration from George Washington University.

In my lengthy private talks with him during my recent trip to Southeast Asia, I was impressed by his overview of the entire political and economic impact of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, in addition to his immediate concern with his division's mission and our military presence.

He views the maintenance of the political and military balance of power in Southeast Asia as essential to U.S. interests. This country is a Pacific power, he said, we became such when Hawaii was made our 50th State.

I also asked him how he felt the Cambodian operations fit into the overall efforts of the United States in Southeast Asia. Drawing from his extensive background in foreign affairs and his most recent experience as the commander of the 1st Airborne Cavalry which led the assault on the enemy sanctuaries, he termed the operation essential. He pointed out that the use of Sihanoukville as a port of entry for extensive enemy supplies and the establishment of vast weapons stores just inside Cambodia, was a grave threat to the stability of the military balance of power in Southeast Asia.

His airborne cavalry division flew 8,000 sorties—over 187,000 air hours—in their effort to interdict and disrupt this massive enemy supply operation. As we now know, this operation was a tremendous military success. And, in the context of the overall political, economic and military situation in southeast Asia, this operation will, in the General's view, mean a greater chance for peace and freedom to gain a solid foothold in that embattled part of the world.

Much more was said, Mr. Speaker. Enough to convince me that General Casey is the type of military man this country needs, a man dedicated not just to winning wars but to winning a just world peace. I hope and know that the rescue efforts will be successful.

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE W. CASEY—MISSING IN ACTION

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in his expressions of admiration for General Casey and his abilities, and also to join him in his expression of deep concern at the fact that this great American, together with some other American servicemen, is missing in action.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would also like to be associated with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and would also comment that the gentleman from Indiana and myself on June 29 were with General Casey. We were with him when the last American troops were withdrawn from Cambodia. I certainly hope that there is hope that General Casey and the six Americans who were lost with him will be found alive and safe. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM LOWEST IN MORE THAN 3½ YEARS

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written about the President's decision on Cambodia. I want to tell my colleagues a piece of news that I heard on the radio this morning in light of that decision. American casualties in Vietnam last week were 61, the lowest in over 3½ years. I know that my colleagues will share with me the hope that this trend will continue until it reaches a point of zero.

USE ARAB PLANES AS BASIS FOR REPLACING ISRAELI LOSSES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, some of the best minds in the world have been puzzled by the conflict-

ing claims about the Arab and Israeli aircraft losses. It seems the Israelis will make a raid on a missile base around the Suez Canal, and the Arabs will say that six aircraft have been shot down and the Israelis will say one has been shot down.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, there is a simple way to resolve this, so we can ascertain what are the true facts. President Nixon has clearly stated we are going to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East. This means replacing the aircraft which are lost by Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that for the purpose of replacing aircraft losses, any time the Arabs claim an excessive number of aircraft as being shot down, that this figure be used by the United States when replacing the aircraft lost by the Israelis.

COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT DOES NOT TIE PRESIDENT'S HANDS

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Military Sales Act is taken up today, I intend to seek recognition to move to instruct the House conferees to accept the Cooper-Church amendment.

There may not be time to debate in detail what this amendment does, but let me summarize two or three main points.

First of all, it is in direct concert with the Cambodian policy objectives announced by President Nixon. It does not tie the President's hands. Under the Constitution, he is always free to come to Congress and seek any kind of specific war authority he may think necessary.

If I am recognized by the Speaker, I will make the motion to instruct, and should a subsequent effort be made to table my motion, I hope the tabling motion would be defeated so we can get a straight up-and-down vote on the Cooper-Church amendment.

COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT CLEARLY RESTRICTS AND TIES HANDS OF A PRESIDENT

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), commented that he would offer a motion today to instruct conferees to accept the so-called Cooper-Church amendment. In support of that, he said the amendment was in keeping with the President's program and that it would not tie the hands of the President.

Let us not deceive ourselves. I cannot recall a single historic precedent in which the Congress or any responsible part of the Congress in a time of military conflict has attempted so clearly to restrict and tie the hands of a President in the exercise of his responsibilities as Com-

mander in Chief, as the Cooper-Church amendment would do.

The amendment not only says we cannot help the Cambodians, but it also says we cannot help anybody who wants to help the Cambodians.

The amendment not only prohibits funds for supporting any American forces in Cambodia; it prohibits any U.S. personnel from advising or assisting in the training of Cambodian personnel.

As I read the amendment, it would prohibit us from assisting financially in the cases of other Asian forces which might volunteer to help Cambodia defend its independence. It even would prevent our engaging in any aerial activities in support of Cambodian defense forces.

In other words, what the Cooper-Church amendment amounts to is an open invitation to the North Vietnamese to go ahead and take over Cambodia by force if they can, with the advance assurance that we shall not lift a finger to help the defenders and we will not help anybody who wants to help the defenders.

If this is not tying the hands of the President, I frankly do not know what you could call it.

This amendment would tie our own hands and announce to the world that they are tied. Certainly it would be a great encouragement to the North Vietnamese to continue to press their invasion of Cambodia.

Clearly it could not encourage them to come to terms at the negotiating table as the President has been attempting to do.

The amendment cuts the ground from under the President both in his efforts to negotiate peace and in his efforts as Commander in Chief of the military forces. It clearly reduces his options.

The potential harm which this amendment could inflict upon our efforts to terminate that war successfully so far outweighs any conceivable good it might accomplish, that I cannot conceive of the House agreeing to any such provision.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

As for the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) about what the amendment would do to the White House, I would say the gentleman's pipeline to the White House, if he ever had one, is pretty badly plugged up.

COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT WOULD HAMSTRING ANY PRESIDENT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA POLICY

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say there is no question about it that the gentleman from Texas is correct that this so-called Cooper-Church

amendment would, in effect, hamstring and tie the hands of the President of the United States, whether it is this President or any President, in reference to foreign policy in Southeast Asia.

May I say without hesitation or qualification that the President of the United States fully agrees with the action which we plan to take today to table the motion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) so that the conferees can go to the conference and come back with good legislation without the provisions of the Cooper-Church amendment as passed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT INVOLVES ITSELF IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, just prior to coming to the floor of the House I received an interesting phone call which I should like to relate to the Members.

A young lady from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, just prior to my coming to the floor of the House, called me. Our conversation went roughly as follows: "Congressman, do you recall me?" I said, "No, not precisely." She said, "Well, I was in your office a month ago when you had some residents from your district seeking a grant from this Department to assist in your area." I said, "Yes, I do recall." She said, "I am calling today to urge your support of the President's position in opposition to the Cooper-Church amendment." I said, "It seems strange to me that the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be so interested in supporting the President's position on the Cooper-Church amendment. It does seem unusual to me that the affairs of your Department encompass this broad spectrum."

I indicated it seemed equally unusual to me that the only agency with which I have been in contact seeking anything for my district since this administration has been in office would assign the single person in that agency, as minimal in importance as she might be, to contact me to urge support of the President on this particular motion.

I interpreted the comment as a veiled though thinly veiled threat that were I not to be found in the right column on this vote that grant would be in jeopardy. I assured the young lady I would not be found in the right column on this vote.

THE VOTE ON THE COOPER- CHURCH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman from California are true. I have spoken to two other colleagues on the floor within the past 10 minutes, and they, too, have been called

by representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, linking inquiries about local projects with the vote on the Cooper-Church amendment.

There is no doubt about it—the President is doing everything in his power, with the cooperation of many Members of this House, to try to gain votes against the Cooper-Church amendment.

If the Congress is to abdicate any policy direction with respect to the engagement of American Armed Forces abroad, then we should vote to table this motion to instruct the conferees. If the minority leader believes it is in the interests of this Nation to give the President an unbridled and unrestrained hand to commit American forces wherever and whenever he may choose, then he will vote to table this instruction and those supporting unrestrained Executive power will vote with him.

If Members believe the time has come for the Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibilities—and they are spelled out in the Constitution—then one should vote against tabling the instruction and tell the President that the American people, through their Representatives, are speaking for restraint on the most important issue of today.

TELEPHONE CALLS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in these comments about calls from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I am just wondering if I can get with the gentlemen privately and get the phone numbers of these people, because up to now I have not been able to get anybody down there to talk to me, and I am open to negotiation.

CONTACT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat amazed at the two recent statements made by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Minnesota. I suppose my question should be: So what is new now? Those of us who have been around here for some time have gone through this very same experience year after year regardless of what party is in power. Nothing new has been added. The procedure is merely repetitious. Do not get excited about it. I happen to be one of those who, when the President of the United States happened to be a man named Jack Kennedy and a President named Lyndon Johnson, they did not call me from any of their departments, because it so happened these individuals were my Presidents and I believed it was my duty, acting in the welfare of the country, that

I support the President of the United States regardless of party affiliation. That is all there is to it.

THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in our action today on the Military Sales Act—H.R. 15628—some will attempt to define and elaborate on constitutional issues affecting the respective prerogatives of the President and the Congress in the area of foreign policy.

However, the so-called Cooper-Church amendment is neither a precise nor accurate statement of the role of the Congress in connection with the President's primary responsibilities in the area of foreign policy and as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

It should be clear to all that the President has evolved a new foreign policy which departs dramatically from a policy which our Nation has pursued for 25 years.

The Nixon doctrine assures the complete withdrawal of our American combat forces from South Vietnam at the earliest possible time. The President's policy also provides for a reduction of our military involvement elsewhere—and the assumption of major responsibilities by those nations themselves which are threatened by enemy attack.

The President has made good on his promises to withdraw American forces from Vietnam and from Cambodia. In addition, it was announced within the last few hours that 40 percent of our American forces in South Korea would be brought home.

President Nixon's policy is one which I support—and which I believe is best for our Nation and for the entire free world. The slogan "Back Nixon for Peace" makes sense to me. At the present time, I would not want to back any other person in our Government who may claim that he has a better plan—or a sounder foreign policy for the guidance of our Nation. Of course, there is no feasible way in which to substitute the judgment of some other such person for the President of the United States.

In voting against a motion to instruct the managers on the part of the House to accept the so-called Cooper-Church amendment, I am convinced that I am voting for peace in Southeast Asia and elsewhere—and that I am reposing confidence in the most capable hands which are available in this critical period of our history—those of President Nixon.

This is not intended as an answer to the difficulty constitutional issue which has been raised both before and following the Cambodian operation. This subject deserves careful and thoughtful attention and concern. It is my hope that the House bill—H.R. 18205—of which I am a sponsor, now being heard by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, will make it possible to resolve that issue for the benefit of this and future Presidents and Congresses.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3215, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3215) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, THOMPSON of New Jersey, BRAD-EMAS, REID of New York, and SCHERLE.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15628, FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of clause 1, rule XX, and by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) is recognized for 1 hour on his motion.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to use any time and there has been no request for any time, and in an effort to move the legislation along I will move the previous question.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, today I have voted to send the foreign military sales bill to conference with the Senate. This bill is essential to our national defense and that of our allies in both the Far East and Mideast.

I urge the conference to report a bill back quickly so that we might have the means to supply Israel with needed military equipment at a time when Communist pressure is being applied against her in the Middle East.

The so-called Cooper-Church amendment, although vague in its wording, could serve to indicate congressional concern with the Far East situation, but its prohibition against paying salaries to all persons engaged in any combat activity in support of Cambodian forces should be removed. I want Asia forces to join together and fight together so that American forces can come home. I want to encourage such activity and to help those resisting communism in the Far East.

The words of this amendment are so broad that they could prohibit U.S. contributions to the U.N. to provide a United Nations peacekeeping force to Cambodia.

In my judgment this provision is against U.S. interests and sets a bad precedent for those countries engaged in the fight against communism around the world.

We should be encouraging nations in the world to join together to fight their own battles against communism and not restricting our efforts and their efforts toward this end.

I believe such a prohibition should be stricken and that the conference should reach quick agreement on the bill so that the President will have the power and means necessary to help our friends and allies.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Cooper-Church amendment passed by the Senate and added to the Foreign Military Sales Act is to prevent the United States from becoming involved through the use of American combat forces in the defense of another Southeast Asian government, and through such a defense becoming involved in a widened Vietnam war.

This was the purpose of an amendment adopted by the Congress last December which was aimed at forbidding the use of American combat forces in Laos and Thailand. Cooper-Church is the extension of that same prohibition to Cambodia.

If adopted, the Cooper-Church amendment would:

First, bar funds for reintroducing American forces into Cambodia;

Second, prohibit funds either directly or indirectly for American advisers for the Cambodian military forces;

Third, prohibit the payment by the United States of salaries of mercenaries to fight in Cambodia; and

Fourth, it would also forbid the financing of aerial activity in direct support of Cambodian forces.

The Cooper-Church amendment would not prevent:

First, "hot pursuit" by American forces of enemy troops into the Cambodian sanctuaries;

Second, artillery fire from South Vietnam at enemy forces threatening our troops from Cambodia;

Third, interdiction by our Air Force of enemy supplies and troops moving along the Ho Chi Minh trail and other routes used to bring men and material to South Vietnam; and

Fourth, military assistance to the Cambodian government in the form of small arms and supplies.

Thus, the Cooper-Church amendment not only is directly in line with the amendment of last December prohibiting the use of American ground combat forces in Laos and Thailand, it is in direct agreement with the Nixon doctrine with its pledge of no more Vietnams.

Passage of the Cooper-Church amendment would not abridge any American treaty obligation. It would not prevent this country's efforts to create a Southeast Asian defense organization among the countries directly involved. Its pas-

sage would not in any way impinge upon, or weaken the President's powers in any other area of the world.

It does strengthen and encourage the Vietnam troop withdrawal policy initiated by this administration: it emphasizes deescalation after the long years of escalation. Its passage would, I believe, also state the belief of Congress in the need for national priorities in foreign and military affairs, in the same sense that this body has often addressed itself in the past year and one-half to the need for new priorities in domestic affairs.

Thus, the Cooper-Church amendment would not hinder or bar administrative freedom of action in Western Europe, in our relations with out NATO allies, or in the Middle East. If it did, I would be the first to vote against it.

Rather, its adoption would clearly state that in the view of this Congress there is a time and a place for all things. That to stand firm against Communist aggression in a rice paddy may be virtuous, but in the priorities of a Western industrial nation it holds little meaning if because of that stand that same aggressor extends its influence over continents.

I am, of course, speaking of the critical situation in the Middle East. Since my election to Congress, I have strongly supported President Nixon's policy of withdrawal from Vietnam, as it has been my belief that only through such a withdrawal could this Nation gain flexibility in areas of the world of greater importance to our national interest. I have repeatedly warned that while this Nation bled and died in the rain-soaked jungles on the outer fringe of the vast Asian Continent, Russia has been moving steadily into an area vital not only to the United States, but to Western Europe.

For 6 long years while this Nation has concentrated its entire foreign and military energies on an area of little strategic and no historic interest to the United States, Russia has quietly moved into a position of dominance in an area of historic and strategic importance for the entire Western World. While we have torn the unity of this Nation in a no-win war in an area that even were we successful, it would bear little meaning to the vital interests of this Nation, Russia has moved a modern fleet into the Mediterranean, with major bases in that important sea and in the Indian Ocean. While we have divided and torn the spirit of this land and watched our best young men fight and die half way around the world, Russia has moved to dominate the entire north African littoral.

While, in the name of American might we have stood knee deep in a rice paddy, we have frittered away every opportunity to protect our own self interest in an area which provides three-quarters of free world oil. We have done this through concentration on Vietnam and Vietnam alone. We have done this until today we have only one friend or ally in that entire area and that is Israel. We have done it until President Nixon has had to warn of the imminent danger of confrontation of the super powers in the Middle East.

For those who equate a defense of Vietnam as of the same magnitude as a defense of Israel and our position in North Africa, Western Europe, and the Mediterranean, I would point out that such an equation in my mind would be like attempting to equate a defense of Madagascar in World War II as of the same importance as a defense of Britain.

Thus, I do not view adoption of Cooper-Church as a conflict between administration and Congress. Rather I view it as a cooperation between the two branches of our Government. I see it as the legislative branch saying to the administrative branch: "You are correct in your policy of disengagement and withdrawal in Indochina. You are correct in your view that a wider war in that area of the world would serve no vital interest of this Nation. We applaud your policy which has so dramatically in only 18 months turned disastrous escalation into deescalation. We support your move from war to peace."

Mr. Speaker, in my view Cooper-Church would strengthen America's position in the world. It would clearly show that the administration and Congress are one in their determination to end this long-drawn war, and that we stand unified in desiring peace. It would also serve notice to the Communist world that we are moving to regain flexibility in our foreign and military policies, and that they will no longer be able to take over the living room of the Western World while we expend our resources on the back alleys of the Asian Continent.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House concerns the Cooper-Church amendment to the Military Sales Act.

Mr. Speaker, during the long debate in the Senate on the Cooper-Church Amendment, I read the newspapers and even the Congressional Record discussions on the various amendments having to do with the Indochina War, but I must admit the full implication of these various amendments that were adopted are rather vague. Before I vote to instruct our conferees to accept the Senate language that has been added to the Military Sales Act, I would want a full explanation as to what it does and what it does not do.

However, what worries me about instructing our managers on the part of the House that they must take the Senate language as it comes from the Senate is something else. I hear, and I am convinced it is true, that if we instruct our conferees, there will be no bill; that it will never get out of conference. My fear is that if the Military Sales Act is not enacted, the effect on the Middle East situation could be very serious in that it would prevent any action on our part to maintain a balance of power between Israel and the Soviet backed Arabs.

The Soviet operation of SA-III missiles against Israeli aircraft in the Suez Canal battle zone represents a further and unprecedented phase of direct Russian military escalation in the Middle East. Yet, if the Congress fails to pass the Military Sales Act and it dies in

conference, any chance then of obtaining the funds for supplying Israel Phantom jets appears doomed; so regardless of the merits of the Cooper-Church amendment, I cannot vote in a way that would preclude keeping a balance of power in the Middle East for peace.

This is a difficult bargain for many, Mr. Speaker, but as President Nixon pointed out in his television interview last week, the situation in the Middle East probably is far graver than that in Indochina, and I would hope that in conference the Cooper-Church amendment in a form more acceptable to all, including the President, could be arrived at.

I have always opposed any arms race, and I do so in the matter of sending arms to the Middle East. However, it is merely a practical matter that these jets are needed by Israel simply to maintain a balance. It is the Soviet Union that is feeding the arms race by their power play in the Middle East. What the Russians seek is to dictate the terms of a new Mideast order, one which in deference to the client states will deny Israel both peace and security.

This is the crux of the issue now being contested along the Suez Canal cease-fire line. The battle is a crucial one because on its outcome depends the future national integrity of democratic Israel and also, in large measure, the future course of the Middle East as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Senate-passed Military Sales Act be sent to conference without instructions, and let us then get on with providing necessary military balance of military might needed in the Middle East.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the U.S. Senate took an historic step toward reestablishing the traditional balance of power between Congress and the Executive.

I support the motion to instruct in the fervent hope that the House of Representatives will join the Senate in reaffirming the constitutional right of Congress to declare war and regulate the military.

When this body was called upon to consider the Foreign Military Sales Act in April, the idea of the United States invading Cambodia was so remote as to be inconceivable. Almost unanimously, we agreed to strict limitations on American involvement in Laos and Thailand. But the very thought of our expanding the war into tiny, neutralist Cambodia was so unbelievable that this body did not bother to enact written limitations.

What happened next is now one of the saddest pages in our Nation's history. On April 30, just 6 days after this body passed the foreign military sales bill, with prohibitions on our becoming involved in Laos and Thailand, the President did what we had thought was too inconceivable to consider. Without the consultation or consent of Congress, the President plunged our Nation headlong into war in Cambodia.

What warped delusions of conquest and grandeur led to such an incredible blunder? We can only guess.

We now know, however, that from

start to finish, the President's invasion of Cambodia was a horrifying and complete failure.

Let us compare the President's promises about the Cambodian venture with what actually happened.

In his April 30 declaration of invasion, the President promised to "attack the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam." This "headquarters" was never even found.

The President promised that his invasion of Cambodia would reduce American casualties in Vietnam. There has been no such reduction.

The President promised that his invasion of Cambodia would limit the scope of the Indochina war. The Communists now control more of Cambodia than they did prior to April 30.

The President promised that by June 30 the entire invasion, including air support for South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia, would be ended. It is now mid-July, and we are still risking the lives of American flyers over Cambodia skies.

Finally, and most tragically, Mr. Speaker, we have learned that news of soon-to-be-replaced supplies we have captured cannot drown out the cries of our wounded in Cambodia, or the sobs of those at home who have lost loved ones as a result of the President's disgraceful escapade.

We have learned that we cannot end one illegal war by trampling over our Constitution on the way to another illegal war.

I ask the Members of this House to join our colleagues in the Senate in saying, "We must face our responsibility and share with the President the burden of foreign policymaking."

I ask the Members of this House to join our colleagues in the Senate in saying, "We will have no more illegal wars."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I cast my vote against the previous question on the motion to send the Foreign Military Sales Act to conference.

My vote reflected a desire on my part to have more extended debate on the various amendments added by the Senate, particularly the Cooper-Church amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate spent a considerable amount of time debating this legislation. It seems to me we could spend at least 1 hour debating and discussing the amendments of the Senate before we send the bill to conference.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I voted against the motion to table the motion to instruct the House conferees to accept the Cooper-Church amendment as adopted by the Senate. My strong feeling is that we should face head on the issue presented by the Cooper-Church amendment.

We in the Congress have too often been accused of "ducking" issues. The adoption of the motion to, in effect, table the House allows the House to avoid the direct question on the Cooper-Church amendment. In my opinion, we should have met the issue head on. We should have been ready and willing to take a

stand on the Cooper-Church amendment.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will yet have the opportunity to vote on the Cooper-Church amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, when I was in Southeast Asia recently with the House Select Committee studying recent developments there, I was particularly interested in learning what the chances were for success of the Nixon doctrine after U.S. involvement in that region is ended. The chances seem slim unless the nations of Southeast Asia evidence more interest in regional cooperation and in preparations for their own defense. If the countries of the region are to be impressed with the need for developing their own initiative, the United States must first make it plain that under the situation as it now exists we contemplate no expansion of our military presence in Southeast Asia to fight the other nations' battles for them.

The Cooper-Church amendment is a vehicle by which Congress can, in the case of Cambodia, clarify the limits of American support and intervention. If it passes we can still provide weapons and economic assistance for the defense of Cambodia but the Lon Nol government will be on notice that on it rests the primary burden for its own defense. Similarly, the other nations of the region will, by passage of Cooper-Church, be made to realize the need for reliance on their own initiatives and manpower to preserve the stability of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, much of the dissatisfaction in the country with our involvement in Vietnam results from the failure of Congress to carry out its foreign policy role and exercise its war powers. It is essential, therefore, if we are to avoid a more divided nation and involvement in another protracted war in Southeast Asia, that Congress reassert its right specifically to debate and act on further American military involvement in the region.

I have no doubt that the President is sincere in his stated intention to refrain from direct military aid to the Lon Nol Government. However, the future holds many uncertainties among them the possibility that the President may decide that his goal of a just peace in Vietnam cannot be achieved without an American presence in neighboring Cambodia. Such a decision could contain the seeds of another Vietnam. I do not believe the President should make such a move without consulting Congress and receiving its approval for his proposed course of action.

We have come to the realization that our interests are best served by phasing out our commitment in Southeast Asia. The Cooper-Church amendment is in line with this policy of requiring local forces to assume the burden of their own defense and I urge concurrence in the Senate's approval of this measure.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the conferees to accept the Cooper-Church amendment.

I know that the various parliamentary maneuvers that will take place might

obscure the substantive and symbolic meaning of the Cooper-Church amendment. What does it mean substantively? It correctly provides that another direct U.S. military operation into Cambodia must have congressional approval. This is long overdue. I do not denigrate the power of the President as Commander in Chief, but as Members of Congress, we do have constitutional responsibilities in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. The Cooper-Church amendment reaffirms, in part, this congressional responsibility to seek congressional authorization for a major U.S. military involvement.

There are other worthwhile substantive features of the Cooper-Church amendment. There are prohibitions against the direct or indirect use of American advisers in Cambodia. This prohibition could prevent the creeping commitment that inexorably lured us in the Vietnam quagmire. I am hopeful that the prohibition against direct air support for the Cambodian Army will have a similar effect, but reports from Cambodia suggest that the military interpretation of U.S. air interdiction will be justified as support of American troops. Still, with this prohibition on record, the administration will be on notice that the Congress does not want another Vietnam or an Indochina war.

On the symbolic level, I feel the Cooper-Church amendment has much more import. It is another opportunity for the Congress to exercise its constitutional prerogative in the conduct of our foreign policy. It has been correctly asserted that the executive branch has primary responsibility for foreign policy, but the abnegation of congressional responsibility cannot be allowed to continue. I have utilized every means to persuade, encourage, and force the incumbent President to end our untenable Vietnam commitment.

We are now offered another opportunity to act assertively and constructively. The Cooper-Church amendment reaffirms the obligation of the President to consult with the Congress and seek approval for major military involvements. This is the first step. The next will come next month when I with other concerned Members will offer an amendment to the DOD appropriations bill to provide the fixed and orderly withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam, the amendment to end the war.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for action. As elected Representatives, we have the obligation to act and extricate ourselves from this quagmire. We are all painfully aware that this undeclared war has caused or exacerbated our domestic crisis. It has caused death and destruction with little tangible results except in the heartbreak of the families of our dead and maimed soldiers, a broken and crushed Southeast Asia, a decimated civilian population. This is graphic testimony to the bankruptcy of our Vietnam policy. If the President is not willing to act then the Congress must assume the burden. The Cooper-Church is another step in taking this responsibility.

I urge the conferees, whatever the results of the House action today to accept the Cooper-Church amendment. Congress as an institution for too long has passively accepted Executive decisions. It is time to act.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the Members of this body to register their support today for those who will be named as conferees to the House-Senate Conference on the Foreign Military Sales Act, H.R. 15628.

This will be a most difficult conference. A number of points have been added to the bill by the Senate, which will require a most careful review by the House conferees.

This will be a conference in which your conferees will need the highest degree of flexibility in order to achieve a reasonable compromise—a compromise that will be acceptable to the House.

I believe that the situation developing in the Near East is causing many people to become increasingly aware that this legislation provides a vital tool to those who seek to find ways to support our friends and allies in that area.

This is only one of many reasons why the conferees should be given the maximum opportunity to cope with a fast-changing situation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the House of Representatives did not fully debate or vote on the Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act.

For more than 7 weeks the other body debated, argued, agonized over whether the Congress had the right and responsibility to withhold funds for the continuation of military operations in Cambodia after July 1, 1970.

The Cooper-Church amendment passed in the other body, and it fell to the Members of this House to decide if we were prepared to follow suit and reassert congressional control and authority over the warmaking powers.

Unhappily, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives did not accept and in reality could not even face up to this responsibility. Working in collusion with the White House, the leadership on both sides could not arrange for even 1 hour of general debate. Imagine that—the 435 Members of the House of Representatives had collectively less than 60 minutes to discuss a matter of grave national consequence. With a singularly collective callousness toward the citizens whom we represent, the House leadership allowed less than 14 seconds per Member for us to debate the question of war and peace.

The antiquated rules of the House of Representatives must be reformed and radically revised. The Members of the House must be allowed adequate time to debate and fully explore the vital national problems which face us. More importantly we must be able to vote on these vital substantive questions; and our individual votes should be clearly recorded for our constituents and all the American people to see.

The American people have a right to expect that their representatives will forthrightly accept and exercise their constitutional responsibilities to order national priorities.

The American people have a right to know that their representatives are debating and voting on vital national issues.

The American people have a right to know how their elected representatives vote in Congress.

The rules and procedures of this House must become more responsive to the mood of the times and to the people.

If America is proud of being an "open society," let us in this same spirit open the debates and votes of the House of Representatives to the scrutiny of all.

I had planned, Mr. Speaker, to join in the general debate urging the House to adopt the Cooper-Church amendment. Unfortunately, I was not permitted to speak. Had I spoken, I would have said the following:

WE MUST SUPPORT THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to accept the Cooper-Church Amendment as contained in the revised Foreign Military Sales Act now before us. The Cooper-Church Amendment, in keeping with the declared objectives of the President, prohibits the expenditure of funds to support the involvement of U.S. forces in Cambodia after July 1, 1970, without explicit Congressional approval.

All American forces have now been withdrawn from Cambodia. This amendment prohibits the reintroduction of U.S. forces into Cambodia, outlaws the use of American air power in support of Cambodian troops, stops the use of American advisors operating to support Cambodian military operations, and, finally, prohibits American funds from supporting third country mercenary operations in Cambodia.

These provisions, Mr. Speaker, are eminently sound. One need not go too far back in history to recall the quagmire into which America fell because we had "advisors" in Vietnam; and it makes little sense for the American taxpayer to subsidize the use of Thai or Vietnamese or any other "foreign" Asian troops in Cambodia through the payment of under-the-counter subsidies to foreign countries.

The Cooper-Church Amendment in no way undermines the Constitutional power of the President as Commander-in-Chief. The President would still retain full power to do whatever is necessary to protect the lives of our troops wherever they may be deployed. This is a vital point.

I support this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, as a minimum first step toward restricting U.S. military involvement in Indochina and reasserting Congressional prerogatives over the war-making power. I am an original sponsor of what is now H.R. 1000 which will cut off all funds for U.S. military activity in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos after July 1, 1971. This is the House version of the "McGovern-Hatfield Amendment" which I hope will be taken up and passed by both bodies without further delay.

Weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I warned that the United States might be supporting military action in Cambodia through the "backdoor" via Thailand. Subsequent development have shown all too clearly that my fears were indeed being realized. By adopting the Cooper-Church Amendment the House will effectively cut off all backdoor financing for the Cambodian military operations. And hopefully our action will serve as a precedent to eliminate all American "backdoor" support for military operations anywhere in the world.

If America is to become involved in military action on any continent, let the Congress openly discuss and approve such action. The power and dignity of the Congress

itself is directly at stake. Passage of this amendment will be an explicit recognition of our determination to reassert our Constitutional prerogatives and squarely meet our Constitutional responsibilities.

To do less, Mr. Speaker, would be to abdicate our mandate from the electorate to re-order our national priorities.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, although the dissatisfaction, which I share with many, about the Southeast Asian situation gives popular appeal to proposals such as the Cooper-Church amendment, I think it is intellectually and legislatively dishonest to single out one geographic area where such a restrictive provision on use of funds may have greater popularity and pretend that other potential Vietnams do not exist.

The proponents of this amendment contend that their efforts are aimed at restoring to the Congress its proper constitutional role in warmaking decisions; yet, the substance of what they propose hardly scratches the surface of this very basic and fundamental question.

How can the so-called antiwar Members of Congress decry the violence and "warmongering" tendencies of this Nation insofar as our involvement in Vietnam is concerned and, yet, not take any steps to preclude such violence and "warmongering" by unilateral act of the President in the Middle East, Europe, South, and Latin America, Africa, and other places in the world? And, how can the so-called antiwar Members of Congress decry the disastrous effort on financing of our domestic needs by the drain on our Federal budget caused by our involvement in Southeast Asia and, yet, not only not object to financial commitments for military sales in all parts of the world but actively be frontline supporters of the "sale" of over \$1 million Phantom jets to Israel?

Do you think that the people of this Nation are so stupid as to fail to see the intellectual and legislative dishonesty—the intellectual and legislative inconsistency—of these positions?

I totally concur with the premise that the Congress must immediately devote its best thinking and efforts to a better delineation of the powers of the President as Commander in Chief vis-a-vis the powers of the Congress with respect to this Nation's military activities and commitments under our constitutional mandate for a separation of powers. But, this effort, this duty, this obligation, must be directed at all military activities, involvements, and commitments, not just to one existent involvement too geographically limited at best and post facto in its application at worst. Are we to assume that the fuzzy thinking of the proponents of this type proposal will await each new involvement unilaterally entered into by the President as Commander in Chief for the taking of similar "after the fact" action and expect to be praised and honored for their efforts as they do on this occasion of our involvement in Southeast Asia?

It is my fervent hope that not only the Congress, but the people of this Nation will reject this superficial, and probably counterproductive attempt toward discharge of the Congress' responsibility on this fundamental issue.

It is my fervent hope that there will be popular rejection of this bandaid solution and equally popular demand that the Congress enact legislation giving "to the President the things that are the President's and to Congress, the representative of the people, the things that are the Congress'."

Just as the fathers of our Constitution attempted to make this delineation of authority and responsibility between the President and the Congress with respect to the warmaking power, so must we for today make applicable, useful, and effective that which has been so conceptually established by our forefathers in our Constitution.

I have held the belief and totally concur with those who contend that the "declaration of war" contemplated by the framers of our Constitution is obsolete today, although their concept of a separation of the warmaking power—the military action commitment power—between the President and the Congress is still valid.

The claim has been made that where authorization is needed nothing short of a formal declaration of war will satisfy the Constitution's demand for congressional control of the war power. It is difficult, though, to find any rationale for such a claim. In addition to the obsolescence and general undesirability of a formal declaration today, the claim finds support neither in the language of the Constitution, the intent of the framers, the available historical and judicial precedents nor the purposes behind the clause. (Emphasis added.)

Congress, the President, and the Power To Commit Forces To Combat—*Harvard Law Review*, vol. 81, June 1968.

For myself, I suggest that we terminate the rhetoric, speechmaking, and extended debate and put our hearts and our minds into a sincere effort toward resolution of this fundamental and inescapable problem. For myself, I have already spent hours and days toward the finding of a legislative solution which will comprehensively, and on a functional basis, establish the limits of the Presidential and congressional authority and responsibility. I am satisfied that such guidelines can be established and that we can, for today and tomorrow—in this age of nuclear weaponry and world supremacy for this Nation—as clearly set forth the separation of powers as did our forefathers at a time when a fledgling nation the constitutional mandate for separation of powers had application only to a preserving of our independence and campaigns against Indians, where the most potent weapon used was a musket.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment upon the procedural aspects of the motion to instruct the conferees. Frankly, to avoid criticism of "gag rule" I would have preferred to have given the proponents of an instruction of the conferees an opportunity to express their views thereon. However, procedurally, this became impossible. This preference is not expressed because I believe some new argument might be made or new material presented, since I think most of us have followed the extensive debate in the Senate quite closely and even the House had earlier debated the substance of the proposal at some length when this bill was originally before us for consid-

eration. Rather, I dislike any attempt to prevent a reasonable opportunity to be heard by any Member even though he may disagree with the position I support.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that President Nixon is the only President we have, and we must back him to the hilt. We must not oppose his present foreign policies, and we must give him carte blanche to do whatever he wishes in the future.

In my view, both the Constitution and common sense require us to reject this line of reasoning. Yes, Mr. Nixon is the only President we have. But a President is neither a king nor a dictator nor a God, even in matters of foreign policy. Nor is he, as is frequently asserted, the Nation's Commander in Chief. He is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This means only that he is superior to every general and admiral; it says nothing about his relationship with the Congress nor with the American people.

By very precisely distributing the power of Government between the various branches, the Constitution explicitly denies the President the power to make certain types of major foreign policy decisions on his own. He cannot bind the country to a treaty without two-thirds concurrence of the Senate. He cannot conduct any military activities at all unless the entire Congress indicates its approval by the authorization-appropriations process.

Although the authority of the Congress to establish policy through the authorization-appropriations process is supreme, as a practical matter it is necessary to leave day-to-day decisions in the hands of the Executive. But today we are not dealing with a day-to-day decision.

We are dealing with the broad policy outlines of the Cooper-Church amendment. This amendment says it is the policy of the Government of the United States not to widen the Vietnam war into Cambodia. It says the U.S. Government shall not send Americans to die in an attempt to preserve the Government of Cambodia. It says the U.S. Government shall not hire troops of other countries to support the Government of Cambodia.

By passing this amendment, we will not be interfering with the powers of the Executive. We will be laying down policy for the Executive to execute. This is what the Constitution says the people of the United States are paying us to do.

Of course, to say the Cooper-Church amendment is constitutional is not to say it is necessarily desirable. But in my view it is most highly desirable.

Four Presidents, from Truman through Johnson, made decisions which progressively led us into the Vietnam quagmire. President Truman chose to support the French in their effort to reestablish colonial domination over Vietnam. When the French effort collapsed, President Eisenhower chose to begin an American effort. President Kennedy chose to expand that effort. And President Johnson chose to commit a half million American combat troops in pursuit of military victory.

I think almost all of us regret these decisions. If we could somehow go back in time and advise these Presidents, our

advice at each juncture would be an urgent "Stay out." It is a heck of a lot easier to stay out than to get out once we are in.

Now we are at a similar fork in the road. We must decide whether or not we want to preclude a commitment to the preservation of the Government of Cambodia.

I suggest it is strongly in the national interest to rule out this commitment. The Lon Nol government has precious little to recommend it. It has almost no demonstrated popular support.

The only move Lon Nol has made that has aroused any popular enthusiasm has been the slaughtering of several hundred ethnic Vietnamese civilians, which we can hardly applaud.

All Lon Nol has going for him is his anticommunism, and even this is not very impressive. Two years ago he was selling guns and supplies to the Vietcong. Today he finds anticommunism more profitable. Tomorrow, who knows?

In any case, as we are finding with Ky and Thieu, it takes more than anticommunism to make a viable or desirable government.

Six years ago, Senator Morse warned Senators who were about to vote for the Tonkin Gulf resolution they would live to regret it. During the past few weeks, we have seen Senator after Senator get up on the floor and tell how much he now regrets his vote.

In 1964, we were asked to open a Pandora's box that should not have been opened. We complied. Today we have an opportunity to lock shut a box that should be locked. If we do not avail ourselves of it, we are going to wish we had.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support the Church-Cooper amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, H.R. 15628, and I hope very much that the House conferees will go along with the Senate amendment in the forthcoming House-Senate conference.

I opposed U.S. intervention in Cambodia and I feel the Congress should make clear in law its opposition to further extension of our military activity in the Far East.

However, I shall oppose any effort in the House to tie the hands of the House conferees in their negotiations with their Senate counterparts. In particular, I refer to the reported plan to instruct the House conferees to accept the Church-Cooper amendment.

My opposition to this proposed maneuver is one of basic policy on procedure—not the issue. I support the Church-Cooper amendment and hope it will survive the conference.

However, as one who has participated in and chaired numerous House-Senate conferences, I believe it is a serious mistake to freeze the House conferees in advance on any particular point of difference.

For this same reason, I am opposing the effort to freeze the House conferees on the postal reform bill as regards the House-approved so-called right to work provision.

I believe the conferees should have freedom to act within the full range of conference limitations.

When the conference report is returned to the House, the Members then

will have the opportunity to act on any specific point in the agreement reached by the conferees. At that time, I hope to have the opportunity to vote in support of the Church-Cooper amendment.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the action in the House of Representatives today in regard to the Foreign Military Sales Act and the Cooper-Church amendment was nothing short of disgraceful.

Through a series of parliamentary maneuvers supported by the leadership, the House rejected the Cooper-Church amendment without permitting even the briefest debate on one of the most important issues facing the country.

The Cooper-Church amendment went nowhere near far enough in defining and limiting the power of the Executive to wage war without the consent of Congress. It did, however, represent an important first step in that direction. It also represented the results of 7 weeks of debate in the Senate; yet the House rejected the Senate's proposal in less than 1 hour and without any discussion whatsoever.

One result of this hasty and ill-considered action was to prevent debate on other provisions of this bill. Thus, the House accepted without question or discussion a provision in the Senate version which prohibits the sale of aircraft to any country but Vietnam. By accepting this provision without debate, the House has—perhaps unwittingly—threatened to close the door on the sale to Israel of the jet airplanes that are so badly needed to preserve the balance of peace in the Middle East and offset Russian missile installations in Egypt.

The day was not totally without gain, however. It did produce a record vote on the Cooper-Church amendment. This was not the final chance for the House to act on the Foreign Military Sales Act. Eventually the House will again have an opportunity to pass on the results of the Senate-House Conference. Those interested in seeing Congress exert its authority in ending the war in Indochina now have a check list of the Congressmen who need further attention from their constituents.

Through its actions today the House once again abrogated the responsibilities of the legislative branch to serve as check and balance to the Executive. By supplementing parliamentary maneuvers for public debate on important issues, the House has again dramatized the urgent need for reform of the legislative process to make Congress truly representative and responsive.

I urge the Senate to hold firm in its position. I also urge that the hundreds of thousands of concerned citizens continue and even redouble their efforts to persuade those representatives who voted against the Cooper-Church amendment today of the need for the House to accept its responsibilities to end the Indochina war.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has an opportunity to join with the Senate in reasserting the prerogative of the Congress on basic questions of peace and war. This should be done by instructing our House conferees to accept the

Cooper-Church amendment with regard to Cambodia, which was so overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate.

I understand that when the motion to instruct the conferees is made, a move will be made to table that motion. I hope the move to table will be defeated, as its passage will foreclose any possibility of debate in the House on the merits of Cooper-Church and also will prevent a clear-cut vote on that issue.

Until about 6 o'clock last night, no decision had been made as to when this matter would be brought before the House in the form of a motion to proceed to conference. At that point, apparently, the administration decided that today would be a good day for a vote on Cooper-Church in the House, and the House leadership inexplicably went along with the administration. Today strenuous efforts were made to persuade the leadership to put the matter off for a few days—until Tuesday next—but without avail. It is hard to understand—or indeed to tolerate—such procedure.

The issue presented by the Cooper-Church amendment is one of the most important to come before the Congress this year. The Senate devoted 7 weeks to debating it. Yet the House of Representatives not only permits no debate on the issue, but refuses to provide a few days for the Members to reflect on the matter and for the American people, understanding that a vote is to be taken at a certain time, to have an opportunity to make their voices heard.

By so doing, the House demeans itself and demeans the American system of government.

I want to refer also to the outrageous way in which the administration has been trying to mobilize support for its position. We have heard this afternoon of Members being pressured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with not-so-veiled threats that if they want any HUD projects in their districts they had better support the President on Cooper-Church.

This is bad enough. But far more serious is the apparent attempt by the administration to make the State of Israel a hostage to Mr. Nixon's determination to have a free hand to carry on our military misadventures in Southeast Asia. Representatives of the administration have been trying to exploit congressional concern for the security of Israel to influence the House vote on the Cooper-Church amendment. They have been suggesting that the President will be forced to veto the Foreign Military Sales Act if it is passed with the Cooper-Church language, and that this will leave the President with no authority to make sales of jets to Israel. This is a real problem only to the extent the President wants to make it so. A Presidential veto of the Foreign Military Sales Act would not put a ban on the sale of jets to Israel, as the administration has darkly implied. There are ample alternative methods for the Congress to assure U.S. support of Israeli security. Jets could be made available to Israel under the military assistance program, for example. If necessary, appropriate language could be added to the defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 currently under consideration

in the Senate, and I understand that at least one Senator has indicated he is ready to propose such an amendment.

According to press reports, the President is inclined to regard the situation in the Middle East as far more serious than the situation in Southeast Asia. In terms of the gravity of a new kind of Soviet intervention and in terms of the degree of interest which the United States has in the area, I am wholly in agreement with that assessment.

Surely, then, the President is not going to allow a difference of opinion with the Congress on Cambodia to prevent the United States from making available to Israel the equipment she needs for her defense, a matter on which the President and the Congress are, in principle at least, fully agreed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 143, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—247

Abbott	Clawson, Del.	Grover
Abernethy	Cleveland	Gubser
Adair	Collier	Hagan
Albert	Collins	Haley
Alexander	Colmer	Hall
Anderson,	Conable	Hammer-
Tenn.	Corbett	schmidt
Andrews, Ala.	Cowger	Hansen, Idaho
Annunzio	Crane	Harsha
Arends	Cunningham	Harvey
Ashbrook	Daniel, Va.	Hastings
Ayres	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Baring	Davis, Wis.	Hébert
Beall, Md.	de la Garza	Henderson
Belcher	Deaney	Hogan
Bennett	Dennis	Holfield
Berry	Dent	Hosmer
Betts	Derwinski	Hull
Bevill	Dickinson	Hunt
Blackburn	Dorn	Hutchinson
Blanton	Dowdy	Ichord
Boggs	Downing	Jarman
Bolling	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Bow	Duncan	Jonas
Bray	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Brock	Erlenborn	Jones, Tenn.
Brooks	Eshleman	Kazen
Brotzman	Evin, Tenn.	Kee
Brown, Mich.	Fallon	King
Brown, Ohio	Feighan	Kleppe
Broyhill, N.C.	Fisher	Kluczynski
Broyhill, Va.	Flood	Kyl
Buchanan	Flowers	Landgrebe
Burke, Fla.	Flynt	Landrum
Burleson, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.	Langen
Burton, Utah	Foreman	Latta
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Lennon
Cabell	Frelinghuysen	Lloyd
Camp	Frey	Lujan
Carter	Fuqua	Lukens
Casey	Gallagher	McClory
Cederberg	Garnatz	McCloskey
Chamberlain	Goldwater	McClure
Chappell	Goodling	McCulloch
Clancy	Gray	McDade
Clark	Green, Oreg.	McFall
Clausen,	Griffin	McKneally
Don H.	Gross	McMillan

MacGregor	Price, Ill.	Steiger, Ariz.
Mahon	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Wis.
Mailliard	Pucinski	Stephens
Mann	Purcell	Stratton
Marsh	Quie	Stubblefield
Martin	Quillen	Taft
Mathias	Railsback	Talcott
May	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Mayne	Rhodes	Teague, Calif.
Michel	Rivers	Teague, Tex.
Miller, Calif.	Roberts	Thompson, Ga.
Mills	Rogers, Fla.	Thomson, Wis.
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Waggonner
Mize	Roth	Wampler
Mizell	Roudebush	Watkins
Molohan	Roussell	Watson
Monagan	Ruth	Watts
Montgomery	Sandman	Whalley
Morgan	Satterfield	White
Murphy, Ill.	Schadeberg	Whitehurst
Murphy, N.Y.	Scherle	Wiggins
Myers	Schmitz	Williams
Natcher	Schneebell	Wilson, Bob
Nelsen	Scott	Winn
Nichols	Sebellus	Wold
O'Neal, Ga.	Shriver	Wright
Passman	Sikes	Wylie
Patman	Skubitz	Wyman
Pelly	Slack	Yatron
Perkins	Smith, Calif.	Young
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	Zablocki
Pickle	Snyder	Zion
Pirnie	Springer	Zwach
Poage	Staggers	
Poff	Steed	

NAYS—143

Adams	Gialmo	Olsen
Addabbo	Gibbons	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson,	Gilbert	Ottinger
Calif.	Gonzalez	Patten
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Blaggi	Griffiths	Pike
Blester	Gude	Preyer, N.C.
Bingham	Halpern	Randall
Blatnik	Hamilton	Rees
Boland	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Brademas	Hanna	Reuss
Brasco	Harrington	Riegle
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Robison
Burlison, Mo.	Hawkins	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roe
Button	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Celler	Hicks	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Horton	Roybal
Clay	Howard	Ruppe
Cohelan	Hungate	Ryan
Conte	Jacobs	St Germain
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Corman	Karth	Schwengel
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Smith, Iowa
Culver	Keith	Stafford
Daniels, N.J.	Koch	Stanton
Dellenback	Kyros	Stokes
Diggs	Long, Md.	Stuckey
Dingell	Lowenstein	Sullivan
Donohue	McCarthy	Symington
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Eckhardt	Mass.	Tiernan
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Tunney
Ellberg	Matsunaga	Udall
Esch	Meeds	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Van Deerlin
Farbstien	Mikva	Vander Jagt
Farnell	Miller, Ohio	Vanik
Fish	Minish	Vigorito
Foley	Mink	Waldie
Ford,	Moorhead	Weicker
William D.	Morse	Whalen
Fraser	Mosher	Widnall
Friedel	Moss	Wolf
Fulton, Pa.	Nix	Wyatt
Fulton, Tenn.	Obey	Wylder
Galifianakis	O'Hara	Yates
Gaydos	O'Konski	

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Pepper
Andrews,	Edwards, La.	Podell
N. Dak.	Findley	Pollock
Ashley	Gettys	Powell
Aspinall	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Bell, Calif.	Kirwan	Rarick
Broomfield	Kuykendall	Reifel
Brown, Calif.	Leggett	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Long, La.	Saylor
Caffery	McDonald,	Shipley
Carey	Mich.	Sisk
Cramer	McEwen	Whitten
Daddario	Meskill	Wilson,
Dawson	Morton	Charles H.
Denney	Nedzi	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Nedzi against.
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Leggett against.
Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Podell against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Cramer for with Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the previous question has been ordered on my motion to go to conference, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 1 hour of debate, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) who has announced that he will propose a motion to instruct the conferees.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RIEGLE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 15628 be instructed to agree to that part of Senate amendment numbered 3 designated as section 7.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the event a motion to table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) is not made, and there is an hour's debate on the motion, who will control the time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) will control the time.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to table.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS moves to lay on the table the motion offered by Mr. RIEGLE.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been prevailed upon to attempt to withdraw my motion on the understanding that there will be some equal division of time, and if it is not too late I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 153, answered “present” 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—237

Abbott	Duncan	MacGregor
Abernethy	Edmondson	Mahon
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Mailiard
Albert	Erlenborn	Mann
Anderson,	Eshleman	Marsh
Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Martin
Andrews, Ala.	Fallon	Mathias
Arends	Feighan	May
Ashbrook	Fisher	Mayne
Ayres	Flood	Michel
Baring	Flowers	Miller, Calif.
Beall, Md.	Flynt	Mills
Belcher	Ford, Gerald R.	Minshall
Bennett	Foreman	Mize
Berry	Fountain	Mizell
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Molloy
Bevill	Frey	Montgomery
Blackburn	Fuqua	Morgan
Blanton	Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.
Boggs	Goodling	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Gray	Myers
Bow	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Bray	Griffin	Nelsen
Brinkley	Gross	Nichols
Brock	Grover	O'Neal, Ga.
Brooks	Hagan	Pasman
Brotzman	Haley	Patman
Brown, Mich.	Hall	Pelly
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Perkins
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Pettis
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Buchanan	Harsha	Pike
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Pirnie
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Poage
Burton, Utah	Hays	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Cabell	Henderson	Purcell
Camp	Hogan	Quie
Carter	Hosmer	Quillen
Casey	Hull	Rallsback
Cederberg	Hunt	Randall
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.
Chappell	Ichord	Rhodes
Clancy	Jarman	Rivers
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Clausen,	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Roth
Clawson, Del.	Jones, N.C.	Roudebush
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Roussellot
Collier	Kazen	Ruth
Collins	Kee	Sandman
Colmer	King	Satterfield
Conable	Kleppe	Schadeberg
Corbett	Kluczynski	Scherle
Cowger	Kuykendall	Schmitz
Crane	Kyl	Scott
Cunningham	Landgrebe	Sebellius
Daniel, Va.	Landrum	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Langen	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Skubitz
de la Garza	Lennon	Slack
Delaney	Lloyd	Smith, Calif.
Dennis	Lujan	Snyder
Dent	Lukens	Springer
Derwinski	McClure	Staggers
Dickinson	McCulloch	Steed
Dorn	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Dowdy	McFall	Steiger, Wis.
Downing	McKneally	Stephens
Dulski	McMillan	Stratton

Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Waggonner

Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob

Winn
Wold
Wright
Wydler
Wyle
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—153

Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson,
Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Barrett
Blaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Chisholm
Clay
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Coughlin
Culver
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Dellenback
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Fascell
Fish
Foley
Ford
William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher

Garmatz
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Harrington
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Koch
Kyros
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McCloskey
McDade
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nix
Obey
O'Hara

O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Philbin
Pfeiffer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Stokes
Sullivan
Symington
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deeren
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Weicker
Whalen
Widnall
Wolf
Wyatt
Yates
Yatron

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

NOT VOTING—40

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Aspinall
Bell, Calif.
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Bush
Caffery
Carey
Cramer
Dawson
Denney
Devine
Edwards, La.

Findley
Gettys
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Kirwan
Leggett
Long, La.
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
Meskill
Morton
Nedzi
Pepper
Podell

Pollock
Powell
Pryor, Ark.
Rarick
Reifel
Rogers, Colo.
Saylor
Shipley
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Gubser against.
Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Pepper against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Nedzi against.
Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Podell against.
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Bell of California for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Pollock for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rogers of Colorado.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL). If he had been present he would have voted “yea.” I voted “nay.” I withdraw my vote and vote “present.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, ADAIR, and MAILLIARD.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1076, YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, DANIELS of New Jersey, O'HARA, HATHAWAY, WILLIAM D. FORD, MEEDS, BURTON of California, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Messrs. HAWKINS, GAYDOS, SCHERLE, QUIE, ESCH, STEIGER of Wisconsin, ERLBORN, ESHLEMAN, and COLLINS.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon the military sales bill.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17070, POSTAL REORGANIZATION AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17070) to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate

amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), the chairman of our committee—I take this time to advise the House that I shall seek recognition to make a motion to instruct the conferees in respect to the language in the House-passed bill guaranteeing to postal employees their right to join or refrain from joining labor unions. We had extensive debate on this issue when H.R. 17070 was before the House on June 17, and at the conclusion of that debate, the house voted overwhelmingly, 179-95, to write into the bill the following language:

Each employee of the Postal Service has the right freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join or assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right.

Despite obvious attempts to create a smokescreen and to suggest that the original bill does not change existing law regarding compulsory unionism, I want to make the point once again that under existing law, including Executive orders which have the force and effect of law, there is no way a union shop can come into existence in the Federal service. Under the provisions of the Senate version of H.R. 17070, the Postal Authority and the unions could negotiate a union shop, or a union shop could be brought into existence through binding arbitration. This would mean that a long-time, efficient career employee could be faced with the choice of joining a union or losing his job. Let me make it clear that we are not arguing here for a National right to work law. We are not arguing for an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act. We are simply saying that every American citizen should have the right to work for his Government without being compelled to join a labor union. I do not believe that the majority of the American people want us to enact a law which can result in making competent, efficient postal employees choose between joining a union against their will or losing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this position has been editorially supported by leading newspapers throughout the Nation including the Washington Evening Star, the New York Times, the New York Daily News, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Lancaster, Pa., New Era, the Macon, Ga., News, the Phoenix Republic, the Chicago Daily News, the Dallas Times-Herald, the New York Evening News, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Baltimore Sun, the Worcester, Mass., Telegram, the Goldsboro, N.C., News-Argus, the Chicago Tribune, and many, many others. I urge my colleagues to protect the traditional freedom of all Federal employees to join or refrain from joining a labor organization.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And the vote by which the House expressed its support for the freedom of choice amendment was taken only 3 weeks ago, and by a margin of approximately 2 to 1 the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina was adopted; is that true?

Mr. HENDERSON. The exact vote was 179 to 95.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, is it the intention of the chairman to move to table the motion to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina?

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Definitely.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I first commend the chairman for being consistent in his principles and consistent with the position he has previously taken.

Recognizing the parliamentary complications, may I point out to the Members that we want to go to conference on postal reform and the only way we can get this right-to-work labor issue out of the way is to instruct the House conferees in such a way as to eliminate it from consideration in conference. Therefore in the interest of postal reform we should support the gentleman from North Carolina.

May I say that the postal unions are not at all upset by this development. They primarily want a pay raise. Most postal workers are union members, so this is an academic issue with them.

The Postmaster General is rather disturbed that the right-to-work issue, actually complicated postal reform. We can remove this issue once and for all by instructing the conferees and then we can proceed to write a proper postal reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI)?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 17070, be instructed to insist on the provision beginning on page 32, line 6, which reads as follows:

"(b) Each employee of the Postal Service has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join, and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right."

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DULSKI

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DULSKI moves to lay on the table the motion offered by Mr. HENDERSON.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 229, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—154

Adams	Ford	Monagan
Addabbo	William D.	Moorhead
Albert	Fraser	Morgan
Anderson, Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	Mosher
Annunzio	Gallagher	Moss
Ashley	Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.
Barrett	Gaydos	Nix
Bevill	Gialmo	O'Hara
Blaggi	Gilbert	O'Konski
Blester	Gonzalez	Olsen
Bingham	Gray	O'Neill, Mass.
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Ottenger
Boggs	Griffiths	Patten
Boland	Gude	Perkins
Bolling	Halpern	Philbin
Brademas	Hanley	Price, Ill.
Brasco	Hanna	Pucinski
Brooks	Harrington	Rees
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Hawkins	Reuss
Button	Hays	Riegle
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Rooney, N.Y.
Celler	Hicks	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Holifield	Rosenthal
Clark	Horton	Rostenkowski
Clay	Howard	Roybal
Cohelan	Hungate	Ryan
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Scheuer
Corman	Karth	Smith, Iowa
Culver	Kastenmeier	Slack
Daddario	Kee	Stafford
Daniels, N.J.	Kluczynski	Staggers
Delaney	Koch	Stokes
Dellenback	Kyros	Stratton
Dent	Lowenstein	Sullivan
Diggs	McCarthy	Symington
Dingell	McDade	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	McFall	Tiernan
Dulski	Macdonald	Tunney
Dwyer	Mass.	Udall
Eckhardt	Madden	Ullman
Edmondson	Mailliard	Van Deertin
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Vanik
Ellberg	Meeds	Whalen
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Wolf
Farbstein	Michel	Wyatt
Fascell	Mikva	Yates
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Yatron
Flood	Minish	Zablocki
Foley	Mink	
	Mollohan	

NAYS—229

Abbott	Camp	Erlenborn
Abernethy	Carter	Esch
Adair	Casey	Eshleman
Alexander	Cederberg	Evins, Tenn.
Anderson, Tenn.	Chamberlain	Fallon
Andrews, Ala.	Chappell	Fish
Arends	Clancy	Fisher
Ashbrook	Clausen	Flowers
Ayres	Don H.	Flynt
Baring	Clawson, Del.	Ford, Gerald R.
Beall, Md.	Cleveland	Foreman
Belcher	Collier	Fountain
Bennett	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Berry	Colmer	Frey
Betts	Conable	Friedel
Blackburn	Corbett	Fulton, Tenn.
Blanton	Coughlin	Fuqua
Bow	Cowger	Gallifanakis
Bray	Crane	Gibbons
Brinkley	Daniel, Va.	Goldwater
Brock	Davis, Ga.	Goodling
Brotzman	Davis, Wis.	Griffin
Brown, Mich.	de la Garza	Gross
Broyhill, Va.	Dennis	Grover
Buchanan	Derwinski	Gubser
Burke, Fla.	Dickinson	Hagan
Burleson, Tex.	Dorn	Haley
Burlison, Mo.	Downey	Hall
Burton, Utah	Duncan	Hamilton
Cabell	Edwards, Ala.	Hammer-
		schmidt

Hansen, Idaho Mills
 Harsha Minshall
 Harvey Mize
 Hastings Mizell
 Hébert Montgomery
 Henderson Myers
 Hogan Natcher
 Hosmer Nelsen
 Hull Nichols
 Hunt Obey
 Hutchinson O'Neal, Ga.
 Ichord Passman
 Jarman Patman
 Johnson, Pa. Pelly
 Jonas Pettis
 Jones, N.C. Pickle
 Jones, Tenn. Pike
 Kazen Pirnie
 Keith Poage
 King Poff
 Kleppe Freyer, N.C.
 Kuykendall Price, Tex.
 Kyl Purcell
 Landgrebe Quile
 Landrum Quillen
 Langen Railsback
 Latta Reid, Ill.
 Lennor Rhodes
 Lloyd Rivers
 Long, Md. Roberts
 Lujan Robison
 Lukens Roe
 McClory Rogers, Fla.
 McCloskey Roth
 McClure Roudsbush
 McCulloch Rousselot
 McKneally Ruppe
 McMillan Ruth
 MacGregor Sandman
 Mahon Satterfield
 Mann Schadeberg
 Marsh Scherle
 Martin Schmitz
 Mathias Schneebeli
 May Schwengel
 Mayne Scott
 Miller, Ohio Sebelius

NOT VOTING—48

Anderson, Ill. Edwards, La.
 Andrews Findley
 N. Dak. Gettys
 Aspinall Green, Oreg.
 Bell, Calif. Hansen, Wash.
 Broomfield Heckler, Mass.
 Brown, Calif. Jacobs
 Brown, Ohio Kirwan
 Broyhill, N.C. Leggett
 Bush Long, La.
 Caffery McDonald,
 Carey Mich.
 Cramer McEwen
 Cunningham Meskill
 Dawson Morse
 Denney Morton
 Devine Murphy, N.Y.

Nedzi
 Pepper
 Podell
 Pollock
 Powell
 Pryor, Ark.
 Randall
 Rarick
 Reifel
 Rogers, Colo.
 Saylor
 Shipley
 Sisk
 Waldie
 Whitten
 Wilson
 Charles H.

So the motion to table was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Caffery against.
 Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Gettys against.
 Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Rarick against.
 Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Devine against.
 Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Denney against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.

Mr. Waldie for, with Mr. Morton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Meskill with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Pollock with Mr. Morse.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) is recognized.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as I said in my remarks under a reservation of objection, this issue has been fully and completely debated with both sides having been afforded full opportunity to express their views.

I believe all Members are fully aware of the nature and purpose of my motion.

I am happy to yield at this time to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) such time as he may consume.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct the conferees. The House conferees on H.R. 17070 should go to the conference unhindered by any instructions from the House on this very complicated bill.

Unfortunately, one of the most controversial issues that has arisen in connection with this bill involves the question of the right of postal employees under the new agency to negotiate the union shop.

The conferees should be afforded the opportunity to work this issue out without being hindered by binding instructions from the House.

The bill reported from our committee, and approved by the House, provided that labor-management relations in the new Postal Service shall be subject to the National Labor Relations Act. Under section 14(b) of that act, a union shop could be negotiated as a part of a collective bargaining agreement except in those States having a right-to-work statute. Consequently, a union shop could not be enforced in the 19 States having right-to-work statutes.

The House adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to the committee-reported bill, providing that an employee of the new Postal Service will have the right to refrain from joining a labor organization.

It is proposed that the conferees be instructed to insist on retaining this amendment as a part of the conference agreement.

The Senate amendment to the House bill contains provisions similar to those adopted by our committee, and does not extend an absolute right for the employees to refrain from joining the union shop in those cases in which the postal employees under free collective bargaining have agreed on a union shop.

Mr. Speaker, I was in favor of the provisions of our bill permitting the negotiations for a union shop. I opposed the amendment to these provisions which was adopted by the House, which would permit an employee to refrain from joining the union, and I continue to be opposed to such provisions.

However, regardless of whether I am in favor of or opposed to this particular proposition, it is much more important to me that conferees not be encumbered by instructions from the House of Representatives which bind their hands on a major issue involved in the postal reorganization.

I strongly urge that the Members vote against the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of this legislation as proposed by the administration, with some reservations I supported the House bill as amended, and have voted for the motion to instruct House conferees on the Henderson amendment.

As to the House bill, it is a considerable step forward in making it possible to modernize our postal service and to get away from the patchwork straitjacket in which it is now trapped. It will not abandon irretrievably the concern and trusteeship of Congress over the mails and the personnel involved. We can at any time act to change or control the operation which is developed under the new law, but the pressures of political expediency will, at least, be somewhat removed from the operating decisions. Unfortunately, the Senate version weakens the House bill in some degree. The American people by a large percentage are indicating that this type of change is overdue and that the postal service should be self-sufficient and business-like. I hope the conferees will heed this spirit.

As to the Henderson amendment, the issue seems to me to have been made clear by the failure to include in the bill any exemption or grandfather clause for those already employed, sometimes with many years of service. Thus, without the Henderson amendment the union could, in a union shop situation, through union discipline alone, cause the loss of many years of vested Federal back-service benefits and credits. This is a danger that I wish no part of.

Moreover, without the Henderson amendment, the position of existing and legitimate employee organizations, could be greatly weakened or perhaps even destroyed. I strongly favor bringing effective collective bargaining into the postal service, getting away from the buckpassing delays and demagoguery of congressionally set wage schedules. The union shop bargained for and agreed to, in those States permitting it, is a proper and established procedure in private industry, and with a postal corporation could, where desired, work properly. It would not be a precedent for public employees employed directly by Government. But this does not justify creating a situation in which existing rights of postal workers or their voluntary organizations could be overpowered and wiped out. Without the Henderson amendment, the bill could have those effects.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 158, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—228

Abbutt	Frey	Pelly
Abernethy	Fulton, Tenn.	Pettis
Adair	Fuqua	Pickle
Alexander	Galifanakis	Pike
Anderson,	Gibbons	Pirnie
Tenn.	Goldwater	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Poff
Arends	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Ashbrook	Gross	Price, Tex.
Ayres	Grover	Purcell
Baring	Gubeer	Quile
Beall, Md.	Hagan	Quillen
Belcher	Haley	Railsback
Bennett	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Hammer-	Rhodes
Betts	schmidt	Rivers
Blaggi	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
Blackburn	Harsha	Robison
Blanton	Harvey	Roe
Bow	Hastings	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hébert	Roth
Brinkley	Henderson	Roudebush
Brock	Hogan	Rousselot
Brotzman	Hosmer	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Hull	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Hunt	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Schadeberg
Buchanan	Jarman	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Schmitz
Burleson, Tex.	Jonas	Schneebeli
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, N.C.	Schwengel
Burton, Utah	Jones, Tenn.	Scott
Cabell	Kazen	Sebelius
Camp	Keith	Shriver
Carter	Kling	Sikes
Casey	Kleppe	Skubitz
Cederberg	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Kyl	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Landgrebe	Snyder
Clancy	Landrum	Springer
Clausen,	Langen	Steed
Don H.	Latta	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Steiger, Wis.
Cleveland	Lloyd	Stephens
Collier	Long, Md.	Stubblefield
Collins	Lujan	Stuckey
Colmer	Lukens	Taft
Conable	McClory	Talcott
Corbett	McCloskey	Taylor
Coughlin	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Crane	McKneally	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	McMillan	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	MacGregor	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Vigorito
de la Garza	Mann	Waggonner
Dennis	Marsh	Wampler
Derwinski	Martin	Watkins
Dickinson	Mathias	Watts
Dorn	May	Weicker
Dowdy	Mayne	Whalley
Downing	Miller, Ohio	White
Duncan	Mills	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	Widnall
Erlenborn	Mize	Wiggins
Esch	Mizeli	Williams
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Evins, Tenn.	Myers	Winn
Fish	Natcher	Wold
Fisher	Nelsen	Wright
Flowers	Nichols	Wyder
Flynt	Obey	Wylie
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski	Wyman
Foreman	O'Neal, Ga.	Zion
Fountain	Passman	Zwach
Frelinghuysen	Patman	

NAYS—158

Adams	Annunzio	Bingham
Addabbo	Ashley	Blatnik
Albert	Barrett	Boggs
Anderson,	Bevill	Boland
Calif.	Blester	Bolling

Brademas	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Nix
Brooks	Griffiths	O'Hara
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Olsen
Burton, Calif.	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Button	Hamilton	Ottenger
Byrne, Pa.	Hanley	Patten
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanna	Perkins
Celler	Harrington	Philbin
Chisholm	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Clark	Hawkins	Pucinski
Clay	Hays	Rees
Cohelan	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Conte	Helstoski	Reuss
Conyers	Hollifield	Riegle
Corman	Horton	Rodino
Culver	Howard	Rooney, N.Y.
Daddario	Hungate	Rooney, Pa.
Daniels, N.J.	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Delaney	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Dellenback	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Dent	Karh	Ryan
Diggs	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Dingell	Kee	Scheuer
Donohue	Kluczynski	Slack
Dulski	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Dwyer	Kyros	Stafford
Eckhardt	Lowenstein	Staggers
Edmondson	McCarthy	Stanton
Edwards, Calif.	McDade	Stokes
Eilberg	McFall	Stratton
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald,	Sullivan
Fallon	Gross	Symington
Farbstein	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Mailliard	Tierman
Feighan	Matsunaga	Tunney
Flood	Meeds	Udall
Foley	Mikva	Ullman
Ford,	Miller, Calif.	Van Deerlin
William D.	Minish	Vanik
Fraser	Mink	Waldie
Friedel	Mollohan	Whalen
Fulton, Pa.	Monagan	Wolf
Gallagher	Moorhead	Wyatt
Garmatz	Morgan	Yates
Gaydos	Morse	Yatron
Gialmo	Mosher	Young
Gilbert	Moss	Zablocki
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—45

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Nedzi
Andrews,	Gettys	Pepper
N. Dak.	Green, Oreg.	Podell
Aspinall	Hansen, Wash.	Pollock
Bell, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Powell
Broomfield	Hicks	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Calif.	Kirwan	Randall
Bush	Leggett	Rarick
Caffery	Long, La.	Reifel
Carey	McDonald,	Rogers, Colo.
Cramer	Mich.	Saylor
Cunningham	McEwen	Shibley
Dawson	Melcher	Sisk
Denney	Meskill	Whitten
Devine	Michel	Wilson,
Edwards, La.	Morton	Charles H.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Podell against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Pepper against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Nedzi against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Denny for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Randall with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Michel with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Reifel with Mr. Saylor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DULSKI, HENDERSON, OLSEN, UDALL, DANIELS of New Jersey, CORBETT, GROSS, CUNNINGHAM, and DERWINSKI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 209 I am not recorded. I was unavoidably detained on the other side of the Capitol on an important matter. If I had been present I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 209 I was not present. If I had been present I would have voted "nay."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the motion to instruct conferees on the bill H.R. 17070, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT'S ENVIRONMENTALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-366)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As concern with the condition of our physical environment has intensified, it has become increasingly clear that we need to know more about the total environment—land, water, and air. It also has become increasingly clear that only by reorganizing our Federal efforts can we develop that knowledge, and effectively ensure the protection, development and enhancement of the total environment itself.

The Government's environmentally-related activities have grown up piecemeal over the years. The time has come to organize them rationally and systematically. As a major step in this direction, I am transmitting today two reorganization plans: one to establish an Environmental Protection Agency, and one to establish, within the Department of Commerce, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

Our national government today is not structured to make a coordinated attack on the pollutants which debase the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land that grows our food. Indeed, the

present governmental structure for dealing with environmental pollution often defies effective and concerted action.

Despite its complexity, for pollution control purposes the environment must be perceived as a single, interrelated system. Present assignments of departmental responsibilities do not reflect this interrelatedness.

Many agency missions, for example, are designed primarily along media lines—air, water, and land. Yet the sources of air, water, and land pollution are interrelated and often interchangeable. A single source may pollute the air with smoke and chemicals, the land with solid wastes, and a river or lake with chemical and other wastes. Control of the air pollution may produce more solid wastes, which then pollute the land or water. Control of the water-polluting effluent may convert it into solid wastes, which must be disposed of on land.

Similarly, some pollutants—chemicals, radiation, pesticides—appear in all media. Successful control of them at present requires the coordinated efforts of a variety of separate agencies and departments. The results are not always successful.

A far more effective approach to pollution control would:

- Identify pollutants.
- Trace them through the entire ecological chain, observing and recording changes in form as they occur.
- Determine the total exposure of man and his environment.
- Examine interactions among forms of pollution.
- Identify where in the ecological chain interdiction would be most appropriate.

In organizational terms, this requires pulling together into one agency a variety of research, monitoring, standard-setting and enforcement activities now scattered through several departments and agencies. It also requires that the new agency include sufficient support elements—in research and in aids to State and local anti-pollution programs, for example—to give it the needed strength and potential for carrying out its mission. The new agency would also, of course, draw upon the results of research conducted by other agencies.

COMPONENTS OF THE EPA

Under the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 3, the following would be moved to the new Environmental Protection Agency:

—The functions carried out by the Federal Water Quality Administration (from the Department of the Interior).

—Functions with respect to pesticides studies now vested in the Department of the Interior.

—The functions carried out by the National Air Pollution Control Administration (from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

—The functions carried out by the Bureau of Solid Waste Management and the Bureau of Water Hygiene, and portions of the functions carried out by the Bureau of Radiological Health of the Environmental Control Administration (from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

—Certain functions with respect to pesticides carried out by the Food and Drug Administration (from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

—Authority to perform studies relating to ecological systems now vested in the Council on Environmental Quality.

—Certain functions respecting radiation criteria and standards now vested in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Radiation Council.

—Functions respecting pesticides registration and related activities now carried out by the Agricultural Research Service (from the Department of Agriculture).

With its broad mandate, EPA would also develop competence in areas of environmental protection that have not previously been given enough attention, such, for example, as the problem of noise, and it would provide an organization to which new programs in these areas could be added.

In brief, these are the principal functions to be transferred:

Federal Water Quality Administration. Charged with the control of pollutants which impair water quality, it is broadly concerned with the impact of degraded water quality. It performs a wide variety of functions, including research, standard-setting and enforcement, and provides construction grants and technical assistance.

Certain pesticides research authority from the Department of the Interior. Authority for research on the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife would be provided to the EPA through transfer of the specialized research authority of the pesticides act enacted in 1958. Interior would retain its responsibility to do research on all factors affecting fish and wildlife. Under this provision, only one laboratory would be transferred to the EPA—the Gulf Breeze Biological Laboratory of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The EPA would work closely with the fish and wildlife laboratories remaining with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

National Air Pollution Control Administration. As the principal Federal agency concerned with air pollution, it conducts research on the effects of air pollution, operates a monitoring network, and promulgates criteria which serve as the basis for setting air quality standards. Its regulatory functions are similar to those of the Federal Water Quality Administration. NAPCA is responsible for administering the Clean Air Act, which involves designating air quality regions, approving State standards, and providing financial and technical assistance to State Control agencies to enable them to comply with the Act's provisions. It also sets and enforces Federal automotive emission standards.

Elements of the Environmental Control Administration. ECA is the focal point within HEW for evaluation and control of a broad range of environmental health problems, including water quality, solid wastes, and radiation. Programs in the ECA involve research, development of criteria and standards, and the administration of planning and demonstration grants. From the ECA, the activities of

the Bureau of Water Hygiene and Solid Waste Management and portions of the activities of the Bureau of Radiological Health would be transferred. Other functions of the ECA including those related to the regulation of radiation from consumer products and occupational safety and health would remain in HEW.

Pesticides research and standard-setting programs of the Food and Drug Administration. FDA's pesticides program consists of setting and enforcing standards which limit pesticide residues in food. EPA would have the authority to set pesticide standards and to monitor compliance with them, as well as to conduct related research. However, as an integral part of its food protection activities, FDA would retain its authority to remove from the market food with excess pesticide residues.

General ecological research from the Council on Environmental Quality. This authority to perform studies and research relating to ecological systems would be in addition to EPA's other specific research authorities, and it would help EPA to measure the impact of pollutants. The Council on Environmental Quality would retain its authority to conduct studies and research relating to environmental quality.

Environmental radiation standards programs. The Atomic Energy Commission is now responsible for establishing environmental radiation standards and emission limits for radioactivity. Those standards have been based largely on broad guidelines recommended by the Federal Radiation Council. The Atomic Energy Commission's authority to set standards for the protection of the general environment from radioactive material would be transferred to the Environmental Protection Agency. The functions of the Federal Radiation Council would also be transferred. AEC would retain responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of radiation standards through its licensing authority.

Pesticides registration program of the Agricultural Research Service. The Department of Agriculture is currently responsible for several distinct functions related to pesticides use. It conducts research on the efficacy of various pesticides as related to other pest control methods and on the effects of pesticides on non-target plants, livestock, and poultry. It registers pesticides, monitors their persistence and carries out an educational program on pesticide use through the extension service. It conducts extensive pest control programs which utilize pesticides.

By transferring the Department of Agriculture's pesticides registration and monitoring function to the EPA and merging it with the pesticides programs being transferred from HEW and Interior, the new agency would be given a broad capability for control over the introduction of pesticides into the environment.

The Department of Agriculture would continue to conduct research on the effectiveness of pesticides. The Department would furnish this information to the EPA, which would have the respon-

sibility for actually licensing pesticides for use after considering environmental and health effects. Thus the new agency would be able to make use of the expertise of the Department.

ADVANTAGES OF REORGANIZATION

This reorganization would permit response to environmental problems in a manner beyond the previous capability of our pollution control programs. The EPA would have the capacity to do research on important pollutants irrespective of the media in which they appear, and on the impact of these pollutants on the total environment. Both by itself and together with other agencies, the EPA would monitor the condition of the environment—biological as well as physical. With these data, the EPA would be able to establish quantitative "environmental baselines"—critical if we are to measure adequately the success or failure of our pollution abatement efforts.

As no disjointed array of separate programs can, the EPA would be able—in concert with the States—to set and enforce standards for air and water quality and for individual pollutants. This consolidation of pollution control authorities would help assure that we do not create new environmental problems in the process of controlling existing ones. Industries seeking to minimize the adverse impact of their activities on the environment would be assured of consistent standards covering the full range of their waste disposal problems. As the States develop and expand their own pollution control programs, they would be able to look to one agency to support their efforts with financial and technical assistance and training.

In proposing that the Environmental Protection Agency be set up as a separate new agency, I am making an exception to one of my own principles: that, as a matter of effective and orderly administration, additional new independent agencies normally should not be created. In this case, however, the arguments against placing environmental protection activities under the jurisdiction of one or another of the existing departments and agencies are compelling.

In the first place, almost every part of government is concerned with the environment in some way, and affects it in some way. Yet each department also has its own primary mission—such as resource development, transportation, health, defense, urban growth or agriculture—which necessarily affects its own view of environmental questions.

In the second place, if the critical standard-setting functions were centralized within any one existing department, it would require that department constantly to make decisions affecting other departments—in which, whether fairly or unfairly, its own objectivity as an impartial arbiter could be called into question.

Because environmental protection cuts across so many jurisdictions, and because arresting environmental deterioration is of great importance to the quality of life in our country and the world, I believe that in this case a strong, independent agency is needed. That

agency would, of course, work closely with and draw upon the expertise and assistance of other agencies having experience in the environmental area.

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF EPA

The principal roles and functions of the EPA would include:

—The establishment and enforcement of environmental protection standards consistent with national environmental goals.

—The conduct of research on the adverse effects of pollution and on methods and equipment for controlling it, the gathering of information on pollution, and the use of this information in strengthening environmental protection programs and recommending policy changes.

—Assisting others, through grants, technical assistance and other means in arresting pollution of the environment.

—Assisting the Council on Environmental Quality in developing and recommending to the President new policies for the protection of the environment.

One natural question concerns the relationship between the EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality, recently established by act of Congress.

It is my intention and expectation that the two will work in close harmony, reinforcing each other's mission. Essentially, the Council is a top-level advisory group (which might be compared with the Council of Economic Advisers), while the EPA would be an operating, "line" organization. The Council will continue to be a part of the Executive Office of the President and will perform its overall coordinating and advisory roles with respect to all Federal programs related to environmental quality.

The Council, then, is concerned with all aspects of environmental quality—wildlife preservation, parklands, land use, and population growth, as well as pollution. The EPA would be charged with protecting the environment by abating pollution. In short, the Council focuses on what our broad policies in the environmental field should be; the EPA would focus on setting and enforcing pollution control standards. The two are not competing, but complementary—and taken together, they should give us, for the first time, the means to mount an effectively coordinated campaign against environmental degradation in all of its many forms.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

The oceans and the atmosphere are interacting parts of the total environmental system upon which we depend not only for the quality of our lives, but for life itself.

We face immediate and compelling needs for better protection of life and property from natural hazards, and for a better understanding of the total environment—an understanding which will enable us more effectively to monitor and predict its actions, and ultimately, perhaps to exercise some degree of control over them.

We also face a compelling need for exploration and development leading to the intelligent use of our marine resources.

The global oceans, which constitute nearly three-fourths of the surface of our planet, are today the least-understood, the least-developed, and the least-protected part of our earth. Food from the oceans will increasingly be a key element in the world's fight against hunger. The mineral resources of the ocean beds and of the oceans themselves, are being increasingly tapped to meet the growing world demand. We must understand the nature of these resources, and assure their development without either contaminating the marine environment or upsetting its balance.

Establishment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—within the Department of Commerce would enable us to approach these tasks in a coordinated way. By employing a unified approach to the problems of the oceans and atmosphere, we can increase our knowledge and expand our opportunities not only in those areas, but in the third major component of our environment, the solid earth, as well.

Scattered through various Federal departments and agencies, we already have the scientific, technological and administrative resources to make an effective, unified approach possible. What we need is to bring them together. Establishment of NOAA would do so.

By far the largest of the components being merged would be the Commerce Department's Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), with some 10,000 employees (70 percent of NOAA's total personnel strength) and estimated Fiscal 1970 expenditures of almost \$200 million. Placing NOAA within the Department of Commerce therefore entails the least dislocation, while also placing it within a Department which has traditionally been a center for service activities in the scientific and technological area.

COMPONENTS OF NOAA

Under terms of Reorganization Plan No. 4, the programs of the following organizations would be moved into NOAA:

—The Environmental Science Services Administration (from within the Department of Commerce).

—Elements of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (from the Department of the Interior).

—The marine sport fish program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (from the Department of the Interior).

—The Marine Minerals Technology Center of the Bureau of Mines (from the Department of the Interior).

—The Office of Sea Grant Programs (from the National Science Foundation).

—Elements of the United States Lake Survey (from the Department of the Army).

In addition, by executive action, the programs of the following organizations would be transferred to NOAA:

—The National Oceanographic Data Center (from the Department of the Navy).

—The National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center (from the Department of the Navy).

—The National Data Buoy Project (from the Department of Transportation).

In brief, these are the principal functions of the programs and agencies to be combined:

The Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) comprises the following components:

—The Weather Bureau (weather, marine, river and flood forecasting and warning).

—The Coast and Geodetic Survey (earth and marine description, mapping and charting).

—The Environmental Data Service (storage and retrieval of environmental data).

—The National Environmental Satellite Center (observation of the global environment from earth-orbiting satellites).

—The ESSA Research Laboratories (research on physical environmental problems).

ESSA's activities include observing and predicting the state of the oceans, the state of the lower and upper atmosphere, and the size and shape of the earth. It maintains the nation's warning systems for such natural hazards as hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, earthquakes and seismic sea waves. It provides information for national defense, agriculture, transportation and industry.

ESSA monitors atmospheric, oceanic and geophysical phenomena on a global basis, through an unparalleled complex of air, ocean, earth and space facilities. It also prepares aeronautical and marine maps and charts.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and marine sport fish activities. Those fishery activities of the Department of the Interior's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which are ocean related and those which are directed toward commercial fishing would be transferred. The Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has the dual function of strengthening the fishing industry and promoting conservation of fishery stocks. It conducts research on important marine species and on fundamental oceanography, and operates a fleet of oceanographic vessels and a number of laboratories. Most of its activities would be transferred. From the Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the marine sport fishing program would be transferred. This involves five supporting laboratories and three ships engaged in activities to enhance marine sport fishing opportunities.

The Marine Minerals Technology Center is concerned with the development of marine mining technology.

Office of Sea Grant Programs. The Sea Grant Program was authorized in 1966 to permit the Federal Government to assist the academic and industrial communities in developing marine resources and technology. It aims at strengthening education and training of marine specialists, supporting applied research in the recovery and use of marine resources, and developing extension and advisory services. The Office carries out these objectives by making grants to selected academic institutions.

The U.S. Lake Survey has two primary missions. It prepares and publishes navigation charts of the Great Lakes and tributary waters and conducts research on a variety of hydraulic and hydrologic phenomena of the Great Lakes' waters. Its activities are very similar to those conducted along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts by ESSA's Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The National Oceanographic Data Center is responsible for the collection and dissemination of oceanographic data accumulated by all Federal agencies.

The National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center provides a central Federal service for the calibration and testing of oceanographic instruments.

The National Data Buoy Development Project was established to determine the feasibility of deploying a system of automatic ocean buoys to obtain oceanic and atmospheric data.

ROLE OF NOAA

Drawing these activities together into a single agency would make possible a balanced Federal program to improve our understanding of the resources of the sea, and permit their development and use while guarding against the sort of thoughtless exploitation that in the past laid waste to so many of our precious natural assets. It would make possible a consolidated program for achieving a more comprehensive understanding of oceanic and atmospheric phenomena, which so greatly affect our lives and activities. It would facilitate the cooperation between public and private interests that can best serve the interests of all.

I expect that NOAA would exercise leadership in developing a national oceanic and atmospheric program of research and development. It would coordinate its own scientific and technical resources with the technical and operational capabilities of other government agencies and private institutions. As important, NOAA would continue to provide those services to other agencies of government, industry and private individuals which have become essential to the efficient operation of our transportation systems, our agriculture and our national security. I expect it to maintain continuing and close liaison with the new Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality as part of an effort to ensure that environmental questions are dealt with in their totality and that they benefit from the full range of the government's technical and human resources.

Authorities who have studied this matter, including the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, strongly recommended the creation of a National Advisory Committee for the Oceans. I agree. Consequently, I will request, upon approval of the plan, that the Secretary of Commerce establish a National Advisory Committee for the Oceans and the Atmosphere to advise him on the progress of governmental and private programs in achieving the Nation's oceanic and atmospheric objectives.

AN ON-GOING PROCESS

The reorganizations which I am here proposing afford both the Congress and the Executive Branch an opportunity to

re-evaluate the adequacy of existing program authorities involved in these consolidations. As these two new organizations come into being, we may well find that supplementary legislation to perfect their authorities will be necessary. I look forward to working with the Congress in this task.

In formulating these reorganization plans, I have been greatly aided by the work of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization (the Ash Council), the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources (the Stratton Commission, appointed by President Johnson), my special task force on oceanography headed by Dr. James Wakelin, and by the information developed during both House and Senate hearings on proposed NOAA legislation.

Many of those who have advised me have proposed additional reorganizations, and it may well be that in the future I shall recommend further changes. For the present, however, I think the two reorganizations transmitted today represent a sound and significant beginning. I also think that in practical terms, in this sensitive and rapidly developing area, it is better to proceed a step at a time—and thus to be sure that we are not caught up in a form of organizational indigestion from trying to rearrange too much at once. As we see how these changes work out, we will gain a better understanding of what further changes—in addition to these—might be desirable.

Ultimately, our objective should be to insure that the Nation's environmental and resource protection activities are so organized as to maximize both the effective coordination of all and the effective functioning of each.

The Congress, the Administration and the public all share a profound commitment to the rescue of our natural environment, and the preservation of the Earth as a place both habitable by and hospitable to man. With its acceptance of these reorganization plans, the Congress will help us fulfill that commitment.

RICHARD NIXON

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 9, 1970.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 PROVIDING FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-364)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code and providing for an Environmental Protection Agency. My reasons for transmitting this plan are stated in a more extended accompanying message.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 3

of 1970 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a) (1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business"; and section 901(a) (3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable."

The reorganizations provided for in the plan make necessary the appointment and compensation of new officers as specified in section 1 of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for other officers in the executive branch who have similar responsibilities.

Section 907 of title 5 of the United States Code will operate to preserve administrative proceedings, including any public hearing proceedings, related to the transferred functions, which are pending immediately prior to the taking effect of the reorganization plan.

The reorganization plan should result in the more efficient operation of the Government. It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 9, 1970.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 PROVIDING FOR NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-365)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. The plan would transfer to the Secretary of Commerce various functions relating to the oceans and atmosphere, including commercial fishery functions, and would establish a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the Department of Commerce. My reasons for transmitting this plan are stated in a more extended accompanying message.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a) (1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business"; and section 901

(a) (3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable."

The reorganizations provided for in the plan make necessary the appointment and compensation of new officers as specified in section 2 of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for other officers in the executive branch who have similar responsibilities.

The reorganization plan should result in the more efficient operation of the Government. It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 9, 1970.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REORGANIZATION PLANS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent the Congress reorganization plans aimed at coordinating the Federal role in the nationwide effort to restore our environment.

I congratulate the President. There is no question that we need a strong independent agency to oversee the protection of our total environment. I strongly endorse the President's proposal to create the new Environmental Protection Agency, and I also favor his new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

As I view the deficiencies in the existing situation, the most compelling reasons for creating an Environmental Protection Agency are the need to provide clear-cut consistent standards for enforcement in the area of industrial pollution and a single Federal agency to which State and local pollution control officials can go for financial support and technical help.

In my view the creation of an independent agency heading up an overall effort to restore our environment is one of the most pressing needs of our time.

I would anticipate widespread support for the President's environmental reorganization plans in the Congress and throughout the country.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon has announced plans for a reorganization in the executive branch in order to establish a new independent agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, and to establish the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the Department of Commerce.

These are two monumental steps forward in the mounting campaign for environmental planning. EPA will bring together the existing governmental activities concerned with the environment into one house. This will work toward eliminating the tremendous overlap and duplication of activity that presently exists with the fragmentation of duties among the many Government agencies.

The establishment of NOAA has been long awaited, and now we can move in the direction of unifying our approach to the problems of the oceans and the at-

mosphere. NOAA will eliminate duplication of activity and create a center of strength within the civilian sector of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the President has taken two timely and much needed steps. The efficiency of housing all related responsibilities under one roof will make far more effective each dollar spent in research and development, and facilitate the needed communication for faster progress in cleaning up our environment. I applaud President Nixon for his action, and I look forward with hope to the results of a comprehensive examination of the total effects of pollution.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the President's announcement of his intention to create a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Commerce Department.

What has been a piecemeal effort, scattered far and wide, has been reorganized into a viable, effective plan which will enable the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration to serve the Nation far better than has been possible in the past.

This combining of atmospheric and oceanic effort under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce is the product of the determination and know-how of an administration dedicated to providing the best possible service for the taxpayer's dollar.

The combining of several projects and programs now being pursued by different agencies of the Government leads to duplication of research effort, and inefficient administration practices. Persons engaged in research often are not aware of findings made by others that could either add to the sum of knowledge in a field of concentration, or could directly relate to it, thereby eliminating unnecessary steps and speeding the effort. Often researchers are faced by a Federal maze in attempting to determine if any investigation has been made on the subject. Knowledge in all areas has been expanding at such a fantastic pace it is difficult for many scientists to keep informed of their own specialty, let alone to stay abreast of developments in closely related fields. Raise this problem to the level of a Federal agency controlling several projects and programs entirely unrelated, except for the fact they are under one department, and one can easily understand the nearly impossible task of easily obtaining information from several different departments.

This is the current status of many projects relating to the environment. One of the main problems is that administration has not kept up with technology.

The creation of NOAA is a step in the right direction, and I find it easy to support it. The combining of the programs directly relates to similar efforts I have made in legislation I have sponsored.

H.R. 715 will amend the rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to which all pollution bills can be referred. It will bring to an end the current situation of almost every committee in the House handling pollution legislation. Leadership and a streamlined method of the legislative

process will make more efficient congressional action on the pollution problem.

I believe the Nation can expect important achievement from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Its creation helps administration catch up with expanding technology.

I am pleased that another reorganization plan announced by the President also provides leadership, planning, and coordination in combating pollution. Reorganization Plan No. 3 establishes the Environmental Protection Agency. The Agency would be structured similar to NASA in that it is directly responsible to the President. It is encouraging that the administration has taken the route of a central agency. The Environmental Protection Agency is similar to an organization proposed in a bill I introduced early this year. H.R. 16414, the Pollution Abatement Act of 1970, establishes the National Environment Control Commission which would have authority to generate and enforce pollution standards, have full power to promulgate all actions involved with the attack, incorporate all future and present pollution programs, and have jurisdiction over more than \$10 billion in Federal funds.

I support the President's two reorganization plans. They will clear the way for efficiencies in Agency expenditures and for more efficient research.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the President's reorganization plans.

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

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN FOR A NATIONAL OCEANIC ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the President today delivered his important message to Congress, concerning his reorganization plan for a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—and I would like to comment on this plan.

The establishment of NOAA will answer a prime national need—to meet the challenges and the opportunities of our environment in a unified effective way.

The hazards and the promises of that environment have been sharply highlighted in recent years and months. The violence of weather is always with us. The creep of pollution has approached a gallop. The oceans, our least understood resource, are long overdue for exploration and understanding.

In NOAA, there will reside a highly unusual and diverse set of capabilities to meet the problems of land, the sea, and the air. An excellent nucleus for the new organization is in being as the Environmental Science Services Administration. Since 1965, ESSA has had the responsibility for observing, describing, and un-

derstanding the geophysical environment, from the ocean floor to upper space. Within the new Administration, the functions of ESSA and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the sea grant program, the U.S. Lake Survey, the Coast Guard data buoy program, the marine sport fish programs of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries, the marine mining technology programs of the Bureau of Mines, and the National Oceanographic Data and Instrumentation Centers will be combined.

Together, they will provide the ingredients for a dynamic Federal effort to serve the Nation's most pressing environmental interests. This grouping of functions will enable the new Administration to achieve far more than would have been possible previously.

The formation of NOAA rather closely parallels the recommendations of the distinguished Stratton Commission, a congressionally chartered body. While the President has not seen fit to make NOAA an independent agency, as the Commission recommended, he has built it well. He has placed it under the energetic and determined leadership of the Secretary of Commerce, and it will be in excellent hands.

I am satisfied that the NOAA concept will serve the Nation well.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress received the long-awaited administration proposal for the establishment of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce. This Administration would pull together the functions of ESSA, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Sea Grant program, the U.S. Lake Survey, the Coast Guard data buoy program, the marine sport fisheries, the marine mining technology programs of the Bureau of Mines, and the National Oceanographic Data and Instrumentation Centers.

I think it is appropriate at this time for us to review the role that Congress has played in the area of marine affairs over the last 10 years. The Congress, in its wisdom and foresight, saw fit to recognize the importance of oceanography in 1959, when the Subcommittee on Oceanography was established within the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. After 7 years of investigation and work, that subcommittee, of which I am now chairman, sponsored the bill which was to become the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. That Act established a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, a Cabinet-level coordinating body chaired by the Vice President. It also created the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, a panel of 15 highly qualified and distinguished citizens, chaired by Dr. Julius Stratton, presently chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation. The Commission was directed to make recommendations on how best to organize the Federal Government for oceanography.

In January 1969, the Stratton Commission made its landmark report, "Our Nation and the Sea," and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries im-

mediately commenced hearings directed toward its implementation. In July of last year I introduced a bill to create a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, and I was joined in that endeavor by our distinguished chairman, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, and the entire Subcommittee on Oceanography. That bill was reported unanimously from the subcommittee and is now pending before the full committee.

Today's action by the administration indicates support for the recommendations of the Stratton Commission. I am gratified to note that the President's program duplicates the one proposed in "Our Nation and the Sea," except in two respects. First, the proposed new Administration would not be independent, as we would have it, but instead reports directly to the Secretary of Commerce. Second, the bill considered by the subcommittee included the Coast Guard in order to provide the kind of broad-based operational support that the agency needs. The Coast Guard, in our judgment, has the ability, the training, and the experience in this area. While the President has not seen fit to include the Coast Guard in his proposal, there is no doubt in my mind that it will continue to have a vital cooperative role in marine affairs in the future.

ESSA, of course, will be the cornerstone to the new agency. Our committee has had experience in dealing with ESSA in the past, and I am glad to see their expertise included. The tie-in between the oceans and the atmosphere makes it imperative that ESSA's talents be fully utilized.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, I am also pleased to see that the fisheries of the United States are being given much needed attention in the new agency.

Mr. Speaker, the oceans are truly the Nation's last great resource. They must be conserved as well as explored and utilized. Science, engineering, law, and politics must join hands to assure a rational regime for the oceans and the atmosphere. The action taken today by the President is a first step in that direction. I support it.

I know that the Secretary of Commerce recognizes the new and challenging responsibilities that NOAA presents, and that he will react with imagination and boldness to work toward the accomplishment of the broadly based objectives so clearly stated in the Stratton Commission report.

For my part, I believe that the Congress must move decisively to provide the legislative support that will be required for new programs. I know that the Subcommittee on Oceanography stands ready to begin by providing these innovative and important new initiatives.

REORGANIZATION PLAN ESTABLISHING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—EPA

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

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the President is submitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, establishing the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—as a new, independent agency within the executive branch.

The EPA brings together in a single organization the major Federal pollution control programs now existing in four separate agencies and one inter-agency council. The creation of the EPA fulfills the President's pledge of February 10, 1970, to recommend improved administrative machinery to meet the current pollution crisis. The EPA will have an estimated fiscal year 1971 budget of \$1.4 billion and 5,650 personnel, and consist of the following components:

The Federal Water Quality Administration—FWQA—now in the Department of the Interior;

The National Air Pollution Control Administration—NAPCA—now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Parts of the Environmental Control Administration—Bureaus of Solid Waste Management, Water Hygiene, and a portion of the Bureau of Radiological Health—also from HEW;

The pesticides research and standard-setting program of the Food and Drug Administration, HEW;

The pesticides registration authority of the Department of Agriculture;

Authority to perform general ecological research, from the Council on Environmental Quality—CEQ;

Certain pesticide research authorities of the Department of the Interior;

The environmental radiation protection standard-setting function of the Atomic Energy Commission;

The functions of the Federal Radiation Council—FRC.

The mission of the EPA is to organize the fight against environmental pollution on an integrated basis which acknowledges the critical relationships between pollutants, forms of pollution, and control techniques. Although each of the units listed above presently carries out similar pollution control functions, each is typically concerned with a single pollutant or source—radiation, pesticides—a single environmental medium—air, water, food—or a limited aspect of the total problem—health or economic effects, esthetics. This fragmentation of effort has resulted in confusion and overlap, some delay in the recognition of new problems, and the continuance of inefficient management techniques. It has effectively inhibited any comprehensive examination of the total effects of pollutants on man, plants, animals, and ecological systems.

The integrated approach to pollution research and to regulatory and assistance programs, which EPA represents, is necessary if we are to cope effectively with environmental contamination as it exists today, and as it may develop in the future.

In addition to upgrading the effectiveness of the Federal Government's major pollution control programs, the creation of the EPA will have the following advantages:

The EPA will provide a central focus

for an evaluation of all pollution-related activities of the Federal Government.

The EPA will serve to upgrade the importance of environmental considerations and pollution programs within the Federal Government, and over a period of time tend to have a similar effect on program priorities within State and local governments.

The creation of the EPA will clarify industry responsibility by providing consistent standards and a single enforcement agency.

State and local pollution control agencies will be able to look to one Federal agency for all their financial support and technical assistance.

The EPA will insulate pollution abatement standard-setting from the promotional interests of other departments.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, today the announcement of President Nixon's Executive order, creating a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—in the Department of Commerce, marks a giant step forward in the campaign several of us have waged for the past 5 years, to coordinate many of our Nation's oceanic activities now fragmented in more than 20 different Federal bureaus.

I know that I speak for many Members of both parties in this House in expressing an enthusiastic salute to the President for his reorganization plan to create NOAA and for his very significant remarks in announcing that plan.

I believe it is important to reemphasize here at least five of the points the President makes in his message today:

First, I am pleased that the President specifically recognizes the thought and effort various individuals and groups have made, contributing to his reorganization plan decision, including the lengthy, conscientious work of our Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman LENNON.

Second, it is very important to note that President Nixon specifically declares:

We may well find that supplementary legislation to perfect (NOAA's) authorities will be necessary. I look forward to working with the Congress in this task.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the President that we on the Subcommittee on Oceanography already are discussing several ideas for legislation which we believe will be needed to give the new NOAA the breadth and depth of statutory authority it will need to do the job adequately, which we and the entire oceanographic community hope it will do effectively and energetically.

Third, Much will depend on the administrative skills, energy, and leadership genius of the person to be appointed by the President to head NOAA. There-

fore, it is very good that the President's order provides that NOAA's administrator will be very high in the executive scale, at level 3.

Fourth, It is good that President Nixon uses the strong adjective "compelling" in referring to our need for an expanded effort to explore and develop the uses of our marine resources. The need is very compelling.

Fifth, It also is very good that the President fully recognizes the fundamental truth that this earth's oceans and this earth's atmosphere do constitute an indivisible, interacting system, and therefore our activities in the oceans and the atmosphere rightly should be combined in the same administration.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is one giant step we are taking today toward the creation of NOAA, and it now warrants much further effort on our part here in the Congress to supplement and strengthen this wise, timely initiative from the White House.

ADJUSTMENT OF GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1078 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1078

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16968) to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1078 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 16968 to adjust Government contributions for Federal employee health benefits.

The purpose of H.R. 16968 is to increase the Government's contribution for employee health benefits, to extend coverage under the health benefits program and the group life insurance program to noncitizen employees in the Panama Canal Zone, to permit part B of medicare to be a qualifying plan under the retired Federal employees' health

benefits program, and to correct an inequity with respect to the survivors of employees who have less than 5 years of service.

The bill provides that, beginning on the first day of the first pay period of each year, the Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of the average of the charges in effect on the beginning date of the adjustment. Initially the Government's contribution was 38 percent and at the present time it is down to approximately 24 percent.

Noncitizen employees have constituted the bulk of our Government's work force in the Canal Zone during and since the digging of the Panama Canal, but they have been excluded from coverage in both the Group Life Insurance Act and the Health Benefits Act. This legislation would provide coverage for them under both acts.

The Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act, applicable to pre-July 1960 retirees and survivors, restricts a direct Government contribution to only those annuitants to subscribe to health insurance plans offered by nongovernmental organizations and denies such contribution in the event he or she receives a Government contribution toward another plan.

The bill eliminates the minimum 5-year service requirement of deceased employees in order for their survivor-annuitants or beneficiaries to be eligible for continued health-benefits coverage.

The legislation amends the law to the extent that part B of the medicare program will constitute a qualifying plan. Thus, additional annuitants will be eligible to receive monthly contributions to apply in payment of their share of supplementary medical insurance under the medicare program.

The bill also authorizes the Civil Service Commission to waive the recovery of any such direct payments when, in the Commission's judgment, the annuitant is without fault and when recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

It is estimated that the cost to the Government, assuming the 12-percent increase, of the contribution for health benefits would be \$314.3 million for calendar year 1971, or approximately \$157 million for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1971.

The cost of the extension of life and health insurance coverage for Canal Zone employees is estimated at \$1 to \$2 million annually.

The cost for the extension of coverage to survivors of short service deceased employees and allowing a direct Government contribution to a comparatively few elderly annuitants would be de minimus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1078.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Young), House Resolution 1078 does provide an open rule for 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 16968 to provide for

the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health-benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants.

Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of the bill is to provide for a more equitable cost-sharing basis by the Federal Government and its employees with respect to the premium charges under the Federal employees health benefits program. Additionally, the bill extends coverage of the group life insurance program to non-citizen employees in the Panama Canal Zone and corrects an inequity with respect to survivors of employees with less than 5 years of service.

Under current law the Government's share of the premium costs of the health benefits program is a fixed dollar amount. As costs of the programs have risen and more and more employees have chosen the high-option plans, the Government's share of the total premium costs has continually dropped. The bill seeks to adjust this imbalance by providing that, effective January 1971, the Government's share of the premiums charged will be based upon the high-option benefit level in the Federal Government health benefit program. The maximum Government contribution will be 50 percent of such average premium costs. In no case shall the Government contribution exceed 50 percent of the total premium charges for the program's low-option level of benefits.

This proposal has the advantage of eliminating the expression of the Government contribution in terms of fixed dollar amounts and substitutes for it a percentage of the total premium charges. Because of this percentage basis, it has the added advantage of annual automatic adjustment as future premiums are increased. As an illustration: If the new formula were applied to current high-option premiums, the Government contribution would be increased from the current \$8.88 to \$19.85. The Civil Service Commission estimates that the Government contribution required by this change in current law, assuming a projected 12-percent increase in premium charges to take effect in January 1971, would be increased by \$314,300,000 for calendar 1971. The increase for the last 6 months of fiscal 1970 would be \$157 million.

The administration supports a Government payment equal to 38 percent of the premium costs. This was the percentage which existed at the time the program was instituted. As the bill exceeds this figure, the administration is probably not happy with the bill, although no letters of opposition are contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, there are no minority views.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Broyhill).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16968, which this rule makes in order, addresses itself to one of the major problems with which we are confronted.

With all due respect to the problems of pollution, crime and campus unrest,

one of the gravest domestic problems with which we are confronted in the Nation today is the rapidly increasing cost of medical care. Our people have an increasing desire and need for medical services, due to the great advances in medical achievement as well as the fact that Americans want the best in life and health for themselves and their loved ones. So the cost of medical services would be increasing by leaps and bounds even without the inflationary spiral confronting us.

Because of high medical costs many proposals are being made for more Government action in this area. In fact, just as recently as the other day a very prominent representative group proposed a nationwide governmental health insurance program and we have had numerous proposals for compulsory health insurance. We have also been faced with meeting the increased costs of medicare and medicaid, and with proposals for further extending these programs.

The best solution, however, to meeting the costs of medical care, is the same solution we have used over the period of history in our Nation. That is to encourage as much as possible the initiative of the individual and private industry. For history has repeatedly proven that Government interference is the most costly, as well as the least effective and the least satisfactory, solution to such problems. But government must enter the picture when private initiative has failed.

Today, however, we are considering a proposal in an area of medical care in which the Government is cast in the role of an employer, not a paternalistic government. The proposal we have before us today requires the Government to meet its responsibility as an employer and by so doing to set an example for other employers throughout the Nation to follow. By exercising this type of leadership as an employer, the Government may also save itself a great deal of money which might otherwise be required of it in the future as a paternalistic government. It may also save the Government money by virtue of the fact that we will have greater assurance that all Federal employees will provide themselves with the proper amount of health insurance so that they will not be compelled to use public assistance in the event of a catastrophic illness.

Voluntary health insurance programs are relatively new, and the use of these programs has increased by leaps and bounds in recent years. Even so, the Federal Government was quite late in coming into the employee health insurance program. The health insurance program was not adopted by the Congress until 1959 for regular employees and 1960 for retired employees.

When Congress was considering the programs, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service determined that a 50-50 participating plan was fair and reasonable. Because it was a new program and the cost to the Government was not yet estimated a formula was adopted wherein the Government would pay 50 percent of the cost of the least expensive low option family program. By virtue

of the type of insurance plan that the employees adopted, however, the cost distribution at the time of enactment amounted to a 38-percent cost for the Government and a 62-percent cost for the employee. Due to the increased costs of medical care since that time the Government contribution had to be increased in 1966 to simply maintain the unfair 38-62 ratio. Since that time further increased costs has caused the formula adopted in 1966 to be reduced to a 24-76 ratio.

In other words, the Federal Government is now paying only 24 percent of the cost of what should be a 50-50 employer-employee program. The bill we have before us today will correct this inequity and provide for a 50-50 participation in the future regardless of increases in the cost of medical care.

Another excellent feature of this bill takes care of an inequity resulting from overlapping and duplicating provisions between part B of medicare for employees who retired prior to 1960. In order for Federal employees who retired prior to 1960 to benefit from the retired Federal employee health insurance program, they had to pay for certain benefits which were also provided for them under part B of medicare which is available to all American citizens whether former Federal employees or not. This bill will permit the amount of the Federal contribution to the retired Federal employee health insurance program to be paid as a part of the employee's share of part B of medicare, thereby eliminating overlapping and duplication of benefits.

It is interesting to note that the House Committee on Ways and Means in its recent action on social security legislation is requiring this type of action to be taken. Because, if this action is not taken, the social security bill recently passed would prohibit the medicare program from being used for any benefits in which there is a Federal health insurance program involved providing the same benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. This is a fair bill. It provides a way for the Federal Government to meet its responsibility as an employer. Equally as important, however, as I pointed out before, it may, by providing an example for employers elsewhere, provide a way in which the Government will prevent every increasing cost in this area in future years. I hope the rule and the bill will be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17923. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and re-

lated agencies 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. 17923) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 3348) entitled "An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

ADJUSTMENT OF GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16968) to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16968, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16968 represents a step in the right direction. This legislation is long overdue. It will correct an inequity under which our Nation's dedicated Federal employees and retirees have labored for the past decade.

The inequity of which I speak requires enrollees under the Federal employees' health benefits program to pay more than three-fourths of the program's costs. There is no question but that workers in progressive private enterprise receive much larger management contributions for health benefits than is the case with our own Government workers.

When the program was established in 1959, it was the consensus of congressional opinion that the Government

should pay at least half of the premium costs. Because we had no experience in this new field at the time, the administration prevailed upon the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to set a dollar limit on the Government's share of costs—\$1.62 biweekly for self-enrollment or \$3.94 for self and family. Upon implementation of the program in 1960, that limit turned out to represent not 50 percent of the costs but 38 percent, with employees and retirees paying the remaining 62 percent of charges.

We all know the unfortunate history, which found the dollar limitation forcing the Government share ever downward, and the enrollees' burden ever upward. In fact, the situation has now deteriorated to a point where the Government pays only 24.2 percent, while the participants under the program are picking up 75.8 percent of the tab.

There is absolutely no justification for this unconscionable shifting of the heavy burden of health care protection from management to employees.

I commend the chairman of our Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) for the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in obtaining committee approval of the bill. I commend the members of the subcommittee for their unanimous support of the reported bill, and the 20 members of the committee, on both sides of the aisle, for their cosponsorship of this vitally essential measure.

I trust that the Members of this body will lend their enthusiastic support to the committee's endeavors by giving H.R. 16968 your unanimous approval. This improvement in the health benefits program will mark a real breakthrough in terms of Government participation.

For an explanation of the provisions of the bill, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the subcommittee chairman, so much time as he may consume.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the membership of this House to lend their strong support to the legislation under consideration (H.R. 16968), the major purpose of which is to relieve employees and annuitants from continuing to bear a disproportionately large share of the premium charges under the Federal employees' health benefits program.

Perhaps it may be well, at the outset, to recall the legislative history behind both the Federal employees' health benefits program and the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act.

The Federal employees' health benefits program, now codified into positive law under chapter 89 of title 5 of the United States Code, was enacted on September 28, 1959, as Public Law 86-382. Its enactment established the largest voluntary group health insurance plan in existence in the United States, effective July 1, 1960, making basic and major health protection available to Federal employees in active service on and after July 1, 1960, and to their families. Such group coverage is also extended to

those—and their families—who retire from active service thereafter.

The primary purpose of the program is to facilitate personnel administration by providing a measure of protection for civilian Government employees against the high, unbudgetable, and, therefore, financially burdensome costs of medical services through a comprehensive program of medical insurance, the costs of which are shared by the Government, as employer, and its employees.

In the development of the enabling legislation, congressional proponents favored a 50-50 employee-employer sharing of all costs, and such a rate of contribution was included. However, because of the unknown factors inherent in an entirely new area of Federal employee fringe benefits in which the Government had no previous experience, a limitation was placed on the maximum contribution to be paid by the Government. This maximum was geared to the least expensive Government-wide low option plan and a dollar limitation was imposed which, at that time, contemplated that a "standard" policy which would be adequate for most employees' needs could be purchased on a 50-50 sharing basis. It provided, further, that "preferred" policies be made available, but that those employees enrolling in high option or more expensive prepayment plans would pay the entire costs of the additional benefits.

A year later the Congress, by the enactment of Public Law 86-725, established the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act for those retirees and dependents who were not eligible to enroll in the active program because their annuity rights were based upon separations occurring prior to July 1, 1960.

Experience gained from implementing the 1959 act indicated the desirability of establishing: First, a single uniform Government-wide plan, rather than the multiplicity of plans developed under the active employee program; and, second, in order to meet the varying needs of retirees, to grant the option of a person retaining or enrolling in a private health benefits plan—subject to certain qualification requirements—with the Government's contribution to the cost being paid directly to the annuitant.

These two programs now constitute the largest voluntary employer-sponsored health insurance system in the world. The active program covers almost 2.7 million employees and annuitants. Together with their 5½ million dependents, it covers in excess of 8.2 million persons. The retired program covers more than 175,000 annuitants, plus several tens of thousands of their dependents. Combined coverage approximates 8½ million persons.

Since the inception of the Federal employees' health benefits program a decade ago, employees have had a free choice among plans in four major categories, including: First, a Government-wide service benefit plan offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; second, a Government-wide indemnity plan offered by the insurance industry; third, one of several employee organization plans;

and, fourth, a comprehensive prepayment plan. The two Government-wide plans must offer at least two levels of benefits—a low option or "standard" policy and a high option or "preferred" policy. While the current 36 employee organization and prepayment plans may offer two levels of benefits, only 14 do so, the remaining 22 offering only a high option level. All plans allow for coverage for self alone, or for self and family.

Perhaps the program is unique when compared with traditional patterns in private industry, in that the employee has a broad range of choice between carriers and levels of benefits, and, to a lesser degree, may continue coverage into retirement. While the law prescribes, in general, the types of benefits to be provided under all plans, it authorizes the Civil Service Commission to contract with qualified carrier for such services, subject to any maximums, limitations, or exclusions considered necessary or desirable.

In 1960 the initial distribution of enrollments between self-only and family coverage, between high and low options, and among the various 30-odd plans resulted in the Government's contributing only 38 percent—not 50 percent as anticipated—of the aggregate premiums for all enrollments, with employees contributing 62 percent.

As time went on, this 38-percent Government share of the aggregate premium gradually diminished for two main reasons: First, employees gravitated toward the more adequate high options; and, second, high-option premiums increased because the cost of medical care increased, improved benefits were made available, and a relatively high morbidity was experienced.

By 1966 the Government's share of the program's cost was down from 38 percent to 28 percent of the total average premiums. Congress reacted by increasing the maximum Government contribution so as to restore it, in effect, to the less-than-ideal initial 1960 level of 38 percent. However, premium increases in January of 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, have again diminished the Government's contributions to approximately 24 percent of present aggregate premiums. In fact, there are now only a few low-option plans in which the Government's contribution equals one-half of the total premium charges.

Time was, and not too long ago, when human reluctance to enter a hospital—or even to go to a doctor—stemmed largely from fear of physical discomfort. Today it stems, as well, from fear of acute financial discomfort—and well it might, hospital and medical care costs have risen astronomically, and no deceleration is in sight.

In the post-World War II period charges for medical care have risen persistently. From 1946 through 1969 the medical care component of the consumer price index increased by 158 percent, to 258 percent of what it was in 1946. During the same years the index for all consumer items rose at a much slower rate, increasing comparatively by 88 percent.

Increases in medical care costs have particularly occurred since 1959. With a

base period of 1957-59 equaling 100, the medical care index rose from 104.4 in 1959, the year in which the Federal employees' health benefits program was enacted, to 159 in January of 1970. The "all items" index increased from 101.5 in 1959 to 131.8 in January of 1970.

The problem of escalating medical care costs is, of course, not peculiar to the Federal employees' health benefits program—it is a problem common to all segments of the Nation's populace. In administering this program every effort is made to control risk charges and administrative expenses, to provide minimal, but adequate, reserves for adverse experience, with the objective of utilizing every possible penny of the premium dollar to provide for maximum benefits.

While our committee has had a continuing concern over the skyrocketing costs of providing health benefits protection under the programs within its jurisdiction, its scope of activity cannot, unfortunately, stop or minimize spiraling costs of medical care. Premiums must be sufficient to pay for the benefits provided, and rate increases must be approved annually in order to maintain the financial soundness of the plans participating in the program. As health care costs rise, the portion of them not covered by insurance constitutes a greater burden for Government employees and annuitants, and, as premium charges rise to cover such costs, an additional financial burden is imposed upon them. Given these factors, enrollees are faced with an increasingly difficult problem of paying for benefits.

From the program's beginning, the Government has made a uniform dollars-and-cents contribution to the enrollees' selected health insurance plan. In 1960 that monthly contribution of a self-and-family plan was \$6.76, which was 50 percent of the cost of the least expensive Government-wide low option plan. As previously stated, the preponderance of high-option selection resulted in employees sharing more than 60 percent of the cost of their respective plans. As premium charges increased thereafter, because of the fixed maximum contribution, the Government's relative percentage of contribution gradually declined.

While the individual's plight was slightly alleviated in 1966, when the uniform monthly Government contribution was increased to \$8.88, that relief was short lived. Within a period of 5 short months, because of the continuously rising premium charges, the Government's relative share again began to decline below an average of 38 percent of charges. In fact, during the program's 10-year history premium costs have increased by more than 120 percent, but enrollees' costs have increased by over 175 percent, while the Government's contribution, as a percentage of the total, has declined by 40 percent.

The real inequity, attributable to the Government's fixed dollar contribution, is that the employees and annuitants have been repeatedly forced to assume all of the premium increases caused by skyrocketing hospital and medical costs. It is they who are presently paying over 75

percent of the costs of their medical insurance, whereas today the Government, as the employer, is paying less than 25 percent of the total costs. Our concern is further heightened by the inevitable prospect that failure to remedy this imbalance will result in the enrollees bearing 80 percent of the program's cost in 1971.

The testimony developed by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits during 4 days of public hearings supports, I believe, the contention that the Federal Government, as a major employer, is lagging far behind major employers in the private sector in this important area of employee benefit programs. Evidence, confirmed by official Government statistics and analyses, shows that major industrial employers are paying most, if not all, of the costs of comparable health benefits protection for their workers. It is the consensus of the committee, therefore, that the Government's maximum contribution under the Federal employees' health benefits program be increased to a level at which it will share equally with most of the program's enrollees the premium charges for coverage, and that such cost-sharing ratio be maintained in future years.

This primary objective is embodied in the legislation before us today, H.R. 16968. The bill embraces a method proposed by the Civil Service Commission for automatically determining and adjusting the Government's contribution to premiums, with the relevant variable being the percentage of the premium cost the Government will, in a responsible sense, equitably assume. The committee feels strongly that such variable should be not less than 50 percent.

H.R. 16968 accomplishes that objective by eliminating the maximum dollar amounts, and by expressing the Government contribution in terms of a percentage of total subscription charges. Effective in January of 1971, and each year thereafter, the Government's share of the premium charges under the Federal employees' health benefits program will be pegged to the high-option level of benefits, using a premium base representative of the different kinds of plans that participate. Each year the average of the high-option premiums of the two governmentwide plans, the two largest employee-organization plans, and the two largest prepayment group practice plans will be used to determine the maximum Government contribution to any plan or option. These six plans represent approximately 90 percent of all enrollments. The maximum Government contribution for all employees and annuitants would be fixed at 50 percent of such average. However, the Government contribution could not exceed 50 percent of the premium of any plan's low-option level.

The bill also provides the following:

First, to conform to last year's change in the civil service retirement program, whereby widows and children of employees who die in active service with less than 5 years of service are granted minimum annuity benefits, the health benefits law is amended to extend health insurance protection to such survivors.

Second, to fulfill a longstanding commitment of the United States, contained in treaty negotiations and reaffirmed in subsequent memorandums of understandings, to make available to Panamanian employees the same governmental health and life insurance protection as is available to U.S. citizen employees in the Canal Zone, coverage under the Federal employees' health benefits and Federal employees' group life insurance programs is extended to approximately 12,000 active noncitizen employees in the Panama Canal Zone; and

Third, the Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act, which applies to pre-July 1960 annuitants, is amended to permit part B of the medicare program to constitute a qualifying plan for the purpose of allowing certain annuitants to become eligible for a monthly Government contribution toward their health care costs.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation is demonstrated by the fact that H.R. 16968 was unanimously approved by all eight members of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, cosponsored by 20 of the 26 members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and overwhelmingly adopted by the full committee, without amendment.

It is my strong belief, and the judgment of my committee colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that to do less than that proposed by this bill would perpetuate the unfair practice of requiring retirees and employees to bear the "lion's share" of incessantly rising health care costs.

I urge that this body also lend its overwhelming support to H.R. 16968, without amendment.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, not only do I rise in full support of modernizing the funding mechanism of the Federal employees' health benefits program, but to emphasize the great need for Panamanians employed by the Federal Government in the Canal Zone to be included in the program on an equal basis with U.S. citizens.

I believe that when the Congress reviews our Government's employment practices with respect to three-quarters of its employees in the Canal Zone, it will want to rectify the inequities—from the standpoint of living up to international commitments.

We Americans like to contemplate our Government as leading the way in matters concerning the welfare of individuals. It therefore comes as a shocking disappointment of disillusion when we observe the Federal Government trailing exceedingly far behind private employers and a substantial number of the States and cities in respect to health benefits for its employees.

For the Congress of the United States this package of employee benefits for noncitizens in the Canal Zone is a small matter without impact on the Federal budget. But for approximately 12,000

individuals and their families, it is a matter of extremely great magnitude.

Noncitizen employees have constituted the bulk of our Government work force in the Canal Zone during the digging of the Panama Canal and since its opening in 1914. They have performed their duties loyally and well for the United States.

For many years it has been a matter of extremely intense irritation on the part of the Panamanians and the Government that we have denied to those noncitizen employees many of the benefits of employment accorded Federal employees who are U.S. citizens. Such unequal treatment is in direct contravention of repeated promises of equality which have been made by our Government to the Republic of Panama and represents a constant source of anti-U.S. feeling among Panamanians.

The United States has accepted an international commitment to provide equal pay and retirement benefits to noncitizen employees in accord with that received by U.S. citizen employees. Yet it still has not made available fringe benefits such as health and life insurance. It is interesting to note that the Panama Canal Company, the largest employer of noncitizens in the Canal Zone has continually made recommendations for the extension of the health benefits coverage to all of their employees.

The continuation of soaring space-bound increases in daily hospital charges and doctors' fees has raised the premium that an individual has to pay to receive coverage to the level that many of the workers cannot afford coverage. This then puts them and their families in a welfare position when illness occurs.

As early as December 23, 1908, 6 years before the canal opened; the Secretary of War issued a statement declaring as a matter of public policy that the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment would be maintained. This policy was restated again by Executive orders issued on February 2, 1914, and once more on February 20, 1920.

During the treaty negotiations of 1936, the U.S. Government forwarded a note to the Republic of Panama stating:

Regarding Panamanian citizens employed by the Panama Canal or by the Panama Railroad, I have the honor to state that the Government of the United States of America, in recognition of the special relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama with respect to the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company, maintains and will maintain as its public policy the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment set down in the Order of December 23, 1908, of the Secretary of War, and in the Executive Orders of February 2, 1914, and February 20, 1920, and will favor the maintenance, enforcement or enactment of such provisions . . . and will assure to Panamanian citizens employed by the Canal or the Railroad equality of treatment with employees who are citizens of the United States of America.

In 1939, President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed his determination to implement the statement of parity in Canal Zone employment practices. On the occasion of the signing of a law authorizing new construction in the Canal Zone, the President stated:

I intend to ask Congress in its next session to amend the present law so that it may conform with the obligations acquired in respect to Panama, to concede to the citizens of Panama opportunity and treatment in employment for the Canal Administration and the Panama Railroad Company equal to that offered to those who are citizens of the United States.

The promise of parity was once again announced in 1955. In that year the United States concluded a new treaty with the Republic of Panama. In connection with those negotiations the U.S. Government transmitted to the Republic of Panama a memorandum of understanding in which the following promise was made:

The United States will afford equality of opportunity for citizens of Panama for employment in all United States Government positions in the Canal Zone for which they are qualified and in which the employment of the United States citizens is not required in the judgment of the United States for security reasons.

In 1962 again in connection with treaty negotiations, our Government reaffirmed the policy in a joint statement with the Government of Panama:

The United States Government has prepared a draft bill for presentation to the Congress of the United States which would make available to Panamanian employees of the United States Government in the Canal Zone the same governmental health and life insurance benefits as are available to the United States citizens employees.

For these reasons, and by virtue of the oft-enunciated promises, I introduced H.R. 9136 in the first session of the 91st Congress.

It cannot be argued that the outlay will throw the Federal budget out of balance. On the contrary, all costs of canal operations are covered by canal receipts. The Panama Canal Company, for fiscal year 1969, reports net operating revenue of \$15,566,098—after payment to the United States Treasury of operating costs and interest payments on the United States investment.

The complete annual expenditure for health and life insurance benefits, if applied to today's employees, would amount to less than \$2 million, most of which can be covered without any trouble out of net operating revenue of the Panama Canal Co. and the Canal Zone Government.

The Panamanians are looking to us for some of the securities which most of us in the United States have long since come to expect as a fundamental condition of employment. Passage of H.R. 16968, without providing for coverage for the noncitizen workers in the Canal Zone, will further facilitate the disparity that presently exists between the citizen and noncitizen employees.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee's wisdom in incorporating in this legislation the provision extending both health insurance and life insurance coverage to these deserving employees. I am gratified that the pertinent administrative agencies have urged its incorporation herein. I am pleased, as the author of the bill to fulfill our Government's commitments to our Panamanian em-

ployees, that my bill has been embodied in H.R. 16968.

I urge the membership of this House to adopt the committee's bill without amendment.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to lend my support to H.R. 16968, and to help in the process of balancing the cost of Government and employees into a more reasonable ratio of 50-50. This bill will, to some extent, help Federal employees to reach the level of health insurance benefits offered by private American employers.

It was not until 1960 that the present insurance program was adopted. Since that time, the Federal Government has never contributed more than 38 percent of the aggregate premium costs, and then only on two occasions. The promise of equal sharing has been there, but the actual benefits to employees have failed to materialize. Since 1960, the Government's contribution has declined, under the fixed dollar contribution limit, to approximately 24.2 percent.

What began as a contribution of more than one-third has dropped in just 10 years to less than one-quarter. If hospital and medical costs continue to rise at their present rates, premiums will increase yearly, and the Government's contribution will begin to approach one-fifth of premium costs, then one-sixth, then one-tenth—unless immediate remedial action is taken.

You will note that Government's share of the cost has increased approximately 32 percent while the increase of costs to the employee has increased 104 percent. Stated differently, the employer is paying over 75 percent of the cost for self and family enrollment in high option and the Government is paying less than 25 percent.

It is important to note that the major cost of premium increases has been due primarily to the spiraling costs of health care and not to liberalizations or new coverages provided in the benefit structure. This fact was recently documented in a report prepared for the Civil Service Commission by Milliman & Robertson, Inc., a firm of consulting actuaries. In their analysis of the two Government-wide plans they noted:

Premium increases for both the Service Plan and the Indemnity Plan have been several times greater than benefits added—about 8 times greater for the high option plans and about 3 times greater for the low option plans. Thus, higher payments under the original benefit provisions have accounted for much of the additional premium needed.

Increases in hospital room rates were the main contributor to the use in medical care costs. What this means—and it is a surprise to no one, members of this committee, administration officials, and least of all to Federal employees—is that health insurance premiums will have to increase again next January to cover these burgeoning medical care costs.

Few, if any, employees can afford not

to have health insurance, yet the point may be approaching when some employees cannot afford health insurance, or at least the option they should have to assure peace and adequate protection in the event of major illness.

During recent years, the trend in the private sector has been for management to assume a larger proportion of the cost of employee's insurance. In a majority of instances the employer foots the full amount. A 1967 study of employee benefits made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce of 1,150 firms revealed that 3.2 percent of the payroll was paid for various types of insurance. Eighty-four firms reported insurance payments amounting to 6 percent or more of the payroll. The report also shows that "payments for insurance was reported by 98 percent of both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing firms." A breakdown of the amount paid out by the firms for health insurance was not given. However, the outlook section of the February 18, 1969, issue of the Wall Street Journal states:

Health insurance, like the Blue Cross plan, is an outstanding type of unseen income today. It's been estimated that as of 1967 almost 163 million Americans had some type of private health insurance, and insurance men figure that probably three-fourths of these are covered by group policies either totally or partly paid for by employers.

This simply supports something we already know—that group health insurance has during the past few years become a part of our way of life. Surveys over the last few years by the Bureau of Labor Statistics report that almost 100 percent of employees in private industry have health insurance plans.

In 1962 the Congress enacted the Federal Salary Reform Act, providing that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those in private industry. Even before that, in 1959, the Congress had enacted a provision for a health insurance program for Federal employees. In this respect the Congress provided for a fringe benefit for Federal employees which was intended to be comparable to that of employees in the private sector. The original intention of the Congress was that the Government should pay 50 percent of the costs of an adequate plan, leaving it up to the individual employee whether he wished to subscribe to a richer plan at his own cost.

The assumption that the majority of employees would choose low-option coverage turned out not only to be totally invalid, but, far worse, it has diverted the development of the Federal employees' health benefits program away from the original intentions of Congress. A system developed, therefore, in which today the low-option plans, in which a very small minority of the percentage of employees is enrolled, determine the contributions which must be paid by the 90-percent majority enrolled in high options. This demonstrates the need of a 50-50 ratio based on the high-option plan for the Government's contributions, with annual adjusting of contributions as costs change.

To summarize, health insurance is a fringe benefit of the Federal employee which the Congress intended to be com-

parable with that of employees in private industry. In private industry today, the employer contribution, as a percentage of basic wages, is almost twice that of the Federal Government, more than half of private industry health insurance plans are financed solely by the employer, and in those which are contributory the employer pays more than half. In my opinion, the proposal of 50-percent Federal financing, as embraced in H.R. 16968, at least as to a basic plan, is required if the promise of comparability is to be kept.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of H.R. 16968 is essential. I urge its unanimous passage.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 16968, the primary purpose of which is to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution under the Federal employees' and annuitants' health benefits program.

Your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and its Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, considers the operation of this particular fringe benefit program to be one of its most important responsibilities. In fact, with the terrifying inflation in health care costs, it might well become our most important concern.

The incessant increases in hospital and medical care costs common to all segments of our society are reflected in these programs, and particularly in the Federal employees' health benefits plan. These rising costs are causing considerable anguish not only to employee and annuitant subscribers, but to employers and the purveyors of health insurance policies, as witnessed by the multitude of discussions on the subject in various congressional committees and throughout the country.

The apparent consequence of spiraling health care costs has been that premiums have had to be substantially increased in order to maintain present standards of benefits. A further consequence, because of the maximum dollar limitations imposed upon the Government's contribution, has been that the employees and annuitants are unrelentingly burdened with an ever-growing share of premium charges.

In fulfillment of this responsibility, its Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits recently conducted public hearings to review and evaluate the experience and administration of these programs, which are of vital importance to both the active and retired Federal work force. While the subcommittee hearings largely dealt with the serious question of the inadequacy of the Government's sharing of premium charges—the basic problem being of such magnitude that it transcends the scope of our jurisdiction—we addressed ourselves objectively to the related problems of these programs in the hope that our deliberations will have at least a salutary effect upon the larger issue.

The committee has had a continuing concern over the skyrocketing costs of providing health benefits protection under the programs within its jurisdiction. Medical care costs, including the cost of hospitalization, surgery, physician and nursing fees, drugs and medicines, and laboratory services, have spiraled in recent years and continue to accelerate faster than the prices of any other commodities or services.

The largest percentage rises in health care costs have occurred over the 10 years in which the Federal programs have been in effect. While the medical care index rose by an average rate of 4.7 percent annually during the 1950's, medical care prices during the 1960's have increased at a much faster rate, rising 6.6 percent in 1966, 6.4 percent in 1967, 6.1 percent in 1968, and 6.9 percent in 1969.

A particularly disturbing fact is that daily hospital rates have been increasing more rapidly than any other component of the medical care price index, which increased 595 percent in the post-war period; that is, they increased to 695 percent of what they were in 1946. While physicians' fees increased 142 percent over the same period, the index for all consumer items increased 88 percent. Within the medical care component, hospital room rates rose especially sharply, increasing by 16.5 percent in 1966, and leaping further by an additional 15.5 percent in 1967.

I am sure that all Members of the Congress appreciate that the sharply rising costs of care, and consequently the increases in that portion of premiums not paid by the Government, has resulted in less take-home pay for employees and annuitants. With additional premium increases appearing to be inevitable, I am equally sure that we all agree that the Government should responsibly share the financial burden of these increases.

During our deliberations on remedial legislation, the committee took cognizance of a recent actuarial evaluation of the program made by Milliman and Robertson, Inc., regarded by the insurance industry as one of the country's leading consultants in the field. The consulting actuaries report stated:

It would seem desirable for the Government to pay a larger part of the premium since the limitations now imposed have resulted in the decreasing percentage of contribution observed.

Recognizing the traditionally conservative nature of actuarial authorities, particularly in submitting such a report to the Government, the committee feels the suggestion to be most compelling, the variable being the relative percentage of costs that the Government will equitably assume. In an apparent effort to indicate what funding role the Government should play, the actuarial consultants reported:

A review was made by seven very large employer plans that had been recently revised, and which have benefits comparable to the governmentwide plans. In all instances the employer paid part of the cost; in three instances the entire premium for

both employees and dependents was paid by the employer; in only one case was the employee contribution more than \$3.00 for an individual enrollment or \$7.00 for a family enrollment.

H.R. 16968, while not attaining the ideal of providing a cost-free health benefits program, offers a moderate answer to the problem faced by several million employees, retirees, and survivors by increasing the Government's contribution from its present one-fourth to one-half of the subscription charges. The bill has the added advantage of annual automatic adjustment, so as to continue the cost-sharing ratio on a 50-50 basis.

This legislation will put meaning into the funding formula by updating it in a manner to assure that the Government is at least striving to match private industry's trend toward providing its workers and pensioners cost-free health insurance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the unanimous adoption of H.R. 16968.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this extremely important legislation, and I urge its passage by the House this afternoon.

The bill, H.R. 16968, corrects a longstanding inequity that has existed in the Federal Employees Health Benefits program since it became effective 10 years ago.

At that time it was the intent of the Congress that this new fringe benefit be financed on a 50-50 sharing basis through employee and agency contributions. However, after the initial "shakedown" period it developed that because of the distribution of enrollments between self-only and family coverage, between high and low options, and among the various 30-odd plans, that the Government's contribution was only approximating 38 percent of total premiums with the employees contributing 62 percent.

This unequal sharing of cost has continued with slight variations until now the Government is actually contributing only 24 percent with the employee picking up the remaining 76 percent.

As indicated earlier, this change in the overall premium rates continually increase with the Government's share remaining at a fixed dollar amount.

In other words, every time the total premium for any of the health benefits plans is increased, the employee ends up paying the total amount of the increase with a resultant corresponding decrease in his take-home pay.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this situation is extremely inequitable. The Federal employee is not the cause of, nor does he have any control over, the increasing cost of medical care. Until or unless this problem of rising medical cost is attacked and solved separately there is no justification whatsoever in requiring the employee to pay all of the increased cost.

The bill now before us tackles this

problem in a most reasonable and equitable manner. Beginning next January 1, and each year thereafter, the Government's contribution will be set at a level at which it will pay one-half of the total premium charges with the employee paying the remaining one-half.

Mr. Chairman, I would much prefer to see the Federal Government as an enlightened employer paying more of the employees' health benefits costs as is now done in private industry. However, recognizing the existing budgetary problems I feel that 50 percent is as far as we should go at this time. This is the very least we should do to keep this vital employee fringe benefit in pace with the times.

Again, I urge approval of H.R. 16968.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and join with the chairman in urging its passage. It is but one of many measures introduced to increase the Government contribution to health benefit coverage of Federal employees and annuitants. One bill would provide that the Government pay the entire cost of health benefits coverage and another would have the Government pay 50 percent when the bill was enacted, with a later increase to 75 percent and still later to assume the full cost of coverage. Government employee representatives appearing before our subcommittee urged that the full 100 percent cost of coverage be paid by the Government. They were advised, however, that their proposal was unrealistic and had little chance of becoming law.

On the other hand, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in his testimony before the subcommittee, suggested the Government contribution be increased to 38 percent, or approximately the same percentage assumed by the Government when the health benefit program became effective on July 1, 1960.

The basic reason this bill is needed is that hospital and medical costs have risen substantially over the years, but the Government contribution has been on a fixed basis. Therefore, the increase in costs, over the years, for the most part, has been assumed by the employee.

The bill under consideration is a compromise between opposing views on how to meet a need. It provides for a substantial equal sharing of the cost of health benefits between the Government and the employee. The Government contribution of 50 percent toward the cost would be based on high option plans carried by approximately 84 percent of employees subscribing to all plans.

After public hearings, our subcommittee had informal discussions and executives sessions to attempt to come up with what we considered to be the fairest measure to both the employee and the Government. We concluded that an equal sharing of the cost of health benefits would be fair to both. Hospital and medical care costs are rising, and if this bill is enacted and becomes effective next January 1, it will add approximately \$157 million to the cost of Government for the remainder of the fiscal year. However, the cost of medical care for Government employees will be the same

whether or not the bill is enacted. Therefore, the question before us is what part of the cost of medical and hospital care should be provided by the Government and what portion should be assumed by the employee. Our committee favors this bill providing for an equal sharing between the Government and the employee. I believe it is a fair bill and urge its passage.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this vital legislation. The recognition of the necessity and importance of H.R. 16968, toward the solution of a problem too long neglected, will gain the gratitude of all Federal retirees and their dependents, who are the real victims of inflationary medical costs.

Health benefits are, without a doubt, one of the most important and necessary fringe benefits received by an active or retired employee. Not only does it affect the employee and retiree, but it also has a direct effect on the members of his family. It is a benefit he can ill afford to be without. However, the premiums have risen to a degree where they are becoming a burden almost too heavy to bear.

The Government's contribution to the payment of premiums is lagging and is not comparable to the pattern which has been adopted by private industry. Health benefits in private industry have been steadily improving over the past few years and now provide coverage for substantially all medical expenses. In most cases, especially in the larger companies, the complete cost of benefit plans are paid for both hourly and salaried employees.

The latest statistics show that medical costs have shot up to an unbelievable height. Recent figures show costs ranging as high as \$100 a day for semiprivate facilities.

The net result of the increased cost is that the premiums for hospital insurance have also been on the increase. The ultimate effect of this is to cause enrollees to experience what amounts to a "pay cut." By definition "pay cut" means Government salary or Government retirement pay has been reduced by the amount that must be paid to meet increased premium costs for medical and hospital insurance.

While the effect upon the actively employed is substantial, the impact on retired employees is even more serious. As a retired employee, a man receives a fixed amount of money in his annuity that is much lower than his income was as an employee, and upon this he must plan his future needs and existence, and the need for protection against the high cost of medical and hospitalization expenses. Premium payments for such protection continues to increase. Such increases become burdensome to the retiree since they continually lower his fixed income which is already heavily committed for his normal needs.

Our retired people cannot hope to pay

much longer the premium that will be required of them. By the same reasoning, it is foreseeable that all plans under the Federal employees' health benefits program will be in serious financial trouble in the not too distant future, if the present benefit and premium structure applies to all subscribers, regardless of age or income levels.

In any case, Federal annuitants and employees are paying an extremely disproportionate share of the cost for health benefits, at a time when the trend in private industry has been toward the payment by the employer of the total cost of their workers' and pensioners' health insurance programs. Many of the larger companies in private industry now assume the complete cost and many small employers pay at least half of the cost of their personnel's health benefits premiums.

According to the latest available figures of those industries surveyed which had insurance plans, over 61 percent were employee-noncontributory for the basic hospitalization coverage and 60 percent were employee-noncontributory for surgical coverage. Even for the more unusual medical and catastrophic coverage, it was still true that a majority of those were employee-noncontributory plans. As it happens the latest data available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics is taken from a survey made in fiscal 1967-68. There is every reason to believe that the percentage just quoted are even higher today.

Consider the statistics on this subject from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. They have collected data on fringe benefits in private industry since the enactment of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. The Department has regarded fringe benefits as a part of the Federal salary which the Congress intended to be comparable with private industry. The Bureau's first survey was conducted in 1963, and in the preface to its report on this subject the Bureau stated:

As the Nation's largest employer, the Federal Government has an obligation to develop and maintain a sound program for compensating its employees—a program which is equitable both to the employees and to the country's taxpayers.

It is recognized that basic salary normally is only part, although the major part, of total employee compensation. Particularly since World War II, a host of supplementary pay practices (commonly called fringe benefits) have become established as integral parts of the compensation package. Consequently the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission, which share responsibility for analyzing results of the Bureau of Labor Statistics salary survey and for preparing the President's recommendations to the Congress on Federal pay, expressed a need for data on supplementary pay in private industry. The Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission, therefore, requested the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct a study of supplementary compensation in private industry which could be analyzed in conjunction with the Bureau of Labor Statistics' salary survey.

The result of the latest study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of employer expenditures for pay supplements pro-

vided by private industry during 1968 showed that 25.1 percent of pay supplements of basic wages and salaries were paid as compared with 24.3 percent in the Federal Government. Between 1966 and 1968 expenditures for supplements relative to basic wages and salaries ascended upward by approximately one-half of a percentage point in each.

Another area of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, dealing with employee compensation in private industry for 1968, found that for that year management paid an amount equivalent to 3.6 percent of basic wages for life, accident, and health insurance, but in the Federal Government the Government paid only an amount equivalent to 1.6 percent of basic wages for this purpose. An advance of 0.3 of basic wages for life, accident, and health insurance was made as compared with 0.2 of a percentage point in the Federal Government for the same area.

As it stands now, the Federal employee is shouldering too large a part of the burden. Unless appropriate action is taken to relieve him of a part of this burden, by providing a more reasonable contribution by the Federal Government, as expressed in H.R. 16968, that burden will continue to become heavier. This fast pace will not only have a further depressing effect upon active employees, but will especially strike hard at annuitants, whose limited incomes make them particularly tragic victims of the high cost of medical goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Government assume its fair share of the load by the enactment of the legislation under consideration.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. DANIELS, for his fine leadership in both the subcommittee and in the full committee in guiding this legislation to the House floor.

I fully support it.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to issue an urgent appeal to the House in expressing my total support of H.R. 16968. The Congress should take a hard look at the facts and give its full support to this legislation, for the much-needed relief from the burdens of the unbalanced share of medical expenditures which the employee in Federal Government, and the retiree from Federal service, has to face.

This legislation would provide a major improvement in the funding formula of the Federal employees' health benefits program, as originally adopted and as it presently exists. The original formula, established by the 1959 act, set the U.S. Government contribution at a maximum of \$3.12 per pay period for its employees. Public Law 89-504, enacted in 1966, increased the contribution to a maximum of \$4.10 per pay period. Unfortunately, the 1966 act continued the fixed-dollar contribution formula and, thus, was merely a temporary

resolution of the cost problem for employees participating in the program.

When the Federal health program was enacted in 1959, it was anticipated that the majority of employees would elect coverage under low options. The general intent, based on the legislative history, would indicate that the Congress desired to set the Government's share of the cost at 50 percent. It was assumed that the majority of employees would elect the low option plan. It was the premise that this would, on the average, provide an adequate level of protection. The original Government contribution did cover 50 percent of low-option coverage. The vast majority of employees, however, elected coverage under high options. Quite evidently the majority recognized the desirability of securing the best health insurance protection available. Experience of the years has certainly demonstrated that it was wise to insure in high option. In each open-season enrollment period since the program started in 1960, the net result has shown a constant movement to high option, and it is estimated that more than 90 percent of all insured now hold high-option coverage. Thus, it is necessary for the Federal Government to establish a 50-50 split of costs based on high options, to provide adequate relief for the vast majority of those enrolled in this program.

The cost of medical care, surgery, and hospitalization has skyrocketed alarmingly since the enactment of the act, and corresponding increases in premium costs and additional types of coverage adopted by the private sector industry have necessitated a review of the program to determine what changes are appropriate and desirable after 10 years of experience. In 10 years of experience, the Government's share of the premium cost for very limited coverage has reduced to approximately one-third, while its share of more adequate coverage has reduced to almost one-fifth of total charges.

It is important to note that the major cost of premium increases has been due primarily to the spiraling costs of health care, and not to liberalizations or new coverages provided in the benefit structures. This fact was recently documented in a recent report prepared for the Civil Service Commission by Milliman & Robertson, Inc., a firm of consulting actuaries. In their analysis of the two Government-wide plans, they noted:

Premium increases for both the Service Plan and the Indemnity Plan have been several times greater than the benefits added—about eight times greater for the high option plans and about three times greater for the low option plans. Thus, higher payments under the original benefit provisions have accounted for much of the additional premium needed.

This sharp increase in costs for the same benefits is primarily responsible for the sharp increase in premiums. Benefit changes have, of course, contributed somewhat to the cost problems. The Civil Service Commission has from time to time recommended and requested liberalization of benefits in order to provide a greater health care coverage in those areas where experience has shown a par-

ticular need. This has resulted in a few slight liberalizations of benefits within the plans.

Over the years the percentage contribution of costs by the Government has dwindled due to the limited liberalizations of benefits within the plan, greater utilization by the insureds, but, more importantly, due to the rise of health care costs—all of which have mandated increased rates.

From all information it appears at least for the next several years we will have a considerable increase in health benefits premiums. An annual adjustment in the cost-sharing to keep the 50-50 ratio should be made so that the financial burden will not hang completely on the employee, annuitant, and survivor as it has in the past. Such a proposed increase would represent substantial and worthwhile progress.

Therefore, I believe that justice would be well served if Congress moved to pass the equal employee-employer cost-sharing ratio prescribed by the committee in H.R. 16968.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that again I must rise in opposition to another in what has come to be a succession of "giveaway" bills reported in this Congress from the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Quite simply and bluntly, I do not think the long-suffering American taxpayers can now afford the luxury of paying an additional \$314 million per year toward the cost of health insurance for Federal employees including Members of Congress.

Regardless of how desirable it might sound for the Government to be paying a greater percentage of the costs of health benefits, I think it is equally desirable that we consider whether or not we can afford to do so, particularly in view of what we have already done in the way of pay and fringe benefits liberalizations.

Consider, if you will, our record in this area to date:

So far in this Congress the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has been responsible for the enactment of eight public laws. Three of these were relatively minor, dealing with the use of the Civil Service Commission's revolving fund, a study of the position classification system, and the franking privilege for Mrs. Eisenhower, widow of the late President.

However, the remaining five were not so minor, particularly as to their effects upon Government spending and the tax load carried by the average U.S. citizen.

Exactly 14 days after the 91st Congress convened, Congress approved a bill doubling the salary of the President from \$100,000 to \$200,000 per year.

That one was followed with a backdoor pay increase for all Members of Congress, for all judges, and for all Federal executives. This was accomplished by the committee's refusal to permit the House to take a vote on the resolution

I and other Members sponsored that would have disapproved the President's pay recommendations.

Next came a bill to give hefty pay raises to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of both the House and Senate.

Then, since it appeared that everything had been done that could be done to that moment with respect to pay, the committee turned its energies to sweetening the retirement programs for Federal employees, including Members of Congress. Under the guise of enacting urgently needed legislation to protect the financial solvency of the retirement fund, we enacted into law major improvements in everybody's retirement.

And then we closed out the first session by creating nearly 200 additional superjobs paying up to \$35,000 a year.

The last enactment came in April of this year with another 6 percent across-the-board pay raise for all Federal employees, retroactive to last January 1.

This pay raise came fully 1 year earlier than it was budgeted, and involved a total cost to the Federal Government of \$2½ billion.

And, I might add at this point that while not yet enacted into law, we have, in effect, "given away" the postal service in the so-called postal reform bill which passed this House just 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, in reciting this legislative record of my committee, I certainly have no intent to cast any unfavorable reflection upon the committee or any of its members, and I hope that my remarks are not so construed. However, I do so in an attempt to try to place into some perspective the legislation now before the House.

I submit that, regardless of its basic merits or demerits, in view of what this Congress has already done to provide improved pay and improved retirement for Federal employees, this additional costly benefit can at least wait until or unless we are in a better position to pay for it. Our Nation's economy is in too perilous a condition at this time for us to take the risk of adding another \$314 million to the Federal deficit.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the committee undertake a more comprehensive and complete study of the entire Federal employees health benefits program to ascertain if the real answer to rising medical costs is, in fact, a continual increase in premiums.

I had hoped that the subcommittee would have gone into this subject more thoroughly when the announcement came that health benefits hearings were to commence. With a bewildering array of 38 health benefits plans, offering some 54 options all of which have administrative expenses and risk charges, it is quite possible that there is a much better way of providing Federal employees with superior health protection at a much more reasonable and stable cost.

However, this subject unfortunately was not explored and the subcommittee came up with the easy answer of requiring the Government to pay more and more of the total increases in costs.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the overall picture of pay and fringe benefits for Federal employees and especially at the enactments to date in this Congress, I think the record clearly indicates it is now time to give the taxpayers a breather and that we should send this bill back to the committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to support the gentleman from Iowa on many of the matters to which he alluded during his remarks, but I am sure he does not expect the hard-working Federal employees to bear the total burden for the fiscal irresponsibility of this body.

We always seem to turn to the Federal employees and say, "We cannot afford this pay raise; we cannot afford this fringe benefit." But nowhere else do we seem prone to use the knife of fiscal responsibility to cut spending.

I strongly supported many of the measures which the gentleman from Iowa mentioned in an effort to cut down expenditures, including the pay raise for Congress, but I rise at this time to express my strong support of H.R. 16968 of which I am a cosponsor. I feel this bill will relieve insureds of the heavy financial burden which they presently bear.

When the Federal employees' health benefits program was being set up, it was thought that the Federal Government would pay approximately one-half of the cost of the premium. The assumption was that the majority of employees would opt for the low—rather than for the high benefit plans. However, the great majority, 85 percent currently, of employees choose the high-benefit option and the Federal Government's share of the cost was about 38 percent when the program became effective in 1960.

Since medical expenses have continually risen, the Government's share in 1966 was increased by 33 percent in order to restore the ratio which had existed when the program was inaugurated. Also, due to a greater awareness on the part of our citizens of health care, health services are being used more extensively. As a result, the rising cost of medical care has resulted in Federal employees paying an average of 76 percent of the cost of their premiums. For example, in 1960 the premium for the Blue Cross high option was \$19.37. The current premium is \$38.33 or 199 percent of the 1960 premium. Aetna's high-option premium, which was \$17.46 in 1960, is now \$44.94, or 257 percent of the 1960 premium. Consequently, the Federal Government now pays 24 percent of the total cost of the program, rather than the 38 percent it paid in 1960 or the 50 percent which was contemplated as the Federal payment when the program was established.

These figures point out a steadily deteriorating situation and demonstrate the urgency of relieving Federal employees and retirees of the entirely unfair, monumental burden of bearing the major share of continuously increasing medical rates.

The Congress has been committed for some years to the concept of Federal em-

ployee pay comparability with private industry pay. This concept necessarily should include Federal employee fringe benefits as compared with those in private industry. In the private sector today, in a majority of industries, management pays the entire amount of medical insurance premiums, and in the minority of those industry, plans to which the employees contribute, management pays over half of the cost. Year by year, it is the impression that the percentage of management contribution continues to increase. This is the direction in which our society is headed. In the Federal service, the employer pays far below one-half of the cost. This puts the Federal Government as an employer lagging for comparable practice.

Prevailing in private industry in years ahead the Federal Government will continue to be even more out of line.

It was my hope that the subcommittee would at this time give serious consideration to authorizing the Federal Government to pay 100 percent of the premium costs for certain minimum benefits as provided in my bill H.R. 10593.

On April 28, 1969, I introduced H.R. 10593 which would, as I said, authorize the Government to pay 100 percent of the cost of certain minimum benefits which would be provided for all employees, annuitants, and their families. I proposed that this would become the low-option plan which each carrier would make available at no cost to the employee. Each carrier would then be free to offer such additional benefits as it chose, with the employee paying all of the additional cost.

Inasmuch as my plan set a limit on the types of coverage to which the Government could contribute, it would not have tended to inflate the health benefits policies offered to Government employees, but would have continued to encourage the competition that now exists among the 36 plans serving Federal employees.

I am confident that the basic idea of this approach to providing health benefit coverage for Federal employees is sound and merits consideration.

Although the bill before us today does not take the same approach to the problem as I proposed, it is a sound step in the right direction.

Premium costs have increased between 1960 and 1968 without any significant increase in benefits; and the indication is that people were required also to almost double the amount of out-of-pocket cash they spent on medical care not reimbursed by insurance.

The reason, in my opinion, is to be found in the almost total neglect of the Federal Government to redeem its promises of 10 years ago to its employees. Only once during the past decade has the formula for the sharing of premium costs been adjusted. That was in 1966.

Except for some low-option plans and certain self-only enrollments, the contribution by the Federal Government has never equaled 50 percent of the total cost. In fact, it has never exceeded 38 percent for the overwhelming majority of employees, and now is at a threatening low of one-fourth of its original intention.

This lopsided apportionment of costs

was not what the 86th Congress had in mind when it approved the act. The printed report that accompanied the bill at the time of its enactment included the following language:

The committee recognized that the maximum amounts indicated could not remain unchanged over a long period of years, any more than the cost-of-living has remained frozen. Medical care costs will undoubtedly fluctuate at least as widely as other items of living costs. The committee believes that the Congress will continue to be responsible to the needs of the employees and will appropriately act to keep the proposed program in consonance with future developments.

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that simple justice requires that the Government reverse the trend of declining employer contributions to the Federal program.

I feel very strongly that the request for a more equitable participation in the matter of health insurance represents a reasonable request. The correction of this inequity is long overdue. The employees and retirees have been patient. One thing is certain—the problem is not going to yield to rhetoric alone. What is needed is positive action—now—to fulfill the commitment made by Government to its employees 10 years ago.

I hope the House will overwhelmingly pass this long overdue legislation to demonstrate to our dedicated Federal employees that we will keep faith with them.

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

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. I subscribe to a 100-percent employer payment. I wonder if the gentleman has any opinion as to what this administration would do about such a bill?

Mr. HOGAN. I assume the gentleman knows that the Civil Service Commission representatives of the administration testified in favor of 38 percent. So at this time I would think we would be correct in assuming that the administration would oppose a 100-percent plan.

Mr. OLSEN. So the gentleman thinks that would be impossible at this time?

Mr. HOGAN. I think it would be impossible at this time on the basis of the testimony taken by the subcommittee.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN), a member of the committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has long been committed to comparability in compensation to its employees, to their working conditions, their retirement benefits, and health benefits, and by that I mean comparability between Federal employees and employees in the private sector. This legislation is just a small step in the right direction.

There are some great businesses in our country that are comparable to the Federal Government in many areas that pay 100 percent of the health benefit premiums for their employees, and indeed there are leadership organizations in this country, large organizations comparable to some sectors of the Federal Govern-

ment, who pay 100 percent of the premiums for retirement for their employees.

Here is a small step going to 50 percent of the health benefits premiums for Federal employees.

Why is comparability important, Mr. Chairman? I want everybody to understand why comparability is important.

The main reason is that the Federal Government as an employer has to attract the best talent it can. We are in competition to attract the leadership in every classification, be they engineers, lawyers, letter carriers or clerks, we have to attract comparable talent. What we are doing is just one of the elements of comparability. As I say, it is a small step in that direction.

I think we ought to have that much pride, and to have that much of a progressive attitude in desiring comparable employees, so that we have if possible superior talent in every endeavor of the Federal Government, because we all know the Federal Government plays such an active part in almost every type of endeavor. That is the real reason. The real reason for comparability is so that the Federal Government as an employer can compete with the other great employer in the private sector of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I support this much-needed legislation, of which I am proud to be cosponsor.

The chief purpose of this legislation is to correct a problem too long unanswered. The problem I speak of is the unfair, unbalanced, out-of-proportion cost of premium charges of health benefits placed on the shoulders of the Federal employees and annuitants. I think it is quite clear that adjustment by the Government to a more proportionate sharing of premium charges is in order, as stated in H.R. 16968.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service believes the time is long overdue for the Government to begin catching up with private industry in providing fringe benefits to its employees. The committee has long felt that the Government should be a leader in all areas including pay, fringe benefits, and so forth, rather than constantly lagging behind. Members of Congress should be cognizant of the problems that exist and take corrective action.

Rises in hospital costs are averaging about 15 percent per year, and as a result, every single carrier has been compelled to increase premiums over the past few years for essentially the same benefits. The net practical effect has been annual pay cuts for employees, who are forced to pay substantial increases in premiums in order to maintain essential coverage.

As for health and hospitalization programs, the Federal employee is being treated not only as a second-class American citizen—he is treated far worse than citizens working in the private sector. And he is actually also worse off than 10

years ago, when the Federal employees' health benefits system was installed.

Public Law 86-362, establishing the Federal employees' health benefits system, shows clearly that the primary, original intent of the committees drafting that legislation, and of the Congress enacting it, was to provide to Federal employees a contributory health benefits system comparable to that available at that time to employees of large-scale private industry.

One would expect, from these clear expressions of congressional intent, that Federal employees are being provided with a health benefits program equal to that available to employees of large-scale private enterprise at the rate of a 50-50 split of the costs.

Despite action taken by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Congress, the Government percentage of the contribution has steadily declined and now is less than 25 percent. This places a tremendous burden on all employees because of the constantly increasing costs of health insurance, with benefits increasing considerably less than the premiums.

This spread in the percentage of costs borne by the Government and the employee will continue to widen with the passage of time unless corrective legislation is enacted. It is vital, in improving the funding formula, that a new method be adopted which will eliminate any fixed dollar contribution on the part of the Government and assess a percentage of cost which will be automatically adjusted in line with experience of the plans.

Government calculations show that medical costs are rising faster than the total cost of living. A recent actuarial study of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits program indicates that health insurance premiums will double over the next decade. The study also suggests that the two Government-wide plans can be expected to increase premiums from 10 percent to 35 percent every 2 years between now and 1976, averaging between 20 and 25 percent.

Also to be considered is the burden placed on retirees, who must continue to pay the full premium beyond the age when employees in private industry are given free medicare hospital coverage. This is a rather severe penalty on retired employees who paid substantial premiums during their active working years, and now must continue to pay increasingly higher premiums for health benefits each year when their income is at its lowest.

With these tremendous increases facing us—in addition to the many increases already made in the health insurance premiums—it is of the utmost importance that legislation be enacted as quickly as possible to grant Federal employees and retirees immediate relief. Health insurance is extremely necessary, but the rapidly increasing premiums are making it very difficult for these dedicated persons to continue this important coverage.

It is, therefore, proper and desirable, Mr. Chairman, that the Government re-examine its position in order to more

clearly align its obligation and responsibility to reflect the more progressive practices of private enterprise. Therefore, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 16968.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and wish to add my voice in commendation for the efforts of the committee. This legislation is needed, its concept is sound, it is equitable, and the Federal employees deserve no less.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, in view of the upward spiral in health care costs generally, the relief for Federal employees contained in H.R. 16968 is sorely needed, and I therefore rise in support of that bill.

When this health insurance plan was first established by Congress over a decade ago, the goal was a 50-50 sharing of the total health premium cost between the Government and the individual insured. However, for a variety of reasons, the Federal share was limited to 50 percent of the premium for the lower priced, so-called standard policy.

It soon became clear that most Federal employees did not consider the low-option coverage adequate. Little wonder that this was so, Mr. Chairman, as health care costs skyrocketed during the sixties. Those who chose the more comprehensive "high option" policies were forced to bear the entire cost of the additional premium.

The net result is that, instead of paying close to half the cost of its employees' health insurance coverage, the Government share is today less than 25 percent.

H.R. 16968 reaffirms the Federal Government's intention to pay half the cost of its employees' health insurance. More important, it sets up a formula for computing the maximum Federal share that would allow that intention to be realized. That maximum, I believe, will be set at 50 percent of the average cost for high-option coverage among the various insurers involved. Automatic annual readjustments of the maximum are provided for.

According to the figures in the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the benefit to individual Government employees will be both tangible and substantial. Currently, for example, the total premium for high-option benefits is about \$40, with the Government contributing about \$9 and the employee paying about \$31. Under the provisions of this legislation, that \$40 premium would be shared equally by the Government and the employee.

Passage of this measure is imperative if we are to make it clear that the Federal Government intends to match the efforts of private industry to provide low-cost health insurance coverage for employees. I therefore urge swift passage of H.R. 16968.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16968, legislation which I have joined in cosponsoring under my own name as H.R. 17472.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to attract competent employees to work for the Government, and one important reason is the fact that benefits offered to Government employees cannot compare with what private industry offers.

The bill now before us would help ease the burden of rising hospital and medical costs of Federal employees by requiring the Government to share equally the cost of their health benefits. Presently the Government pays only 24 percent of the premiums charged under the Federal Employee Health Benefits program, which is available to the nearly 2.5 million Federal employees, including some 600,000 postal workers.

I might point out that in 1960, the Government was contributing approximately 38 percent of the premiums but because inflation has caused medical costs to increase along with everything else, the Federal employees are now forced to pay 76 percent of the cost of health insurance, which takes a large chunk out of the family pay check.

By enacting this legislation, we will have moved one step closer to matching private industry's trend toward providing its workers cost-free health insurance.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support, and I earnestly hope that the great majority in this House will also support, the measure now before us, H.R. 16968, designed to more equitably adjust the Government's contribution to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants.

It is commonly agreed that the executive department and the Congress should cooperate in doing everything they reasonably can to encourage the recruitment of competent Federal employees. It is obvious that to recruit such personnel, the Federal Government, as an employer, must demonstrate a disposition of genuine concern for the welfare of the employee and his family, and also be in a position to compete with private industry for the highest qualified personnel.

One of the basic areas and elements that enters into such competition is, of course, the quality and the cost of essential health benefits coverage for employees, both while they work and when they are living in retirement.

While eminent authorities have testified on the point, it is common knowledge that the Federal Government, as a major employer, is way behind major private enterprise employers in this very important factor of employee benefit program and that major industrial employers are paying most, and in a great many cases all, of the cost of comparable health coverage benefits for their employees. If this great disparity in competitive benefit attraction, in such a basic area as health benefits coverage of employees and dependents, between the Federal Government and private enterprise, is permitted to continue, the Federal Government will inevitably lose the services of many highly competent and diligent potential employees.

In view of the great weight of the expert testimony, and by any other rea-

sonable yardstick of judgment, the objectives of this bill are clearly in the national interest and I hope that the substance of this measure will be speedily and overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, the measure we are considering today, H.R. 16968, which will adjust contributions made to plans providing health benefits to our Federal employees, not only reflects a moral and legal obligation the Government owes its workers but also plays an important role in assuring our retired Federal employees that they will not face a continuing diminution of their fixed pension incomes because of ever-increasing health plan costs.

Our obligation stems from the fact that Federal employees now pay more than 75 percent of the premiums for their health plans which is totally inconsistent with the concept of comparability as prescribed in the 1962 Federal Salary Reform Act. Figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as well as by private agencies distinctly show that management in the private sector assumes the major share of employee health plan costs. It has also been determined that in a majority of cases, the private sector employers pay the full health plan premiums for their workers.

An examination of the experience of the Federal health plan program since 1960 discloses some facts that are embarrassing in conflict with the intended purposes of a progressive Government. When the present health plan was conceived in September 1959, the clear intent of the framers was to establish a 50-percent contribution on the part of the Federal Government. However, because of a failure to consider the effects of possible immediate increases in costs, the fixed-dollar amount contributed by the Government turned out to be in reality only 38 percent of the premiums paid for the types of coverages available to employees. The Federal worker was required to pay 62 percent of the costs at a time when private employers continued their trend to take up most if not all of their employees' health care premiums.

Had the 38-percent figure remained, the present legislation would not be as crucial as it is. But the combination of ever-rising health care costs and a shift to high-option coverages has pushed the Federal employees' share of the premiums to a ridiculously high 75.8 percent, further eroding his paycheck.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about health care costs for 2.7 million Federal employees and approximately 5.5 million of their dependents. In addition, we are dealing with the costs of living for 175,000 annuitants in the retired Federal employee health-care program who also have thousands of dependents included under the coverages provided. When we consider the undeniable fact that medical care costs generally have increased 158 percent over what they were in 1959, we realize that the fixed dollar contribution made by the Federal Government has imposed this increase squarely on the shoulders of our Federal employees—and worse yet, on the retired Federal employees who can least afford

to reduce the already dwindling value of their pension checks.

The bill before us will establish a percentage contribution to the plans pegged at the high-option level of benefits. This will correct the obvious inequity of the fixed-dollar contribution now made by existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed 50-50 splitting of costs between the Government and the employee is the least we can do for the employees and retirees of the Federal Government. It will no doubt be claimed that the Federal budget cannot afford to include additional funds for health care benefits. The Bureau of the Budget, reflecting the administration's concern with inflation, at first did not approve any increase in contributions made by the Federal Government. It cited "urgent national needs" as the reason to justify their disapproval of such additional expenditures. Later, in reconsidering the matter, the Bureau of the Budget expressed its approval of an increase raising the Government's contribution to 38 percent of the costs of health plans, stating that this was the proportion paid in 1960.

I completely disagree with this sort of reasoning. It is surprising that all the evidence available from a 10-year experience of rising health costs plus the trends in private industry to assume the bulk of premium payments for their employees has been apparently overlooked by the Bureau of the Budget. The question they pose is "Can our taxpayers afford this increase in our expenditures?" We in this body most certainly are concerned with the burdens placed on the American people. But these burdens cannot be computed only in terms of health care costs and taxes. If we examine the health care situation nationally, it may provide us with a clearer picture of the impact of this legislation.

First, let us recognize that a great majority of all our taxpayers are covered by some form of health insurance. If we further consider the fact that most of these plans in private industry are fully paid for by management, we must assume that, indirectly, these payments cut into the tax revenue of the Federal Government. The conclusion, therefore, is that, in some form or another, health benefits for all employees, public and private, are subsidized by the people.

If, as we are now proposing, Federal employees will be required to pay half of their health plan costs while the majority of private employees enjoy noncontributory or much lower contributory plans, then it follows that the presently proposed 50-50 cost split between the Federal Government and its employees is indeed a modest adjustment in contributions.

An additional factor must also be considered. The high cost of health care plans today may force some Federal workers, especially those at the lower grade levels, to either choose not to be covered, or to select the minimum coverages. Worse yet, retired Federal employees with their fixed incomes may find the cost of continued coverage so excessive that they may elect not to participate in the plan at a time in their

lives when it will be most needed. Who can put a dollar value on the burdens Federal employees and retirees with little or no health coverage will eventually place on the public? Lost work days, decreased productivity, public health agency costs, and even ultimate untimely deaths because of inadequate care must be included as "costs" to our society in whatever terms they are expressed.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill to increase the Federal Government's contribution to 50 percent for health plan costs; to extend benefits to survivors of Federal employees who die in active service with less than 5 years of Federal employment; and to cover certain retired Federal employees who are pre-1960 annuitants of the Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act are crucial to the welfare of our employees and are in the best interest of the public they serve. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, the biweekly Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this chapter shall be adjusted, beginning on the first day of the first pay period of each year, to an amount equal to 50 percent of the average of the subscription charges in effect on the beginning date of the adjustment, with respect to self alone or self and family enrollments, as applicable, for the highest level of benefits offered by—

"(1) the service benefit plan;
"(2) the indemnity benefit plan;
"(3) the two employee organization plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission; and
"(4) the two comprehensive medical plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which commences after December 31, 1970.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 8901(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) a member of a family who receives an immediate annuity as the survivor of an employee or of a retired employee described by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;"

(b) Section 8901(3)(D)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "having completed 5 or more years of service,"

Sec. 3. (a) Section 8701(a)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and the Panama Canal Zone" immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

(b) Section 8901(1)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and the Panama Canal Zone" immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

Sec. 4. (a) The Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849; Public Law 86-724) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2(4) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and includes the Social Security Administration for purposes of supplementary medical in-

surance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act";

(2) Sections 4(a) and 6(a) are each amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The immediately preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the plan for supplementary medical insurance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act."; and

(3) Section 9 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no recovery of any payments of Government contributions under section 4 or 6 of this Act from any person when, in the judgment of the Commission, such person is without fault and recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on January 1, 1971.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 1, strike "50" and insert in lieu thereof "38."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered will change the Government's contribution to the health benefits program from the 50 percent contained in the reported bill to 38 percent.

When the Federal employees' health benefits program commenced operations in 1960, the Government's share of the total premium cost worked out at 38 percent. When, because of constantly increasing premium charges the Government's share fell below the 38 percent level, it was again increased by law to 38 percent, by Public Law 89-504, in 1966. My amendment will again set the Government's share at 38 percent and keep it at that level in the future.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that over the years we have had generally consistent opposition from all administrations in the White House to increasing the Government's share of health benefits premiums. This year, however, the present administration did recognize that an inequity had developed, and instead of appearing before the committee and opposing any increase in the Government's share, the administration spokesmen suggested a formula whereby the Government would begin, and continue, to pay the historic 38 percent.

Instead of accepting the administration's recommendation, the committee went much further and set the rate at 50 percent. The cost to the Federal Government at 38 percent is \$182 million; the cost at 50 percent is \$314 million.

Mr. Chairman, while I would prefer to see action delayed upon this entire piece of legislation, at least until such time as we are in a better position to pay for it, I think the very least we

can do at this time is to adopt my amendment which will cut the cost of this bill by \$132 million. We cannot afford the luxury of going 50 percent at this time.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. As reported, the bill will relieve insureds of the heavy financial burden which they presently bear. Any lowering of the percentage figure I feel would be detrimental and unfair to Federal employees.

When the Federal employees' health benefits program was being established, it was intended that the Federal Government would share equally with the employees and retirees the total costs of the necessary premiums. This, however, has never become reality and amounts to a broken promise. Acceptance of this amendment would not only fail to purify the conscience of Congress, but would continue the Federal Government in the role of somewhat less than a first-rate, progressive, model employer.

Since medical expenses have continually risen, the Government's share has decreased to 24 percent of the total cost of the program, rather than the 38 percent it paid in 1960, or the 50 percent which was contemplated as the Federal payment when the program was established.

The figures point out a steadily deteriorating situation and demonstrate the urgency of relieving Federal employees and retirees of the unfair burden of bearing the major share of continuously rambling medical rates. If this amendment is to be the answer, then the Federal employees have a right to be concerned and alarmed, for this amendment would surely perpetuate an inconscionable situation.

The Congress has been committed for some years to the concept of Federal employee pay comparability with private industry pay. This concept necessarily includes Federal employee fringe benefits as compared with those in private industry. In the private sector today, a majority of industries management pays the entire amount of medical insurance premiums, and in the minority of those industry plans to which the employees contribute, management pays over half of the cost. Year by year, it is the impression that the percentage of management contribution continues to increase. This is the direction in which our society is headed. A proposal that, in the Federal service, the employer pays far below one-half of the cost simply follows behind comparable practice prevailing in private industry, and in years henceforth will continue to be even more out of line. Yet we are offered an amendment that would not put us in step, but merely hamper progress and keep us in a backward stage of health benefits program development.

Premium costs have increased between 1960 and 1968 without any significant increase in benefits; and the indication is also that people were additionally required to almost double that

amount of out-of-pocket cash they spent on medical care not reimbursed by insurance. A continuation of this practice is unacceptable; and to offer token appeasement, as this amendment suggests, is to play havoc with the lives of Federal employees.

The Government has almost totally neglected to redeem its promises of 10 years ago to employees. Only once during the past decade has the formula for sharing of premium been adjusted. That was in 1966. Otherwise it was a decade of "benign neglect."

Except for some low-option plans and certain self-only enrollments, the contribution by Government has never been equal to 50 percent of the total cost. In fact, it has never exceeded 38 percent for the overwhelming majority of employees, and now is at a threatening low of one-fourth of its original intention.

This lopsided apportionment of costs was not what the 86th Congress had in mind in approving the act. The printed report that accompanied the bill at enactment included the following:

The Committee recognized that the maximum amounts indicated could not remain unchanged over a long period of years, any more than the cost of living has remained frozen. Medical care costs will undoubtedly fluctuate at least as widely as other items of living costs. The Committee believes that the Congress will continue to be responsible to the needs of the employees and will appropriately act to keep the proposed program in consonance with future developments.

I believe sincerely that simple justice requires that the Government reverse the trend of declining employer contributions to the Federal program. I urge this body to reject this amendment, which would deny employees the 50-50 ratio Congress promised in 1960, and which we are attempting to deliver today.

I feel very strongly that the request for a fair shake in the matter of health insurance represents a reasonable request. The correction being proposed is long overdue. What is needed is positive action—now—to fulfill the commitment made by Government to its employees 10 years ago. I urge the defeat of any amendment that would deny this promise.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this bill without the amendment provides for a 50-50 sharing of cost between the Government and the employee. It is a compromise measure. The amendment, as I understand it, would reduce the 50 percent the Government would contribute to 38 percent.

This is an unfair amendment insofar as the Government employee is concerned. We have had other bills before our committee that would have the Government pay the entire 100-percent cost of health benefits. One bill considered would have 50-percent payment by the Government for the first period of time with a later 75-percent contribution by the Government, and still later 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I might mention that the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in a re-

lease dated May 18, 1970, indicated that the fringe benefits, the amount paid for life, accident, and health insurance by private industry, averages 3.6 percent over and above the base salary of the employee whereas the Government pays only 1.6 percent in fringe benefits, which indicates the Government is lagging considerably behind private industry in this field.

It is my understanding that the Government today contributes roughly 24 percent of the cost of health benefits. It seems reasonable to me, however, that contribution between Government and employees should be on an equal, a share-and-share-alike basis, between the Government and the employee. Therefore, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa. As the bill presently stands it will, to some degree, help Federal employees to reach the level of health insurance benefits offered by private American employers.

The inescapable trend in private employment has been directionally pointed toward noncontributory health insurance plans. While the Federal employee knows that the Government is unable to grant him a noncontributory health program at this time, he would humbly accept the provisions of H.R. 16968.

This bill should be left untampered with, so that it can promote a moderate measure of relief to some of the financial burdens of employees and annuitants. If passed in its reported form, it will be a landmark in Government health benefits. It will restore some sensibility to the ridiculous imbalance which now exists.

The proposed amendment does little to modernize the present health benefits program. Something on a larger scale must be done now to alleviate the hardships that medical costs have brought to Federal employees and retirees. If adopted, the amendment is but one more failure to respond to Federal employee needs. Fifty percent is a small price to ask when consideration is made of the trends in private industry, the increased cost of living, and the increased medical care cost. What the question boils down to is whether Congress will allow a continuation of a "horse-and-buggy" health benefits program, or whether it will make a positive move for a trade-in on something a little more dependable and modern.

When Congress adopted the present insurance program in 1960, the promise of equal sharing between Federal employees and the Federal Government was the intention. However, this intention has never materialized, and adoption of this proposed amendment would further undermine the original congressional intent.

This amendment, by decreasing the proposed legislation, would merely perpetuate the already flagrant inequity that has been leveled on Federal employees by the Government.

By reason of periodic increases in premiums, brought on mainly by rises in medical care costs, and the failure of Government to be responsive to the

needs of employees, the employee has been obliged to absorb practically the entire amount of these periodic premium raises. The situation today finds the average Federal employee worse off than he was 10 years ago when the law was enacted. This amendment would involve only a small percentage of what is necessary to be done, and if it is adopted, it will be outmoded upon acceptance.

The amendment offered is a negating factor in all conceivable ways. I urge that it be rejected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in objection to the proposed amendment. The Congress should take a long look at the facts and give its full support to the legislation without amendment. The burdens of the unbalanced share of medical expenditures which the employee in Federal Government, and the retiree from Federal service, has to face cannot be met by a compromise to a lesser figure.

This legislation, as approved by your committee, would provide a major improvement in the funding formula of the Federal employees' health benefits program, as originally adopted and as it presently exists. To accept this amendment would provide only a minor improvement to an evergrowing problem, one that is not substantial enough to match the present trends in private industry or the needs of Federal retirees and employees.

When the Federal health program was enacted in 1959, it was anticipated that the majority of employees would select coverage under low options. The general intent, based on the legislative history, would indicate that the Congress desired to set the Government's share of the cost at 50 percent. However, the vast majority of employees elected coverage under high options, making it evident the majority recognized the necessity of securing the best health coverage available. In each open season since the program began in 1960, the net result has shown a constant movement to high option, and it is estimated that more than 90 percent of all persons insured now hold high-option coverage. Therefore, I think it is necessary for the Federal Government to establish a 50-50 share of costs based on high options, rather than compromise by amendment to a figure unfair to the vast majority of those enrolled in this program.

Under Public Law 86-382, passed in 1959, the Federal employee has consistently paid from two-thirds to three-fourths of the entire premium costs. This definitely was not the intention of the 86th Congress in approving the measure, and it definitely should not be the intention of the 91st Congress by accepting the amendment.

The first, last, and only adjustment made in the Government's share of the total premium cost was in 1966. The bi-weekly contribution for high option, family plan increased from \$3.12 to \$4.10 or about 31 percent. This during a period when, as indicated, medical expenses increased by 52 percent. Are we going to stand by and accede to an amendment comparable in degree to the action taken

in 1966? The answer should be definitely not.

The cost of medical care, surgery, and hospitalization has skyrocketed progressively since the enactment of the act, and corresponding increases in premium costs and additional types of coverage adopted by the private sector industry have made necessary a review of the program to determine what changes are appropriate and desirable after 10 years of experience. In my opinion, H.R. 16968 is the minimal answer to the change needed in the program. To establish a lesser ratio, as proposed in this amendment, would be unjust and unharmonious with the cost of medical care, surgery, and hospitalization.

Government calculations indicate medical costs have been rising faster than the total cost of living. A recent actuarial study of the Federal employees' health benefits program indicates that health insurance premiums will double over the next decade. When faced with this study, can the Congress consider such a proposed amendment featuring a lesser ratio of Government and employee sharing? The study also indicates that the two Government-wide plans can be expected to increase premiums from 10 percent to 35 percent every 2 years between now and 1976, with biannual increases averaging between 20 and 25 percent. What further proof is needed to invalidate the amendment offered?

A comparison between what the Federal Government pays and what private employees pay for the health benefits programs has been made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is expressed in terms of a percentage of basic wages and salaries. The contrast is striking. According to the latest figures, some 3.6 percent of private wages are allocable to health benefits programs, whereas the Federal Government's expenditure for the same benefits is only 1.6 percent of wages. This comparison further demonstrates the need for H.R. 16968 to be adopted without any reduction in the percentage rate recommended by your committee.

Should there be a mere 5-percent improvement in benefits in 1971, 1973, and 1975, the annual premium would increase to over \$900. Unless the Government's contribution toward premium is increased from the present yearly legal maximum of \$106.56—26 pay periods times \$4.10—I wonder how many of the 2½ million employees and their 5½ million dependents will be able to afford health insurance 2, 3, or 5 years hence? Sure, the amendment would provide relief, but why do a poor job when a good job is better?

Also to be considered is the burden placed on retirees, who must continue to pay appreciable premiums beyond the age when employees in private industry are given free medicare hospital coverage. While this amendment would alleviate this problem to a small degree, its adoption would place a severe penalty on retired employees who have paid substantial premiums during their active working years, and then must continue to pay a large percentage of the premiums for health benefits each year when their income is at its lowest.

The time is long overdue for the Government to begin catching up with private industry in the area of providing fringe benefits to its employees. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has long felt that the Government should be a leader in all areas including pay, fringe benefits, and so forth rather than subscribing to a policy of being a poor follower.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to unanimously reject the proposed amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gross amendment and in support of the committee bill. I have long called for a greater Government contribution toward health benefits for our Federal employees. Although the present bill increases that contribution, it still is far from comparable to that provided for by private industry.

The Gross amendment would further turn back the clock and increase discrimination against our Federal employees. I sincerely hope that this is only a start toward increasing the fringe benefits to which our Federal employees are entitled and have long waited for. I ask my colleagues to vote down this amendment and support the bill without any amendments.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, when the health plan was enacted in 1959, the intent was for the Federal Government to pay 50 percent of the costs of coverage. Rising costs of health benefits have been the leading factor in bringing about an inequitable ratio between employer and employee costs.

One of the undesirable results of the passage of Public Law 86-382, generated 10 years ago, has been a formula whereby the employee has consistently paid two-thirds or more of the entire premium costs. This definitely was not the intention of the 86th Congress in approving the measure. The clear intent was no less than a 50-50 sharing of costs.

Medical care costs have increased during those 10 years since the passage of Public Law 86-382. They have not only matched the increases in all other items; they have outrun them by a great margin.

From 1960 through January of 1969, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the Consumer Price Index for all items in the index budget increased slightly less than 25 percent.

During that same period, the amount of all medical care items increased by 52 percent. Contributing factors to that amazing figure include a 55-percent increase in physicians' fees and a 155-percent increase in hospital daily charges. Only charges for prescription drugs remained relatively stable during the same period.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics also reported that about two-thirds of the employers with contributory arrangements paid over half the cost of hospitalization, surgical and medical plans.

The first, last, and only adjustment

made in the Government's share of the total premium cost was in 1966. The bi-weekly contribution for high option, family plan increased from \$3.12 to \$4.10 or about 31 percent. This during a period when, as indicated, medical expenses increased by 52 percent.

Unless steps are taken to determine who is going to insure the retired Federal employee, and how his insurance is going to be financed, it is a reasonable prediction that: First, Federal annuitants are soon going to be priced out of the health insurance market; or, second, the Federal employees' health benefits program, as we now know it, will cease to exist.

Retirees pay the same premium and receive precisely the same benefits as active employees. There are two things wrong with that kind of setup. In the first place, the Federal retiree can ill afford a monthly premium ranging from \$25 to \$35 and up for practically the same insurance protection the average married citizen at age 65 has been getting under medicare for \$8 per month.

Certainly, cost is a relevant factor—along with all the other factors militating the achievement of economic justice for Federal workers and annuitants, and fulfillment of the fundamental pledge of comparability. The key to reducing prices is not a stubborn resistance to any enlargement of the Government's premium obligations. The wiser course would be for the Government to bend its efforts, in meaningful ways, to slow down the spiraling costs of medical services.

The cruel reality is that a workingman today simply cannot afford a serious illness, the end value of which is often bankruptcy and death. The workingman—any person of moderate means—receives only rudimentary medical attention and is prostrate for considerably longer financially than he is medically.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore urge the overwhelming rejection of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, there are no further amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16968) to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1078, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill H.R. 16968 to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike "50" and insert in lieu thereof "38."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 146, nays 200, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—146

Abbt	Foreman	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Fountain	Passman
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Pettis
Anderson, Calif.	Frey	Pickle
Andrews, Ala.	Fuqua	Poage
Arends	Goodwater	Poff
Ayres	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Baring	Gross	Quie
Belcher	Grover	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Gubser	Rhodes
Betts	Haley	Robison
Blackburn	Hall	Roth
Bow	Hammer-	Rousselot
Bray	schmidt	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Sandman
Burton, Utah	Hastings	Satterfield
Cabell	Hosmer	Schadeberg
Camp	Hull	Scherle
Casey	Hutchinson	Schmitz
Chamberlain	Ichord	Schneebeli
Chappell	Johnson, Pa.	Schwengel
Clancy	Jonas	Sebelius
Clawson, Del.	Keith	Shriver
Collier	King	Sikes
Collins	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Colmer	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Conable	Langen	Smith, N.Y.
Conte	Latta	Snyder
Coughlin	Lloyd	Springer
Cowger	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	McClure	Steiger, Wis.
Daniel, Va.	McMillan	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Talcott
Dellenback	Mailliard	Teague, Calif.
Dennis	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.
Dickinson	Martin	Vander Jagt
Dorn	Mathias	Watson
Dowdy	May	Watts
Duncan	Mayne	Whalley
Dwyer	Michel	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins
Erlenborn	Minshall	Williams
Esch	Mizell	Winn
Fisher	Montgomery	Wold
Flowers	Mosher	Wolf
Flynt	Natcher	Wyman
Foley	Obey	Zion
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski	

NAYS—200

Addabbo	Gialmo	Ottenger
Albert	Gibbons	Patman
Alexander	Gonzalez	Patten
Annunzio	Gray	Pelly
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Barrett	Griffin	Philbin
Bennett	Gude	Pike
Bevill	Hagan	Pirnie
Blaggi	Halpern	Preyer, N.C.
Biester	Hamilton	Price, Ill.
Bingham	Hanley	Pucinski
Blanton	Harrington	Purcell
Blatnik	Harsha	Rallsback
Boggs	Harvey	Rees
Boland	Hathaway	Reid, N.Y.
Bolling	Hawkins	Reuss
Brademas	Hays	Riegle
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Roberts
Brinkley	Helstoski	Rodino
Brooks	Henderson	Roe
Brotzman	Hogan	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Mich.	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hungate	Rosenthal
Broyhill, Va.	Hunt	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Jacobs	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Jarman	Roybal
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Jones, N.C.	St Germain
Button	Karh	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Scott
Clark	Kazen	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Kee	Stafford
Cleveland	Kluczyński	Staggers
Cohelan	Koch	Stanton
Conyers	Kyl	Steed
Corbett	Kyros	Stephens
Corman	Lennon	Stokes
Culver	Long, Md.	Stuckey
Daddario	Lowenstein	Sullivan
Daniels, N.J.	Lukens	Symington
Davis, Ga.	McDade	Taylor
de la Garza	McFall	Thompson, Ga.
Deaney	McKneally	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Macdonald,	Tiernan
Downing	Mass.	Tunney
Dulski	Madden	Udall
Eckhardt	Matsunaga	Ullman
Edmondson	Meeds	Van Deelen
Edwards, Calif.	Melcher	Vanik
Ellberg	Mikva	Vigorito
Eshleman	Miller, Calif.	Waggonner
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Waldie
Evins, Tenn.	Mink	Wampler
Fallon	Mollohan	Watkins
Fascell	Monagan	Whalen
Feighan	Moorhead	White
Fish	Morgan	Whitehurst
Flood	Morse	Wright
Ford	Moss	Wylder
William D.	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
Friedel	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Fulton, Pa.	Nichols	Young
Fulton, Tenn.	Nix	Zablocki
Galifianakis	O'Hara	Zwach
Gallagher	Olsen	
Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—85

Adams	Dingell	Mills
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, La.	Mize
Anderson, Tenn.	Farbstein	Morton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Findley	Myers
Ashbrook	Fraser	Nedzi
Aspinall	Gaydos	Nelsen
Beall, Md.	Gettys	Pepper
Bell, Calif.	Gilbert	Podell
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Pollock
Broomfield	Griffiths	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Pryor, Ark.
Bush	Hansen, Wash.	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Randall
Caffery	Heckler, Mass.	Rarick
Carey	Hicks	Reifel
Carter	Horton	Rivers
Cederberg	Jones, Tenn.	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Kirwan	Saylor
Chisholm	Kleppe	Shipley
Clausen, Don H.	Kuykendall	Sisk
Cramer	Leggett	Slack
Cunningham	Long, La.	Stratton
Dawson	McCarthy	Taft
Denney	McCloskey	Weicker
Dent	McCulloch	Whitten
Devine	McDonald,	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Mich.	Wilson,
	McEwen	Charles H.
	MacGnegor	Wyatt
	Meskill	Wylie

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Farbstain with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Mize.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Adams with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Fraser with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Reifel.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Taft.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Myers with Mr. Wylie.

Messrs. FOLEY, BRAY, and WIDNALL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 57, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—284

Abbott	Brotzman	Coughlin
Adair	Brown, Mich.	Cowger
Addabbo	Brown, Ohio	Culver
Albert	Broyhill, N.C.	Daddario
Alexander	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Va.
Anderson	Buchanan	Daniels, N.J.
Calif.	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Ga.
Annunzio	Burke, Mass.	de la Garza
Ashley	Burlison, Mo.	Delaney
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Donohue
Barrett	Button	Dorn
Belcher	Byrne, Pa.	Dowdy
Bennett	Cabell	Downing
Betts	Chamberlain	Dulski
Bevill	Chappell	Dwyer
Blaggi	Chisholm	Eckhardt
Blaster	Clancy	Edmondson
Bingham	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Blanton	Clay	Ellberg
Boggs	Cleveland	Esch
Boland	Cohelan	Eshleman
Bolling	Collier	Evans, Colo.
Bow	Collins	Evins, Tenn.
Brademas	Conable	Fascell
Brasco	Conte	Feighan
Bray	Conyers	Fish
Brinkley	Corbett	Fisher
Brooks	Corman	Flood

Flowers	Long, Md.	Roe
Foley	Lowenstein	Rogers, Fla.
Ford, Gerald R.	Lukens	Rooney, N.Y.
Ford	McClure	Rooney, Pa.
William D.	McDade	Rosenthal
Frelinghuysen	McFall	Rostenkowski
Frey	McKneally	Roth
Friedel	McMillan	Roudebush
Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,	Roybal
Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.	Ruth
Fuqua	Madden	Ryan
Galifianakis	Mahon	St Germain
Gallagher	Mailliard	Sandman
Garmatz	Marsh	Satterfield
Gialmo	Martin	Scheuer
Gibbons	Mathias	Schneebeli
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Schwengel
Goodling	May	Scott
Gray	Meeds	Shriver
Green, Oreg.	Melcher	Sikes
Green, Pa.	Mikva	Slack
Griffin	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Calif.
Grover	Minish	Smith, Iowa
Gubser	Mink	Snyder
Gude	Minshall	Stafford
Hagan	Mollohan	Staggers
Haley	Monagan	Stanton
Halpern	Moorhead	Steed
Hamilton	Morgan	Steiger, Wis.
Hammer-	Morse	Stephens
schmidt	Mosher	Stokes
Hanley	Moss	Stubblefield
Hanna	Murphy, Ill.	Stuckey
Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Harrington	Natcher	Symington
Harsha	Nichols	Talcott
Harvey	Nix	Taylor
Hastings	Obey	Teague, Calif.
Hathaway	O'Hara	Teague, Tex.
Hawkins	O'Konski	Thompson, N.J.
Hays	Olsen	Tierman
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neal, Ga.	Tunney
Helstoski	O'Neill, Mass.	Udall
Henderson	Ottinger	Ullman
Hogan	Passman	Van Deerlin
Hosmer	Patman	Vander Jagt
Howard	Patten	Vanik
Hull	Pelly	Waggonner
Hungate	Perkins	Waldie
Hunt	Pettis	Wampler
Hutchinson	Philbin	Watkins
Ichord	Pickle	Watson
Jacobs	Pike	Whalen
Jarman	Pirnie	Whalley
Johnson, Calif.	Poff	White
Johnson, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.	Whitehurst
Jones, Ala.	Price, Ill.	Widnall
Jones, N.C.	Purcell	Wiggins
Karth	Quile	Williams
Kastenmeier	Railsback	Wolf
Kazen	Rees	Wright
Kee	Reid, N.Y.	Wyder
Keith	Reuss	Yates
Koch	Rhodes	Yatron
Kyl	Riegle	Young
Kyros	Roberts	Zablocki
Lennon	Robison	Zion
Lloyd	Rodino	Zwach

NAYS—57

Abernethy	Edwards, Ala.	Mizell
Andrews, Ala.	Erlenborn	Montgomery
Arends	Flynt	Poage
Baring	Foreman	Price, Tex.
Berry	Fountain	Reid, Ill.
Blackburn	Goldwater	Rousselot
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Schadeberg
Burton, Utah	Hall	Scherle
Camp	Jonas	Schmitz
Carter	King	Sebellus
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Colmer	Landrum	Smith, N.Y.
Crane	Langen	Springer
Davis, Wis.	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Dellenback	McClory	Thomson, Wis.
Dennis	Mann	Watts
Derwinski	Mayne	Winn
Dickinson	Michel	Wold
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Wyman

NOT VOTING—90

Adams	Bush	Devine
Anderson, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Diggs
Anderson, Tenn.	Caffery	Dingell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Carey	Edwards, La.
Ashbrook	Casey	Fallon
Aspinall	Cederberg	Farbstain
Beall, Md.	Celler	Findley
Bell, Calif.	Clausen, Don H.	Fraser
Blatnik	Cramer	Gaydos
Brock	Cunningham	Gettys
Broomfield	Dawson	Gilbert
Brown, Calif.	Denney	Griffiths
	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
		Hébert

Heckler, Mass.	MacGregor	Rivers
Hicks	Meskill	Rogers, Colo.
Hollifield	Mills	Ruppe
Horton	Mize	Saylor
Jones, Tenn.	Morton	Shipley
Kirwan	Myers	Sisk
Kleppe	Nedzi	Stratton
Kluczynski	Nelsen	Taft
Kuykendall	Pepper	Thompson, Ga.
Latta	Podell	Vigorito
Leggett	Pollock	Weicker
Long, La.	Powell	Whitten
McCarthy	Pryor, Ark.	Wilson, Bob
McCloskey	Pucinski	Wilson,
McCulloch	Quillen	Charles H.
McDonald,	Randall	Wyatt
Mich.	Rarick	Wylie
McEwen	Reifel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Farbstain with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Mize.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Adams with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Taft.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Myers with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Pucinski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 16968, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry, we have no further business for the week and will ask to go over until Monday after the announcement of the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day and we have two District bills.

H.R. 18086, to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioner to sell or exchange certain real property in Prince William County, Va.; and

H.R. 17146, to amend the act incorporating Columbian College—the George Washington University.

Also, while this is not on the whip notice, there may be conference reports from the Committee on the District of Columbia and from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also for Monday and the balance of the week, there are scheduled:

H.R. 17654, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Open rule with 4 hours of debate.

H.R. 13100, to extend programs for training in the allied health professions. Open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 14237, to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. Open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 16542, to regulate the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. Open rule with 2 hours of debate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I notice some blank spaces at the bottom of the program for next week and I fully expected to find there some notation as to when I might expect to get a little recess to go fishing or for some of us to go fishing for votes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish I were able to give the gentleman a definitive answer at this time, but I expect that the last 2 weeks of August and the first week of September might possibly be recess time.

Mr. GROSS. That takes real good care of it. I thank the majority leader.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3215

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the arts and humanities bill, S. 3215, may have until midnight tomorrow night to file the conference report to be printed in the Record under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 212 I was unavoidably detained with a delegation in my office and was unable to vote. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea" for this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 212 I was called out of the Chamber. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea."

TOBACCO INDUSTRY EXPRESSES RESERVATIONS CONCERNING H.R. 16920, TEXTILE IMPORTS

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

Mr. McMILLAN. As a cosponsor of the Mills bill, H.R. 16920, in connection with textile imports, I have heard a rumor that some members of the tobacco industry have expressed reservations concerning this proposed legislation.

My interest in this legislation is to protect the textile industry and its employees. We all know that by permitting textiles to be shipped into this country from cheap labor markets, we are destroying the textile industry in both South Carolina and the entire Nation, thereby causing thousands and thousands of valuable, skilled employees to lose their jobs.

I am certain there is nothing in the textile bill which would jeopardize the export of tobacco from this country as other countries certainly need our tobacco to produce good cigarettes.

I am inserting a letter from the

Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in the RECORD at this point. I would like to state that the Coker Co. is the largest tobacco seed company in the Nation and its president, Mr. Robert Coker of Hartsville, S.C., is one of the outstanding agriculturists in this country. He is greatly interested in the tobacco industry since his company is located in my congressional district and tobacco is the largest money crop. However, Mr. Coker has not only the tobacco industry, but other farm products and the textile industry of our State and the Nation at heart. We are equally interested in cotton and textiles and will do everything possible to see that the Government places quotas on textiles coming into our country from cheap labor markets.

I hope every Member of Congress will take time to read Mr. Coker's letter, which follows:

COKER'S PEDIGREED SEED CO.,
Hartsville, S.C., June 30, 1970.

HON. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: It is our opinion that the textile import legislation known as the Mills Bill (HR 16920), which you have introduced in Congress, is of vital importance to the future of cotton production in the United States.

Our company has for many years been engaged in seed breeding and development of improved varieties of the principal southern field crops which include cotton, tobacco, soybeans, wheat and corn. The export market for all of these farm commodities is of great importance to the welfare of American agriculture.

The many issues involved in your proposed legislation have been widely discussed pro and con. The purpose of this letter, copy of which will be released to the news media in the agricultural areas of the South, is to respond to the argument advanced by some opponents of the measure that its passage would result in retaliation by foreign countries against a broad range of American agricultural export products.

Because of the importance of the agricultural export market, notably Japan, to American farm interests, the natural concern felt for any legislation which might have a damaging effect on any segment of the agricultural economy is understandable. However, this concern is not justified by the facts of international trade as it exists today.

Actually, textile imports have no direct relation to exports of our agricultural products. Our trade with Japan is the best example. Japan is the leading foreign market for American farm products. Last year, Japan purchased from the United States about \$1.1 billion worth of wheat, corn, feed, grain sorghum, tobacco, cattle, hides, lemons, alfalfa meal, soybeans, cotton, tallow and other farm products. At the same time, the United States purchased from Japan about \$4.9 billion worth of products, mainly manufactured goods. Japan's total purchases from the U.S. came to \$3.5 billion. This left a difference of about \$1.4 billion in favor of Japan or a deficit in that amount for the United States.

With such a favorable trade balance, growing larger every year as a result of a carefully sheltered home market and aggressive and often subsidized selling abroad, the Japanese are in no position to talk about "retaliation". Japan's gross national product is increasing 10 to 14 per cent annually, and

today it is the second largest in the free world. Japan's economy is moving rapidly toward heavy industrialization, and as a result, is dependent more and more on imports of agricultural products.

It is a well established fact that Japan buys needed raw materials wherever and whenever it can get the best price, most reliable source of supply and best trading terms. This is illustrated in recent years by rising textile imports from Japan and falling raw cotton exports. Since 1965, Japanese imports of U.S. agricultural products increased from \$901 million to about \$1 billion in 1969, an increase of 11 per cent. Over the same period, U.S. purchases from Japan rose from \$2.4 billion to \$4.9 billion, an increase of 104 per cent.

Japan sells virtually no cotton textiles in Mexico, yet, last year Japan imported more raw cotton from Mexico than it did the United States.

Tobacco is another case in point.

The United States is the major supplier of tobacco to Japan. In 1969, we sold \$49 million worth of tobacco to Japan for a 74 per cent share of its total tobacco purchases. But to argue that the imposition of reasonable restraints on U.S. textile imports from Japan will mean a reduction in her American tobacco purchases is contrary to simple economic facts. Japan buys tobacco and other raw materials from those countries from which she can obtain the best prices, quality, and trading terms. This she will continue to do. There is really no relationship between our Japanese textile imports and our exports of tobacco to her. In 1966, Japan sent us \$415 million worth of textiles. She bought from us \$46 million worth of tobacco. In 1969, her textile exports to the U.S. totaled \$540 million in value, while her tobacco imports from us reached \$49 million. While textile imports rose by \$125 million worth, tobacco exports rose by only \$3 million.

Under your legislation pending in Congress, there would be no reason for Japan to curtail its purchases of cotton, tobacco or any other farm commodities. The bill does not seek to cut off all textile imports. On the contrary, it encourages the President to negotiate reasonable agreements with exporting nations. Only if a country refused to enter into a voluntary agreement would the specific limitations outlined in the bill apply.

The United States textile industry is by far the biggest, best and most dependable market for American grown cotton, and its economic health and well-being are highly important to our national economy. The passage of this legislation should be supported by farm people and their leadership.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT R. COKER,
President.

ALBERT RAINS SPEECH CONTEST WINNERS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, each year since becoming a Member of Congress, it has been my privilege to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the three winning speeches in the annual Albert Rains Speech Contest held at Snead State Junior College in my congressional district. This contest, which is sponsored by former Congressman Rains, gives the students at Snead the opportunity to express their thoughts and feelings on vital topics. These speeches are always interesting and informative and show the intense concern today's stu-

dents have for the problems facing our Nation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD copies of the three winning speeches and offer my congratulations to the winners.

This year's winners are:

First place: Larry Buchanan, 1600 O'Brig Avenue, Guntersville, Ala. 35976.

Second place: Mrs. Cindy Godwin, Route 2, Horton, Ala. 35980.

Third place: Freddie Henley, Route 1, Guntersville, Ala. 35976.

SHOULD 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTE?

(By Larry Rogers Buchanan)

What are our youth? We are people who have interests in the successes of our city, our state and our nation. We are people who have something to offer this nation and its people.

We are not all rioters; but neither are we all good. The majority of our students are prepared to stand for this nation and its beliefs. We are ready to tell the world that this nation is great and that its goals are going to be successful because we are going to make them that way.

By the time we are eighteen years old, we have already come into contact with many of the problems that face this nation. We have already come into contact with the poor. We have met the sick. We have met the hungry. We have developed sympathy and compassion for the people who are affected by these conditions.

We want to make changes; but we don't necessarily want to make those changes that the radio, and television, and newspapers say that we wish to. We don't necessarily want to burn the colleges. As a matter of fact, the majority of the youth want to learn. We don't necessarily want to trample on the flag. As a matter of fact, most of us still appreciate what it stands for: the symbol of freedom, the symbol of rights for all men, and the great heritage that it represents: Washington's fighting, Henry's statement that still rings through the history of the United States.

We want to make changes, yes. We want to change the conditions that prevent man from having a happy life. We want to thwart disease. We want to improve education. We want to alleviate poverty.

Many of us will, in the next few years, be fighting for our flag and all of us will be fighting the problems that this nation must face.

We are interested in good government more so than any other age group. Just look at the polls that are taken in our high schools and colleges during the governor's race and the senate race and the presidential race. At these polls there is a better turn out than there is at the polling place on election day.

We are constantly bombarded with headlines in newspapers and on radios and on television that tell us of the ills of our nation. Constantly we hear about the problems that we face as a nation. We know these problems that we face, and we wish to be able to help solve them.

We are responsible. Most of us have learned responsibility by having had jobs which told us that responsibility is a good word.

We are more highly educated than the twenty one year old group was when the twenty one year old age limit was set. By eighteen, most of us have graduated from high school and most of us have started to attend a college or trade school or business school. This is a new thing compared to the time when the twenty one year old limit was set.

What makes the big difference in education is that we have better facilities and classes through which we are able to learn about world affairs. We have already had many years of history. We have studied

geography. We have studied in a limited amount the field of space and we have already learned about the stock market. We have the chance to learn to vote through having Student Council on a widespread basis.

Most people when thinking of this new age for voters think that if a person is old enough to go fight for his country, he is old enough to vote. Just giving a man a gun does not make him qualified to vote. The thing that does make him qualified is interest. We are interested in better education. We are interested in better government. We are interested in being able to help fight man's problems that prevent his having a good life.

We learn many things from our parents. From them we learn the problems of this nation. We want to be a part of the solutions to our problems and not a part of the problems. We do want to vote.

Eighteen year olds should be able to vote because we are qualified: we have been exposed to our problems, we want better government, and we want to vote. If we are allowed to vote now, we can be better prepared to be good leaders later because we will know how to be responsible in making decisions.

You cannot have freedom without responsibility. If you will give us the right to vote, we will do our best to exercise that right responsibly.

SHOULD 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTE?

(By Cindy Godwin)

For a nation that has historically concerned itself with enlarging the electorate, the United States has always treated one large group of citizens with curious neglect. Over the years, five major groups have been added to the voting ranks; the landless, Negroes, women, citizens in the District of Columbia and refugees from the poll tax. Yet America, a nation obsessed with youth, with half its population under 25, does not let a citizen vote until he is 21. An 18-year-old can be drafted, he can be held responsible before the law, and can even be given the death penalty in some states, but he cannot cast a ballot except in Kentucky and Georgia.

The idea of 18 year olds voting first reached Capitol Hill in 1942 and President Eisenhower lost a 1954 bid to lower the nation's voting age by a mere 5 votes. In 1968, President Johnson proposed the 26th Amendment to lower the voting age, which was also killed. President Nixon has again proposed the amendment but the chances are growing dim that it will pass.

Why should 18 years olds be given the privilege of voting? President Johnson expressed it this way. "The young people of America in this decade," he declared, "are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generation of the past." The weight of recent physiological and psychological evidence suggests the the U.S. 18 year old is not appreciably different from a 21 year old. The voting age of 21, after all, survives in the U.S. as the age of maturity more because of legal conveniences and medieval custom than through biological necessity. "Based on everything we know," says Dr. C. Keith Connors, director of the Child Development Laboratory at Mass. General Hospital, "an extra three years is not going to add to emotional stability or maturity."

Equally important, according to Dr. Edward Shoben, director of Academic Affairs for the American Council on Education, today's 18 year olds are well-informed. They stay in school longer, more of them get high school diplomas, and more of them go on to college than ever before. Furthermore, the media all keep the young informed about what is happening. In fact, Shoben believes, the

scores that young people make on achievement tests show that they know more about the world than their parents did at the same age. Mr. Shoben says, "One of the major problems for youth is that they are biologically men and women and they have the same information as men and women have, but they are excluded from making decisions and acting as adults."

The most frequently heard argument in favor of letting younger people vote is this: If a man is old enough to fight and die for his country in the armed forces, he is old enough to vote. Way over one-fourth of the American troops in Viet Nam are under 21. Why shouldn't these young men be allowed to vote for the man they will ultimately take orders from, the President.

If the right to vote is denied to the young people between the ages of 18 and 20, it is entirely possible that they will join the more militant minority of their fellow students and engage in destructive activities.

Another argument for lowering the voting age is that it would stimulate interest in public affairs. We young people have been accused of being too idealistic. But maybe that is just what our government needs, a little more idealism and optimism.

I am 20 years old now, but when I was 18 and a senior in high school, I felt the voting age should definitely be lowered. I still feel the same way, and I will continue to work to have it lowered so that maybe by the time I have children and they become 18, they will be able to have a voice in our nation. America is a wonderful country. God has truly shed his grace on us. We younger people would like to make it even greater, and I know we can if we are ever given the opportunity.

SHOULD 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTE?

(By Freddie Henley)

If you don't think 18-year-olds should vote, I suggest you visit any Army Medical Center in this country. Go and talk to the thousands of young men who are crippled and scarred for life as a result of their involvement in a war in southeastern Asia. Many of these young men don't vote.

In 1968 over 10 million young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 were denied the right to vote. They were refused the privilege of helping to select their future leaders.

At present, there are over 3 million people under 21 who are married. Many have children. They are unable to vote.

More than 6 million young people between ages 18 and 21 work and pay taxes. They are, therefore, taxed without representation. It was not too many years ago that taxes without representation was one of the battle cries for a revolution.

Eighteen year old men and women facing criminal charges are brought into adult, not juvenile, courts to be tried.

All of the points just mentioned are valid reasons for lowering the voting age to 18. There are, however, other reasons just as important.

Today's world is fast and action packed. The activities of this age are keyed on the young people. Almost everywhere you turn, advertising beckons the youth. Fashions, movies, television, music—all center on young people.

The youth of today are involved. They know more and are better informed on vital issues. It is a proven fact that more young people graduate from high school and college today than in any other age.

Earlier this week a newscast reported on a proposal made by the United States senator from the state of Washington. He suggested that during election times, college campuses should close for two weeks to allow students to participate in campaign work for their favorite candidate. The majority of college students who work in political campaigns cannot vote.

Throughout America, political leaders acknowledge the fact that 18 year olds are concerned and interested in the welfare of this country. In the words of former President Johnson:

"The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able, to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generation of the past."

President Nixon, former Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower all have acknowledged that 18 year olds should vote. Yet nothing has been done.

Other countries around the world allow 18 year olds to vote. Israel, Uruguay, and Brazil, all have a voting age of 18 without any obvious trouble or confusion.

I am sure that at one time or another you have heard the saying, "America's greatest resource is her young people." Well, if this statement is true, then America is wasting that valuable resource. The young people of this country are shackled and rendered virtually useless by a medieval law that passed from reason years ago. The voting age of 21 survives in the United States more because of custom and legal convenience than anything else.

By concerning and better educating themselves on issues that confront this country, the young people have earned and well deserve the right to vote at age 18.

REALITIES REQUIRE BARGAINING IN CHANGE OF COMMITMENT TO KOREA

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the information that Secretary Rogers is indicating an accelerated action on previously indicated intentions to withdraw at once troop strength in Korea disturbs us. The move if taken now would be ill timed in our opinion. Whereas it is correct now and actually overdue to discuss a new stance in the Pacific, it is a matter which takes careful planning and delicate and selective timing.

My own view of the matter is being conveyed to Secretary Laird with copies to Secretary Rogers and to President Nixon. The text of those views, Mr. Speaker, is included below:

Following World War II, the U.S. completely threw off its traditional tendency to remain aloof from the rest of the world. America has given generously of its human, financial and material resources in the reconstruction and improvement of many areas of the world. Nor has all this activity been without reward. Our sales and investment experience has contributed significantly to the growth of both production and wealth in our own nation.

We are now facing a serious re-evaluation of our overseas commitment program. Domestic economic and political conditions are placing severe restraints upon the Washington policy-makers. Although these domestic conditions are compelling, it is hoped that we will not allow our short term problems at home to seriously distort and damage our long term foreign policy and our international interests abroad.

Last week we marked the anniversary of our original involvement in Korea. It might be well to use this country and our commitments there as an illustrative case. There is presently some suggestion relative to reducing our troop strength in the immediate future. Let us examine the ramifications of any precipitous and ill-planned exercise to accomplish such an end.

South Korea was the first point of confrontation in Asia in the bipolarized world of East and West. Its economic and geographical conditions were most unfavorable but the indomitable will and the boundless energies of its people have countered much of this. Unquestionably, the remarkable progress of the Republic of Korea, particularly under President Park, make of it one of the most successful examples of the worth of American foreign assistance programs. May we hasten to point out, however, that knowledgeable and thoughtful study of existing conditions would warn against an overestimation of present stability in Korea.

There is ample evidence of improvement and a welcomed and genuine emergence of self-confidence and self-reliance. But the truth is all of this is still fragile, and needs some additional care before it can be counted to flourish on its own. When one calculates the great sacrifice and suffering of the Korean people and in partnership therewith the losses and expenses of the Americans and other allies; when one recounts the impressive efforts for economic improvement mustered by the Republic of Korea and the matching investments over the years by U.S. Aid and technical assistance; it is not a thing one would lightly place at risk.

The truth is that a sudden and present withdrawal of our two divisions from Korea would do just that, placing in jeopardy not only all that we have given and invested in the past but make highly questionable the future goal which now appears so close to realization, i.e., that point at which the Koreans would have reached a plateau of social, economic, and political stability.

There are two aspects of the situation which must be understood and appreciated: the factual situation and the psychological situation. Factually, the South Koreans have placed their emphasis and efforts on private and public economic expansion and internal improvement. Although they have sustained an outside burden of tax and manpower commitment to military security, the basic reliance has been upon the presence of American troops in the country and military aid. On the other hand, commencing with far more natural resources and already available industrial capacity, the North Koreans have placed their country into an all out war economy, with all their people, all their basic production and all their moral readiness aimed at an eventual invasion and take-over in South Korea. To achieve that end, they also rely on China and Russia for material, financial and technical aid.

When one knows and accepts these facts, then the psychological situation can be understood and appreciated. The South Koreans are all too painfully aware of the situation in the North. They realize how important the reliance factor remains relative to a visible U.S. umbrella. Should the sudden withdrawal of these troops occur, the result would not be hard to anticipate; rather, the confidence and determination of the Korean people to resist the aggressive North would collapse. Domestic investment and effort would fail. Foreign investment would be periled and a healthy history of improvement and reconstruction could be lost.

May we suggest an alternative with a more sensible scheduling and of more assurance for the future all of us would like to achieve.

First: Korea should be requested immediately to take greater responsibility for defending the Armistice line at the D.M.Z. The Korean government should assign one or two additional divisions to the Yim-Jin River area and allow the 2nd division of the U.S. Army to drop back from the D.M.Z. and be free from patrol assignment. This would increase the sense of responsibility on the part of the Koreans and save the U.S. further casualties from small scale contacts with the enemy.

Second: Immediate and thorough research should be undertaken to determine what is

required for Korea to defend itself without further U.S. assistance. Proper measures, such as establishment of some armament factories and a fuller modernization of military hardware, should precede the U.S. troop withdrawal.

Third: Since any sensible program of the complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam will take three to five years, it may be advisable to open negotiations with the Korean government to dispatch additional Korean troops to Vietnam if it would assist and accelerate U.S. withdrawal from that conflict.

Fourth: In the event the U.S. cannot maintain its operating bases in Japan in the future, negotiations could be opened with the Republic of Korea on the possibility of utilizing facilities in South Korea.

It is our belief that a scheduled program such as the above is preferable to both parties. It provides no invitations for Kim, Il Sung and his aggressive followers to exploit an imagined vacuum and its safeguards not only the Korean past and future, but it will assure our continued strong and genuine friendship between the U.S. and its most dependable, if small, ally, Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I further circulated my views to a number of my colleagues in the House and the following letters are examples of the reaction of others in this House conversant with the Korean troop withdrawal problem. I insert these letters at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1970.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RICHARD: Thank you for your statement concerning the U.S. commitment in Korea. Your recommendations provide a sound basis for a responsible withdrawal of American forces from Korea. Our goal should certainly be to encourage greater participation of the South Koreans in their own defense. By taking steps to ensure the safe but rapid transference of responsibility both countries will benefit.

A scheduled program such as you suggest will guarantee the territorial integrity of South Korea and relieve the burden on U.S. forces. South Korea has been a faithful ally and I am confident that it will welcome the opportunity to fend for itself.

I support your recommendations and trust that Secretary Laird will give them the consideration they deserve.

With all my best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1970.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have read your communication of June 29, 1970, and the attached statement you propose to make on Korea.

I am fully aware of the impressive record of South Korea, both in economic development and in maintaining an effective fighting force. If all recipients of United States assistance had made as good use of our help, the world would be better off.

I am not aware of any plan for the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea that might be characterized as sudden, and I believe that issues and alternatives should be fully explored before embarking on a specific course of action.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1970.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I have your Korean analysis contained in your letter of June 29.

You are certainly right—we should talk about our Korean posture before a rider is attached to a Senate Bill. It might mandate an abrupt withdrawal.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1970.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I have your note of June 29 and the enclosed statement.

To me it is not necessary to have a long involved explanation. I simply agree that now is not the time to pull forces out of Korea.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

PELLEY PRESSES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the Council on Environmental Quality, I am pleased the President has taken step No. 2.

The President today transmitted to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, calling for creation of an Environmental Protection Agency—EPA. The plan, which the President indicated was under study in his environment message of February 10, provides the institutional basis for a bold and comprehensive attack on the urgent problems of pollution.

The head of the new independent agency will report directly to the President. For the first time the President, the Congress, and the public will have a single organization responsible for managing our pollution control programs. Consolidation of the programs now scattered among several Federal agencies reflect the crucial importance which this Administration attaches to an effective program in this area.

EPA would run the Federal programs for control of air and water pollution and solid wastes, for control of the environmental effects of pesticides, and for setting standards for environmental radiation exposure. Its major components would include the Federal Water Quality Administration, now in the Department of the Interior, and the National Air Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Solid Wastes Management, both now in HEW. In addition it would take over the responsibility for registering pesticides, now in the Department of Agriculture, the setting of pesticide tolerances on foods, now done by the Food and Drug Administration, and the environmental radiation standard-setting functions of the Federal Radiation Council and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The new agency's total budget, on the basis of current levels of activity, would amount to more than \$1.3 billion, and it

would consist of approximately 6,000 personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the creation of EPA, by eliminating jurisdictional uncertainties, will enable new pollution problems to be more rapidly identified and controlled. Some of the new pollution problems such as chemicals and trace metals are not clearly air or water pollutants, and thus go unrecognized, at least temporarily. The new agency, since it will have central responsibility for all forms of pollution, will be able to recognize and deal with such problems much more quickly.

The monitoring, enforcement, research, and standard-setting activities of the pollution control programs will be greatly strengthened by the consolidation.

Monitoring will be able to take full advantage of such advanced technologies as observation by satellites, and duplication, such as separate monitoring of the air for radiation, pesticides, and other pollutants can be eliminated.

Enforcement strategies can be developed which will attack pollutants at the point where they can most efficiently be controlled.

Research and standard-setting will benefit from being able to simultaneously consider all forms which a pollutant takes and from taking into account interactions among different types of pollutants.

The crucial question in the establishment of standards is the total exposure to which humans, plants, or wildlife are subjected. Most chemicals and metals, such as pesticides or lead, appear in air, water, food, and soil. The new agency, by considering all these sources, will be able to base standards on total exposure and control the most important source or sources.

Mr. Speaker, the existence of a unified pollution control agency will greatly simplify relations with industries and with State and local governments. Industries which are often able to dispose of their wastes in liquid, gaseous, or solid form will no longer be subject to inconsistent or partial regulations by separate agencies.

The existing fragmentation of Federal programs has handicapped efforts of a number of States which are either considering or are undertaking the same type of consolidation which we are proposing at the Federal level. The consolidation or coordination of grant programs, technical assistance, and manpower training programs which will take place under the EPA proposal will simplify the task of State and local governments and will strengthen their pollution control efforts.

The current Federal organization for controlling pollution has developed piecemeal over many years. It is not adequate to sustain the massive, comprehensive effort to improve the quality of the environment which this administration is undertaking. This reorganization will assure that our Federal organization to handle pollution is equal to the scale of the problem. The agency which it would create will provide the necessary foundation for strengthening our current pollution control efforts and will be the springboard for new and more compre-

hensive approaches to environmental protection. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency is an important step forward in assuring the American people the quality environment which they are now demanding.

CAPTURED AMERICAN JOURNALISTS

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, three American journalists captured by the Communists in Cambodia were recently released after 40 days in captivity. Their colleagues and others expressed great surprise at the brevity of their imprisonment. Some 20 other news correspondents captured in that country, including at least four Americans, were held longer, indeed have not yet been released, nor has there been any word of them. Two more were murdered on the spot.

Upon closer examination, however, the swift release of these three is not at all surprising. At least two of them were so eager to write and voice pro-Communist propaganda that it served the Southeast Asian Communist cause far better to free them than to detain them. The two of whom I speak are Richard Dudman of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Michael Morrow of the Washington-based Dispatch News Service. Dudman and his newspaper have long opposed U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. Dispatch News Service is rather new to the scene, but thus far its chief purpose seems to be to discredit the American effort in Vietnam.

Heretofore, the official propaganda agencies of North Vietnam, Communist China, and North Korea were the most conspicuous consumers of the material in their subsequent dispatches. But because they won fame by their exploit, Dudman and Morrow gained a nationwide audience in the United States for their copyrighted series of stories published by feature syndicates. As many suspected, each and every news story they authored was nothing more than a channel of propaganda for the Southeast Asian Communists. Although we have not heard the statements they made for the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, presumably for later broadcast, they are probably more of the same. They told newsmen upon their release that the statements contained nothing which they did not believe to be true. No doubt, that is correct: they are fond of those whose hospitality they enjoyed for 40 days.

Their exploits are nothing new. A similar feat was performed by a French woman journalist, Michele Ray, in 1967. She publicly announced that she was going to drive the length of the country, from the southern tip of South Vietnam to its northern border. She later admitted that she deliberately invited capture so that she could write about her experiences. Miss Ray was at least frank about her views. She loathes everything America stands for and prefers Marxism-Leninism. Her stories published in Life sang paeans of praise for her Vietcong captors.

The recent reports of Dudman and Morrow have a suspiciously similar ring. Perhaps they, too, deliberately set out to become guests of the Communists. An authority on Southeast Asia assures me that to attempt to drive from Saigon to Phnom Penh unescorted as they did not only invited capture: it demanded it.

Dudman does not refer to his captors as "Communists," but as "revolutionaries" or "guerrillas" or "members of the National Liberation Front." Morrow writes:

Ho Chi Minh's birthday was the beginning of a new relationship with the group of five men who took care of us . . . it was just the beginning of an extremely fruitful period of personal exchange among eight people, five of them and three of us, that changed the nature of the relationship from captor-prisoner to friend-friend.

Dudman loads his dispatches with quoted references to the "American aggressors" and descriptions of the heroic, gentle, wonderful enemy our soldiers are fighting in Southeast Asia. He conveniently forgets the numerous massacres perpetrated by the Communists in Hue, in Montagnard villages, against schoolchildren and helpless villagers. Both men report that they made no attempt to escape from their captors. Indeed, when American helicopters swooped by on what may well have been a search mission for them, they hid to avoid being "seized by the Americans." Is that not strange—Americans concerned about "seizure" by Americans.

Let us listen again to Mr. Morrow:

We moved out onto the road on which we had traveled the preceding morning. We had not gone far when headlights appeared behind us about a mile back. Not knowing if the vehicle was friend or foe, we turned off on a side road . . .

The "foe" of whom he speaks was American and South Vietnamese forces operating in the area. Dudman stops short of referring to the allied forces as enemies, but he records an interesting reaction to the allied operation:

We felt we were watching the terrorization of the peasants of Cambodia.

Presumably, he believes that communism will be their salvation.

Reading these so-called news reports, one cannot help but recall the fate of two American television network newsmen who were brutally shot to death when they were captured by the Communists in Cambodia the week before. The same fate was suffered by four other newsmen when Communist forces fought their way into Saigon during the bloody Tet offensive of 1968. Nor can one forget those newsmen currently held by the Communists, of whom we have received not a single word.

Contrast with the reports of Morrow and Dudman the experiences of another newsmen, Grant Wolfkill of NBC, captured by the Communists in Laos in 1961 and held prisoner by the Pathet Lao and the North Vietnamese for 15 months. Mr. Wolfkill, despite starvation, torture, and physical and mental debasement, remained defiant until his release. He made no statements and wrote no articles. Upon his release, he published a terrifying account of his ordeal in a book titled "Reported To Be Alive." It is an excellent

antidote to the trash written by Dudman and Morrow.

These two "propaganda puppets" have discredited themselves as honest and objective newsmen by becoming—possibly duped, but certainly willing—tools of Communist propaganda. Their slanted reports mask the voice of Hanoi behind a facade of respectability. They should be unmasked for what they are and given no more than the attention they deserve: the contempt of honest journalists and perceptive readers everywhere.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRESS IN PROVIDING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, equal opportunities for all Americans is a matter with which our Nation has concerned itself for some time. And, although the present administration has not yet been in office 2 years, it has made remarkable progress in this area.

At the recent annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the chairman of the board, Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, not only neglected to acknowledge this progress, but also portrayed the Nixon administration as not acting in the best interests of the black people.

In order that this situation may be placed in its proper perspective, I include the text of the telegram from Leonard Garment, special consultant to the President, to Bishop Spottswood in the RECORD:

TEXT OF WHITE HOUSE TELEGRAM REPLYING TO NAACP HEAD'S CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION AS ANTI-NEGRO

The Comments you made in your speech at the N.A.A.C.P. convention are an unfair and disheartening attack on an Administration which:

Inaugurated the Philadelphia Plan, which for the first time is opening up the high-paying construction trades to blacks on a major scale;

Proposed \$1.5-billion to aid the process of desegregation, and to help fund experimental projects to promote interracial experiences among children where racial isolation persists;

Proposed the landmark family assistance plan, for the first time providing a floor under the incomes of every family in America, wherever it lives;

Greatly improved existing family food assistance programs and proposed legislation granting free food stamps to very low income families;

Proposed a revolutionary family health insurance program for all poor families which would provide a comprehensive package of health services, including both hospital and outpatient care;

Proposed changes to present subsidized housing programs that would allow rent to vary with income so that families would not be forced to move at some arbitrary income limit;

Named more blacks to policy-making posts than any previous Administration.

In addition, your comments misstate and misrepresent the record of the Administration so as to present it in a highly distorting light. For example:

The Administration's efforts in the area

of equal employment opportunity are dismissed with a reference to the early defense contracts with textile companies. No reference is made to subsequent action on those contracts or to the stringent conditions imposed in more recent defense contracts in the aircraft and shipbuilding industries or to the effects of the Philadelphia Plan in the construction industry.

The Administration is accused of pulling back on school desegregation even though the number of black public school students in desegregated school systems in the 11 Southern states will have increased from 164,000 at the end of the 1968-1969 school year to well over one million at the start of the 1970-71 school year.

The Administration is charged with weakening the Voting Rights Act "in the House"; the bill as enacted and signed by the President, despite widespread doubt about the constitutionality of the 18-year-old vote, is stronger in its present version since it incorporates the existing Voting Rights Act and suspends literacy tests nationwide. In this connection, and only a week ago, Roy Wilkins, Clarence Mitchell and Senator Brooke "hailed" the President for signing the bill and praised his "statesmanship" for doing so.

While the speech accuses the Administration of opposing cease-and-desist powers for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, it does not point out that the Administration has proposed legislation that would enable the E.E.O.C. to bring court actions immediately against employment discrimination, thus preventing the long delay that would be required to establish the machinery necessary to implement cease-and-desist legislation and also avoiding the case backlog problems already faced by agencies such as the N.L.R.B.

It is grossly unfair to take the phrase "benign neglect" out of context, to persist in the false characterization of the Moynihan memorandum, and to misuse the phrase as a label to characterize Administration policies, when every single constructive Administration measure in this area is ignored in the rest of the speech.

Major efforts to open housing opportunities in suburban areas to expand minority ownership, to find new ways to attack entrenched poverty problems, as well as small-scale experimental projects such as funding youth organizations united in collaboration with the National Urban League (a risk this Administration was willing to take where the previous one would not) are all ignored.

It is one thing to criticize, to give voice to deeply-felt concerns and to articulate real disappointments. Everyone benefits from such a debate. It is an entirely different thing to search out ways to portray the actions of this Administration in the worst possible light, to rally every fear, and reinforce every anxiety. Such a message, painting a false picture of what the Administration has done, is doing, and hopes to do, sows distrust and makes our commonly-agreed-on goals more difficult to achieve.

I note that even now, as speakers at your convention are attacking every aspect of the Administration's record in this area, and doing so without a balancing word, members of the Administration are working with many of your colleagues on important projects of mutual concern.

The President and the Administration are committed to achieving equal opportunity for every American, and are determined to maintain their efforts to reach that goal.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT TAFT, JR., SUPPORTING A BILL ON FOREIGN POLICY

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

ute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill in the House of Representatives defining the authority of the President to deploy and commit to combat Armed Forces abroad without the express consent of Congress. In addition, the bill includes a general statement of principle defining the U.S. foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia as the withdrawal of all U.S. combat forces but continued material and economic support of those free nations trying to resist aggression. The bill also repeals the Gulf of Tonkin resolution passed by the House and the Senate in 1964. I am asking the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, to hold immediate hearings on the bill.

The often-confusing debate which we recently witnessed in the U.S. Senate has served to make clear the need to define the respective roles of the President and the Congress in foreign policy. The proper and responsible role of the Congress in foreign policy is to work with the President in the formulation of general principles and policy directions. It is the role of the President to implement and execute these principles and policy. It would be a tragic error for the Congress to hamstring the President, depriving him of the flexibility of action and response needed to safeguard this country in an age where decisions must often be made immediately or on short notice.

I am personally committed to the idea that Congress must be consulted before the United States commits itself to any costly and dangerous foreign adventures. My father before me argued for this general principle at the time of the Korean conflict. I am disappointed by and in disagreement with the reasoning of those who wish to limit the President's power in foreign affairs and who seem to be trying to take political advantage of the sincere attempts of the Nixon administration to extricate this country from an extremely complex situation into which the previous administration involved us so deeply.

I am also distressed that some Members of the Senate of the press and of the public seem to have forgotten that the House of Representatives also has a role in foreign policy and the constitutional exercise of the warmaking power. Indeed the House of Representatives is the body most broadly representative of the people of this country. This should make its views of even greater importance.

Consequently, I believe Congress should make a clear statement of the foreign policy objectives of the United States in Asia along with a statement regarding the use of force to support this policy.

Part I of my bill defines the conditions under which the President should have the right to deploy Armed Forces without prior congressional authorization. I think that in this age of advanced technology and nuclear threat, we must permit the President, as Commander in Chief, to deploy Armed Forces whenever the United States or its forces are under attack or imminent threat of attack.

There have, of course, been criticisms of the self-defense doctrine in the past and even allegations that the doctrine has been used to justify offensive actions. While I do not feel these criticisms are completely justified, we certainly would want to analyze these charges in the course of our hearings.

The second type of situation in which the President should be allowed to use the Armed Forces without congressional action is where required to do so in the fulfillment of treaty obligations already approved by the Senate. This is closely related to the question of our national commitments, and I endorse the call for careful reevaluation of our present commitments and their extent. Our membership in the United Nations, for instance, is a treaty obligation and I believe that under some circumstances the President might be required, by virtue of our membership, to take action. The issue of the United Nations is one which the Congress should consider.

The third general situation in which the President need not consult with the Congress is in the implementation of a previous declaration of war. The Senate has exhibited some confusion over just what constitutes a declaration of war. Many have argued that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was the functional equivalent of a declaration of war. Speaking for myself, I have never agreed with this view, but I have its repeal in the context of an affirmative statement by Congress on the deployment of our Armed Forces.

Finally, we may wish to state our belief that the President has the authority under international law or article 51 of the U.N. Charter, to use the Armed Forces in connection with the inherent right of self-defense. Again, the exact ramifications of this right are not clear. I have included this provision to stimulate debate as to where we should act to protect civilians or national interests whether on land, in the air, on the seas, or in space.

Part II of my bill calls for a general statement of policy in Southeast Asia. It adopts the Nixon or Guam doctrine which states that the primary duty of defense must rest upon the nations of that region. This principle is a marked shift from and improvement over the open-ended commitments developed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. The bill provides for the furnishing of economic and military aid to those nations trying to repel aggression. The bill also clearly puts the Congress on record as favoring the orderly and irreversible withdrawal of our Armed Forces as the South Vietnamese assume the primary responsibility for the defense of their own country. This approach is preferable to the adoption of a fixed timetable. The setting of an arbitrary limit upon our presence in South Vietnam will only cause confusion, negate negotiation possibilities, and lead to a lengthening of hostilities. During the period of 1961 to 1968, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson increased the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam. In his first 18 months in office, President Nixon has reduced our commitment by one quarter and has announced further reductions for the next

year. I am convinced that the reductions announced will be made on schedule or earlier.

The final part of my bill repeals of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. As I stated earlier, I feel its repeal should be accompanied by an affirmative statement of our policy in Southeast Asia, a statement embodied in the first two parts of my bill.

Mr. TAFT introduced the following:

H.J. RES. 1302

A joint resolution to define the principles which shall govern the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States by the President, to express United States foreign policy objectives of the United States in Southeast Asia, and to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution

Whereas wide discussion and differences of opinion have arisen among the members of the body politic with respect to the power of the President as Commander in Chief to deploy the Armed Forces of the United States beyond its territorial limits and to commit such Armed Forces to combat, and

Whereas the Congress has through acquiescence and overt action sanctioned on numerous occasions the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States beyond its territorial limits and commitment of such Armed Forces to combat without prior express authorization or a declaration of war by the Congress, and

Whereas in order to eliminate the confusion caused by the previous acquiescence and overt actions by Congress, there is a need for a clear statement of policy by the Congress as to the foreign policy of the United States in Southeast Asia, the deployment of Armed Forces by the President generally, and specifically their deployment in fulfillment of such foreign policy; therefore,

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

PART I

The deployment and commitment to combat of the Armed Forces of the United States in, within the territorial waters of, or over the territory or territorial waters of any nation is authorized and shall be undertaken only with specific prior authorization of Congress by law; except that the President, as Commander in Chief, is authorized to deploy and commit to combat such Armed Forces at his sole discretion:

(1) When he finds that the territory or the Armed Forces of the United States are under attack or imminent threat of attack; or

(2) When he finds that such deployment is necessary to fulfill a treaty obligation of the United States not qualified by constitutional or treaty contained limitations of conditions; or

(3) When he finds that such deployment is necessary to effectuate a declaration of war acted on by the Congress; or

(4) When he finds that such deployment is necessary to exercise the inherent right of self-defense of the nation or its nationals pursuant to established principles of international law or article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The President shall notify the Congress within 24 hours after any such finding of all action he has taken at his sole discretion pursuant to any such finding. In the event the Congress is not in session, then President shall convene the Congress in an extraordinary session and so notify the Congress within 48 hours after such finding. This authorization shall terminate upon the passage of a concurrent resolution to that effect by both Houses of Congress.

PART II

The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that each of the several free Southeast and South Asian nations should have the primary responsibility for the defense of its own territorial integrity; provided, however, that it is the policy of the United States where requested and where needed to furnish economic and military material assistance to such nations whose territorial integrity is threatened by armed aggression. The Congress specifically authorizes the continued deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States in the territorial limits of the Republic of South Viet Nam for such time and in such manner as the President, as Commander in Chief, shall deem necessary and appropriate to accomplish a responsible and irreversible withdrawal of such Armed Forces of the United States and the assumption by the Armed Forces of the Republic of South Viet Nam at the earliest feasible date of the responsibility for the defense of the territorial integrity of the Republic of South Viet Nam; provided further, that the Armed Forces of the United States should not be deployed or committed to combat in Indo-China in territory other than that of the Republic of South Viet Nam, except as provided in PART I hereof. This declaration of policy and authorization shall terminate upon the passage of a concurrent resolution to that effect by both Houses of Congress.

PART III

The Congress hereby repeals the authority embodied in Public Law 88-408, 78 Stat. 384, known as the "Gulf of Tonkin" resolution, in accordance with its terms.

TIGER CAGES AT CON SON

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with the return of the Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia has come valuable first hand information on our military operations there and the progress of the war.

Regrettably, with the return of the committee comes news that seriously undermines assertions by the Saigon government that it genuinely represents the people of South Vietnam and is dedicated to their interests and common well-being.

Thanks to the tenacity of the member of the Select Committee from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) and the member from California (Mr. HAWKINS) a scandalous situation was exposed at Con Son prison where hundreds of political prisoners are being kept like animals under the most inhumane conditions.

These persons are kept in so-called "tiger cages." I am certain many of you have read of these in the Washington newspapers over the past 24 hours. These "tiger cages" hold five prisoners in an area about 10-feet long and 5-feet wide. The prisoners are shackled to an iron bar in such a way that movement is greatly restricted resulting in the loss of use of the prisoners' legs.

In this condition the prisoners are tortured, denied proper food, sanitation facilities, sleeping accommodations, health care, or even the smallest measure of humane consideration.

Prior to their arrival at Con Son prison

the two members of the committee were assured that, contrary to previous reports, the prison was "a correctional institution worthy of higher ratings than some prisons in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, this assertion along with others as to the fitness of the Con Son prison was made by Frank E. Walton, Director, Public Safety Directorate, Civic Operations and Rural Development Systems, Agency for International Development. Mr. Walton is described as the chief American public safety adviser in Vietnam.

Mr. Walton's assertion was made in a "fact sheet" which was given to the members of the committee who visited Con Son and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a copy of that "fact sheet" in the RECORD at this point:

FACT SHEET ON CON SON NATIONAL CORRECTION CENTER PURPOSE

To provide background information relating to the Con Son Correction Center and to discuss problems and accomplishments associated therewith.

FACTS

1. The Con Son Island National Correction Center, located in the South China Sea approximately 140 miles southeast of Saigon, is Vietnam's largest Correctional institution. Established by the French in 1862 as a penal colony, it has long held a reputation of being a "Devil's Island." This reputation still prevails, in spite of an enlightened and modern administration of the facility.

2. Currently, this facility is utilized for the detention of hard-core Communist criminals and common criminals who have been convicted of serious offenses.

3. The Con Son Correctional colony had an inmate population of 9,916 on June 1970. There are seven correctional camps within the colony with a total capacity of 9,750 inmates. Two thousand of the currently assigned inmates are classified as trustees and live outside the camps in semi-private minimum custody homes. The trustees are permitted to raise their own food and maintain a daily routine of their own choosing, but under the eyes of supervisors.

4. Con Son has one Public Health Doctor. With the assistance of inmate technicians each prisoner receives annual inoculation for plague, cholera and smallpox. Schick tests are given to detect tuberculosis. Dental care is irregular from visiting VN Navy ships and U.S. DENTCAP Teams.

5. The inmates are kept busy with a work projects and vocational tasks such as wood-cutting, tile making, woodworking, animal husbandry, chicken and duck production and sewing. Inmates also attend classes in literacy training, and all grades of formal education. Rice, papayas, coconuts and vegetables grown on the prison farm and fish caught by the prisoners supplement the diet.

6. All trustees and 75% of the inmates housed in the camps are allowed supervised swimming, mail, canteen service and Correction Industry Shop and Vocational Training classes. The GVN allow selected inmates to have visitors on the monthly supply ship.

7. A pre-release community of 30 homes has been built on the beach to house 300 inmates. These inmates are assigned to the community 120 days prior to release.

8. The International Committee of the Red Cross periodically inspects the prison. Their reports have generally reflected praise for the conditions observed.

9. In the opinion of Correction Advisors with lengthy U.S. penology experience, Con Son is not a "Devil's Island," but on the contrary is a correctional institution worthy

of higher ratings that some prisons in the United States.

Based on the evidence discovered by the members of the select committee it is obvious that the author of this fact sheet, Mr. Walton, either was not aware of the true facts existing at Con Son and is, thus, incompetent or he was deliberately attempting to mislead the members of the committee.

In either case he should be relieved of his post immediately and summarily dismissed from the service of the Federal Government.

If Mr. Walton was deliberate in an attempt to mislead by virtue of orders from his superiors then those involved in this conspiracy should be called upon to explain their actions and be held accountable.

It is my further understanding that the U.S. Government during the last fiscal year contributed some \$442,000 to the Vietnamese penal system. Not one penny further should be spent until the conditions at Con Son have been cleaned up, demonstrated to be humane, and an absolute guarantee given they will not occur again there or at any other place in South Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the evidence turned up at Con Son in regard to these "political" prisoners lends great weight to the charges that the Thieu government does not truly represent the people of South Vietnam if it must resort to this sort of inhumane suppression of political opposition. From the evidence gathered many at Con Son are not hardened revolutionaries or even Vietcong. They simply expressed disagreement with the Thieu government and for that were subjected to imprisonment without charge or trial for up to 25 months.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the story of Con Son might well be viewed as a capsule commentary on what is the real cause of the prolonged American involvement in Vietnam in terms of the viability and political validity of the current regime in Saigon.

HEW, INTERIOR SHOULD ACT IMMEDIATELY TO HALT ALL DUMPING OF MERCURY IN WATERS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks there have been numerous reports in the area of water pollution resulting from the dumping of mercury and the effects that this highly toxic substance can have on individuals who eat fish which have taken in this substance.

Briefly speaking, mercury can paralyze, debilitate, afflict the unborn of expectant mothers and even kill. It is only a matter of how much mercury the individual takes in.

The problem is that we know that mercury is being dumped into rivers, streams and lakes but we are not effectively controlling it. I personally feel that there should be no such dumping and I am today calling upon the Secretaries of Interior and Health, Education, and Wel-

fare to immediately step in and halt the dumping of mercury.

Contact with certain States has resulted in local bans on fishing and in the case of Alabama, there has been put into force a ban on all commercial fishing. The point is, however, that we want to halt the dumping of the culprit substance, mercury, not fishing.

The problem of mercury is not something new. The Federal Water Quality Administration and the Food and Drug Administration have both been working on this. FDA established standards this year after realizing that there was a problem, and is now conducting a national survey.

There is a graphic example of what mercury poisoning can do in Japan where almost 90 persons have been stricken. It was discovered that mercury was being dumped into the bay, but the bay was not being flushed out to sea, so the fish in the bay were taking in the mercury. These fish, however, were not being harmed, but the natives who ate them were.

There was some notice in the United States when in March they found traces of mercury in Lake St. Clair and then later in Lake Erie. Now we have evidence that the Tennessee Valley area has been tested and traces of mercury have also been found there.

This is a national problem, not just one where headlines have appeared.

The Department of the Interior could act right now on interstate waterways under present law that says waterways shall be free of all toxic substances. Mercury is certainly toxic.

The entire situation should immediately be given high priority. All Governors should be contacted and advised of the danger of mercury. And if the States do not act, then the Secretaries of the Interior and HEW should act to protect the health of the public by banning the dumping of mercury.

I am pleased that some States have already taken such steps and that FWQA and FDA are trying to give this problem some exposure. But I feel more should be done.

Mercury does not dissipate very quickly at all, so the problem is a lasting one. As a matter of fact, pesticides are ranked as to their persistence and compared to a pesticide which is persistent, mercury is almost permanent.

Then too, mercury is lost in the air as well as through water disposal. This means that it goes up a stack and may be rained down miles away into a water source and cause problems there also.

I sincerely hope that the Secretaries of Interior and HEW will act promptly in halting all dumping of mercury, and I hope that FDA's standards of 0.5 parts per million will be restudied. I think that except for background, there should be no mercury contributed to the environment.

PANAMA CANAL: U.S. CONTROL MUST BE RETAINED

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal has been a perennial subject before the Congress since the advent in 1945 of the atomic bomb which, by supplying the technological means, revived the old idea of the sea-level canal. I have had a deep and personal interest in the canal since shortly after World War I when my father brought home an illustrated book on the construction thereof.

Little in the improvement of the canal has occurred since that time except enactment of the Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950. A series of expensive, but inconclusive, canal studies, and the enlargement of Gaillard Cut from 300 to 500 feet minimum width which is now nearing completion. With the exception of the last and the construction of the Madden Dam project, the Panama Canal remains what it was in 1914—a monument to conquering "yellow jack," American know-how and its farsighted designers and builders. Because of increased traffic, it is approaching the point when it will no longer be able to handle all ships effectively and, thus, it is time that we commence projects to improve operations and increase the capacity of the canal.

Unfortunately, events have combined to delay and confuse the real issues involved in the interoceanic canal problem. These developments are harmful to the United States, Panama, the users of the canal, and the security of the entire Western Hemisphere because they have weakened the juridical structure of the Panama Canal.

Bluntly stated the two principal canal issues are:

First, safeguarding our indispensable sovereignty and ownership of the canal zone territory and Panama Canal; and the second, major modernization of the existing high-level-lode and lock-type canal.

An admirable summary of the interoceanic canal problem by Dr. Donald M. Dozer, distinguished professor of history, University of California, Santa Barbara, a leading authority on Latin American policy, and author, was recently published in Human Events, the well-known weekly in Washington.

As the indicated article is most timely in connection with measures affecting the Panama Canal now before the Congress, I quote it as part of my remarks and urge that it be read by all Members of the Congress.

Dr. Dozer's article follows:

PANAMA CANAL CONTROL

Certain bits and pieces of news, released in tantalizing brevity, are raising questions ominous for the future control of the United States over the Panama Canal, one of the few remaining world channels of maritime commerce which operates unobstructed by enemy action.

Last September the military government of Panama, on a hint from the State Department, appointed a high-level three-man team to resume negotiations with the United States on the three unsigned canal treaties of the Johnson Administration.

These draft treaties recognized Panama's sovereignty over the "canal area," admitted Panama to joint administration and defense responsibilities with the United States in the canal, increased the annual payments to

Panama, raised the tolls on ships and cargoes transiting the canal, and provided for the construction of a new sea-level canal which would render the present lake and lock canal unnecessary.

Earlier this year the assistant secretary of state for Inter-American Affairs, Charles Meyer was quoted as saying that the treaties negotiated in 1967 by the Johnson Administration will serve as a "basis for the continuation of a process to seek permanent solutions to United States-Panama relations in reference to the canal."

Despite subsequent official denials, this statement appears to be corroborated by a White House announcement on May 16 of the designation of a 33-year-old White House aide and former Wall Street investment manager, Daniel W. Hofgren, as ambassador, to take over negotiations with Panama for a new Atlantic-Pacific Canal under the continuing direction of Ambassador Robert B. Anderson, who negotiated the treaties of 1967 in accordance with guidelines supplied by President Johnson. Ambassador Anderson continues to serve as chairman of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission which is scheduled to report the results of its five-year investigation of sea-level canal routes across the Central American isthmus by December 1 of this year.

Is the present Administration in Washington, like its predecessors, the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, preparing to abandon the Central American canal interests of the United States?

President Nixon's silence on the crucial Panama issue, as well as on the Castro problem in Cuba, in his 40,000-word round-up of "United States Foreign Policy for the 1970's" on February 18 suggests either an apathy on this question in White House councils or secret preparations yet to be unveiled for surrender of the Panama Canal.

Perhaps it was no coincidence that soon after the President's address the State Department informed Nicaragua that it is ready to terminate the Bryan-Chamorro treaty with that country which was concluded in 1914 and which gave the United States the right "in perpetuity" to construct a canal through Nicaragua. The treaty had lost its significance, it was explained, because the Anderson Commission had ruled out the Nicaraguan route from consideration as a possible sea-level canal.

In addition, as recently as May 7 a special subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, consisting of two Republicans and one Democrat, recommended the abandonment of our joint military command headquarters in the Panama Canal Zone. This recommendation was announced at the very time when a Soviet naval squadron was prowling through the Caribbean on an unknown mission in the sea lanes approaching the canal.

During discussion between President Kennedy and President Roberto Chiari of Panama in the White House in 1962, Kennedy assured the latter that the United States no longer claimed sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Zone.

After the bloody fray between a Panama mob and Canal Zone troops in 1964, President Johnson promulgated a joint statement with the then president of Panama, Marco Robles, in which he similarly renounced United States sovereignty over the canal and the Canal Zone and authorized negotiations with Panama which resulted in the treaties summarized above.

Those treaties failed of consummation only because of strong opposition in Congress and in the press to any surrender of our treaty position and historic rights in the canal. Congressional opponents pointed out that the Constitution gives Congress alone, not the President, authority to dispose of territory

belonging to the United States (Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2).

As a result of the outcry against the treaties, the Johnson Administration pigeonholed them. Does the Nixon Administration consider the time now propitious for resurrecting those treaties of betrayal?

Ever since the Panama Canal issue became freshly acute in 1960 with the flying of the Panamanian flag in Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone on direct orders of President Eisenhower, the issue has been befuddled, probably deliberately, by advocates of a sea-level canal. Their obsession with this visionary and costly scheme has prevented a clarification of the issue and has woefully aggravated relations between the United States and Panama.

The dream of a sea-level strait bisecting the isthmus has been uncritically accepted by certain politicians, and it holds out the promise of lucrative profits for interested earth-moving companies. An attempt has been made to find substantial support for it in the specious arguments that the present Panama Canal is obsolete, that a new sea-level canal would not be subject to sabotage or damage by nuclear warheads, and that such a canal if substituted for the present canal could be operated more efficiently and at less cost. All these arguments have been many times unanswerably refuted.

The sea-level canal scheme contains basic fallacies which throw doubts upon the utility of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission when it was first appointed in 1965.

The difference in tidal range at the two sides of the isthmus, measuring some 22 inches on the Caribbean side and 22 feet on the Pacific side, creates serious navigational hazards inseparable from a tidal strait.

The deep excavations required to dig a sea-level strait through the high cordillera and the unstable terrain in Panama present insuperable engineering problems.

Recent studies suggest that the lowering of the canal channel to sea level will increase the fog problem.

A perhaps decisive blow to a sea-level canal has been struck by the Committee on Ecological Research for the Interoceanic Canal, consisting of a group of distinguished scientists named by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the Anderson Commission and headed by Prof. Ernst Mayr of Harvard University.

In their preliminary report in April they warned that a sea-level canal which would allow free exchange of marine life between the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea would seriously disturb the ecological balance in both bodies of water. They therefore called for the preservation of the fresh-water barrier which exists in the present lock canal.

In the light of these facts it appears that the Anderson Commission has been perpetrating a gigantic boondoggle for five years. Acting under instructions from President Johnson to consider the feasibility of a sea-level canal, it resolutely undertook to find justifications for abandoning the present canal and constructing a new one at sea level.

In the attempt to justify this preconceived fixation, the commission ignorantly conducted surveys through jungle growth so dense that the jungle closed in after them, and for this and other reasons the commission was obliged to ask for a deferment of the deadline for submission of their report to December 1 of this year and for an increase of \$1.5 million in their appropriation to make the total cost of their investigation to United States taxpayers about \$24 million.

A new canal built within the 10-mile limits of the present Canal Zone could obviously not be dug with nuclear power because of the proximity of this site to densely populated areas which would be decimated by nuclear fallout.

For this and other reasons the proposal to construct a sea-level canal with nuclear power has failed to receive the endorsement of the Atomic Energy Commission as practical, and one alleged advantage after another that has been cited by the advocates of a sea-level canal—the economic, the political, the military and others—all have been discredited.

So far as defense is concerned, if the existing lock canal is abandoned its elaborate military defense installations constructed at a cost of approximately \$3 billion, would have to be reconstructed, undoubtedly at greater cost, along the course of any new canal.

The impossibility of digging a sea-level canal within the limits of the existing Canal Zone has been given as a pretext for the negotiation of the treaties of 1967 and has presumably prompted the initiation of the new secret negotiations of the Nixon Administration. In these negotiations the United States exposes itself to blackmail by Panamanian authorities who demand exorbitant concessions for canal rights in other parts of the republic. The financial cost of such a canal, whether constructed with conventional earth-moving machinery or with nuclear explosives, would be almost astronomical.

In view of the unstable political situation in Panama, where a puppet president has been installed in office by Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, who himself came to power by a military coup, the political advantage to the United States of coming to terms with such a regime for the digging of a new canal is at most dubious.

These weaknesses in the United States position in relation to Panama will become especially troublesome if, as rumor has it, the commission is about to recommend the construction of a sea-level canal running partly through the present Canal Zone and partly outside the zone in the Republic of Panama approximately five miles west of the Canal Zone.

This recommendation, if endorsed by the Nixon Administration and accepted by Congress, will necessitate complicated negotiations with Panama for new canal rights beyond the limits of the present zone and will undoubtedly provoke large financial demands from Panama, representing the sum total of all its past grievances against the United States.

Besides, this new canal route, planned to empty into the Pacific near the town of La Chorrera, will require the construction of an artificial terminal harbor replacing the present Port of Balboa and will probably require drastic modifications in the defense installations in the present Canal Zone.

Why scrap the present canal? In 1959 Congress authorized the widening and deepening of the summit channel of the Panama Canal, particularly in the Gaillard Cut. This work will soon be completed at a total cost of over \$81 million.

New equipment has been added to facilitate transit of ships through the locks, and lighting fixtures have been installed for the entire length of the channel in order to make night transits possible. All that remains to adapt the canal to modern traffic requirements is to carry forward the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan which was begun in 1939 and was suspended three years later because of wartime needs of higher priority.

In pursuance of that plan while it was in operation new lock sites and channels for a third lock system, supplementing the existing dual locks, were dug at a cost of \$76,357,405, and they can be utilized today for the construction of a third channel with locks paralleling the existing Gatun locks at the Caribbean end of the canal and the Pedro Miguel and Miraflores locks at the Pacific end.

In the interest of efficient navigation the

plan calls for the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks and the consolidation of the Pacific locks into a single lock complex at Miraflores.

Of paramount importance is the fact that this Terminal Lake-Third Locks modernization, on which a total of more than \$157 million has been expended, will not require new treaties with Panama but can be carried out entirely under existing treaties, namely, the Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty of 1903, the Thomson-Urrutia treaty of 1914-1922, the Hull-Alfaro treaty of 1936-1939, and the Eisenhower-Remón treaty of 1955.

This eminently practical plan has been endorsed by engineering experts and has been embodied in bills introduced by Congressmen Daniel Flood (D.-Pa.) and John Rarick (D.-La.) in the House (HR 3792 and HR 4031) and by Sen. Strom Thurmond (R.-S.C.) in the Senate (S 2228). The approval of this plan now by Congress would make it possible for the Nixon Administration to terminate its special diplomatic mission to Panama and to discharge *sine die* the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission.

The suspicion can hardly be avoided that the sea-level canal scheme which would supplant the present highly efficient Panama Canal has been deliberately used to conceal an obvious and commonsense solution to our problem of transporting ocean traffic across the Isthmus of Central America.

Gov. Walter P. Leber of the Canal Zone estimates that with the benefit of improvements already made or projected, the canal can serve the needs of world commerce "through the end of this century."

With the additional improvement of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks project, which is embodied in the pending House and Senate bills and which calls for an appropriation of only \$850 million as contrasted with a price tag for a sea-level canal initially estimated in 1960 at \$2.368 billion, not including the cost of new treaties with Panama, the existing canal will serve all necessary trans-Isthmian traffic requirements until well into the 21st Century.

This project, it is true, as embodied in the pending bills, will not provide transisthmian transit for all vessels traveling the ocean lanes, but, as Gov. Leber has explained, the international mandate which the United States assumed and exercised in building the canal does not require the United States to provide this service to all the world's shipping.

The large tankers now plying the oceans are designed specifically to avoid the tolls of canal transit. If the United States could dig a canal deep enough and wide enough to accommodate such a vessel, Gov. Leber has asked, "Could we charge him more than the regular tolls for our added costs? Oh, no. We would have to charge him less, because even at present toll rates, he'd have to pay about \$150,000 in tolls and it would be much cheaper for him just to take the time to sail an alternate route. . . . When we talk about responding to the needs of our traffic, we have to gauge by economic analysis whether an improvement is needed or just nice to do." (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, April 22, 1970, p. 7).

The present canal, when provided with wider locks and when modernized in accordance with the bills pending in Congress, will adequately serve our national defense needs. Those needs, based as they are upon a two-ocean navy, no longer require that our aircraft carriers and other super vessels be able to transit the canal.

Protesting against any further betrayal of our national interest in the Panama Canal, more than 100 representatives in Congress, beginning last October, have gone on record in opposition to any surrender of United States sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

Individual members of Congress have sent strong letters to President Nixon opposing the negotiation of any new treaties with Panama concerning the canal, insisting that the United States maintain its sovereign control over the canal and the Canal Zone in accordance with existing treaties and putting the President on notice that any contrary action by the White House will be resisted by the Congress.

It is therefore imperative that Congress (1) reaffirm the sovereign control of the United States over the Panama Canal Zone which was established "in perpetuity" in the Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty and has not since been officially weakened; and (2) initiate hearings immediately on the Flood-Rarick bills and the Thurmond bill.

Such hearings will demonstrate clearly the superiority of the existing Panama Canal, when adequately modernized, over a will-of-the-wisp sea-level scheme and will expose the elaborate investigations and impending report of the Anderson Commission as irrelevant to the exercise by the United States of its mandate to convey ships and cargoes across the Central American isthmus.

DERWINSKI CALLS U THANT PRO-SOVIET, ANTI-ISRAELI

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East crisis is growing even more explosive and failure of the United Nations, and specifically Secretary General U Thant, to provide any leadership or vehicle for peace is deplorable. The tragic weakness of the United Nations has been demonstrated in that body's inability to play an effective role in calming the Middle East crisis.

May I remind the Members of the House that U Thant is a philosophical Marxist, and has repeatedly demonstrated a pro-Soviet, anti-Israeli bias. His latest contribution to troublemaking in the Middle East is his support of the Russian proposal on the Middle East while disregarding the recent United States peace proposal.

U Thant is obviously more interested in appeasing the Soviet Bloc at the United Nations than in developing an objective peace proposal for the Middle East. He is deliberately blind to the Soviet-directed aggression in Southeast Asia, and to the fact that the Soviet Union is the diabolical cause of military escalation in the Middle East.

Peace and stability will not be produced in the Middle East so long as the Soviet Union supports radical Arab militants and the dictatorships in Egypt, Syria and Iraq. Soviet activity in Libya and the pressure they are directing against Jordan and Lebanon add to the complications in the Middle East.

As the Members know, the Russians have dreamt of controlling the Mediterranean since the days of the czars and it is unfortunate that during the Johnson Administration they were able to establish military strength in the area.

I believe that peace can be negotiated in the Middle East if the Arab governments deals directly with Israeli. I do not believe that the so-called four power meetings can be successful. The Soviet Union would scuttle any proper solution

since it prefers to keep the Middle East in a constant state of turmoil. We must keep in mind that the Russians are openly anti-Israel as evidenced by their refusal to permit Jews to leave the Soviet Union and migrate to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I reemphasize my conviction that Secretary General U Thant is a willing tool of Soviet foreign policy in the Middle East. By his actions he is collaborating in the development of greater tensions in that area, in complete contradiction to the peace-keeping role that the United Nations, at least theoretically, should play.

TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEM

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, recently negotiations with the Japanese over our growing textile import problem have generated much attention. The Japanese have continuously refused to negotiate on a meaningful basis and claimed that they as a nation embrace the philosophy of free trade. They argue that the United States position is one of contradiction of that policy.

Now, we are all aware of the many restrictive practices employed by the Japanese Government to protect its home industries. These, of course, are in direct violation of the GATT which our Japanese friends purport to accept.

But it was not until Monday that the impact of these restrictions was brought so emphatically home to me. On that day, I received a copy of a letter written by a Japanese domestic buyer to the editor of Tokyo's Asahi Evening News questioning Japan's definition of the term "free trade" and documenting Japan's highly restrictive trade practices.

He points out that a U.S.-produced Ford Mustang costs \$14,000 in Japan. He states that he paid a \$5 duty on shirts sent to him—sent to him because he could find no shirts in his size in Japan. He had to pay a \$1,400 duty on a Volkswagen he brought to Japan last January.

These are but some of the examples that he cites in his most enlightening letter. They show clearly and without doubt the need for a firm U.S. posture with Japan. This posture is provided in H.R. 16920, the Mills bill, which must be enacted at the earliest date.

I include the full text of this letter at this point in the RECORD, and I commend its careful reading to all of my colleagues:

JUNE 26, 1970.

EDITOR,
Asahi Evening News,
Tokyo.

DEAR SIR: I would appreciate very much if someone can explain to me the term "Free Trade" as it is used in Japan.

In your paper of June 25 you carry a story on the current talks going on in Washington regarding the textile negotiations.

You quote Japanese International Trade Minister, Kiichi Miyazawa, as saying:

"GATT is based on the principle that where injury is proved or the threat of injury is proved a trading nation can seek compensation from the country causing the damage.

But the U.S. appears to be establishing other trading principles in which imports

must be restricted to a certain percentage of national consumption. A rapidly growing country like Japan which embraces free trade principles cannot agree to this concept."

"Free trade" for whom, might I ask? Although a Japanese auto can be purchased in the U.S. for less than it costs in Japan, a Ford Mustang in this country costs about U.S. \$14,000.00. It even costs more to park a foreign car, in spite of the fact it only takes up the same amount of space allowed to a Japanese car. A package of 19-cent pipe tobacco costs 80 cents. I just paid \$5.00 duty for some shirts sent to me, as my size is not sold in Japan. A trip through any department store or the American Pharmacy which sells foreign goods will show you that items such as shaving lotion and toothpaste cost four times the price as in the country of origin. A pleasure boat of 25 feet which would cost \$5,000 in the U.S. is \$25,000 in Japan. A water ski which is \$60 in the U.S. is more than \$225.00 in Japan.

The only way Japanese goods can compete in the U.S. is because they sell for a cheaper price than those manufactured in the U.S. The only way they can sell cheaper is to have the Japanese "subsidize the export," in other words, we must pay more in Japan for a Japanese car so that those going abroad can sell at a competitive price.

I had to pay \$1,400 duty on a 1965 Volkswagen I brought to Japan in January 1970. And I had to get a license from MITI to import it. Of course the duty was decided after arrival of the car. I would never have brought it in the first place had I known I would be charged more than the car is worth.

As far as I can determine, Japan imposes fantastic duties and restrictions on imports to Japan, while aggressively burying the rest of the world in Japanese products, made at attractive price-wise at the expense of the domestic Japanese consumer.

A Japanese company can freely establish a Japanese subsidiary in the U.S., "Subaru of America," "Datsun of America," "American Honda," "JTB of America," "Takashimaya of America," "Seibu of America," etc., etc. Yet we are subject to every kind of discrimination yet dreamed up to keep us out of the Japanese market. Japan has the advantage of every unfair trade agreement yet thought up. These were of course made to help Japan after the war and when Japan was a "poor country," which is no longer the case. There is not one so called liberalized industry in Japan without strings. Hotels have been liberalized because the government here is fully aware that no foreign hotel company can pay the current market price of land and make a profit.

Japan spends less than 1 per cent of her national budget on defense while much of what the U.S. spends for defense goes right into Japanese pockets. Not only what is spent here by U.S. servicemen and the fantastic sum it takes to maintain the U.S. facilities here, but what about all of the industrialists who can attribute so much of their earnings to direct income from the manufacture of items being produced to prolong the war in Vietnam. The Japanese put on a pious anti-war face, but do not miss a trick when it comes to making a buck from this unfortunate war.

There is no danger of the U.S. military being pushed out of Japan by any amount of student demonstrations. The Japanese government does allow (and I firmly believe encourage) anti-American demonstrations to be sensationalized in the press so they can get a trade concession in return for what they have convinced Washington is a super effort on the part of the government to allow the U.S. military to stay in Japan.

All U.S. government leaders should spend one year in a commercial company in Japan. That would help them in a hurry to the devious tactics applied here.

The one who really has to pay for all of this is the Japanese domestic buyer. He has to pay outrageous prices for any imported goods, and outrageous prices for Japanese-produced products to allow the same item to compete overseas. One day the people will wise up that "Free Trade" means higher prices at home.

A JAPANESE DOMESTIC BUYER.

CUT IN FARM SUBSIDIES

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed great news for the downtrodden American taxpayers yesterday when the Senate came to their rescue by limiting subsidy payments in the farm program to \$20,000 annually for any one farm operation. I well remember the fight some of us put up in the House 2 years ago when we succeeded in limiting the annual payments to \$20,000 for any individual farm operation. We thought it was a great victory but when this legislation went to the other body the limitation was discarded and thousands of wealthy landowners continued their fabulous bonanza of reaping Government payments for idle land. I made a statement on the floor of the House at that time that approximately 10,000 wealthy farm operations were paid more than the Government allotted for low-rent public housing over the Nation. In 1968 over \$784 million was paid in subsidies for not planting cotton. Up to now the subsidies paid farmers for idle land reaches the highest cost of Government subsidies in our history.

I believe the Members of Congress are almost unanimously in favor of aiding the economy of any needy farmer. Two years ago it was enacted by this body that \$20,000 per year to any one farm operation was sufficient but this limitation was not effective because of Senate opposition.

In a few days this body will have the opportunity to follow the Senate's "change of heart" and instruct the conferees to agree with the other body and place a \$20,000 annual limitation to any one farm operation.

Mr. Speaker, last year I secured statistics from the Senate hearings which revealed the payments made to farm operations over \$5,000 annually. These astounding figures I hereby enclose with my remarks:

Range of payments	Number of farmers	Amount received
\$5,000 to \$7,499	41,798	\$252,629,409
\$7,500 to \$9,999	18,244	157,163,180
\$10,000 to \$14,999	15,415	186,318,214
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9,894	186,931,864
\$25,000 to \$49,999	4,843	161,642,642
\$50,000 to \$99,999	1,285	84,603,708
\$100,000 to \$499,999	388	64,883,041
\$500,000 to \$999,999	15	9,556,372
\$1,000,000 and over	5	10,889,036

I just wonder if the Members realize that there are approximately 3,500,000 farmers in the Nation. Only 185,000 farmers get over \$5,000 a year. Under this annual subsidy too many are filed in the six-figure bracket—\$100,000 and up. Six

corporation farms are in the \$1-million-and-up bracket. One farm operation gets over \$4 million per year.

When Congressmen go back to their districts, they will get many complaints that this program has been extended. Our Members will hear from their neighbors back home who are going to protest the high figure payments for rural relief.

I got a long-distance call the other day from Georgia. A farmer down there said his neighbor has planted nothing. His wife inherited 1,000 and some additional acres, and all they have done is receive a check for \$70,000 per year for enjoying life on Government payments. He said, "If they plant anything, I do not know what it is." There is a great deal of that going on all over the country.

Ten farming operations received a total of \$14,785,760, which is more than the total of \$13,409,756 received by all farmers in 10 States—Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine, and West Virginia—plus the Virgin Islands.

These 10 large operations received payments in excess of those received by all farmers in any one of 15 States—Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, New Jersey, Maryland, Hawaii, Utah, and Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to incorporate with my remarks some of the astounding payments under this \$3,700,000,000 program during the calendar year 1967:

LARGEST INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS UNDER FARM PROGRAMS, CALENDAR YEAR 1967

	Payment received	Cumulative payments
1. J. G. Boswell Co., Litchfield Park, Ariz. (Kings County, Calif.)	\$4,091,818	\$4,091,818
2. Rancho San Antonio, Gila Bend, Ariz. (Fresno County, Calif.)	2,863,668	6,955,486
3. Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	1,353,770	8,309,256
4. South Lake Farms, Five Points, Calif. (Kings)	1,304,093	9,613,349
5. U.S. Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla. (Hendry)	1,275,687	10,889,036
6. Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield, Calif. (Kern)	838,130	11,727,166
7. Acco Seed, Leoti, Kans. (Fresno County, Calif.)	814,714	12,541,880
8. Kohala Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	800,718	13,342,598
9. Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif. (Kings)	789,910	14,132,508
10. Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott Miss. (Bolivar)	653,252	14,785,760
11. Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson, Ark. (South Mississippi)	619,489	15,405,249
12. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., Fellsmeire, Fla. (Palm Beach)	610,923	16,016,172
13. Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii	600,477	16,616,649
14. Mount Whitney Farms, Five Points, Calif. (Fresno)	591,980	17,208,629
15. Oahu Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	571,453	17,780,082
16. Farmers Inv. Co., Aguila, Ariz. (Maricopa)	554,817	18,334,899
17. State of Montana, Helena, Mont. (Daniels)	553,358	18,888,257
18. Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii	539,570	19,427,827

If the House will go along and accept the Senate limitation of \$20,000 per year to any one farm operation we could allocate the saving of approximately \$2 billion to much-needed hospitals, schools, and highway construction over the Na-

tion, all of which are in critical shortage caused by scarcity of funds necessary for these programs.

CONDITIONS OF THE STOCK MARKET WHICH WILL AFFECT THREE SOCIAL EVENTS

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, since the Republican President moved into the White House, Americans who own stock have seen one-third of the value of such holdings disappear. Since July of 1968, over 40 broker-dealer firms have "failed," of these four were members of the New York Stock Exchange. Many in fact most, brokerage houses are laying off people and cutting back operations.

The magnitude and dimensions of the effect of continued tight money and high interest on the average corporation can be seen in the following considerations. First, expansion in the 1960's was accomplished on debt, much of it short term. Fortune magazine in June of this year reports that from a study of 820 industrial companies debt as a percentage of total capital rose from 15.5 percent in 1959 to 25 percent in 1969. This 61-percent increase in debt reached a peak just as interest rates reached their peak and tight money began the real illiquidity crunch. Just how hard this has hit profit ability can be judged by a report from IRS that last year net income was less than 3.5 times interest payments. The figures are worse now and for manufacturing corporations it takes 30 percent or more of the cash flow to make fixed interest payments.

As we predict that absent new and bolder action by this administration to increase productivity and stabilize wages and prices, money will remain tight and interest stay high, there is only one harsh alternative for U.S. corporations. They must sell stock. Since prices are down, it will require larger issues for a given required sum than if prices were at a healthier level. Note this then. Equities of existing stock owners will be diluted and lower net earnings will be spread over more individual shares. We are forced to agree with the study of Smith, Barney, a leading brokerage house on Wall Street to the effect that "profit growth per-share may average less than 3 to 5 percent during the next five years."

This state of the stock market may explain the point of the following story:

It is said that the following three social events could with equal conviction be predicted to fail—President Nasser hosting a Bar Mitzvah in Tel Aviv; Governor Maddox guest speaking at a Black Panther rally in Harlem; and President Nixon holding a fund-raising dinner on Wall Street.

CREDIT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE POOR

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed a series of historic civil rights legislation beginning in 1964, it was felt that the concept embodied in the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment would finally become a reality. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in the areas of voting rights, jury selection, open housing and public accommodations, this Nation has progressed in expanding the idea of equal opportunity in regards to legal and civil rights.

Five years ago this summer, this Nation watched in stunned astonishment as the business section of a Los Angeles ghetto went up in flames amid much looting, rioting and violence. Today, "Charcoal Alley" has changed very little. Despite some admirable efforts from outside groups, the economic conditions of Watts in 1970 are not much better than they were at the time of the 1965 riots. And even though we have created agencies and departments such as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, there has not even been a modicum of social and economic progress in areas like Watts to alleviate the conditions that led to the 1965 riots.

These conditions—I speak of urban poverty, substandard housing, poor quality and unequal education, inadequate job opportunities, and insufficient consumer services—are also exacerbating the problem of crime in our metropolitan areas.

A society that does not possess the flexibility to respond to these circumstances will soon lose by default to those who desire to destroy that society. These problems will not be solved by words, but they can be at least mitigated through specific social and economic measures. It is time for action.

Our progress in the field of civil rights must be complemented with an equal amount of progress in extending economic opportunity. If we fail to assure the latter, we will nullify our advances in the former. As Federal District Judge Charles R. Weiner has stated:

It is fundamental that civil rights without economic rights are mere shadows.

One of the most serious problems faced by the poor living in the city is their inability to obtain credit. While the amount of consumer credit has grown from \$21 billion in 1950 to \$113 billion in 1969, private industry has been totally unresponsive in easing the poor person's credit problems. The effect has been to force low income people to buy their goods from ghetto merchants at exorbitant prices and exploitative credit policies. Not only are these people unable to obtain money for expenses, but when reputable stores with good-quality merchandise refuse to grant credit to low-income urban residents, they get less for the money they do spend.

Thus the poor and those who are welfare recipients face a vicious circle in which they purchase inferior products at higher prices and are excluded from obtaining reasonable credit to help them get more for their money. I think it is time we as members of Congress begin to take action to relieve low income people from this unjust and exploitative economic burden.

The importance of consumer credit cannot be underestimated. Our whole financial system is tied to credit and a good credit rating is a must in today's marketplace. The poor have very few opportunities to expand their economic base, but depriving them of credit is to severely limit their borrowing and buying options.

We can stop this vicious circle by bringing legitimate retail credit into the ghetto. As it is now, most reputable stores refuse to extend credit in areas of low-income. While the financial position of the poor person is generally precarious, a study released by the National Urban Coalition shows that the poor are able to and do repay their debts.

The study cited an experiment in this field cosponsored by the United Planning Organization, Washington's antipoverty agency, and Kann's Department Store. The program allowed low-income people \$50 worth of credit at Kann's on the condition that they attend consumer counseling classes and were approved by UPO.

Such a program has been most successful. The Kann's model has shown that a business is not giving away money by liberalizing their credit policies to the poor. In addition, this policy allows the poor to take advantage of sales and discounts on special and vitally needed items at reputable stores.

This program not only provides facilities and low-cost credit union service to those in low-income areas, it also establishes a program of consumer education. The program teaches potential credit buyers how to wisely and efficiently allocate their money. Such family financial counseling is the keystone to extending credit to the low-income consumer.

A similar program, "Operation Credit-Worthy" was introduced in Boston in October 1968. The plan was to inject legitimate retail credit into the ghetto through credit union cooperation with retail business. The pilot program in Boston included 13 Federal credit unions serving people of limited income. These credit unions have loaned out more than \$400,000 and have about 5,000 members. The loss rate is less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount loaned.

"Operation Credit-Worthy" utilizes trained counselors to teach members financial responsibility. When the member has reached the stage of borrow maturity and has proven he can adhere to a strict payment schedule, his name is referred to the retailers as a responsible credit risk. If a retailer has problems with a delinquent account, he is assisted in the collection process by the referring credit union.

One of the more encouraging aspects of this program is the seed effect it has on the ghetto economy. By extending limited amounts of legitimate credit to people in low-income or ghetto areas, more money is injected into that area. This not only means that the ghetto resident is being assisted in his financial problems, but that the other people not participants in Credit-Worthy are able to approach stores under the program to obtain credit. In short, by supplying a marginal amount of money to Credit-Worthy participants, we can create a multiplier effect on the particular area's economy.

The primary objective of the program

is to qualify limited income credit union members for legitimate credit. Low-income credit unions maintain lists of members who have established good credit rating within their union. The names are then referred to the retail trade board, and credit in participating stores is arranged. The policy contains needed safeguards to insure fiscal success.

The Boston pilot program has been a success. The Boston Retail Trade Board reports that there have been no particular problems and that it can be administered on a city scale without any great difficulty.

It has allowed many low-income people to obtain credit in stores that have previously refused to extend credit to them. The poor are now able to buy better merchandise at more reasonable prices, to obtain credit at more reasonable interest rates. It gives the low-income person the dignity that comes from being able to purchase goods when and where he pleases.

Both the Kann's and Boston models could be and should be applied elsewhere with the hope of expanding Operation Credit-Worthy nationally. Under this program the poor have the opportunity to buy on credit at a reasonable rate. But there is a stake on this program for the merchants too. Those merchants participating in Credit-Worthy have the opportunity to enlarge their number of customers.

Despite the fact that the pilot program in Boston has been proven as a sound approach to assisting the underprivileged to obtain credit, the chances for expanding this program to other cities are infinitesimal. The operation is sponsored through cooperative efforts of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and CUNA, International, Inc. The problem is simple: There are no funds available to accelerate the development of this worthwhile project.

Under the present budget, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions will only be able to set up approximately one new project per year. The Bureau has the expertise available for a much larger program. Shall we let this reservoir of expertise go to waste?

The main deterrent to the BFCU inaugurating this program in other cities has been the lack of funds. And although the Bureau desires to engage in an inter-agency agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund an expansion, OEO, too, is unable to provide funds for what it calls an "excellent creative proposal."

I think it is a mistake to let a program with so much proven potential as Operation Credit-Worthy to lay dormant because of bureaucratic and financial complications. I think it is a tragedy to allow such "an innovative approach to liberate the poor from storekeepers offering overpriced merchandise and credit" to die because of limited funds. I think it is wrong to deny thousands of limited-income persons in our cities the means to climb out of their financial rut, their vicious economical circle, because there is no will in the Federal Government to provide those means.

The present system compels a poor consumer to go to merchants willing to accept people with no credit rating. The merchants often take advantage of this situation by engaging in unethical and unscrupulous practices. Why should we subject people in low-income areas to stores that charge as much as 25 percent a month on inferior-quality merchandise? A simple funding of Operation Credit-Worthy could allow those same people to obtain better quality consumer goods for as little as 1 percent interest per month.

The problem of urban poverty will only increase in the coming years as the concentration of low-income people in the central cities will be far greater in the next decade. Presently 13.6 million low-income people reside in all U.S. central cities. The 1985 projection of poor people in the inner city reaches 20 million.

I think the need for this program is clear. There is also a great deal of interest if not enthusiasm, on the part of OEO community action program, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the communities to expand Credit-Worthy to various cities in the United States. If the poor are to climb out of the grasp of poverty such a credit program is a basic requirement. And if the poor are expected to achieve economic responsibility with this new source of credit, family financial counseling must be available on a continuing basis.

I am introducing legislation today to have the Office of Economic Opportunity community action program contract with the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions to establish Operation Credit-Worthy in 12 other cities. Under this proposal the BFCU will implement the program while the OEO will reimburse BFCU for its services. OEO will also have general surveillance over the project.

The estimated cost per city is \$93,764. Thus for \$1,125,168 we can bring this worthwhile project to 12 other metropolitan areas in the United States. The funds requested are a small price to pay for legitimate credit and financial training for one-half million poor, the initial goal set by BFCU.

I do not offer this proposal as a quick solution, as a panacea, as a promise to drastically reduce the plight of the 14.4 million hard core poor earning less than \$2,200 per year. But if Congress will appropriate the funds necessary to expand this program, we can reverse the trend that makes a poor person's limited income even smaller. We can through Operation Credit-Worthy encourage and assist credit unions and the business community to infuse additional credit and additional funds into poverty areas.

The lack of only a little more than a million dollars is the only deterrent to funding Operation Credit-Worthy in 12 major cities. With "black capitalism" consigned to the role of campaign rhetoric, I feel that the need for aiding our poor is more urgent now than in the past.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote:

It takes time to persuade men to do what is for their own good.

Perhaps it will take Congress less time to end the pattern of dependence that the less fortunate people in our cities are subjected to, and to erase the economic shadow that hangs over our civil rights laws.

THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF OUR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, having just returned to Washington after rather active participation in several Fourth of July activities held in various parts of my district, I want to report to my colleagues in the House my reflections on the events and to comment on one of this Nation's major problems.

I found the people disturbed over the confusion and divisions of which we are victims. They are disturbed because they innately know that what they are hearing is not the whole story and is a distortion of the facts as they are. They cannot put their finger on the misrepresentations but they are not unaware that the distortion is due to the misuse of words and phrases which have double meanings. The problems that beset us are basically theological and political in nature and, may I emphasize, in that order. We are living in troublesome times, yet we live in a great period in history. The challenges are limitless as are our opportunities for real and meaningful progress. This Nation is not wanting in terms of ideals or goals. The people of this Nation, including the vast majority of our young people, are as loyal and dedicated as in any period in our short 194 years of history as a Nation, and they are better equipped and better educated to pursue these ideals and goals.

Perhaps at no time in human history has there been a greater need for that rare combination of youthful vigor, mature judgment, experience, centered wisdom and raw courage, than now.

Mr. Speaker, the people are demanding solutions to what they insist are problems which demand attention but they are calling for solutions to the "effects" of our problems rather than solution to our "causes" of our problems and because we address ourselves to their plea for us to do something immediately, which, of course, is an honorable and reasonable responsibility on our part, we leave undone the task of addressing ourselves to finding solutions for the cause of our problems. The result is that the problems remain unresolved and in fact double. They double because of the impatience and total lack of understanding on those who insist that Government "do something."

One of the major problems confronting us is that of peace. Men cry, "Peace, peace," but there is no peace because we are not willing to make the sacrifices peace demands of us.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned about our failures as a nation of free men when I sit down and analyze

not only what the people are shouting for but what is being passed off as solutions by those who, representing the people in this great Republic, seem not to be any more understanding of the problems than the people they represent.

Let us take for example the problem of war and peace. We hear impassioned cries of some in and out of Government for an immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. This has strong emotional appeal, but it completely ignores the need for a solution to the larger problem which if not taken care of will create a more dangerous effect in the not too distant future.

What are those who cry out for immediate withdrawal of American combat forces asking for? First, they would have us pull out without honoring our commitments made in good faith to other nations—commitments made not by the Nixon administration but by preceding administrations with the full consent of some of the Members of the other body who today are the carping critics of the policies of the present occupant of the White House. They insist that national honor is unimportant. Would they do business with or respect an institution that did not stand behind its word; that could not be trusted to honor its commitments? Is the Nation's honor any less important than the honor of the institutions operating within her borders? The decision as to whether or not we will not honor our commitments is primarily a theological question, but it also is a political one. Try operating a bank, or a feed company or an industry or a business without honoring your commitments—keeping your word, if you please—and see how long you can stay in business. Just as a business cannot survive if it fails to honor its word so a nation cannot survive if it does not keep its word.

The fact is that one of the major causes of continuous violent disruption in the world since World War II is the unwillingness of governments and more specifically one government—the U.S.S.R.—to honor its commitments.

Certainly those who have even a limited sense of moral values and of history know that the most rudimentary responsibility of a nation is that of keeping her word. This great United States, the apologists for freedom notwithstanding, has stood as a shining beacon in a world darkened by the struggle for raw power, as a symbol of honor and respect.

Those who would have us bug out of our commitments would have us do so without regard to the safety and well-being of literally hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese civilians—men, women, and children—who would be murdered in coldblood for no reason other than they did not share the political views of their tyrannous master. We do not have to speculate about this—we need merely to turn back a few pages of contemporary history to be reminded of the lie of those who claim that communism is acceptable and must be given equal status with freedom because it has "mellowed." Ask those who saw heads rolled in the massacres in China. Ask the people of Tibet. Ask the hundreds of

refugees who were fortunate enough to flee Cuba with their lives. Ask the people in the captive nations who suffer even today as they are ground under the heel of their repressive leaders—whom they neither had the opportunity to oppose in the ballot box nor after the takeover to depose from office. Ask our men suffering in Communist prisoner-of-war camps.

Those who would have us bug out of our commitments would have us do so without regard to the encouragement this betrayal of trust—this outright surrender—for that is what it would be—would give to North Vietnam which we could, if we wanted to, wipe off the face of the map in a day's time. Those who in hypocrisy are ashamed to be called American and accuse their Government as being repressive and materialistic and aggressive and arrogant—insisting upon imposing her will on others—fail to mention its restraint in the use of the awful power at its command.

I am not suggesting by any stretch of the imagination that we use the nuclear power available in our arsenal in Indochina. That would be unthinkable both from a practical and psychological point of view. It would be morally unacceptable. What I am saying is that it is high time this Nation use its power in a moral way to prevent the unnecessary slaughter of human beings, South and North Vietnamese as well as Americans—and civilians as well as military. When President Nixon permitted our military command to venture into Cambodia for a limited time and a limited objective with the full consent of the Cambodian Government, he did just that. The military mission was to destroy the arsenal of weapons that were being stashed there to neutralize the gains made by the South Vietnamese since the new policy of Vietnamizing the war was put into effect by this administration, as well as to harass and kill the maximum number of Americans as the withdrawal of our forces moved ahead according to schedule.

Should we bug out without honoring the commitments made by this Government the stage would be set for a significant increase if Communist activity in many different parts of the world. The suggestion by those who are indifferent to Communist extension of its totalitarian rule over smaller nations that the domino theory does not apply to the troubles in the Far East and the Mid-East is to misunderstand communism and misinterpret history.

We cannot isolate the situation in Indochina from past Communist ventures in other parts of the world. The U.S.S.R. has become involved in the Mid-East because they have not been sufficiently frustrated in the ventures in Korea—and Europe—and Cuba.

Had we not settled for a truce in Korea but sought and achieved victory, the Communists might not have found it convenient to venture into South Korea. Our failure to take the decisive steps necessary to prevent a Communist takeover of Cuba and make there a base of Communist operations against the Western Hemisphere might well have slowed, if not prevented, Soviet activity in the Mediterranean.

Had we not chosen to be a partner in creating a Communist government in China by stabbing the friendly Chiang Kai-shek government in the back, there would have been no Chinese intervention in Korea on the side of Communist North Korea.

The situation in Vietnam is due if not directly, then most assuredly, indirectly to past mistakes and failures in policy and in our diplomatic efforts to carry out that policy. Yet today some of the very same individuals who were participants in those policies that failed and, in fact, helped to frame those policies are pointing an accusing finger at President Nixon and are crying "failure" because he cannot undo the adverse effects of the failure of their policies in 1½ years.

The facts of life are just as simple as this: Should we choose to bug out, our NATO as well as our SEATO treaties would go with it and we would commit the world and freedom to a threat of such great proportions that in the scramble for power the world would become victim either to total communist tyranny or to some other kind of totalitarianism equally unacceptable to free men.

The name of the game is avoid world war III. The question is "How?" I happen to believe we cannot gain the desired goal of avoiding a third world war by turning over one-half of the world to Communist rule—unless, of course—we are willing to give up our way of life and the freedom associated with it.

In these confusing times people are being misled by words and slogans. Words can cajole, frustrate, disgust, disillusion, build up, destroy, inspire faith, make cowards—depending on the words used, and how they are used. There is an entire verbal arsenal from which to draw our weapons: Polarization, alienation, priorities, and what have you.

Possibly the most corrupted word is the word "peace."

Some people use it as if they were the originators of the idea and the only ones who understand the meaning of it or who desire peace.

The wrong word has been used if peace is what we really want.

What is it that they want?

What is our primary national goal? Is it peace at any price? Or is it freedom? Any student of history, past or contemporary, must know that while peace is a byproduct of freedom enjoyed within the framework of law, freedom on the other hand, is not a byproduct of peace that is acquired under compromise within tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of war, peace, and freedom is basically a theological one involving the choice of a goal. No one is for war, much less the one who speaks these words who knows by personal experience the trials of war. I wish I could say that all are for freedom. My hope and prayer is that the American people recognize the tree by its fruit. The political issues are not basic. They address themselves merely to the "effects" of having made wrong moral choices. They are the salves that cover the sores and bring temporary relief from pain. They are not a cure for the cause of the sores. Once the people become aware of this they will

demand realistic answers to the problems it seems politically advantageous to emotionalize.

Mr. Speaker, in January of next year as the 92d Congress convenes, God willing, with the consent of the people of my district, I will seek the floor to address myself to the theological aspect of the economic and social problems that continue to plague us.

MERCURY POISONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 27, page 35967, and part 30, pages 40948 to 40950, I brought to the attention of the House the fact that the Department of Agriculture has failed to enforce provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act—FIFRA—intended to protect the public from hazardous pesticide products being marketed and used. I stated that unless constructive action were taken by the Department of Agriculture much of our food would be illegally adulterated with pesticide residues and much of the food supply would contain large amounts of cancer-producing pesticide compounds.

In recent weeks the Department has admitted that the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act needs amending and that the Department could and should do better in its administration of FIFRA. A few chemical companies, manufacturers of pesticides, have also been critical of Agriculture's administration of FIFRA. Other voices have been raised from the Congress. The administration has taken note and now proposes to remove the functions assigned to the Department of Agriculture under FIFRA and place them under the new proposed environmental agency.

Many of the lakes, bayous, rivers, and streams of the United States and Canada are mercury-contaminated. Today the Federal Water Quality Administration admits that fish and water in 14 States is contaminated by mercury. Mercury and compounds containing mercury poison the soil. They accumulate and settle in the bottom of waterways. They appear in the tissues of fish and other marine life.

Mercury containing compounds and mercurials find their way as a soil and water contaminant through industrial and agricultural use. Mercury as used in the electrolysis of brine and potash forms compounds of mercuric and mercurous chloride which passes as affluent. Mercury compounds are used as antislime agents in papermaking. Mercury based paints are used to paint the hulls of ships. Mercury containing pesticide compounds are used as fungicides. Some Mercurial pesticide compounds are cancer-producing in animal systems, poisonous to animals and humans. Mercurial residues illegally adulterate food. In turn mercury poisoning derived from food may cause damage to the central nervous system.

An examination of the grounds of the

1,600-odd pesticide registration objections made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over a 5-year period from July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1969—and largely ignored by the Pesticide Regulation Division of the Department of Agriculture—discloses that HEW continually objected to the registration and reregistration of many mercurial pesticide compounds as potential human health hazards.

I pointed out in my earlier statements that the Mrak—Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health—Commission's recommendations—Nos. 4 and 5—called for the restriction on the use of pesticide compounds containing mercury for the purpose of minimizing human exposure to mercurial pesticides because they considered them to present a potential health hazard to man.

The use of many mercury pesticides is now prohibited in Sweden.

On January 24, 1970, the Associated Press reported from El Paso, Tex., that doctors were using mustard gas to fight acute mercury poisoning that put two children in a coma and left their older sister blinded and paralyzed. The three, ages 8, 13, and 20 became ill after eating pork from a hog their father butchered last September. The hog had been fed grain treated with a methyl mercury pesticide.

More than 30 animals had been sold for slaughter after being fed the poisoned grain. The Department of Agriculture embargoed a lot of meat which may have come from the mercury-containing animals but they were never sure they found it all. If the Department of Agriculture had initially carried out its responsibilities under existing law it would not have had the problem of attempting to find the poisoned meat. Leadership and the exercise of judgment by the Department of Agriculture would have made life less hazardous for many.

Organic mercury pesticides have been responsible for at least three epidemics of poisoning by pesticides in recent years. In each instance the initial material contaminated was seed grain. Iraq suffered an epidemic of 321 cases of mercury poisoning in 1961 in which 35 people died. West Pakistan reported an epidemic of 34 cases in 1963 in which four individuals passed away. In 1966 Guatemala had an epidemic of 45 cases in which 20 deaths resulted.

In Japan, deaths, teratological and fetal minamata disease—infantile cerebral palsy effects—have been directly attributed to the intake of seafoods containing mercury.

Poisoning by organic mercurials is characterized by nervous system involvement which can produce total incapacitation or death, a wide variety of dermatoses, irritation of mucous membranes of the eyes resulting in optic neuritis with loss of irregular portions of peripheral fields of vision and atrophic changes of the fundus.

Mercurial poisoning is a potential hazard to humans and there is no effective

remedy to fight it with the possible exception of a heavy metal chelating agent. Mercurial residues can persist up to 100 years in polluted lakes. Mercurials accumulate in the soil to the point of toxification. They remain unless physically removed as by leaching with water. Since the mercurials' solubility is low, they tend to remain where applied.

Poisoning by organic mercurials occurs more than one realizes as individuals will cheat by including in a sale of food grain some mercurial-treated seed grain. Further, a California State wildlife official has recently reported that mercury poisoning poses a threat to California pheasants. The pheasants contained mercury pesticide compounds used to treat cereal seed grain prior to planting. The California official reported the amount of mercury present in the pheasants to be of public health significance.

There are pesticides which are adequate and economically feasible as substitutes for mercurial pesticides. Thus was the lack of action to restrict the use of mercurial pesticide compounds by the Department of Agriculture nonfeasance or lack of judgment?

After the disaster the Department of Agriculture took a step in the direction of safeguarding human health and the quality of the environment by suspending the pesticide, cyano-methyl mercuri guanidine from further use. This was the causation agent involved in the New Mexico incident. The Department also asked the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council's Advisory Center for Toxicology for advice and recommendations concerning other organic mercurial pesticides. As a result—the obvious—the Department canceled the registration of 60 percent of mercury pesticide compounds and compositions. I urge the Department of Agriculture to continue to take steps to minimize pesticide uses that constitute a potential danger to health and the quality of environment. The uses of pesticide compounds containing the heavy metals; arsenic, lead, and mercury must be reexamined in this context. I believe the Department of Agriculture should have utilized the resources of, sought the advice and followed the recommendations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where a potential pesticide use danger to health may be involved. It should have taken heed of the Mrak Commission recommendations. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act should be amended to provide such mandatory provisions.

The Department of Agriculture has not been the only delinquent Federal agency relating to the mercury poisoning problem. The Federal Water Quality Administration admits that U.S. plants either along waterways flowing into or beside Lake Erie have been dumping possibly as high as 300 pounds of mercury a day into the lake as of this year. This figure does not include the contribution made by Canadian plants. The Federal Water Quality Administration claims that now only 10 pounds a day enters the

lake from U.S. industrial plants. But mercury continues to accumulate on the lake and other bottoms. There is no known way to remove it. The Federal Water Quality Administration has yet to take action against mercury containing mildew resistant paints which may be used to paint ship bottoms. Mercury poisoning, even mild cases, can cause irreversible central nervous damage so the danger continues as an imminent hazard.

Again I urge the President to require the Department of Agriculture as well as other governmental agencies to carry out its responsibilities under existing law in order to protect the public health; to assure the safety of our food; to prevent contamination of the environment and to remove hazards to life. I urge the administration to seek actual achievement, not paper results.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. In 1969, the total private insurance sales in non-Communist countries amounted to \$100 billion. Sixty percent of the total premium volume was in the United States, 25 percent in West Germany and 4 percent in Canada.

ESTABLISH AN AMBULANCE SERVICE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago this month I called the attention of my colleagues to the crisis in emergency medical services in the District of Columbia. Not only the ambulance service but also the entire field of emergency medical care leaves much to be desired in the District of Columbia.

On July 1, 1969, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12552, to establish an Ambulance Service Corps as a separate entity, outside the jurisdiction of the Fire Department under which it is presently operating. The corps, as envisioned by my bill, would have its own administrative organization, a system of promotions for personnel, higher qualifications, and superior training. It would be professional in every sense of the term and dedicated entirely to its primary mission—emergency ambulance service.

The situation at the other end of the ambulance run, in the hospital emergency rooms, is also in a crisis state at the present time.

The problem confronting nonprofit hospitals in this area is similar to a very significant problem confronted by the emergency ambulance service. Hospitals can no longer afford to pick up the tab for the emergency care of the city's indigents just as the 10 ambulances which

serve the 200 to 800 daily emergency calls in the city cannot continue to be used as a "taxi service" by indigents.

Mr. Speaker, these two problems have been well-documented in a series of editorials recently broadcast by WRC. For the benefit of my colleagues who may not have had the opportunity to hear them broadcast, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

AMBULANCES

In a medical emergency you call an ambulance. It is rather comforting to know that help is on the way—ready and able to take care of almost any problem.

In the District of Columbia that is not the case.

The alarming fact, as you have seen, is that there are only ten public ambulances to handle an average of nearly 200 calls a day in the city. On Friday and Saturday the number can go to 800.

The ten ambulances are operated by the Fire Department. The drivers and attendants are firemen who do a superb job under the most trying circumstances. However, their forty hours of medical training is woefully inadequate.

The only thing they have to go by in their work is the firemen's manual. Incredible as it may seem in a function involving human life—there are more rules and regulations for barbers in the District than for ambulance attendants.

The service is abused. In the District it is free so it is cheaper than a taxicab. It is estimated that anywhere from 38 to 75 per cent of all ambulance runs in 1969 were for non-emergencies. This means that some people who desperately needed help—didn't get it.

Then there is the matter of emergency equipment—D. C. ambulances do not come close to meeting the minimum criteria set by the 1966 highway safety act.

That is the deplorable state of affairs of the public ambulance service in the District. But assume you survive the incident that caused your injury, and the ride to the hospital, what are your chances for emergency care?

We'll go into that subject tomorrow.

CLOSED HOSPITALS

WRC-TV has pointed out editorially that ambulance service in the District is inadequate because of lack of vehicles, manpower and training.

However, once in the emergency room of a District hospital your medical care will be adequate. But a very serious problem is the fact that more and more private hospitals have either closed their doors entirely for emergency medical care or are curtailing their services to public ambulance patients. The reason is very simple—they can no longer afford to pick up the tab for the medically indigent of the city.

It is a merry-go-round of cause and effect. There has always been a positive correlation between public ambulances and the indigent. Private, non-profit hospitals, operating emergency rooms pass the cost in part onto their regular paying patients. In turn, prices for medical care go up and insurance companies refuse to pay the added amounts.

Much of this problem can be laid at the door of the Medicaid and Medicare programs and the inadequate and outdated Medical Charities Act that pays only about half the cost of hospital care.

Thus, more people are endangered because ambulances are forced into longer runs to an open hospital perhaps miles away, across town. This means that others who need attention must wait until an emergency vehicle is available—sometimes that can be too late.

So the District has inadequate ambulance service—and a steady decline in emergency medical hospital facilities.

Tomorrow we will discuss what can be done about it.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE

For the past two days WRC-TV has editorially discussed public ambulance service and emergency medical care.

Both need a drastic overhaul and immediately.

D.C. firemen operate the city's public ambulances and they do a superb job under most trying conditions.

But what is needed is a career corps of highly trained technicians under an independent Emergency Medical Facilities Agency which would operate all private and public ambulances under one communication and dispatch system.

There must be separation of emergency and non-emergency use of ambulances. The practice of using such vehicles for taxicabs must end so that those who desperately need help can get it.

Emergency rooms at hospitals and other medical centers must be kept open and even expanded so that the injured and the ill can be treated quickly and expertly.

Minimum standards and guidelines—ordinances and surveillance need to be instituted to assure adequate ambulance service and emergency medical care.

All of this takes money and legislative action.

That is up to the Congress with the first priority more vehicles with better equipment. The fact that there are only ten public ambulances to meet the daily emergency needs of perhaps a million and a half residents, commuters and visitors in the District is courting disaster.

Will it take tragedy to get action?

AIR TRAVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the great step forward taken by President Richard Nixon and this administration in the whole field of air travel. On Monday, June 22, the President released our Government's new statement of international air transportation policy. This is a long-awaited document, because the last time our Government made itself crystal clear in this area was in 1963.

It is with great pride as an American and as a Republican that I recommend close examination of this historic statement by every Member of Congress. As the President said when he introduced the new policy:

International aviation in the 1960's made a unique and valuable contribution to our commerce and contacts abroad, and consequently to our national life. At the same time, as in most human activity, this rapid expansion brought some complications along with its undoubted benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this excellent statement has realistically and thoughtfully tackled these complications. I am very optimistic about the future.

However, I think it is incumbent upon this Congress to take America's position in the air transport field every bit as seriously as the President has. We have a job to do as well. I believe it would be in the best interests of the traveler and

the shipper and every member of the industry for the Congress to give this policy statement the full force of law. We are dealing with the very survival of the competitive, free enterprise system in the air transport industry. This document deals not only with maintaining a strong competitive picture among American carriers, whether they are scheduled or charter carriers, but of also maintaining a strong competitive position for all American lines overseas. Here is where the voice of this great body can and should be heard.

The Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable John A. Volpe, proud son of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, said:

In order to maintain an economically sound service network, . . . U.S. carriers must be assured a fair and equal opportunity to compete. The policy calls for firm U.S. measures if our carriers' services are unreasonably limited.

We should join with the President and the Secretary in meeting this far-reaching challenge. As the policy statement says:

Attempts to restrict U.S. carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed, the foreign landing rights for charter services should be regularized as free as possible from substantial restriction.

I feel confident that Secretary Volpe, Secretary of State William Rogers, and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board will heed these words and follow the President's direction that—

This new statement of policy guidance be used henceforth by responsible officials of the Government in dealing with international aviation problems.

Congress has a duty and a responsibility as well. We must also fashion such laws as might be needed to make this Nation and its vigorous air transport industry leaders everywhere in the world.

THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary maneuvers which today—once again—stifled debate on the most essential issue which faces this Nation, and her elected Representatives in this Congress, can only be matched by the contorted justifications and misstatements which have been used to condone and explain our policy in Vietnam, and most recently in Cambodia.

Were the stakes not so high, I might venture a more sanguine regard for the continued failure of Congress to meet the needs of a people who have watched over 42,000 young men die in combat in a distant land ruled by despotic regimes. Were the tragedy not so great, I might view with more calm the continued evasion of responsibility evidenced anew today.

The fact is that the House of Representatives today, with a consistency which has rarely been matched in its history, rejected again, as it has been doing since the war began, the chance—

the obligation—to measure up to the constitutional responsibility with which it is vested.

In passing, I would note how much I deplore the fact that the amendment introduced by the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CHURCH, and the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, and passed by the Senate by a vote of 58 to 37, was so hurriedly rejected by this House. The other body devoted 7 weeks of debate to this amendment; the House cut off debate. Surely, this circumstance leaves little by way of defense to those who claim that our system is working right. Millions of people who oppose the war—of all ages, of all groups—have elected to the Congress men and women who are to represent them. Whether these millions constitute a silent majority or a silent minority is not really important. The point is that they expect their needs, their wants, and their concerns to be articulated. I think it nothing less than insult—and default of our responsibilities—that this House heeds them so slightly.

But, although I deplore today's perfunctory consideration of the Cooper-Church amendment, the real question was one of votes. Perhaps some Members might have been persuaded, had they had the opportunity to hear more fully the thoughts of their colleagues. I doubt if the number would have been very significant, though.

The real matter is votes. And the votes indicated that Cooper-Church, whether debated for 10 hours or 10 days in this House, would have failed. The key vote today, that on the previous question, was 247 to 143; the motion to table carried by a vote of 237 to 153.

What was rejected? Certainly no real answer to the Vietnam War. No real answer, even, to the question of future Vietnams. But, the Cooper-Church amendment, passed by the Senate and rejected by the House, did begin, finally, to enunciate the division of constitutional powers which is mandated by the Constitution. For it is Congress' right and its responsibility to control, to raise, and to support armies. And Congress is charged with declaring war.

The Cooper-Church amendment arises out of the crisis that has been facing this country for some time, and which Congress has been unwilling to recognize. The sending of American troops into Cambodia has brought this issue to a head. This move was made with neither the knowledge nor the approval of Congress. Congressional leaders were not informed. Congressional committees dealing with foreign affairs and armed services were not consulted. Neither the House nor the Senate was asked for approval.

Such action by the President was the natural consequence of Congress' refusal in the past to exercise its responsibilities with respect to Indochina.

Congress has voted billions of dollars in appropriations for the war in Vietnam with only a few of us really questioning what the money was being used for, what the policy was, and how successful the policy was. Rather than assuming its constitutional role, the Congress acquiesced and acceded to the word of the President

and his military advisers that the war was going well and our military operations were successful.

During the past 6 years, the executive has begun to regard its power as virtually unrestrained, permitting the President to make military decisions not only in Vietnam, but also in Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and the Dominican Republic—without substantial knowledge or approval of Congress.

While not tying the President's hands, the Cooper-Church amendment begins to redefine the division of warring powers in this Nation. It tells this President and future Presidents that the executive does not have unlimited and open-ended powers in regard to sending American troops into combat.

The amendment rejected today merely bars funds for the retention of troops in Cambodia after June 30, 1970, and for the reintroduction of American ground troops in Cambodia. It prevents use of funds for indirect or direct advising or instructing of Cambodian military forces. It prohibits payment of salaries and bonuses to any persons engaged in mercenary military activity in support of Cambodian forces. And it prohibits the financing of aerial combat activity above Cambodia in direct support of Cambodian forces.

So the Cooper-Church amendment, whatever its symbolic value—and I stress that in that coin this amendment is worth a great deal—is really a mild rejoinder to an unconstitutional act undertaken by the Executive—the deployment of American ground troops in Cambodia.

The Executive has told us that the Cambodia adventure was a success. I should think, to say the very least, that 339 Americans dead and 1,501 wounded tarnishes that success somewhat. I hasten to add, of course, that I do not question the President's concern for these dead and wounded. I am sure that he, bearing the responsibility to commit troops to battle, greatly feels the tragedy.

But, while I sympathize with his burden, I much more greatly sympathize with the loved ones who must bear the grief of a dead or wounded son or husband or father. And, so long as this war continues, the bearers of this grief will grow in number.

Cooper-Church would have done little to abate this process. It does not prevent "hot pursuit" by Americans into Cambodian sanctuaries. It does not prohibit artillery fire from South Vietnam into Cambodia. It does not prevent interdicting from the air North Vietnamese supplies and troops moving along routes used to bring men and materiel into South Vietnam. And it does not prevent military assistance to the Cambodian Government through arms and supplies. In sum, the Senate amendment is large in symbolic value, but small in literal accomplishment.

Yet, symbols loom very large in the events of history. They are not to be discounted. Cooper-Church should not, in these terms, be discounted. For it would signal a revived Congress—a legislative body prepared to begin the long-overdue task of reasserting the powers it has gradually surrendered over the past

quarter of a century. This task, in view of the vote today, still remains.

But, symbols apart, there are other tasks which await doing. The war must be ended. It must be ended now. This country cannot continue to pay the price it has been paying for 5 years. We never could really afford it. That is why I have voted against every appropriation for the war in Vietnam. We cannot afford it at all today. And that is why I voted in favor of the Cooper-Church amendment today, by voting nay on the previous question and against the motion to table the motion to instruct the House conferees to accept the Cooper-Church amendment. That is why I will continue to oppose the war. That is why I am a sponsor of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war. It is why I will offer, as a significant, albeit not total, answer, an amendment to the Department of Defense appropriation bill when it comes to the floor in the near future barring the sending of draftees to Vietnam without their express consent.

If this war is to end, the President must acknowledge that a political solution is the only answer. Invasion of Cambodia refutes any commitments to such solution. Continued mouthings of insistence upon the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese is mere rhetoric, so long as our vehicle for realizing that end is a repressive regime which imprisons political dissenters in "tiger cages" on Con Son Island prison. What in the nature of the successive South Vietnamese governments which we have supported make our ostensible aim of securing the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese credible? The question is a rhetorical one, but I will supply the answer for any who might possibly miss it. "Nothing."

Instead of a political solution, the administration offers us a policy labeled "Vietnamization." Vietnamization will not work. We will always have troops in Vietnam so long as we insist on military answers to political problems. For, after all, this has been our policy ever since the United States sent combat troops to Vietnam. The name of the policy has changed, but the notion of helping the South Vietnamese until they could help themselves was the excuse for fighting in South Vietnam in the first place. So, the excuse remains the same. And it remains a misguided, tragically wrong excuse.

The Cooper-Church amendment went down to defeat in the House today. But defeat for those of us who have opposed the war in Indochina is not new. It is not going to deter us. We will not be deterred.

The House must fulfill its responsibilities. It must be willing to extensively debate the war. It must be willing to reassert its constitutionally mandated role in foreign and military affairs. And it must be willing to bring the death and destruction in Southeast Asia to an end by refusing to appropriate money to continue a bankrupt policy which insists upon a military solution to a political problem.

CAMBODIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the President withdrew all U.S. troops and advisers from Cambodia, thus ending a 60-day excursion into that country which has divided our own Nation and caused worldwide outcries. I think it would be worthwhile at this time to examine our reasons for entering Cambodia and to assess the results of our actions in that country.

The President listed his reasons for ordering American troops into Cambodia when he addressed the Nation on April 30. At that time he stated:

To protect our men who are in Vietnam and to guarantee the continued success of our withdrawal and Vietnamization programs, I have concluded that the time has come for action. . . .

The action I have taken tonight is indispensable for the continuing success of. . . [the] withdrawal program.

A majority of the American people want to end this war rather than to have it drag on interminably. The action I have taken tonight will serve that purpose. . . .

We take this action not for the purpose of expanding the war into Cambodia, but for the purpose of ending the war in Vietnam and winning the just peace we all desire. . . .

This is not an invasion of Cambodia. . . . our purpose is not to occupy the areas. . . .

Tonight, American and South Vietnamese units will attack the headquarters for the entire communist military operation in South Vietnam. . . .

I do not believe that the Cambodian invasion, nor the Laotian intervention recently revealed, has saved American lives.

Nor has the war been shortened.

Nor have we insured the speedier withdrawal of American troops.

Nor have we actually found and destroyed COSVN.

Nor have we been moved any closer to the goal of a "just" peace.

The rationale which the President has given us for expanded military efforts is not valid and I suggest it derives from a cold-war mentality ill fashioned to our times.

Our new involvement unfolds the probability that the United States will be committed to an even greater degree on the Asian mainland. The Vietnamization program in which the President has placed so much hope can scarcely be strengthened by continued commitment of Vietnamese forces to Cambodia.

At the same time, we have damaged prospects of success at the peace talks in Paris. The extension of the war has made us ever more dependent upon the Thieu-Ky government. We are a tethered power. Quite possibly, Secretary of State Rogers sought to broaden the grounds of negotiation last week when he said:

The Communists may decide it is in their best interests to negotiate an agreement which gives them representation proportionate to their numbers.

But the Thieu-Ky government, unhappy with the troublesome prospect of suggested support for a coalition government, promptly dampened U.S. efforts in that direction. In addition to showing no receptivity to the Rogers view, that government shut down 10 newspapers which published the Rogers statement.

Perhaps we should have heeded the words of Hanoi's chief military commander, General Giap. He has asserted for years that every extension of the area of battle serves the revolutionary interests because it is to the advantage of the side with the greater firepower and superior heavy equipment on the ground to concentrate its forces in one area. The side with greater mobility and lighter armaments has an interest in breaking up the fighting and enlarge the combat zone. In addition, revolutionaries depend on the help and support of the people but a foreign force must spend a great deal of time and effort to win over or control for force the people around whom the fighting is going on.

We have fallen into the trap of spreading ourselves too thin, and at the same time stating that we are trying to get out. We cannot fight a war and build up the South Vietnamese if we take on four Indochinese revolutionary parties in three different countries at the same time.

Listed below is a chronology of events and statements by leaders of the United States and South Vietnam. The chronology identifies our deepened involvement in Indochina, documents U.S. dependence upon decisions made by the Thieu-Ky government, and marks comprehensively the failure of the administration to deal honestly with the American people.

April 30: President Nixon announced that he will send ground troops into combat in Cambodia. He also announced that he had ordered renewed bombing of North Vietnam—four bombing raids—to prevent the National Liberation Front from crossing the demilitarized zone.

May 8: Nixon said that South Vietnamese troops were not necessarily bound by the June 30 deadline for American troops but that a pullback of South Vietnamese forces was expected to come "approximately at the same time that we do, because when we come out, our logistical support and air support will also come out with them."

May 8: South Vietnam's Thieu stated the South Vietnamese were not bound by the deadline set by President Nixon:

We have no deadline, no limits. . . . Where there is a target, we will strike it.

Thieu also said that he had reached this understanding with the United States 2 to 3 days before Nixon's April 30 speech.

May 11: Thieu indicated that neither the timetable for withdrawal nor the 21-mile penetration limit would apply to South Vietnamese troops. If the Cambodian Government requested it, he said, the South Vietnamese forces "can go farther into Cambodia and there is no deadline yet for getting out."

May 11: The State Department said that "no understanding or agreement" between Washington and Saigon on how long the South Vietnamese forces would remain in Cambodia had been reached.

May 13: Secretary of State Rogers said that the United States would not become "militarily involved" with troop or air support to defend the Cambodian Government. He said the South Vietnamese and Thailand would be encouraged to cooperate with Cambodia in repulsing

the Communist threat—a policy in line with the Nixon doctrine of fostering cooperation among Asians to handle their own problems.

May 16: The State Department announced that the United States had secretly shipped small arms to Cambodia on April 25 while the Nixon administration publicly announced that it was considering the request for aid from the Lon Nol government. These 3,000 captured Communist AK-47 rifles were sent to Cambodian Government troops in unmarked South Vietnamese military transports.

May 20: First public acknowledgement by the United States that South Vietnamese troops might stay in Cambodia after the deadline. The "determination has not been made" said the State Department.

May 21: Ky said:

I wish to make clear that we will not let our hands be bound by anyone any more.

Ky said that South Vietnamese forces were capable of operating independently in Cambodia and would stay here "not only to destroy the Communists but also to provide protection for the lives and property of 600,000 Vietnamese residents."

Ky called the hypothesis of a Saigon troop pullout along with an American pullout "a silly argument of a silly people."

May 21: Presidential Assistant Ron Zeigler at the White House said:

It would not be appropriate to put a timetable on the South Vietnamese forces.

May 22: Secretary of Defense Laird said it would "be a mistake to make a further timetable and establish it here for South Vietnamese forces to withdraw." Presidential Assistant Zeigler chose to reserve comment on whether we would provide South Vietnam with air support if they remained after June 30.

May 25: Carl Barch of the State Department said that the administration's tactical air support for South Vietnam after June 30 was a possibility being left open.

May 27: The South Vietnamese and Cambodians signed an agreement which stated, in part, that Saigon's military forces had entered Cambodia to "help Cambodian troops to drive out the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces—and will withdraw when their task is completed."

June 3: Nixon spoke to the Nation. The President called Cambodia the "most successful mission of this long and difficult war." He said he would pull out all troops, air support, and advisers on June 30.

Nixon said:

The only remaining American activity in Cambodia after July 1 will be air missions to interdict the movement of enemy troops and material where I find it is necessary to protect the lives and security of our men in South Vietnam.

As for the South Vietnamese, Nixon said their activity in Cambodia "after their withdrawal from the sanctuaries will be determined by the actions of the enemy in Cambodia."

June 6: Ky said that South Vietnamese air forces had begun to support Cambodian troops in operations in central and western Cambodia. He stressed the need to keep pressure on the Communists after June 30:

If we stop, in the next two or three weeks they—the communists—will mount a big attack.

June 7: Rogers conceded that the United States would probably bear a "substantial part of the cost" of the war if it evolved into "South Vietnamese forces and Cambodian forces and even possibly Thai forces fighting a common enemy." Rogers would not term the decision not to return to Cambodia as irrevocable. We would return, he said:

If it is necessary to protect the lives of American forces right on the border.

July 1: President Nixon in a televised interview refused to state that he would not send American ground combat troops back into Cambodia. He also gave his support to American air support of the South Vietnamese and did not preclude the same for Cambodians.

Summarizing this chronology, there is no doubt that the Cambodian adventure represents an escalation of our war effort in Indochina, an escalation obscured by rhetoric but revealed by the calendar of events.

Nor is this escalation confined to tactical assistance.

The heart of the present effort to aid Cambodia is the military assistance program—MAP. The MAP program is directed toward insuring the survival of the Lon Nol government. American officials insist that MAP is limited in scope in Cambodia and that it will not reach the level of aid which we are now providing to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. But the past is prolog, and I see old acts repeating themselves in Cambodia.

Specifically, we seek in Cambodia to build the Cambodian army into a self-sufficient force of 50,000 to 60,000 men within 6 months. The maximum number of Cambodian soldiers engaged in defending their country during the past 2 months was 20,000. Their performance was mediocre at best.

At the present time, \$7.9 million in current MAP funds have been earmarked for Cambodia. However, new plans are being drafted to expand the MAP program for Cambodia and estimates are that the administration will ask for \$60 million for fiscal 1971. That is about 18 percent of the total world expenditure for MAP.

At this time, MAP is paying for weapons and supplies which are constantly pouring into Phnom Penh. It is also paying for six battalions—3,000 men—of Khmer Khrom ethnic Cambodians who were trained by American Green Berets and have been imported from South Vietnam to fight in Cambodia. It is also paying for the combat training program for Cambodian troops that is taking place in South Vietnam.

In addition to MAP funding, America is spending large sums on the massive air operations in Cambodia.

While we escalate in both Cambodia

and Laos, enemy activity has increased in Vietnam. The Communists seized and briefly held the city of Dalat—South Vietnam's ninth largest city previously considered safe and an example of the success of our Vietnamization program. Dalat was seized on May 31, right in the middle of the Cambodian invasion when 40,000 South Vietnamese troops were engaged in that country and 30,000 American troops joined them.

By late May, the Communists had also gained control of Northern Cambodia and the Southern Panhandle region of Laos. These seizures now permit them to work on new supply and infiltration routes for troops to South Vietnam. Supplies now move along the Sekong and Mekong Rivers from Laos to Cambodia where they are transported overland to South Vietnam through Communist-held Cambodian territory.

The Communists in early June controlled every highway into Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, and cut off the city's rail link with the outlying provinces. By encircling the capital they also blocked oil from Kompong Som—the only oil refinery—and prevented shipment of rice to the city. Within the past week a North Vietnamese heavy weapons platoon was sighted within 9 miles of the capital. This heavy fighting in the Phnom Penh area severely threatens the Government of Lon Nol which the United States is tacitly committed to supporting.

We did not expect Hanoi to establish new base areas or supply routes when we began our "clean-out" mission, nor did we anticipate any full-scale Hanoi attack against Cambodia with the corresponding attempt to bring down the Lon Nol Government. But the Hanoi actions were in keeping with their general traditions. Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese forces have made forays into Laos and with some success.

On April 30, they captured Attapeu in Laos and threatened Saravane, the provincial capital, 70 miles to the north. On May 5, the Communists warned that they would assault Saravane. The Laotian Government evacuated 2,500 civilians from that city. By May 9, three North Vietnamese battalions totaling possibly 1,000 men had advanced to within 18 miles of that strategic center on the Mekong River.

On May 11, Laotian Prince Souvanna Phouma expressed fear that the North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao would intensify the Laotian war because of Cambodia. He described the latest attacks in Laos as a direct response to the United States and South Vietnamese developments in Cambodia. In addition, Phouma is being pressed by the rightists in Laos to pursue a more vigorous military policy against the Communists.

If the Communists did move into Laos we would be endangering our present posture supporting South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand. The Mekong area is considered crucial by Thais who would pressure us heavily to respond to Communist action. Rather than send in troops, we would probably give air support and advisers, but that would involve us in the defense of a fourth Indochina nation.

The military situation in Laos and Cambodia has greatly disturbed Thailand because of Communist infiltration so near its borders. On June 1, Thailand announced that they would send volunteer forces into Cambodia. On June 2, it was announced that Thai troops would assume defense duties in Phnom Penh and other Cambodian cities, releasing regular Cambodian troops for combat duty. The Thai soldiers were to be composed of Thais of Cambodian descent. On June 1, the United States expressed support of the Thai-Cambodian agreement and on June 2 announced that we would provide arms and equipment for Thai forces. On June 5, Thai forces were placed on alert since their border with Cambodia was in danger.

The major Thai division to be stationed in Cambodia is the Black Panther Division previously based in South Vietnam. This division has done little fighting and its combat effectiveness is questionable. The South Vietnamese in Cambodia are accustomed to U.S. advice, air support, and artillery. If either the South Vietnamese or the Thais in Cambodia are threatened with destruction, the United States may be in a very difficult position.

The United States is now committed to air support of South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia and perhaps to Cambodian troops. We are also committed to supporting Thai troops in Cambodia. We have admitted involvement in Laos and we are preparing to supply millions of dollars in a MAP program for Cambodia. We have also implicitly committed ourselves to the support of the Lon Nol government. It would seem that the United States is committed to an indefinite continuation of the "cleaning-out" operation and an expanded Indochina war.

I question the capability of the South Vietnamese to carry out a large scale complex military operation by themselves in Cambodia, Laos or their own country. In addition, to transfer such responsibilities to the South Vietnamese will cause serious difficulties. There is no love lost between the Vietnamese and the Cambodians or the Laotians. Each ethnic group in Indochina is distrustful of the others. There has been a traditional animosity between these peoples and the South Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia has not helped the relationship between them.

For example, on May 21, Major Amrongs, spokesman for the Cambodian military command said that Cambodians would rather die than "live under Vietnamese domination." He referred to all Vietnamese. During his press conference, posters demanding withdrawal of South Vietnamese troops from Cambodia were pasted on the walls of the briefing room. They accused Saigon soldiers of "looting, raping our women, burning and massacring women and children." On May 22, the chief of the Cambodian information service said:

We now have two invasions being conducted in Cambodia, the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese. . . . The Vietnamese are expansionists and we fear that

if this continues, Cambodia will disappear, although we would die before this happens.

Although reports of ethnic antagonism have been downplayed, the fact remains that the peoples of Indochina have never lived together harmoniously regardless of political affiliation. The attempt by the United States to superimpose its principles on these peoples overlooks fundamental antagonisms which cannot be obliterated by any foreign power, no matter how rich and strong.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Cambodian invasion may have opened a Pandora's box of problems in Southeast Asia.

We have, by that act, involved ourselves in all of Indochina, and I see unrelenting and costly war as a result. I suggest that President Nixon's policy in the 1970's is based on a 1950 concept of our role in the world. His picture of monolithic communism has been refuted time and time again by the facts, by the nationalistic nature of Asian communism and the split between Peking and Moscow. Yet Nixon continues to react to all communism as if it were a clear and present danger to our national security.

This country can no longer be the world's protector. It must recognize the fact that it does not have the right to invade neutral nations under the guise of protecting them from "communism."

In his April 30 announcement the President said:

Small nations all over the world find themselves under attack from within and from without. If when the chips are down, the world's most powerful nation . . . (the U.S.) acts like a pitiful, helpless giant, the forces of totalitarianism and anarchy will threaten free nations and free institutions throughout the world. . . . If we fail to meet this challenge all other nations will be on notice that despite its overwhelming power, the United States when a real crisis comes will be found wanting.

This fear of totalitarianism, this feeling that America cannot lose because to lose would mean humiliation and defeat forever, this concept of a world cleanly divided between evil communism and saintly democracy is the core of our present policy and the key to our real defeat. We are now the "pitiful, helpless giant" to which the President referred. We have lost our sense of dignity. We have lost our honor and we have lost our perspective.

By waging an endless land war in Southeast Asia we have lost the respect of other nations and, contrary to President Nixon's statement that "the credibility of the United States would be destroyed in every area of the world where only the power of the United States deters aggression," we have lost respect and credibility. The international repercussions of our entree into Cambodia have been numerous. For instance, on May 18 Peking abruptly canceled the scheduled Sino-American diplomatic meeting in Warsaw. This cancellation constituted a setback to attempts by the Nixon administration to break the deadlock in U.S. relations with Peking. Ironically,

the President's decision to send American troops into Cambodia seems to have worked against his own efforts to initiate a dialog with Communist China.

Throughout the world, U.S. allies expressed critical and apprehensive comments about the Cambodian venture. On May 5, then Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Britain voiced "apprehension and anxiety" that the American military moves would "add a new dimension to the area and scale of the fighting."

French Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann on May 5 warned that any escalation of the war in Indochina would only solidify the Communists. A French Government statement issued after a Cabinet meeting May 6 said that France was "concerned by the worsening of the international situation caused, almost everywhere, but essentially in the Far East, by a number of recent events, which we deplore."

On May 5, U Thant issued an appeal for an international conference to seek a peaceful settlement of the Indochinese war. He expressed fear that if the parties to the conflict "do not take urgent measures toward peace, it will become increasingly difficult to end a war" that threatened not only Indochina but "the whole of mankind."

Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India on May 6 called the Cambodian invasion a "dangerous step" and urged President Nixon to reconsider his move.

On May 6-10 worldwide demonstrations were held to protest the American advance into Cambodia. Five thousand people marched on the United States Embassy in London on May 9; thousands of antiwar demonstrators fought police in front of the U.S. Cultural Center in West Berlin on May 9. Demonstrations were held May 8 in Montreal, Calcutta, Caracas, Venezuela, Canberra, Australia, and Auckland, New Zealand.

Asian diplomatic analysts have stated that the U.S. thrust into Cambodia appears to have thwarted Soviet attempts to persuade the Vietnamese Communists to negotiate and has pushed them closer to China, which has long advocated a tough approach to the war. Analysts here believe that the Chinese probably pledged Le Duan, First Secretary of North Vietnam's Lao Dong—Workers Party—to whom they accorded "red carpet" treatment, to step up their military and economic aid to Hanoi and the Vietcong in anticipation of a lengthy Indochinese conflict.

On May 14, Sihanouk bluntly asked the Soviet Union to recognize his Peking-based government in exile. The bluntness of his approach suggests that the Communists are exerting pressure on Moscow to adopt a hard line.

While our credibility worldwide is shaken, our credibility at home is in shambles. Many young people have been severely alienated, and many of their parents share their sense of frustration and anger. The unprecedented dissent which followed Nixon's announcement on April 30 should demonstrate to anyone that the very foundations of our society have been shaken. The congressional debate on the President's role in foreign

policy exemplifies the tensions besetting the country. The President has truly challenged the Congress and the Senate has responded at least in part by passing the Cooper-Church amendment. I only hope that the House will have the good sense to do the same.

It is true folly to continue our present course. As Townsend Hoopes wrote in *Foreign Affairs* this month, we are immersed in a "cold-war syndrome." This view persists today:

The trouble and the tragedy have been that the American response to the cold war generated its own momentum and, in doing so, led us progressively to actions beyond the rational requirements of our national security . . . The pressures arising from a combination of real and spurious threats, and from our assumption of vast responsibility in a world seething with change and discontent, moved U.S. policy—and American opinion—toward a Pavlovian tendency to see every local uprising as a mortal test of wills between a communist octopus and the free world coalition.

It is time now to differentiate in our foreign policy between real and imagined threats. We must avoid commitments which stem from an unrealistic world view—a view which says things ought to be this way and refuses to accept what is. Our "moral crusade" in Vietnam is unrealistic and dangerous. By imposing our "morality" abroad we are losing it at home. The dissent caused by the Vietnam war and the billions of dollars we have spent in this exhausting and fruitless action, have undermined the confidence of the American people in their government and damaged their self-esteem. We have neglected our duties to our own citizens by tilting at Asian windmills. Many Americans are poor, some are starving; racial discrimination is destroying the fabric of our society. Our cities are dying, our air is unbreathable, and our water is undrinkable. Yet the money and the energy which are desperately needed to attempt to remedy these situations are being wasted in that senseless war.

President Nixon cannot cope with this reality. He refuses to open his eyes to the country's internal defeat.

President Eisenhower in 1954 said:

There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the Constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it. Now let us have that clear.

We—the Congress and various administrations since 1954—have quite obviously threaded a course which ignored President Eisenhower's pronouncement.

Today in the vote on the Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to redress the balance, to demand that sustained and massive commitment by this Nation abroad be regulated by appropriate constitutional process.

PROPOSAL TO CUT OFF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES PRODUCING ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a proposal which is cosponsored by 127 Members of the House of Representatives and which is directed to one of the most urgent problems facing our Nation—the problem of narcotic addiction.

Under the bill which I am introducing, the President is directed to suspend economic and military assistance to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent such drugs as heroin, opium, cocaine, and morphine produced, in whole or in part, in that country from unlawfully entering the United States. This bill also authorizes the President to utilize such agencies and facilities of our Federal Government as he deems appropriate to assist foreign countries in their efforts to curb the illegal drug traffic.

I am convinced that such legislation has been long overdue. For many years our Government, mostly through our State Department and through international organizations, has been attempting to persuade foreign governments to curb the illegal growing of opium poppies and the illegal production of heroin, morphine, and cocaine. The little progress that has been made has been more than offset by a rapidly growing increase in the flow of narcotics into the United States. In my judgment, humanitarian appeals for the cooperation of foreign governments simply do not suffice. It has become necessary for us, instead, to impose meaningful economic sanctions on governments that do not cooperate.

Narcotic addiction in the United States has become a national epidemic and it is urgent that we abate the contagion of disease and crime that is now increasing at a rapid rate. Faced with this epidemic, it is essential that we do all in our power to reduce the consumption of narcotics. One of the most effective means of abating the epidemic is to attack the problem at its source. Almost 100 percent of the hard-core drugs being consumed in the United States are produced abroad. Under these circumstances, we should be prepared to assist any foreign government which is willing to cooperate in drying up the supply and to impose economic sanctions on those governments which are unwilling to cooperate and are simply turning their back while illegal production in large quantities continues within their borders.

Certainly no reasonable person can argue that the bill that I am introducing today is without justification. According to some estimates, there are now 300,000 or 400,000 narcotic addicts loose on the streets of communities all over the United States. In some of our cities such as New York, Washington, Philadelphia, and my own city of Newark, there is evidence that more than 50 percent of the street crimes are committed by narcotic addicts out of the desperate need to feed their habits.

So rampant is the addiction problem that in New York City, for example, some 900 juveniles died last year from overdoses of heroin. Also in New York about 1,000 babies each year are now being born addicted as a result of the addiction of their mothers during pregnancy.

The relationship between addiction and crime is more than substantiated by the fact that a typical addict now requires more than \$50 a day to pay for illegally obtained narcotics. Others require \$150 per day or more. Translated into the amount of property which must be stolen to obtain \$50, this can amount to more than \$300 per day.

Even if we assume that there are only 100,000 addicts in the United States, this could mean that more than \$2 billion per year is going into the hands of organized crime through the illegal sale of narcotics. This could also amount to an economic loss of \$30 million a day or almost \$11 billion per year in terms of stolen property and illegal profits. Yet these figures do not even take into account the effect of drugs on the costs of our court system, our law enforcement facilities, and various types of welfare programs.

Yet staggering as is the economic loss due to addiction, the social loss is even greater in terms of families destroyed, young lives ruined, and large segments of our society which live in the constant fear of becoming the victims of addiction-related crimes.

Because of the enormous devastation which narcotic drugs is bringing to our society, it is simply absurd for the American people to be expected to provide aid to foreign countries which permit foreign narcotics producers to reap vast illegal profits by preying on our youth and our poor.

One of the most outrageous examples involves the illegal growing of opium poppies in Turkey. About 80 percent of all the heroin smuggled into the United States is made from opium grown in Turkey where farmers have been cultivating poppy fields for hundreds of years. According to reliable information the illegal supply of opium is so plentiful in Turkey that the amount necessary to produce a kilo of heroin can be purchased for about \$350. The price to narcotic addicts in the United States purchasing 1 kilo of heroin is about \$225,000.

The only way in which we will be able to deal effectively with this problem is for the Congress to enact a law which will impose sanctions and which will have teeth. The bill that I am introducing today will provide such a law.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have introduced other legislation designed to cope with the narcotics problem. On June 2, 1970, I introduced H.R. 17883 which proposed giving the President the authority to curtail economic and military assistance to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent the ingredients of such drugs as heroin, morphine, and cocaine from entering this country. Two days later, during the course of debate on H.R. 17861, the foreign assistance and related programs appropriations bill, I introduced an amendment which embodied substantially the same provisions. Although I withdrew the amendment because of a point of order, many of our colleagues expressed their support for such legislation. Today, as a result of this general support, and out of a deep sense of urgency to abate the spread of addiction, I am introducing a bill which

contains the provisions of my original proposal, and in addition expands the scope of the bill so as to authorize the President to provide assistance to those countries which actively cooperate in our efforts to wipe out narcotic drugs at their source.

On April 27, 1970, I also introduced another proposal which will contribute to curbing the narcotic epidemic. That bill, H.R. 17269, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1970, permits public health authorities to initiate the medical commitment of any person known to be a narcotic addict. It also gives the President broad powers to utilize any facility of the Federal Government to deal with the narcotics problem. Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee has already commenced hearings on this proposal.

Each of these proposals is part of a three-pronged attack on the narcotic problem. First, by using public health authorities to remove addicts from the streets, we can dry up the demand for narcotics. Second, by placing the control of the addict in the hands of public health officials, we can free law enforcement officials to concentrate on cracking down on the narcotic pusher. Third, by providing assistance to countries which cooperate and cutting off economic and military assistance to countries which do not control the illegal production of narcotics, we can reduce the supply of narcotics entering the United States.

I believe each of these steps are imperative and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give these proposals prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill as well as an article from the New York Sunday Times of June 14, 1970, concerning the problem of opium production in Turkey.

H.R. 18398

A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(v) The President shall suspend (in whole or in part) economic and military assistance provided under this or any other Act, and shall suspend (in whole or in part) sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and sales under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken appropriate

steps to carry out the purpose of this subsection. In implementing the provisions of this subsection, the President is authorized to utilize such agencies and facilities of the Federal Government as he may deem appropriate to assist foreign countries in their efforts to prevent the unlawful entry of narcotic drugs into the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed with respect to any action taken by him under this subsection. Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1970]

U.S. LOAN TO TURKEY DISMAYS NARCOTICS OFFICIALS

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 13—The Administration's drive against heroin and other narcotics took an unexpected turn this week when the White House quietly approved a \$40-million development loan to Turkey.

Some narcotics enforcement officials here noted that the new loan was "too far down the road" to be made conditional on a further reduction by Turkey in the number of provinces where opium poppies may be grown legally. The officials are setting their sights on next year's loan negotiations instead.

About 80 per cent of the heroin smuggled into the United States originates in Turkey, where legal production of opium has been about 100 tons a year. Unofficial estimates here indicate that as much illegal opium is produced in Turkey as is processed under Government controls.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE URGED

Federal studies have acknowledged that there can be little hope of denting the traffic in heroin and other dangerous drugs without the cooperation of governments of the countries where they originate. Some enforcement officials contend that inducing this cooperation will require the use of all possible economic leverage available to the United States.

There is reason to doubt, however, whether the United States ever will be able to use fully its economic leverage in Turkey.

The State Department places great importance on Turkey's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It considers as no less important that country's strategic position at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, where the Soviet Union has been expanding its naval presence. Turkey's proximity to the explosive Middle East has magnified its importance even more, in this view.

These considerations argue against trying to get tough with the Turkish Government of Premier Suleyman Demirel, whose grip on his Justice party is not as firm as it once was, according to State Department reasoning.

The question to be resolved in the year ahead is whether Turkey's strategic importance outweighs the effects of the continued legal production there of opium, which when converted to morphine and refined into heroin in the Marseilles area threatens American youth.

TURKEY'S POSITION STRONG

Premier Demirel is committed to gradually phasing out legal opium production. Since the United States made Turkey a \$3-million loan in 1968 for opium eradication and for conversion to other crops, the number of provinces permitted to grow opium poppies has been reduced from 17 to 9.

The effect of the reduction was to concentrate production in the interior of the country. Another result was to double the amount of opium actually produced because of more intensive cultivation and illegal planting.

According to unofficial estimates here Turkey would have produced 200 tons of opium from the current harvest if not for a prolonged drought that cut yields about a third below normal. It had been expected that the Government would further reduce the number of provinces where opium poppies may be produced from nine to seven this summer.

ABOUT 110,000 GROW POPPIES

But nobody here who is familiar with Turkish politics believes this is likely now. About 110,000 peasant farmers are still engaged in opium production, and they are a factor to be reckoned with in local and national elections.

Tradition has made it difficult for the Government to carry out Premier Demirel's commitment to eradicate all opium production by 1971. Although official Turkish figures indicate that opium production contributes only about \$5-million to a gross national product of \$13-billion, peasant farmers have always planted poppies.

The official estimate of \$5-million a year from opium production is considered low by experts here, since it is based on legitimate production that must now be sold to the Government for \$10 to \$11 a kilo, or 2.2 pounds. Buyers of illegal opium pay up to \$30 a kilo for the same product.

Under the Government's control program, all land planted with poppies is supposed to be inventoried and the producers licensed. This is expected to cut down on the practice of planting as much illegal acreage as officially approved acreage. But it probably will take years to eliminate the practice.

The Turkish national police has been training a 750-man narcotics force since last December—420 special narcotics policemen and 330 gendarmes. About 250 of them are now in the field. But observers in Turkey consider them vulnerable to corruption by those engaged in illegal narcotics traffic.

For a member of the special narcotics police is paid less than \$50 a month. And the gendarmierie operating in the countryside might earn as little as 36 cents a month.

The process of opium production begins when the petals drop from the poppy blossom, leaving the pod. The pod is slit and the milky liquid that oozes out is allowed to harden and then is scraped off.

Ten kilos of illicit opium at \$30 a kilo will bring \$300 from an illegal buyer in Turkey. It takes about 10 kilos of opium to make one kilo of morphine base, a yellowish powder. A kilo of morphine is worth about \$500. When delivered to the merchants in Marseilles, who refine it into heroin, the same kilo of morphine is worth \$1,000.

When smuggled to the United States, the amount of pure heroin that can be held in the palm and fingers of one hand is worth as much as \$250,000.

More than the Turkish opium output is involved in that Government's commitment to phase out production. Iran last year lifted its 13-year ban on opium production largely because Turkey and Afghanistan had failed to follow her example. Illegal transactions in gold to pay for Turkish and Afghan opium smuggled into Iran were costing the country precious foreign exchange.

Before the ban in 1955, Iran was producing 900 tons to 1,200 tons a year. Iran's acreage in poppies this year is about half that. The Government has pledged to restore the ban if its neighbors get out of the business.

The \$40 million United States loan through the Agency for International Development amounts to a line of credit for purchases in the United States of commodities and equipment needed for Turkey's economic development. It is a so-called program loan which means it can be used for purchasing any nonluxury items for which Turkey does not have available foreign exchange.

A TRIBUTE TO MIKE M. MASAOKA

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a great leader brings inspiration to his people, instills confidence in them to replace despair, makes them oblivious to distance and difficulties. He gives the dramatic process a dynamic quality, a vividness and a faith that brings realization to seemingly impossible dreams.

Such a leader is a man I am proud to call my friend: Mike M. Masaoka. In his 30-year dedication to the well-being of Japanese Americans, he has led that group from their plight of discrimination, deprivation, and despair to a position of acceptance, approval, and friendship in American community life.

Born in Fresno, Calif., Mike was educated in Salt Lake City, Utah, graduating with honors from the University of Utah in 1937 with a major in political science and history. Even at this early age, Mike showed a particular ability in the art of reasoned persuasion, winning many collegiate debating and public speaking honors. In 1940, he was recognized by the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce as its "Citizen of the Community" for his many civic activities.

In August, 1941, Mike was appointed as national secretary and field executive of the Japanese American Citizens League. In this position he was able to see clearly the plight of Japanese Americans who were victims of the long standing anti-Japanese feeling in the West, now growing steadily worse due to the strained relations between Japan and the United States. He provided much of the leadership so vital to Japanese Americans in the period before, during, and after World War II.

The period of the mass evacuation of persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast was an enormously difficult one. Their removal from their homes and their subsequent incarceration has been described by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights as "the most striking interference since slavery with the right to physical freedom." Mike fought vigorously against the unprecedented evacuation and when the event became inevitable, he was influential in bringing much more humane treatment to the evacuees by the War Relocation Authority, the Government agency having supervision over the detention camps. Believing that at this juncture in American history, Nisei could best dramatize their loyalty to the United States by fighting in its armed forces, Mike was instrumental in persuading President Roosevelt to authorize Japanese-Americans to become members of the armed forces and with this decision, the Nisei flocked to volunteer for combat duty, resulting in the formation of the 442d Regimental Combat Team for which Mike was the first volunteer from the mainland. The Nisei built a combat record second to none as they enlisted from behind the barbed wire fences of relocation centers. In the words of the late Gen. Joseph W. Stillwell:

These Japanese American troops bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood.

In 1948, 2 years after he had been discharged from the Army, and as Washington representative for the Japanese American Citizens League, he was to point out to a congressional committee that—

Fifty thousand parents of these gallant soldiers cannot become citizens of the country for which they and their sons gave so much . . . they are still branded as enemy aliens, and we, their American children, are forced to suffer from this accident of birth.

He was determined that the Issei, the foreign-born Japanese, should gain the same full status as American citizens as all other ethnic groups and he haunted congressional offices and committees with a persistence and an eloquence rarely seen in congressional corridors. His determination to correct existing injustices against Japanese Americans met with success. Some of the bills whose passage he influenced most notably included the right to naturalization for persons of Japanese ancestry, compensation for property losses incurred by evacuees, prevention of the deportation of Japanese aliens whose families included American citizens, and authorizing servicemen to marry and return with Japanese war brides. He also was one of the leaders which brought statehood for Hawaii. His success in obtaining passage of so many bills made him the subject of an article in the Reader's Digest entitled "Washington's Most Successful Lobbyist."

Mike did not limit his activity to the cause of the Japanese Americans, but was very active in the fight to assure human rights for all Americans. He was one of the organizers and charter members of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and he served as chairman of the National Civil Liberties Clearinghouse. He became active in many other civil rights and political groups working in the human relations field.

Some 10 years ago, after he had "worked himself out of a job" as a full-time Washington representative for JACL, he organized with Samuel Ishikawa of New York what is now known as Masaoka-Ishikawa & Associates, Inc., with JACL remaining as one of its clients. It is the only Japanese American company that specializes in governmental representations and national and international public relations and consultations. As president of this company, Mike is still in the middle of activities promoting the continued good relations of Japan and the United States. He is called upon as a consultant on many levels where United States and Japanese interests are involved. He served as president of the Japan America Society of Washington, D.C., in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 16, a testimonial dinner will be held in honor of Mike Masaoka at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago. Among the featured speakers, there will be Edward J. Ennis, chairman of the board of directors, American Civil Liberties Union; Roy Wilkins, chairman, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; the Honorable U.

Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and former U.S. Ambassador to Japan; and Shig Wakamatsu, past national president of the JACL. It will be my privilege also to speak in tribute to Mike, and my friend and colleague, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, will be the toastmaster.

Mr. Speaker, this dinner will be well attended as proud and grateful men and women from all over the country come to Chicago to pay their homage to a man whose vision, courage, and determination made history in this country. It will be our privilege, too, to hear from Mike that evening, to listen again to the eloquence which made a singular impression upon so many Members of Congress.

I am attaching to my remarks two statements by Mike made years ago. The first which is entitled "The Japanese American Citizens' League Creed" was read into the Record by Senator Elbert Thomas of Utah on May 9, 1941. The second was made by Mike on April 21, 1948, before the House Committee on the Judiciary in the hearing on changes in the immigration laws.

The statements follow:

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE CREED
(By Mike Masaoka)

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way; above-board, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her Constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

STATEMENT OF MIKE M. MASAOKA, NATIONAL
LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, JAPANESE AMERICAN
CITIZENS LEAGUE

Mr. MASAOKA. Mr. Chairman, I have a rather lengthy statement, but I will not presume upon your time by insisting upon reading it. I will simply make a few comments and answer one or two questions I think may have been raised in your minds.

Mr. FELLOWS. Will you give your name and whom you represent for the record?

Mr. MASAOKA. My name, Mr. Chairman, is Mike M. Masaoka. I am the national legislative director for the Japanese American Citizens League.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that my testifying today is something I owe to a lot of fellows I fought with overseas. It is a promise I made to a lot of fellows over 3 years ago, and that promise has a long story. It begins something like this; it follows something along the lines of the questions Mr. Chelf brought out.

When war came, as Mr. Ennis so ably pointed out, persons of Japanese ancestry were asked by their Government to move out, and, as pointed out by a witness before a subcommittee of this same Judiciary Committee last year, the Japanese people in the United States are the only people in its history who have ever been asked to go bankrupt voluntarily and then go to jail, because that is what happened.

But, the important thing is this: Because persons of Japanese ancestry, and I was one, two-thirds of whom were American citizens, felt that it was a war contribution to the defense of the United States, we—a great number of us college graduates who believed and lived the American way—went to these barren barracks, virtual prison camps, because we believed fundamentally in the American way.

Therefore, even though Selective Service originally turned us down for the draft, we insisted upon the right to fight for the United States, to prove on the battlegrounds of this World War that we believed in America and—

Mr. CHELF. You believed also that it would not be in vain, did you not?

Mr. MASAOKA. Definitely. And that is why I am here today, sir. We urged the Selective Service, and finally they said, "We shall use some of you in the Pacific. We shall use others in the combat elements in Italy."

I was one of five brothers to volunteer. All of us saw combat in Italy and France. All of us were wounded. One of my brothers will not come back. Another brother of mine had 34 operations. He is still convalescing. A younger kid brother, who had no business volunteering, except that he wanted to look after me because I was probably the less capable of all, still limps and will limp the rest of his life.

Well, overseas there were lots of fellows who believed in some of the things I had said, because during the evacuation process I was the national secretary of the organization of Japanese Americans, and we took it upon ourselves to urge every eligible Nisei to volunteer either against the Japanese enemy or for combat in Europe.

A lot of those fellows believed in me, and I can remember time after time overseas we would be sent upon a dangerous mission, and a fellow would say, "Mike, don't go on this one. This is on us. Your job is to go back and see that what we are trying to do isn't forgotten; that our parents will get citizenship."

Amazingly enough, right in the fox holes before battle we would talk about a lot of things; but the No. 1 topic was this: Sure we wanted America to win the war, but we also wanted America to be the kind of America that it professed to be, and that kind of America would not discriminate against people like my mother, who came here early in the 1900's. When she had eight children, dad died leaving us practically penniless. Yet, my mother saw every one of us through school, a number of us through college, and when the test of supreme loyalty to this country came it was my mother who first said, "Boys, your job is to go out and fight for these United States, because it is my country."

Well, there were lots of other mothers and fathers like that, and, as I say, their sons and I knew each other overseas, and over and over again they insisted that

my job was to come and tell you, the Congress of the United States, what their loyalties were—loyalties which could not be questioned.

Now, I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into the long combat record of Four Hundred and Forty-second. I think it is pretty well known. I would, however, like to give you a few statistics about its casualties.

When the combat team originally went into action they had a complement of a little over 3,000 men. After only 120 days of combat fighting, mind you, our casualties, as the War Department has carried them time and time again, were over 300 percent. We had 9,486 casualties. Most of these casualties were sustained when we rescued the lost Texas battalion of white Americans. After fighting through from Salerno up through Italy, we were transferred to northern France to go through the various mountains there. No army in history up to that time had ever broken through this area.

We were assigned the job of spearheading the drive. We broke through, yes, but during the initial break-through one of our battalions of Americans from Texas—it is too bad the Congressman from Texas is not here because he could tell you the story—was isolated by the Germans. Seven regiments were ordered to the rescue of that one Texas battalion, but none were able to break through.

After 4 days of waiting, the Japanese-American combat team in another sector was pulled out of the line and ordered to the rescue of that Texas battalion. We made it. We rescued 189 Texans, but we lost over 200 men killed just in that rescue.

I will never forget that, because my brother was one of those.

I remember when we went into the line in northern France we had a full rifle complement to every company, over 200 men. We had 40 men in reserve for each company. Yet, after we made the rescue of the Lost Battalion, after we had spearheaded the drive of the Seventh Army through northern France, one company had only two men who could crawl out under their own power.

Yet, none of us ever asked for relief. None of us ever showed the white feather. And the only a.w.o.l.'s—absent without leave, gentlemen—were those of the men in the hospitals who, though they were seriously wounded and should have remained in hospitals, knowing the tragic situation of their buddies up front insisted upon leaving their hospitals, some still lame, some still halt, others with gaping wounds, in order to strengthen that thin red line that we had up there.

The commanding general of the Thirty-sixth Division—and I will never forget it—told us at our little memorial ceremonies we had that no outfit in American history "has ever showed greater courage, greater conviction in the American way, than you Japanese-Americans."

I say this not to brag about our outfit—although I think it is an American trait to brag about a good outfit like that—but I say it simply to indicate that here you had a great number of American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who believed in America, who so believed in it that even though they were incarcerated in virtual prisons they saw behind and beyond the barbed-wire fences; they saw beyond the watchtowers manned by armed MPs; they saw America, just and fairminded, willing to give them and their parents a decent break.

And that is why, even though they were suspected by their own Government, they went out and fought as well as they did.

So much for those in the European theater. May I just make one comment about those who served in the Pacific? In the Pacific area our intelligence was weak. The reason for that was that very few persons in America could speak and understand the Japanese language well enough. Thus, Jap-

anese-Americans were used as combat intelligence troops.

Just last week, in the April 10 edition, I believe it was, of the Saturday Evening Post, there was an article by one of the intelligence chiefs under General MacArthur, and he tells us the use of Japanese-American troops in the Pacific shortened the war by months and saved thousands of American casualties.

Let me tell one story and I will wind up this particular part of my statement. We had a fellow by the name of Frank Hachiya. He was a fellow about my age. He lived in Hood River, Oreg. At the time of the evacuation he was moved to the relocation center in the desert area of Idaho. While he was gone the American Legion of that particular post removed his name from the honor roll of that community along with 15 others.

What happened to Frank? He volunteered for military intelligence duty. Frank, after finishing his basic training, was dropped behind Japanese lines at Leyte. During the invasion, the amphibious landing, Frank tried to crawl back with information. He was shot by an American soldier who mistook him for the enemy. And yet, because he knew that the safety—yes, the lives—of his American buddies depended upon his getting through, mortally wounded though he was, he crawled in his own path of blood, as it were, to his commanding officer, gave him the entire defenses of the Japanese on Leyte.

He received for that a Distinguished Service Cross, but Frank isn't here to plead with me for citizenship for his dad and mother.

Now, Dr. Judd's bill does present two different problems. One is the problem of naturalization; the other the problem of immigration.

Unfortunately, I am not an expert on the problem of immigration, but I do say this: Our interests in immigration are the same as any other American, and we certainly are opposed to any discrimination based upon race or color or creed.

On the other subject of naturalization, however, I believe that I am an expert. I am an expert because the great majority of the people that are going to be benefited by this bill are our parents, who came here either prior to 1924, which is the date of the passage of the Oriental Exclusion Act, or prior to about 1908, when the agreement between Japan and the United States limiting immigration was passed. In other words, the great majority of the people we are now considering under the legislation today are people who have been here 40 or 50 years.

Certainly they have contributed to America. There is the case of the great potato king of Stockton Valley. He saw the swamps and the malaria-infested islands in the Stockton River. He devised a system of draining the water, irrigating the soil, so that today the Stockton Islands are some of the best potato-producing country in the world. In fact, I think they give Maine some competition these days, Mr. Congressman.

There is also the case of a gentleman from Texas, Mr. Saibara, from Webster, Tex. He introduced rice growing into Texas. He had a son who was a lieutenant colonel with the First Army in Europe.

Well, we could go on and on with this record. I would simply like to say this: During World War II allens of Japanese ancestry were screened as no other people have ever been screened in our history, and this bill simply provides these screened people an opportunity to apply for naturalization.

It does not waive any rights. It does not grant any privileges. These people are, under this bill, required to do the same things as any other immigrant, and that is all we are asking. We are not asking for anything special, because we fought the way we did. We do not think that that is in the American

tradition. But we do think we are entitled to ask, as Americans, for our parents, whom we know so well, the same rights as those accorded to other immigrants.

Now, I happen to be a member of the American Legion. I happen to be, in fact, the legislative director for the State of Utah Veterans of Foreign Wars. I would like to make one or two comments about what—should I say my comrade?—from the American Legion said just before Mr. Ennis.

He said, first, that he questioned that there were no Japanese resident aliens in the United States who were not loyal to the United States. He cited the example of a person they caught off Corregidor who he claimed had gone to an American school.

True enough; let's clear the record on all of that. There are a great number of Japanese from Japan who came to the United States for education. These people studied here under agreements between the United States and Japan. Certainly they would know the language, and they would return to Japan. But, the record is certainly clear. Admiral Nimitz, General Marshall, and others have testified just recently before the House Subcommittee on Territories and Lands about the loyalty of the Japanese in Hawaii as well as those in the United States, and their record is clear and convincing.

There has not been a single instance, as far as they know, as far as the Federal Bureau of Investigation knows, not a single instance of any sabotage or espionage on the part of a resident Japanese or a Japanese American in the United States before, during, or since Pearl Harbor.

Now, I have one or two letters I would like to read just to indicate how some of the people we are talking about, pleading for, feel about this thing.

There are two terms that have been used quite often this morning. I would like to clarify them. The term "Issei" means the immigrant Japanese who came from Japan to the United States. The term "Nisei" means American citizens of Japanese descent. Then I would like to introduce the term "Hansel." That means half Nisei.

Now, these are the most tragic of all. The great majority of Issei entered the United States in their teens or twenties. The Hansel are those who entered the United States when they were just 2 or 3 years old.

I have a case here of a girl who, if I may use the term, was conceived in the United States, and her mother had to go back to Japan because her mother was dying there. She was born overseas, and yet she came to the United States when she was just a few years of age—months in fact.

Her name is Miss Yoneko Watanabe. This letter comes from the young lady, who lives at 1511 North Street, Philadelphia, Pa. [Reading:]

"Thank you for notifying me of the hearing of bill 5004 which is designed to give citizenship to the Issei and Hansel, because I happen to be a Hansel and I have a special interest in this bill.

"As far as I can remember, I have always felt that I was the 'black sheep' of the family for I was the only one among four children not to have citizenship. I felt that I was cheated out of something very wonderful and precious for it was only a matter of 3 months that made a world of difference to me.

"My mother, after having two sons born in the United States, was suddenly called back to Japan due to the illness of my grandmother. She was carrying me at the time and if she had remained in the States for another 3 months I would have automatically inherited my citizenship. All this time my father remained in the States. Eventually, my mother returned and my youngest brother was born. This gave citizenship to all my brothers by birth. My two older brothers have served in the United States Army during this last World War.

"The American ideals, its way of living and sharing, have always been my ideals and nothing will mean more to me than being one of its citizens."

I have here, Mr. Chairman, about 80 letters written by these people who want citizenship. One is a father of seven sons that served in the United States Army, and he asks this question:

"America today to me is a house divided. On one side I am ineligible to citizenship. On the other, I have seven sons who wear the uniform of the United States Army."

I would just like to submit all these letters for the information of the committee, as well as some petitions signed by about 3,000 of these alien Japanese who desire citizenship.

Mr. FELLOWS. Are you asking that they be incorporated?

Mr. MASAOKA. I do not think that is necessary, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FELLOWS. All right.

Mr. MASAOKA. But I would like the committee to see how heartrending, how simple and eloquent is the request of these people, and I can hardly conceive of how the American Legion can insist that the parents of soldiers who served so well as the Japanese Americans should be denied the right of citizenship. Because, if the parents can inculcate in their children a desire for America which is far beyond that of most Americans—and I think Congressman Chelf will bear me out that it is pretty tough to be drafted for the Army, but it is a lot more difficult to volunteer. But try volunteering under the same circumstances that so many Japanese Americans did—from barbed-wire concentration camps.

That is real conviction and faith in the American way, and to parents who can produce children like that, Mr. Chairman, I submit are true Americans and naturalization should be granted them.

I am very full of this subject. I could go and talk on and on, because I know these people, as I say, and I wish I had the opportunity to tell you more about them. I am sure that no one can deny one fundamental fact. These people are Americans by every standard of conduct that you can think of except that of technically "belonging."

I, as an American soldier, fought, with the thousands, millions, of other American soldiers, for the right of all people to be recognized as individuals, and that is all we are asking, not to be judged or classified on the basis of race.

I plead with you not to make my promise to some of the boys overseas in vain. I can still remember them. And I recall that when our boys were hit, their cries of pain sounded just like those of any other white American. And when they were wounded, their blood looked just the same. And when they were dead, they were just as dead.

And I noticed that the German bullets did not swerve simply because we were Japanese-Americans and our parents were ineligible to citizenship. They killed us just as dead. On the field of war, on the field of battle, when race and nationality count for nothing and the worth of a man counts for everything, I think we children of these people who are ineligible for citizenship proved that we belonged. We now want our parents to belong.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to submit my statement, together with my supplements, for the record. I would also like to thank all of you gentlemen for your attention. I know that you won't let us down.

Mr. FELLOWS. Thank you. The statement will be incorporated in the Record.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AND AIRLINE FARES

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Federal appellate court today upheld the right of the public to have airline fares set only after full and fair hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board. The court's decision came in a case brought by 31 colleagues and myself, who contended that the CAB had acted illegally in granting a recent air fare increase.

We had petitioned the court to declare the CAB's actions illegal. The CAB, on September 12, 1969, had entered an order granting all domestic interstate air carriers a fare increase of over 6 percent. We had protested, initially before the Board, that such a fare increase would be illegal because:

The Board failed to hold a fair, full, and public hearing as is required by the Federal Aviation Act;

The Board instead scheduled a series of closed meetings with representatives of the airlines to work out a fare increase; and

The Board ignored statutory standards for setting airline rates, designed to determine what are the actual needs of the airline industry and the traveling public, in its haste to grant a fare increase.

When the Board denied our petition to reconsider its decision, we filed a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Today's decision by the court upholds our position. The court ruled that the CAB acted illegally in prescribing the fare increase on the basis of an inadequate record and without public notice and hearing. The court held the Board's order instituting the fare increase to be invalid and the fares based on that order to be unlawful. The court remanded the case to the CAB for further proceedings consistent with its decision.

The Congressmen who appealed the fare-increase order include GLENN M. ANDERSON, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, WALTER S. BARING, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILIP BURTON, DANIEL E. BUTTON, JEFFERY COHELAN, JAMES C. CORMAN, JOHN DINGELL, DON EDWARDS, RICHARD T. HANNA, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CHET HOLIFIELD, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, JOSEPH M. McDADE, JOHN McFALL, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, GEORGE P. MILLER, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY T. MINK, JERRY L. PETTIS, THOMAS M. REES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., EDWARD R. ROYBAL, BERNIE SISK, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, JOHN TUNNEY, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, JEROME R. WALDIE, and CHARLES H. WILSON, and myself.

The court's decision follows:

[U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 23,627]

JOHN E. MOSS ET AL., PETITIONERS v. CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, RESPONDENT, AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., EASTERN AIR LINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIR LINES, INC., NORTH CENTRAL AIRLINES, INC., MOHAWK AIRLINES, INC., BRANIFF AIRWAYS, INC., NORTHWEST AIRLINES, INC., TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC., INTERVENORS

Petition for review of orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(Decided July 9, 1970)

Mr. Stanford G. Ross, with whom Mr. H. David Rosenbloom was on the brief, for petitioners.

Mr. Warren L. Sharfman, Associate General Counsel, Litigation and Research, Civil

Aeronautics Board, with whom Messrs. Joseph B. Goldman, General Counsel at the time the brief was filed, and O. D. Ozment, Deputy General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board, and Howard E. Shapiro, Attorney, Department of Justice, were on the brief for respondent.

Mr. Alfred V. J. Prather for intervenors American Airlines, Inc., Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc. and Trans World Airlines, Inc. Mr. J. William Doolittle also entered an appearance for intervenor American Airlines, Inc.

Mr. Philip A. Fleming entered an appearance for intervenor Eastern Air Lines, Inc. Messrs. Thomas D. Finney, Jr. and Lee M. Hydeman entered appearances for intervenor Continental Air Lines, Inc.

Messrs. Russell A. Garman, Jr. and Raymond J. Rasenberger entered appearances for intervenors North Central Airlines, Inc. and Mohawk Airlines, Inc.

Mr. B. Howell Hill entered an appearance for intervenor Braniff Airways, Inc.

Mr. James M. Verner entered an appearance for intervenor Northwest Airlines, Inc.

Mr. Ulrich V. Hoffman entered an appearance for intervenor Trans World Airlines, Inc.

Before WRIGHT, McGOWAN and ROBINSON, Circuit Judges.

WRIGHT, Circuit Judge: This appeal presents the recurring question which has plagued public regulation of industry: whether the regulatory agency is unduly oriented toward the interests of the industry it is designed to regulate, rather than the public interest it is designed to protect. Petitioners, some 32 congressmen, alleged that the Civil Aeronautics Board, in considering the lawfulness of increases in domestic passenger fares filed by all the major air lines, excluded the public from *ex parte* meetings with representatives of the air line industry and then held a *pro forma* hearing limited to oral argument, as a result of which changes in the fare structure resulting in a six per cent rise in domestic fares were unlawfully approved. The Board admits the *ex parte* meetings, denies that the hearing was *pro forma*, and admits that, without complying with the statutory procedural requirements and criteria for ratemaking by the Board, it approved in advance the filing without suspension of air line tariffs providing for a six per cent increase in air line revenues from passenger fares.¹ We hold that the procedure used by the Board is contrary to the statutory rate-making plan in that it fences the public out of the rate-making process and tends to frustrate judicial review.

I

The statutory plan is relatively simple. Air line passenger rates can be made by the carrier or by the Board.² However made, the rates must be included in a tariff filed with the Board by the carrier.³ It is unlawful for the carrier to charge a rate other than the existing one on file.⁴ On complaint or on its own initiative, the Board may change an existing rate after public notice and hearing.⁵ The Board need not indicate a specific rate; it may simply fix a maximum or minimum or both.⁶ In determining and prescribing a rate the Board must take into consideration, among other factors, five statutory criteria.⁷

An air line carrier may change the existing rate by filing a new tariff with the Board indicating the new rate.⁸ Under the statute, on complaint or on its own initiative the Board, by giving the carrier a statement of its reasons, may suspend the new rate for a period not to exceed 180 days while conducting an investigation as to its lawfulness.⁹ After investigation and hearing, the Board may determine and prescribe the lawful rate, in accordance, of course, with the rate-making provisions of Sections 1002(d) and 1002(e) of the Federal Aviation Act.¹⁰

¹Footnotes at end of article.

II

Petitioners had complained to the Board on prior occasions both about the Board's practice of holding *ex parte*,¹¹ informal meetings with the carriers concerning their need for increased fares, and about the Board's lack of standards for testing the reasonableness of fares. In spite of these complaints, the informal sessions between carriers and Board members continued into the summer of 1969. In early August of 1969, following the lead of United Air Lines, the carriers filed increased passenger tariffs with the Board. While these proposed rate increases were pending before the Board, another *ex parte* meeting between the air line officials and members of the Board was scheduled for August 14, 1969. Petitioner Moss requested and was refused permission to attend this meeting.¹² Following the *ex parte* meeting on August 14, the Board issued an order calling for oral argument on the advisability of exercising its power to investigate and suspend the new rates before they went into effect. There was no suggestion in the order that the Board might promulgate its own fare formula.¹³ Petitioners renewed their complaints about the Board's continued *ex parte* meeting and rate practices and urged the Board to suspend the tariffs, to institute a general passenger fare investigation to define more clearly the statutory rate-making standards, and finally to set reasonable rates based on these more precise standards. Petitioners, however, refused to participate in the oral argument on the ground that the Board's decision on the rate increases had already been made.

On September 12, 1969, eight days after the oral argument, the Board issued its order.¹⁴ In that order the Board found that the proposed tariffs on file "may be unjust [or] unreasonable"¹⁵ and ordered the tariffs suspended and investigated, as it is authorized to do by Section 1002(g) of the Federal Aviation Act.¹⁶ Still purporting to act in accordance with its suspension authority, however, the Board went further. It found that the carriers had demonstrated a need for "some additional revenue"¹⁷ because of greatly increased costs, and decided that a limited fare increase was necessary in order to maintain the financial vitality of the carriers as a group.¹⁸ Accordingly, in the same order which suspended the rates proposed by the carriers, the Board outlined its own fare formula and announced its decision to "permit tariff filings implementing" that formula to be filed without suspension,¹⁹ thus assuring almost immediate effectiveness.

The carriers promptly withdrew their previous filings and filed for new increases based on the Board's model. Petitioners, in an application for reconsideration of the September 12 order, opposed the new filings and requested their suspension and investigation. On September 30, 1969, the application was denied and the fares based upon the Board formula were allowed to stand without suspension or investigation.²⁰ The instant petition for review of both the September 12 and the September 30 orders followed.

III

The question presented by this appeal is whether the Board should have followed the procedures and standards established by Sections 1002(d) and 1002(e) of the Act before proposing the rate schedule it set forth in its September 12 order. Petitioners complain that the Board effectively "determined" rates, within the meaning of Sections 1002(d) and 1002(e), to be charged by the air carriers without proper notice and hearings as required by Section 1002(d) and without taking into account the rate-making factors enumerated in Section 1002(e).²¹ The Board admits that it would have been required to act in accordance with subsections (d) and (e) if its actions amounted to the making of rates. The Board, however, contends that

it was not required to adhere to the standards of subsections (d) and (e) because, as the formal title of its September 12 order ("Order of Investigation and Suspension") indicates, it was not determining rates but only exercising its power under Section 1002(g) to suspend, pending a more complete investigation, the rates initially filed by the carriers in August.

The Board also admits that immediately after its September 12 order the air lines withdrew their August tariffs and filed new tariffs listing rates based directly on and in conformity with that order. But the Board disclaims any legal responsibility for the rates listed in the carriers' September tariffs. According to the Board, the detailed outline of the rate structure which it "proposed to accept" in its September 12 order was not an attempt to prescribe or determine rates for the future within the meaning of the statute, but merely served to explain to the carriers—as required by the statute²²—the Board's reasons for suspending the August filings. The Board points out that the carriers were not legally bound by the September 12 order of the Board to file a new tariff and list rates based on its formula. Therefore, the Board argues, even though the carriers did precisely what the Board indicated in its September 12 order should be done, the resulting rates are carrier-made rates for which the Board is not to be held accountable.

This legalistic reading of the statute is supposedly supported by the Supreme Court's decision in *Arizona Grocery Co. v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.*²³ and its progeny. We find no support in *Arizona Grocery* for the Board's position. For that case referred to agency-made rates as those which had been legislatively prescribed as "a maximum reasonable rate for the future" by the agency.²⁴

We think that these rates, like those involved in *Arizona Grocery*, have been determined by the Board, with the cooperation of the carriers, to be "a maximum reasonable rate for the future." The Board itself stated that it "intend[ed] to consider fares produced by [its] formula as a 'just and reasonable' ceiling." Any analysis of the September 12 order can fairly lead to no other conclusion.

IV

After finding that the rates proposed by the carriers might be unjust or unreasonable and ordering an investigation, the Board went on in the September 12 order to point out that, because of the need for revenue which the carriers had shown, the Board would "be disposed to grant an increase computed in accordance with the criteria set out below." It then set forth a rate-making formula, variously described in the order as "the formula which we are proposing," the formula "we propose to accept," and the formula which "[w]e * * * adopt * * * for our model." The formula detailed by the Board, which is set out in the margin,²⁵ using coach fares as its base, attempts to cope with the increased per mile costs of short flights by establishing a fixed "terminal" charge (\$9.00) for all markets, with an additional charge based on the airport-to-airport mileage. According to the formula, the per mile rate decreases in each successive 500-mile block. From this formula anyone could have filled in the figures and computed the acceptable coach fares.

The Board also "concluded" that it would be appropriate for all fares to be rounded off to the nearest whole dollar. It further "propose[d]" that first class jet fares be set at 125 percent of the coach fare derived by the above formula.²⁶ It "would accept night coach fares computed at 75 percent of the new coach fares." The order then listed each of the various promotional fares, such as Youth Fare and Discover America, and the discounts which "the Board would permit."²⁷

The Board even claimed to be acting in ac-

cordance with some of the rate-making provisions of Section 1002(e). It explained that it had granted the increases because, "[t]aking into consideration these cost pressures on the carriers, and the marked decline in earnings and profit margin since the February increase, the Board finds that a further increase in fares at this time is necessary from the standpoint of the rate making standards of Section 1002(e) of the Act and the need to maintain the financial vitality of the carriers as a group." Also, according to the Board, its formula "produces a reasonable increase in revenues and recognizes the economies inherent in long haul carriage * * * as well as the value of service limitations in short haul markets."

As a practical matter, the Board's order amounted to the prescription of rates because, as the Board admits, the pressures on the carriers to file rates conforming exactly with the Board's formula were great, if not actually irresistible.²⁷ All the carriers had indicated an urgent need for an immediate increase in revenues; the Board had made it clear, by threatening to use its power to suspend proposed rates, that only rates conforming to its detailed model would be accepted and not suspended. It explicitly stated that it would "consider fares produced by the formula as a 'just and reasonable' ceiling, and any fare in excess of this ceiling would be viewed *prima facie* as outside the realm of justness and reasonableness and would ordinarily be suspended and ordered investigated." Any carrier wanting to file higher tariffs would be dissuaded, not only by the indications in the order that only those tariffs meeting the standards set down by the Board would be accepted, but also by the Board's explicit statement that increases would be considered only where strong justification was shown.²⁸ Furthermore, while tariffs in conformity with the Board's model would go into effect and give the carriers some additional revenue almost immediately, the Board required all filings requesting increases above those provided in the September 12 order to have a proposed effective date 75 days after filing. It would seem that upon any realistic interpretation this order involved the legislative determination of rates by an agency for the future, as described in the *Arizona Grocery* case.

V

It would be blinking reality to hold, as the Board argues, that the order of September 12 did no more than suspend and initiate an investigation²⁹ of the rates proposed by the carriers in August. The Board did all that it could, short of formally styling its order at rate-making, to induce the carriers to adopt the proposed rates. The Board does not dispute these facts, but, in order to insulate itself from responsibility for these rates, relies upon the fact that it never in so many words "ordered" the carriers to file the rates now being charged. According to the Board, as long as the Board only "suggests" and does not order the future rates, the rates remain carrier-made. In support of this proposition the Board cites a series of cases which followed *Arizona Grocery*, each of which holds that certain action does not amount to agency approval of the rates in question.³⁰ It has been held, for example, that the agency's refusal to suspend proposed rates does not constitute agency approval of those rates. To the extent that the I.C.C. precedents are relevant to this case³¹ we would agree with the Board that it takes more than a refusal to suspend proffered rates to transform them into agency-made rates.

We do not need to decide, however, in the context of this case the exact extent of agency participation which will make an

agency responsible for the rates being charged by carriers. For the cases which the Board cites simply are not apposite.³² We are not dealing with rates filed by carriers which the Board has refused to suspend, or even with allowance of small percentage increases in revenue based on existing rates,³³ but with a complete innovative scheme for setting all passenger rates for the continental United States.³⁴ The Board has pointed to no case in which the Board or Commission has set out such a complete and detailed scheme for making rates which it wanted filed and in which a court has held that the resulting rates were carrier-made rates. Even a cursory reading of the order makes it clear that the Board told the carriers what rates to file; it set forth a step-by-step formula requiring major changes in rate-making practices and in rates which it expected the carriers to adopt. And the Board concededly took this action after closed sessions with carrier representatives, without statutory public hearings and, according to petitioners, without reference to the rate-making standards of the statute.

If, as the Board argues, the rates resulting from this procedure are carrier-made, rather than agency-made, the public would not only be fenced out of its role in rate-making, but judicial review of the Board's actions would be severely limited. On appeal agency-made rates are tested against the Act's explicit rate-making procedures. Thus a court must decide whether, in determining rates, the Board has properly observed the statutory procedures and taken into account the factors which Congress has said should be considered when rates are made. If the statutory plan has been complied with, the court can then determine whether substantial evidence in the record supports the Board's rates. Here the Board has in effect determined rates and the record made in so doing is inadequate for judicial review. By contrast, if the tariffs filed pursuant to the Board's order of September 12 are not Board-determined rates, judicial review is practically nonexistent. Aggrieved parties can object to carrier-made rates and ask the Board to investigate them, but the Board's refusal to investigate would be reviewable only for an abuse of discretion.³⁵ And, of course, it would be very difficult indeed to apply this limited standard of review to a record made in large part behind closed doors.

Moreover, the Board's suspension authority, on which it relies for justification of its actions in this case, is totally insulated from judicial review.³⁶ It is this power which the Board uses to work its will in rate-making rather than the judicially reviewable statutory rate-making plan designed by Congress to protect the public. In the absence of a compelling justification for the Board's admitted practice of making rates by use of its suspension power, we cannot help but conclude that the Board is only seeking to avoid the strict requirements of the rate-making portion of the statute and the resulting more stringent judicial review. No requirement of Board operation or policy of the Act seems to support the Board's blatant attempt to subvert the statute's scheme.

The Board has argued that to hold it accountable for these rates would "hobble the administrative process," seemingly because it feels that the procedures required by Sections 1002(d) and 1002(c) of the Act do not permit the Board to respond quickly enough to meet the immediate revenue needs of the carriers in times of rapidly rising costs.³⁷ While we recognize that under the statute the Board has an obligation to afford the carriers sufficient revenues,³⁸ that obligation cannot become a *carte blanche* allowing the Board to deal only with the carriers and disregard the other factors, such as the traveling public's interest in the lowest possible fares and high standards of service, which

are also enumerated in the Act as rate-making criteria.³⁹

Furthermore, we see no inconsistency between adhering to the statutory plan and awarding a speeding increase in carrier revenues. The statute does not require a complete, time-consuming, scholarly and theoretical review of all aspects of rate-making before the Board passes upon proposals which are submitted.⁴⁰ The Board is expected to use its experience gleaned from ongoing studies and investigations in its day-to-day activities, and it can act with reasonable speed as long as it affords public notice, holds a proper hearing, and takes the statutory factors into account when it determines rates. In any case, ignoring the general public's interests in order to better serve the carriers is not the proper response to the difficulties supposedly created by an outdated or unwieldy statutory procedure. After all, there is more to rate-making than providing carriers with sufficient revenue to meet their obligations to their creditors and to their stockholders.

In short, we simply do not agree with the Board that abdication from its proper supervisory role under the statute need be the result of today's holding requiring the Board to comply with the statute in rate-making. We would be sympathetic, for example, to instances in which the Board felt that compelling circumstances required it to act without complete information before an investigation is completed. Any approval of rates under such conditions would be subject to revision once more complete information is obtained. We would liken such emergency Board action to the interim approval which Judge Tamm recently remarked upon, in a somewhat different context. Speaking for the court, he said:⁴¹

"* * * [Our] assessment of the Board's findings should be bifurcated, with different standards applied to the findings relating to full and interim approval. That is, the fact that interim approval is useful primarily in situations in which the Board needs to act expeditiously * * * but lacks sufficient information to determine authoritatively whether the agreement as a whole will serve the public interest, indicates that our review of the findings supporting the interim approval should be relatively limited. Since the Board in electing to order an interim approval is essentially saying that * * * further data gleaned from practical experience is necessary to an enlightened determination of the public interest, a reviewing court can do little more than ask whether this conclusion is reasonable and based upon substantial evidence. * * *

We fully recognize that a carrier's exigent economic circumstances at times will make it necessary for the Board to act on the basis of incomplete data. But we emphatically reject any intimation by the Board that its responsibilities to the carriers are more important than its responsibilities to the public. Board action must always comply with the procedural requirements of the statute and must always be based on an assessment of the relevant available data, with due consideration given to all the factors enumerated in the statute, which factors taken together make up the public interest.

VI

It is true that the practice followed in this case does not fit neatly and precisely into the statutory concept of ratemaking by the Board or by the carriers. Actually the practice produces rates arrived at through the cooperation of the carriers and the Board. The Board candidly admits that it devised the practice because the volatile economic conditions in the air line industry made use of the Section 1002(d) and (e) procedures impractical. But Congress requires public participation in making rates because it is the public who

Footnotes at end of article.

pays them. And under this Act, as distinguished from the Interstate Commerce and Motor Carriers Acts, there is no statutory provision for reparations to the public if the rates charged are unreasonable.¹¹ Hence observance of safeguards designed to protect the public before the rates are imposed is imperative.

Since the record shows, as the Board admits, that the public notice and hearing requirements of Section 1002(d) were not observed in issuing the order of September 12, that order is invalid and the tariffs filed by the carriers based thereon are unlawful. Under the circumstances, this case is remanded to the Board for further proceedings.

So ordered.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The scheme, as explained *infra*, involved a rate-making formula which the Board predicted would result in a total revenue increase of 6.35% for the industry as a whole.

² Federal Aviation Act §§ 403, 1002(d), 49 U.S.C. §§ 1373, 1482(d) (1964).

³ Federal Aviation Act § 403(a), 49 U.S.C. § 1373(a) (1964).

⁴ Federal Aviation Act § 403(b), 49 U.S.C. § 1373(b) (1964).

⁵ Federal Aviation Act § 1002(d), 49 U.S.C. § 1482(d) (1964).

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Section 1002(e) of the Act, 49 U.S.C. § 1482(e) (1964), provides:

"Rule of rate making.

"In exercising and performing its powers and duties with respect to the determination of rates for the carriage of persons or property, the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors—

"(1) The effect of such rates upon the movement of traffic;

"(2) The need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation of persons and property by air carriers at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service;

"(3) Such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law;

"(4) The inherent advantages of transportation by aircraft; and

"(5) The need of each air carrier for revenue sufficient to enable such air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide adequate efficient air carrier service."

⁸ Thirty days' notice of such a change is required. Federal Aviation Act § 403(c), 49 U.S.C. § 1373(c) (1964).

⁹ Federal Aviation Act § 1002(g), 49 U.S.C. § 1482(g) (1964).

¹⁰ 49 U.S.C. §§ 1482(d) and 1482(e) (1964).

¹¹ After inquiries from petitioner Moss, the Board subsequently made transcripts of several of these meetings available.

¹² We observe only in passing that, if congressmen are excluded from these *ex parte* meetings between the Board and the air lines, ordinary rate-paying members of the public, or their representatives, would have little chance indeed to be admitted. The Board does not suggest otherwise.

¹³ See C.A.B. Order No. 69-8-108, Docket 21322 (August 19, 1969). The order provided that "[p]ursuant to section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 USC 1482), the Board may, upon its own initiative or in the light of complaints from interested persons, (a) suspend the effectiveness of the proposed tariffs pending investigation of the reasonableness of the proposed rates, (b) permit such tariffs to take effect while it is conducting such investigation, or (c) permit the tariffs to become effective without investigation."

¹⁴ C.A.B. Order of Investigation and Suspension, No. 69-9-68, Docket 21322 (September 12, 1969) (hereinafter cited as Order).

¹⁵ Order, at 3.

¹⁶ 49 U.S.C. § 1482(g) (1964).

¹⁷ Order, at 3.

¹⁸ Order, at 8.

¹⁹ Order, at 9.

²⁰ C.A.B. Order Denying Reconsideration, No. 69-9-150, Docket 21322 (September 30, 1969).

²¹ See Note 7, *supra*.

²² Federal Aviation Act § 1002(g), 49 U.S.C. § 1482(g) (1964).

²³ 284 U.S. 370 (1932).

²⁴ *Id.* at 389. Of course, *Arizona Grocery* did not focus on defining all the attributes of an agency-made rate. It is true that the rates in *Arizona Grocery* were the subject of a binding Commission order defining the maximum reasonable rates, but the Court nowhere stated that the existence of a binding order was crucial to the result. Instead, the Court distinguished between the adjudicative and legislative capacities of the Commission. When acting as an adjudicator, the Commission decides whether rates in the past were reasonable. "[I]ts action affected only the past * * * and adjudged for the present merely that the rate was then unreasonable." 284 U.S. at 385. By way of contrast, when dealing with the rates which will be reasonable in the future, the Commission is exercising its legislative capacity.

The Board was not acting as an adjudicator in this case. Instead, it clearly intended to legislate rates for the future, and therefore should have to adhere to the statutory provisions explicitly relating to the making of rates. See page 22, *infra*.

²⁵ The Board said:

"Turning now to the actual formula which we propose to accept, coach fares will form the core of the fare structure from which all other fares will be based. We believe that the revenue increase produced by the American formula is appropriate as discussed hereinafter, and therefore we adopt that formula for our model, to wit:

"Fixed charge for all markets: \$9.00 plus a variable charge based on mileage and in accordance with the following rates per mile for the applicable portions of the total mileage:

Mileage blocks:	Rate per mile (cents)
0-500	6.0
500-1000	5.6
1000-1500	5.2
1500-2000	5.0
Over 2000	4.8

"Use of this formula will have the desirable result of reducing slightly some long haul fares * * * which have for some time been considerably in excess of costs, while at the same time producing only moderate increases in short haul fares, thus minimizing the impact on the movement of traffic in these markets.

"American has proposed that city center to city center mileage be used in computing fares. However, we are of the opinion that direct airport-to-airport mileage offers a more reasonable and rational basis for computing fares and will adopt that mileage basis for our model. We recognize that there will be instances where application of a mileage basis will be inequitable or impracticable, as for example, where a carrier is required by its certificate to operate via a circuitous routing. We will permit exceptions to the rule over a particular routing where good cause is shown. Further, it is not our intent to discourage common faring of cities or of airports situated about a single city; we would expect to permit common faring under the proposed formula in much the same manner as we have heretofore, provided the mileage used bears a rational relationship to the points so common rated."

Order, at 6-7.

²⁶ "With respect to the various promotional

fares, the Board would permit the following reduced discounts based on the coach fares derived from the above described formula:

Type of fare	Percent discount*
Discover America	20
Youth Standby	40
Youth Reservation	20
Family Plan:	
Children 2-11	50
Children 12-21	33½

* "With respect to the contention of Northwest Airlines that discounts on discounts should be eliminated, the Board would look with favor on tariff amendments that would eliminate these practices (such as children's 50 percent discount on Discover America excursion fares)." Order, at 8.

²⁷ As the Board's brief states, "The compulsion [on the carriers to file rates approved by the Board] in [this] case was undoubtedly great."

²⁸ The investigation aborted, of course, immediately on the withdrawal of all the August tariffs by all the air lines.

²⁹ See, e.g., *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Mechling*, 330 U.S. 567 (1947); *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Inland Waterways Corp.*, 319 U.S. 671 (1943); *Algonoma Coal & Coke Co. v. United States*, E.D. Va., 11 F. Supp. 487 (1935).

³⁰ While the rate-making provisions of the Federal Aviation Act and the Interstate Commerce Act are similar, the practice under them is not necessarily the same because, unlike the Interstate Commerce Act, the Federal Aviation Act has no provision for reparations. *Cf. T.I.M.E. Inc. v. United States*, 359 U.S. 464 (1959); *Tishman & Lipp, Inc. v. Delta Air Lines*, 2 Cir., 413 F.2d 1401, 1406 n.2 (1969). Consequently, all of the cases interpreting the rate-making provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act are not necessarily relevant in determining whether the Board complied with the Federal Aviation Act in making rates. It was the reparation concern of the courts following *Arizona Grocery* which led them to distinguish that case by holding that a Commission order permitting a general increase in rates did not preclude a reconsideration of a particular commodity rate fixed by the carrier pursuant to the general order, so that if a particular commodity rate was found to be unreasonable reparations, as provided by the statute, could be ordered. In the absence of such a retrospective remedy for reparations for air line passengers, the procedural safeguards provided in the Federal Aviation Act become the public's sole defense against unreasonable rates permitted by the Board.

³¹ The Board relies heavily on *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Inland Waterways Corp.*, *supra* Note 29, in its argument. There the Commission found, in an order vacating an order suspending rates proposed by some carriers, that "the proposed schedules are shown to be just and reasonable." This, according to the Commission, did not amount to prescription of rates because it had explicitly stated that *Arizona Grocery* would not apply. The Supreme Court also "re-frain[ed] from approving or prescribing [the rates]." 319 U.S. at 687.

We feel that the Board's reliance upon this case is misplaced. The Supreme Court construed the Commission's statements only as a refusal to suspend proposed rates on the grounds offered by the complainants. According to the Court, the true thrust of the Commission's action was that "the proposed schedules could not be struck down upon the erroneous view advanced by the protestants." *Id.* at 686. Furthermore, the rates in question were filed by the carriers of their own volition, and were not rates outlined by the agency. See also Note 30, *supra*.

³² See *Emergency Freight Charges*, 1935, 208 ICC 4 (1935). Two court cases cited by the Board grew out of these Commission proceedings. They were *Birmingham Slag Co. v.*

United States, N.D. Al., 11 F.Supp. 486 (1935), and Algoma Coal & Coke Co. v. United States, supra Note 29.

The Board, in arguing these cases, omits one very crucial fact. In these cases, involving a general rate order of the Commission which permitted an overall maximum percentage rate increase, the question presented to the court was whether individual shippers could challenge, in court, the validity of individual rates filed by carriers pursuant to the general rate order before asking the Commission to determine the reasonableness of the individual rate pursuant to §§ 13 and 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C. §§ 13 and 15 (1964).

The cited cases do not involve an attempt to avoid judicial review of agency action or the fixing of rates without complying with the procedural requirements of the statute. In recent cases of the same genre as *Birmingham* and *Algoma*, such as *Alabama Power Co. v. United States, infra*, the Commission has explicitly stated that judicial review of its general rate order is available. See 49 U.S.C. § 15(a) (1964). The Commission admits that its finding in these proceedings, to the effect that a "general rate increase is warranted," see 49 U.S.C. § 15(a) (1964), must be supported by substantial evidence, and that a claim to the contrary "states a claim warranting direct judicial review." Memorandum for the United States, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Secretary of Agriculture, *Alabama Power Co. v. United States*, No. 1283, October Term 1969, *probable jurisdiction noted*, — U.S. —, 38, U.S. L. WEEK 3452 (May 18, 1970). See also *Alabama Power Co. v. United States*, D. D.C. Civil Action No. 2970-68, December 4, 1969 Wright, J., dissenting.

In the 1935 rate proceeding discussed above, before allowing certain percentage increases in rates "[a]s a temporary measure, for the immediate alleviation of the more acute financial distress of the railroads." *Emergency Freight Charges, 1935, supra*, 208 ICC at 48, the Commission conducted nearly three months of public hearings at sites scattered throughout the country so the general public could easily attend and offer comments, see *id.* at 9, and invited written comments and briefs from all interested parties. In like manner the Commission held extensive hearings, before four examiners concurrently, from September 9 to October 8, 1968, in the proceedings which were challenged in the *Alabama Power* case.

Thus the Commission, unlike the Board, seems to recognize its responsibility to follow the procedural requirements of the statute and to allow its action permitting the general rate increase to be tested against the statute. The Commission only asks that court review of particularized, individual rates be withheld under these circumstances until the Commission itself has had an opportunity to judge the reasonableness of the particular rate in question and award reparations if warranted.

³³ In addition to the cases cited above, the Board also relies on *Public Utilities Commission of California v. United States*, 9 Cir., 356 F. 2d 236, *cert. denied*, 385 U.S. 816 (1966). That case involved a "Public Notice" issued by the Federal Communications Commission, after a series of informal meetings between the Commission and the Bell System. In that notice the Commission informed the public that Bell was planning to file lowered tariffs for long distance telephone service. Petitioners asked the Commission to reconsider this public notice, contending that by issuing an announcement about future rate filings the Commission had made rates within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 205 (1964). Reconsideration was denied by the Commission because its action "was [not] a ruling on the proposed tariff filing," and the Commission's action was affirmed on appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

While we have no occasion to pass upon the wisdom of that decision, which involves a somewhat different statute and a different industry, we note that the case is distinguishable from the one at bar. There is no indication in the court's opinion that the Commission determined the new rates by use of its suspension power, see 47 U.S.C. § 204 (1964), as was done in this case. Nor is there any indication that the Commission advised the Bell System about the rate filings which would be acceptable to the Commission and which would, in the Commission's opinion, constitute a "just and reasonable" ceiling," as the Board advised the carriers in the instant case.

³⁴ *Trailways of New England, Inc. v. C.A.B.*, 1 Cir., 412 F. 2d 926 (1969); *Flight Engineers' International Ass'n, EAL Chapter v. C.A.B.*, 118 U.S. App. D.C. 112, 332 F. 2d 312 (1964); *Pan American-Grace Airways v. C.A.B.*, 85 U.S. App. D.C. 297, 178 F. 2d 34 (1949).

³⁵ See *Arrow Transportation Co. v. Southern Railway Co.*, 372 U.S. 658, 667 (1963).

³⁶ At oral argument there was repeated reference to the incredible length of time (four and a half years) consumed by a recent general passenger fare rate investigation. Because the Board seems unable to complete such full investigations until years after successive rate increases have become necessary, the Board's reliance upon the new general rate investigation it has ordered as the proper solution to the problems raised by petitioners seems misplaced.

³⁷ 49 U.S.C. §§ 1302, 1482(e) (5) (1964).

³⁸ See 49 U.S.C. § 1482(e) (2)-(3) (1964).

³⁹ As petitioners' brief points out:

"Moreover, * * * the Board appears to be confusing a general passenger fare investigation * * * with the hearing that Petitioners urge is always necessary under section 1002(d) whenever the Board undertakes to prescribe or approve rates. There is no reason whatsoever why the 1002(d) hearing should require 4½ years, and, as the Board has not conducted such hearings, no horrible example to cite."

Petitioners' Brief at 34 n.27. (Emphasis in original.)

⁴⁰ *National Air Carrier Ass'n v. C.A.B.*, — U.S. App. D.C. —, — F.2d —, — (No. 23,012, decided May 28, 1970) (slip opinion at 19). The Supreme Court has also recognized that economic pressures on the carriers may make it necessary for an agency to base its action "upon evidence which the Commission assumed was typical in character, and ample in quantity, to justify the finding made in respect to each division of each rate of every carrier." *New England Divisions Case*, 261 U.S. 184, 196-197 (1923). Mr. Justice Brandeis, for the Court, explained why Congress could not have required the Commission to take specific evidence about each carrier affected by its order:

"Obviously, Congress intended that a method should be pursued by which the task, which it imposed upon the Commission, could be performed. The number of carriers which might be affected by an order of the Commission, if the power granted were to be exercised fully, might far exceed six hundred; the number of rates involved, many millions. The weak roads were many. The need to be met was urgent. To require specific evidence, and separate adjudication, in respect to each division of each rate of each carrier, would be tantamount to denying the possibility of granting relief. * * *

"* * * It was the actual necessities of procedure and administration which had led to the adoption of that method, in passing upon the reasonableness of proposed rate increases. * * *

261 U.S. at 197-198. See also *United States v. Louisiana*, 290 U.S. 70, 76-77 (1933):

"The natural construction of the section, one consistent with its language, and making possible its practical operation, is that which

has uniformly been given to it by the Commission. Section 15a (2) does not relieve the Commission from the responsibility of seeing to it that the rates as increased are to be reasonable. But in performing the duty broadly to increase carrier revenue, it is enough if the Commission, in the first instance, makes such inquiry and investigation as would enable it to say that the prescribed increases when applied to members of the group will generally not exceed a reasonable maximum. The extent of this inquiry and the detail of investigation can not be marked by this Court with certainty. The size of the group dealt with, the nature of the traffic, the urgency of the relief demanded, these and other factors should condition the Commission's procedure in each case. * * * The requirement that increase of rates by Commission action is to be in the exercise of its power to prescribe reasonable rates is thus observed but in conformity to the administrative necessities which the proviso contemplates."

⁴¹ See Note 30, *supra*.

REBUILDING THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the House passed, by a vote of 307 to 1, a bill proposing a long-range program to rebuild the American merchant marine. I sincerely feel that this bill—H.R. 15424—is the most important piece of maritime legislation to come before the Congress since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, 34 years ago.

I am proud of the role my committee has played over the years in the dedicated effort which culminated in the program now about to become law. I want to emphasize that this was a truly bipartisan effort. Without such support, both in my committee and in the Congress as a whole, such overwhelming success could not have been achieved.

This fine spirit of bipartisanship was aptly reflected in a July 1, 1970, speech delivered by the distinguished Republican leader of the House, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD. In speaking to the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, Mr. FORD emphasized both the bipartisan congressional effort to produce this program, and the splendid cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

I am fully cognizant of the personal and active support which Mr. Ford has given our efforts to revitalize the maritime industry. Accordingly, I think his thoughts on our merchant marine are worth repeating, and I recommend his July 1 speech to my colleagues in the House. The speech follows:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

The 91st Congress is now putting the finishing touches to the Merchant Marine Act of 1970—the first major piece of maritime legislation to be enacted in more than a third of a century.

This legislation is the product of many things.

First, and foremost, it is the direct result of the determination of President Nixon and this Administration to bring about the revitalization of the American-flag fleet. Other Administrations, both Democrat and Repub-

lican, over the years have *talked* about putting vigor into our merchant marine; this Administration has *done* something about it.

Secondly, it is the genuine product of a bipartisan effort in the Congress—both in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the floor of the House. I congratulate, particularly, Chairman Garmatz and the Ranking Republican, Congressman Mailliard. Any time you can muster a vote of 307-1 on any piece of legislation, as was done in the House on this bill, you know that the subject has been raised to a position that is above partisanship.

Third, it is the product of a close working alliance between two branches of government—the Executive and the Legislative. In the past, Congress has been actively working for legislation that would put some life back into our shipping and shipbuilding industries, that would replace old ships with new ones, and that would increase the American-flag share of the cargo that moves to and from our shores in world commerce. But despite the bipartisan approach that has always been taken on Capitol Hill, these efforts have been blunted in the past by Administrations unable or unwilling to see the wasting away of our maritime strength, and to do something about it. This time it's different: There is a President in the White House who recognizes the need for urgency in tackling our maritime problems, and who has taken affirmative action in this area.

Fourth, it is the product of the joint efforts of maritime management and maritime labor. On the issue of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the maritime industry has been closer to unanimity than at any other time in recent history. And because the major elements of this industry worked together, and were able to resolve their differences, the prospects for enactment of a worthwhile, progressive, forward-looking maritime program have been greatly enhanced.

The history of this legislation, then, has been a history of people working together—in the Administration, in the Congress and in the industry.

But at the root of this cooperative effort has been the determination and the commitment of President Nixon, his Administration, the Democratic leadership in the Congress and the Republican Congressional leadership. As far back as 1967, the House Republican Policy Committee adopted a strong statement calling for action to preserve America's merchant fleet, and to regain our lost leadership on the oceans of the world. In 1968, the Republican Party's platform called for a vigorous and realistic ship replacement program to meet the changing pattern of our foreign commerce. In 1968, President Nixon issued his landmark "white paper" on the plight of the merchant marine, and his determination to reverse the pattern of drift and indecision which affected this industry. In 1969, President Nixon sent his maritime message to Congress, calling for prompt and forthright action on the legislation which is now nearing final passage on Capitol Hill. The Democratic Congressional leadership has cooperated 100 per cent.

In short, this legislation has come about because of the consistent efforts on the part of President Nixon, the Administration, and the Republican and Democratic Parties to substitute action for words; positive performance for empty promises. It is not necessary—for an audience like this—to compare this with the promise in a State of the Union Message in 1965 of a "new" maritime program, which never surfaced again for the next four years!

The record of President Nixon on maritime affairs can be summed up in a single sentence: He has kept his promise!

But there are other promises that must be kept—not by the Administration or by Congress, but by the maritime industry. Some of these promises have been made explicitly

by leaders of maritime management and labor; other promises are implicit in maritime's pleas for federal help to put this industry back on its feet.

The shipbuilding industry must make good on its promise to streamline its operations and bring down the cost of building vessels in American yards, so that this country can achieve the best possible economic position in competition with the shipyards of other nations. This promise imposes an obligation on shipyard owners and on shipyard workers to keep prices and wages at reasonable and realistic levels; and to introduce the latest possible systems and equipment that will cut the cost of American-built ships, without cutting their quality.

The shipping industry must make good on its promise to introduce innovative new concepts to the movement of goods in foreign commerce, so that our imports and exports travel between ports as rapidly as possible, and so that the least amount of time is lost in the loading and unloading of cargo. This calls for cooperation between management and labor in terms of work-saving devices and techniques—and, again, it calls for reasonableness at the bargaining table and in the setting of rates. Through such efforts, we can close some of the gap that exists between foreign costs and American costs, so that the shipper will get the best value for his dollar—and so that the government, which is making a major investment in the merchant marine, will also get value received.

The merchant marine must make good on the promise which is implicit in this program—the promise that there will be an end to the internecine warfare that has ravaged the merchant marine for decades, and that has drained away so much of our maritime strength. The failure of our past merchant marine legislation—and of those who administered that legislation in the past—to treat all segments of this industry fairly and equitably may have been at the root of this deep division in the merchant marine. But this new legislation will put an end to the old divisions between the "subsidized" and the "unsubsidized" operator. All American operators will be treated fairly and equally under this program. Those who want to take advantage of its benefits, and who are eligible to do so, will have an opportunity to come under this program. This bill will effectively make possible a unified industry—and there will be reason for one element of this industry any longer to be at war with the other. If this merchant marine program is going to work, it will take the collective best efforts of all elements of this industry—and no industry can put forth its best efforts if it spends some, or any, of its time, fighting the other fellow, instead of fighting the common enemy, which in this case is foreign competition.

Those American operators who, for whatever reason, have been engaged in trade both under the American flag and a foreign flag now must make good on the implicit promise of getting out of the foreign trade and getting into the American trade on a full-time basis. This legislation makes possible the orderly phase-out of these foreign-flag operations; now the operators must turn their hands to the task of accomplishing that goal—and at the same time planning for the orderly development of their full American-flag potential.

The operators who have complained about the lack of a long-range shipbuilding program in the past must now make good on their promise to build the ships that this program makes possible. The government is willing to help in a long-range building program. But it's not going to do the job single-handed. It is the ship operators who must plan for the replacement of their old ships and the expansion of their fleets. Unless the operators now come forward with concrete plans, nothing can begin to happen—either

in the shipyards or on the high seas—and the American people will have been deluded.

Ships are only part of the program; cargoes are the other part. The Commerce Department and the Maritime Administration have launched a major effort to convince American industry that it is to their advantage to "ship American." But the government cannot do this job alone—nor should it be expected to do the job alone. This industry has more at stake in a "ship American" program than the government does, and the industry should be willing and eager to carry its share of the task of stimulating greater awareness of the advantages of using American-flag ships. And the industry should bend every effort to see that the shipper *does* get the biggest bargain possible, in terms of rates, in terms of speed, and in terms of first-quality service.

If the maritime industry—shipping and shipbuilding, labor and management—does work together, and does make good on its promises, then all of us will realize the full potential which this legislation offers. Unless everyone works together, then the promises of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 will remain largely unfulfilled.

One final word:

The problems of the merchant marine did not develop overnight; they will not be resolved overnight. As President Nixon has pointed out, we have a long way to go to overcome the gross neglect of our merchant marine. But this legislation charts a course which, if we follow it, will lead to the restoration of America's maritime strength.

LIFETIME REPUBLICAN WRITES PRESIDENT NIXON ABOUT HIGH INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a copy of a letter written to President Nixon by a lifelong Republican who is greatly disturbed by the rising interest rates.

The writer, Mr. Ernest George Williams, a Los Angeles attorney, notes that bank profits and interest rates have been climbing dramatically during the first year and half of the Nixon administration. I quote a paragraph from this letter:

There are 147 banks listed in the Wall Street Journal, and each one of them, without exception, has increased its earnings 22% to 53% every succeeding year since you have taken office. The increased earnings have continued through the first quarter of 1970. Thousands of corporations are listed in both Moody's and Standard & Poor's, and 90% of them have shown either decreased earnings or losses in 1968 and 1969 over previous years, yet, for that same period, 100% of the banks have enjoyed a continuous increase in profits.

Mr. Speaker, I place the text of Mr. Williams' letter to President Nixon in the RECORD:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 2, 1970.

MR. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been an active Republican ever since I became old enough to vote in 1946. I have held various offices in Republican clubs, including the presidency. I have contributed my money, my time and my efforts, not only in supporting you for

the Presidential election, but also on behalf of the entire Republican Party. Like so many others who have supported you for election, I now find myself unable to comprehend your Administration's domestic policy.

There are 147 banks listed in *The Wall Street Journal*, and each one of them, without exception, has increased its earnings 22% to 53% every succeeding year since you have taken office. The increased earnings have continued through the first quarter of 1970. Thousands of corporations are listed in both *Moody's* and *Standard & Poor's*, and 90% of them have shown either decreased earnings or losses in 1968 and 1969 over previous years; yet, for that same period, 100% of the banks have enjoyed a continuous increase in profits.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when a working man who buys a home today must pay \$73 per month for additional interest because the interest rates have been increased from 6% to 9½%? The interest on a \$25,000 mortgage at 6% is \$1,500 per year; at 9½% the interest is \$2,375 per year, or a difference of \$875 per year. Over the life of a 25-year mortgage, a working man must pay \$18,750 interest at 6%, while he must pay \$29,687 at 9½%. The difference of \$9,937 is a result of the increased interest.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when builders of apartment houses, in order to secure funds for financing, must pay 10% interest plus a 2% premium of annual gross? It is now necessary for a person renting a \$200 per month apartment to pay \$273; \$73 per month is entirely attributed to the usurious interest rates. This increase is determined as follows: An apartment renting for \$200 per month in a 30-unit apartment house which has a \$300,000 mortgage must pay \$30,000 per year in interest instead of \$18,000 at 6% interest. The increased interest is \$400 per apartment per year, or a sum slightly in excess of \$33 per month. Two per cent of \$200 is \$40. The added cost attributed to the increased interest is in excess of \$73 per month for each apartment.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when banks, which are exempt from usury laws in the State of California, now charge from 10% to 18% interest on all their loans where before, under the prior Administrations, the interest rate was approximately 6%?

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when the makers of children's clothing, ladies' and men's clothing, and other manufacturers, must pay from 16% to 22% interest for factoring their loans? Under the California usury laws, industrial loans are exempt. This usurious interest must be absorbed by the consumer through an increase in prices.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when corporations, which received Government contracts in 1965 and 1966, now find they must pay interest rates of 10% to 12% when the cost for finance charges was originally computed at 6% interest?

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when fifty million (50,000,000) Americans with credit cards are able to dine at the Waldorf Astoria or take a trip around the world without any cash but at an annual interest charge of 18% per year or 1½% per month?

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when a working man who needs a car for transportation now finds that it takes four years, because of the usurious interest rates, to pay for the same car that previously was paid for in three years?

Can you tell us, the American people,

how your Administration is curbing inflation when banks, through the device of holding companies, are able to borrow as much money as they desire in Europe at minimum rates of 8½% interest in order to make loans to the American businessman at 10% to 18% interest? Under all the prior Administrations, banks were required to borrow funds from the Federal Reserve Bank. The interest rates were 3½% to 4%. The amounts of the loans to the banks were limited to the deposit reserves. The interest rate to the public was 6% or 7%. Under the present Administration a bank is able to bypass the Federal Reserve requirements by borrowing money in Europe at 8½% interest and loaning these funds to the American workers and business people at 10% to 18% interest.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when billions of Eurodollars have been withdrawn from the American stockmarket so that they may be loaned to our banks at an 8½% interest rate? Previously, these billions of dollars were invested in the American stockmarket for the expected return of 5% dividends plus 3% or 4% growth. Now, the withdrawal of these dollars has depressed the stockmarket, and the funds are loaned to the American people through our banks at excessive interest rates.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when billions of dollars have been withdrawn from the stockmarket by banks, Eurodollars and mutual funds? The withdrawal of these funds from the market has caused pensioners, white collar workers, laborers, doctors, lawyers and small businessmen to lose their entire life savings overnight while the banks increase their profits at the expense of the general public.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when thousands of corporations, borrowing operating capital, find their profits being siphoned off by high interest rates? This loss of profit has caused the stocks to drop and indirectly caused millions of Americans to lose their life savings in the market since your Administration has taken office.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when the Department of Water and Power of one of our largest cities issues several hundred million dollars of tax exempt bonds at 6.9%, which, when converted, would be the equivalent of 10.23% interest? The State of California has an amendment on the ballot to increase their tax exempt bonds from 5% to 7%, which would be the equivalent of 10.5%.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when the Federal Government pays 7% to 8½% interest on short-term Treasury notes while it continues to pay the laborer and the man on the street less than 4% on the E bonds? Furthermore, your Administration has raised the minimum purchase of Treasury notes from \$1,000 to \$10,000, making this interest rate inaccessible to the working man and compelling him to keep his funds on deposit with the banks at 5% while they reinvest in U.S. Treasury notes at 8½% interest.

Can you tell us, the American people, how your Administration is curbing inflation when all the corporations now find themselves in the position of not only paying usurious rates to raise operating capital, but must also grant stock options to the lenders? The end result is the decrease of profits because of high interest rates and the dilution of the value of the common stock by the stock options.

As President of the United States you must take immediate action to prevent this situation from continuing longer. Your Administration cannot continue to place the

blame of this inflationary spiral on the prior Administrations or upon the labor unions when the evidence is overwhelmingly to the contrary. You cannot permit a small group of corporations to selfishly reap the harvest at the expense of the majority of the American people.

The writer recognizes that there is no formula or a panacea for the cure of inflation. However, a review of some of the programs adopted by your predecessors may be of constructive value in your adoption of programs to halt the present inflationary crisis.

1. During World War Two, all purchases on credit over \$100 required a one-third down payment. It is difficult to understand why a person desiring to buy a new stereo or a new car can't pay one-third down at the time of purchase. This policy may reduce the amount of interest that bankers and credit card dealers would receive, but it is difficult to understand how it would interfere with the use of credit cards except to cut down credit purchases and eliminate 18% interest.

2. Persons buying new homes could be required to pay 20% down rather than the present 10% down.

3. The Federal Government could sponsor legislation wherein holding corporations of banks would be eliminated.

4. The Federal Government could sponsor legislation making it mandatory for the banks to borrow all of their funds from the Federal Reserve System (of course, legitimate deposits would not be construed as loans). The amount of the loans to the banks would be limited to a percentage of their total deposits.

5. The Federal Reserve could make available such additional funds as are necessary for the banks to maintain their present loans so that the borrower will not be faced with economic hardship or chaos during a certain period of reorganization.

6. The Federal Government could immediately reduce the prime rate from Federal Reserve Banks to the other banks from 7% to 3½%.

7. A ceiling could be imposed by the Federal Reserve System on all Federal Banks of 6% interest on all secured loans and 7% interest on all unsecured loans.

8. The margin requirement for the purchase of listed stocks could be reduced to 40% for a short time. Although the Dow Jones may be down only 33½%, in truth and in fact this represents only 40% of the large companies. The New York, American, and Pacific Boards are down between 50% and 60% since January of 1968. This reduction would enable the small investor to purchase new stocks at a lower price, in order to average out his losses. Otherwise, the banks and mutual funds could purchase all the bargains, and the small investor, without any cash, would have no means of recouping his losses.

9. Banks, mutual funds and foreign investors could be required to purchase all of their common stock for cash.

10. Apartment houses and tract homes could be limited to 6% interest.

Throughout history money lenders have always been preying upon their victims. Two thousand years ago, Jesus of Nazareth found it necessary to cast the money lenders out of the Temple of Jerusalem. Today, as President of the United States, it is incumbent upon you to take drastic action.

A captain of a ship cannot wait until the ship has sunk before he recognizes the hazards confronting him. A doctor must make a timely diagnosis of cancer before he can save the patient by surgical intervention. A leader must recognize the nation's perils before he can avert a disaster.

As President of the United States of America you must recognize that the present program has not achieved its intended objective. You must look for new advisors, in

order to secure new ideas for new programs. History should not be permitted to read that, "The Republican Party died during the Nixon Administration because its leader refused to recognize the perils confronting him"; but instead, it should read that, "At the brink of disaster, the President recognized the imminent perils, and by imposing drastic controls and restrictions upon the wealthy bankers, he abated a major depression."

Very truly yours,

ERNEST GEORGE WILLIAMS.

HIGH INTEREST RATES INCREASE BANKRUPTCIES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as many of us have warned, the high interest rates and the tight-money policies of the Nixon administration are destroying the economy and placing thousands of businessmen in great jeopardy.

One indication of the growing problems of high interest rates is the sharp increase in bankruptcies which are being recorded in all parts of the Nation. Even large firms are finding it impossible to raise money in the market at an interest rate which will allow them to keep their doors open. The Nation is now well aware of the massive troubles of the Penn Central Transportation Co., which could not market its bonds at a 10½-percent interest rate.

Many small firms are being forced to pay much more than 10½ percent. In many cases, the lenders are demanding equity kickers—a piece of the action—in return for capital. Small businessmen everywhere are hard pressed because we have failed to do anything about the high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for Friday, July 3, carried an article concerning the growing number of bankruptcies being entered into by businesses. I place a copy of this article in the RECORD:

BANKRUPTCY ACTS FOUND INCREASING—MILO ELECTRONICS CORP. AND HENRY ROSENFELD FILE

(By Leonard Sloane)

The Milo Electronics Corporation, listed on the American Stock Exchange, announced yesterday that it plans to file a Chapter XI petition for arrangement under the Bankruptcy Act.

In another bankruptcy action, Henry Rosenfeld Industries, Inc., a dress manufacturer, filed a Chapter XI petition in Federal District Court here listing liabilities of \$532,400 and assets of \$502,300.

These developments on the bankruptcy front were the latest in a series of large or well-known companies that have come to public attention recently.

On Wednesday, in fact, the United States House of Representatives approved the creation of a commission to study and recommend the first major overhauling of the nation's bankruptcy laws in 32 years.

1,000 PCT. INCREASE NOTED

The House Judiciary Committee noted that bankruptcies have increased 1,000 per cent in 20 years to an annual rate of 200,000, although 90 percent of these are consumer bankruptcies.

"We will soon be confronted with a serious crisis unless our bankruptcy laws are brought up to date," it said.

The biggest company in the news lately is the Penn Central Company, whose railroad subsidiary asked reorganization under the Federal bankruptcy laws on June 21.

Also last month, Four Seasons Nursing Centers of America, Inc., and Dolly Madison Industries, Inc., filed petitions under Chapter X of the act.

Under Chapter XI, the debtor remains in possession of its business assisted by a court-appointed creditors committee, while Chapter X provides for the appointment of a trustee to operate the corporation.

Among other Chapter XI petitions filed this year by large concerns were Trans-Beacon Corporation and Polard Electronics Corporation. Even the Electric Circus Company, Ltd. which operates a discotheque in Manhattan, took the Chapter XI route recently.

In the case of Milo Electronics, a distributor of electronic parts and an operator of hi-fi stores, the company would not disclose any details of its financial conditions.

It only reported the management changes approved by its board at the same time of the Chapter XI approval and the authorization of stock options to certain officers.

On Tuesday, Milo said that it terminated the previously-announced agreement with Morton D. Weiner, its chairman and the former president of Avnet, Inc., for him to purchase 400,000 shares at \$1 a share.

Yesterday it announced Mr. Weiner's resignation, along with that of Milton Putterman as president and Roman L. Horne as a director.

Newly elected officers were Myron G. Newberger, former president of Avnet, Corporation, a subsidiary of Avnet, Inc., president; Sheldon Factor, vice president and treasurer; and Morton H. Weiner, a cousin of the former chairman, secretary. All were also named directors.

Henry Rosenfeld Industries, whose name-sake is the well-known Seventh Avenue dress manufacturer, would like to continue operating on a smaller scale, according to its lawyers.

Domestic production at two Florida plants will be curtailed he said, and women's apparel will be imported by the corporation.

"It was general business conditions and the failure to sell the line," said Cecil A. Citron, the lawyer for the company. "We hope to continue on a different scale."

Mr. Rosenfeld, he added, will not be actively involved in the management of the business. Instead he "will counsel" the officers and executives, Mr. Citron asserted.

WHO OWNS THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS?

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has always been a great deal of misunderstanding about who actually owns the Federal Reserve banks. Recently, these misconceptions have been growing.

There is no question that the Federal Reserve banks, like the rest of the Federal Reserve System, are part of the Federal Government and are owned by the Government.

One of the sources of the misconception about the ownership of the Federal Reserve banks comes from the fact that the Federal Reserve Act, in 1913, required member banks of the Federal Reserve System to put a certain percentage of their capital into the "stock" of the Federal Reserve banks. But the stock which emerged from the Federal Reserve

Act was not stock in the ordinary meaning of that term at all.

Over the years, I have interrogated the various Chairmen of the Federal Reserve System to clarify this point in an attempt to clear up these lingering misconceptions.

In a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee on June 17, 1942, the then Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Marriner Eccles, stated:

Well, the Government, in effect, for all practical purposes, owns the Federal Reserve banks.

Later, in a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee in 1956, I discussed this same issue with William McChesney Martin who was then the chairman of the Federal Reserve. The following exchange took place:

The CHAIRMAN. That stock, or that word 'stock', is a misnomer, is it not?

Mr. MARTIN. If you are talking about stock in terms of proprietorship, ownership—yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well of course, that is what stock is; yes. Normally that is what stock is; when you say 'stock,' you mean a proprietary interest of some kind, do you not?

Mr. MARTIN. In the ordinary sense, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, in the ordinary sense.

Mr. MARTIN. You and I are in agreement that it is not proprietary interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Therefore, this does not convey any proprietary interest at all, and the word "stock" is a misnomer. It is not a correct word at all. It is just an involuntary assessment that has been made on the banks as long as they are members.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Therefore, the statement that the banks own the Federal Reserve System is not a correct statement, is it?

Mr. MARTIN. The banks do not own the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Speaker, there are four major points that should be kept in mind concerning the so-called stock in the Federal Reserve banks. These include:

First. It carries no proprietary interest. In this respect, the stock is unlike the stock of any private corporation.

Second. It cannot be sold or pledged for loans. It thus does not represent an ownership claim.

Third. In the event of the dissolution of the Federal Reserve banks, the net assets after payment of the liabilities and repayment of the stock go to the U.S. Treasury rather than the private banks.

Fourth. The stock does not carry the ordinary voting rights of stock. The method of electing officers of the Federal Reserve banks is in no way connected to the amount of stockownership. Instead, each bank in a district has one vote within its class, regardless of its stockownership.

In reality, there is no need for a continuation of this practice of allowing the commercial banks to hold stock in the various Federal Reserve banks. The retirement of this stock would not change anything in the present Federal Reserve System.

The same method of electing the boards of the Federal Reserve banks, the same requirements for membership in the Federal Reserve System, and the same organizational structure of the Federal Reserve banks could be main-

tained. The same check clearing and other relationships between private member banks and the Federal Reserve could exist. There is no reason to believe that the basic structure of the Federal Reserve System would be changed simply because the stock was retired.

LEGISLATION TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS TAX DEDUCTIBLE

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, on behalf of myself and 26 other Members of the House from both parties, a bill to encourage private donations to the United Nations and related agencies by making such donations tax deductible.

Cosponsors of this bill are:

Mr. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. CHISHOLM, of New York.
Mr. CORMAN, of California.
Mr. DIGGS, of Michigan.
Mr. DULSKI, of New York.
Mr. EDWARDS, of California.
Mr. FRASER, of Minnesota.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.
Mr. HALPERN, of New York.
Mrs. HANSEN, of Washington.
Mr. HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts.
Mr. HORTON, of New York.
Mr. LEGGETT, of California.
Mr. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii.
Mr. MEEDS, of Washington.
Mrs. MINK, of Hawaii.
Mr. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts.
Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. OTTINGER, of New York.
Mr. PODELL, of New York.
Mr. REES, of California.
Mr. REID, of New York.
Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York.
Mr. RYAN, of New York.
Mr. SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This legislation is appropriate and timely for a number of reasons. The United Nations this year is celebrating its 25th anniversary—an occasion which will be celebrated this weekend with the official state visit to Washington by Secretary General U Thant, the first official state visit by an incumbent U.N. Secretary General.

During its 25-year history, the United Nations and the various agencies created by the General Assembly have performed innumerable invaluable services for the benefit of the American public and citizens of all of the nations of the world. U.N. forces have performed valuable peacekeeping missions in the Congo, the Middle East, Cyprus, Indonesia, and India-Pakistan. The United Nations development program, despite severely limited funds, has provided important economic and financial assistance to developing nations on a multilateral basis. Specialized U.N. agencies have fostered international cooperation to help prevent and control disease, improve working conditions, develop peaceful applications of nuclear energy, and protect and train the world's children, to name just a few areas of U.N.

activity. These accomplishments, which have been made from day to day at the working level without great publicity or fanfare, are certainly as significant as the occasional failures of the organization which seem to be cited so frequently.

The United Nations and its related agencies require and deserve increased funds not only to continue the valuable work they have done over the past 25 years, but also to take on new and expanded responsibilities where international cooperation is essential, such as the preservation and restoration of the environment, the control of world population, international satellite communication and the exploration and development of the seabeds and outer space. The legislation we are introducing would help provide such funds.

Gifts, donations, grants, and legacies from the many foundations, associations, and individuals in the United States who have developed an interest in the work of the U.N. and a deep respect for its accomplishments constitute an attractive potential source of funds for future U.N. activities. This source, however, remains largely untapped. Many Americans and American foundations who might be disposed to do so have been discouraged from providing funds to the U.N. by the fact that contributions to the United Nations and its related agencies are not tax deductible under current U.S. law.

The legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today would make contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations and certain agencies established by the U.N. General Assembly deductible for purposes of income, estate, and gift taxes.

The increased donations that would be stimulated by passage of this legislation might particularly provide an important source of funds for the establishment and operation of a U.N. Peace Fund as recommended last year by a distinguished panel headed by Yale President Kingman Brewster. That recommendation was supported by 15 Senators and 59 Representatives in a joint letter to the Secretary of State. It would also provide increased funds for continuation and expansion of the U.N. Development Fund as recommended most recently in the Twentieth Report of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation offers a positive step in the direction of increased emphasis on multilateralism that has been one of the important lessons of our experience in Vietnam. I hope that other Members of the House will examine this legislation and join us in working for its passage.

QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today sending to my constituents in the Fifth District of North Carolina a questionnaire designed to ascertain their views on the vital issues which confront this body today.

Representative government is the foundation of America's greatness, and there is no greater representation than through the direct voice of the people. The questions I am asking my constituents are these:

QUESTIONNAIRE

- (1) If a postal corporation is established, should it be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis?
- (2) Do you believe the United States can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union?
- (3) President Nixon has recommended strong anti-crime legislation. Do you favor:
 - (A) Allowing Federal officers with a warrant issued by a Federal court to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed?
 - (B) Keeping a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" if his record indicates he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial?
- (4) Should balancing the Federal budget to curb inflation be given priority over greater spending on government programs?
- (5) Do you favor elimination of draft deferments for college students?
- (6) In Vietnam, which one of the following four alternatives do you think will best serve our commitments and our national interest? (Please mark one.)
 - (A) Immediate and unconditional removal of all U.S. troops.
 - (B) Removal of U.S. troops by a definite deadline, regardless of any other consideration whatsoever.
 - (C) Gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops, depending on the ability of the South Vietnamese to assume the total defense of their country.
 - (D) Escalation of all military action to achieve a military victory.
- (7) Do you favor an all-out Federal attack on pollution, even if it means higher taxes?
- (8) Are you satisfied with President Nixon's overall performance?
- (9) Federal farm controls and subsidies should be:
 - (A) Phased out within five years, or
 - (B) Continued as is, or
 - (C) Made permanent, with the subsidies reduced.
- (10) Do you agree with President Nixon's decision to neutralize the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia?
- (11) Should the colleges expel any student who uses physical force as a means of persuasion?
- (12) Please list the priorities which you feel the Congress should spend tax money on in our country.
 1. _____
 2. _____

Mr. Speaker, these are important questions, and this Congress must find adequate answers to all of them. In an effort to enlighten my distinguished colleagues with regard to the feelings of my constituents, I will at a later date report the findings of this survey to the Members of this body.

I trust that this report will be helpful as we make these important decisions.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BYRNES ACCOMPANYING INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 18392

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is currently meeting in executive session

to consider comprehensive amendments to our trade laws. One of the problems the committee is focusing on concerns the growing trend of U.S. companies to locate their productive facilities overseas. The Treasury Department has made a recommendation to the committee to encourage U.S. companies to locate their productive facilities in the United States. This would be accomplished through a new Domestic International Sales Corporation—the so-called DISC—that would be permitted to defer U.S. income taxes on export income. In order to place the specific legislation incorporating the Treasury's recommendation before the Congress and the Ways and Means Committee during the committee's current deliberations on trade, I today, introduced H.R. 18392 to implement the Treasury's recommendation.

The purpose of the bill is to correct a distortion in our income tax structure which actually encourages the transfer of production and sales facilities abroad at the expense of U.S. production for export. Thus, under existing law U.S. companies may organize wholly owned foreign subsidiaries to manufacture and sell abroad and defer their U.S. tax liability on these foreign earnings completely until those earnings are distributed as dividends to U.S. shareholders. In contrast, U.S. companies manufacturing for export or engaged in export selling are subject to U.S. income tax on a current basis, although performing essentially the same function—supplying foreign markets—as the foreign subsidiary of the U.S. company manufacturing abroad.

It is even possible under existing law for large U.S. companies with extensive foreign operations to form foreign subsidiaries to engage purely in selling operations abroad and obtain the same tax deferral benefits. This usually requires, however, a highly complex network of foreign subsidiaries and benefits only those companies with the most sophisticated tax advice.

Our trade balance has been adversely affected by this existing bias in our tax laws against exports. The encouragement to manufacture abroad to obtain the benefits of tax deferral has made our companies less export-minded and has thereby resulted in a loss of jobs for American workers in the United States. The time has come to remove this particular bias against U.S. exporters. The DISC concept will achieve that goal.

In recent years, U.S. tax laws applicable to international business have been formulated with large, multinational corporations in mind. An important consequence of the DISC proposal will be to aid smaller U.S. companies to enter into or increase their export activities without having to resort to complicated foreign structures and highly sophisticated tax planning.

The laws of many foreign countries provide comparable or more favorable treatment of export earnings of their companies under the so-called territorial concept of taxation or by granting deferral treatment in a variety of ways. Thus, the DISC proposal will put our companies in a sounder competitive

basis in developing foreign markets in competition with producers from other countries.

Although the bill grants the deferral privilege to a DISC without being tied in any direct way to an increase in export sales, the possibility of phasing in this change by adding an incremental requirement should be given careful study by the House Ways and Means Committee. I recognize the inherent difficulty in an incremental approach stemming from the necessity of establishing a base period as a standard for measurement and making adjustments both to the base period and current results to achieve comparability.

There is no greater example of this difficulty than the complexity of our excess profits tax laws in World War I, World War II, and Korea. The Congress decided not to use an incremental structure for the investment credit even though it was originally recommended by President Kennedy in 1961. I would add that I am also aware of the fact that there are serious inequities in denying benefits to companies which maintain their existing level of export sales when they would otherwise transfer manufacturing operations abroad; we are equally interested in protecting our existing level of export activity.

At the same time, these problems may not prove as serious as they sound on intensive study of applying an incremental formula in this particular context. I will urge the Ways and Means Committee in taking up this bill to consider carefully the incremental concept.

CONTINUING EFFECT OF TIGHT MONEY AND HIGH INTEREST

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable to all and justifiable to some that the present administration blames its substantial woes over economic conditions on past administrations. Treat that as you will, having the responsibility of office it is incumbent upon the Nixon team to deal with the problems they campaigned so zealously to assume.

May I suggest that up to now they have failed to understand the genesis and nature of the inflation they hold to be the key villain of the piece. If you will follow our simple narrative we hope to point out where and why the trouble started and why the present methods of solution are not and will not work.

One of the classic and simple explanations of inflation is that condition where too much money is chasing too few goods. This in truth is at the root of our present inflation and it came about as follows: In 1961 President Kennedy was elected partly on the theory of getting America going again and partly on matching the efforts of the Russians in missiles and in space. After the election he introduced executive administrative efforts that addressed the country to both. As a matter of effect, this encouraged growth in the private sector

through tax deductions and growth in the public sector to meet the assessed needs to fill the missile gap and to gain advantage in the space race.

What was not noticed was the countereffect of these two economic activities. The general output of the private capital effort was in production of goods and services for the consumer market. The general output of the great government effort was for production outside the consumer markets. However, the workers associated with both efforts were consumers. Moreover the workers involved in missiles, weapons, and space hardware were, on the average, far better paid. When these workers as consumers met in the marketplace they were bidders for the output of the first group with the buying advantage on the part of the second group. As the two segments gathered momentum, the inflation affect was not felt. It took a period from 1961 to 1966—approximately 5 years for the disparity of consumer goods to consumer demand to be felt. It was precisely at this time that the Vietnam war effort came on with a \$30 billion annual acceleration of spending which increased military hardware production outside the consumer market and further distorted the bidding ability of consumers whose work output did not contribute to consumer goods. Below are a set of charts showing the growth of spending on missiles—space and military other than missiles from 1961 to 1969:

NASA

[In millions]

Fiscal year 1961	-----	\$755.5
Fiscal year 1962	-----	1550.6
Fiscal year 1963	-----	3230.5
Fiscal year 1964	-----	4593.9
Fiscal year 1965	-----	5187.4
Fiscal year 1966	-----	5031.6
Fiscal year 1967	-----	4650.9
Fiscal year 1968	-----	4132.7
Fiscal year 1969	-----	3652.0

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Missiles	Other ¹	Total
1961	2,887	11,351	14,238
1962	3,541	13,141	16,682
1963	3,857	13,003	16,860
1964	3,567	12,264	15,831
1965	2,422	12,001	14,423
1966	2,004	20,591	22,595
1967	2,039	21,972	24,011
1968	2,518	21,092	23,610
1969	3,282	19,827	23,109

¹ Includes aircraft, tracked vehicles, ships, and all other procurement.

Following is a set of charts showing the growth of work force in the private economy in each of these two categories from 1961 to 1969:

NASA

[In thousands]

1961	-----	57.5
1962	-----	115.5
1963	-----	218.4
1964	-----	347.1
1965	-----	376.7
1966	-----	360.0
1967	-----	272.9
1968	-----	211.2
1969	-----	181.0

DOD	
[In thousands]	
1961	2,327
1962	2,507
1963	2,520
1964	2,196
1965	2,102
1966	2,591
1967	3,082
1968	3,574
1969	3,300

Our thesis is simple. Here was the ground floor for inflation. Appropriate if unpopular countermeasures for this condition would have been: One, tax increase early in 1966—a step I spoke for on the floor and offered to support. Two, a short price and wage freeze to discourage expansion and a management-labor battle over increased profits. Three, selective credit controls to channel a required amount of capital into productive activities in the consumer market and to set downpayment requirements to encourage forced savings. Such actions would have been required only for a short period. The administration then and the administration now preferred to rely rather on tight monetary policy. The cost of this course of action has been enormous. Its benefits are still in question. As to the burdens these can be seen in the severe recession in the building industry, the bankruptcies in small businesses, and the cost to the taxpayers in servicing the debt of the United States. It also quickly became an additive to inflation as the cost of money became part of the price increase of every item the consumer purchased. At this point interest rates raised prices. Prices forced up wages and the new character of cost-push inflation was formed.

The counterproduction on Government is demonstrated by:

The shortening of the Government debt.

The increase in the Government debt, that is, in 1961 the U.S. debt was \$289 billion and the average length of obligations was 4 years, 6 months.

In 1970, the U.S. debt was \$370.9 billion and the average length of obligations was 3 years, 8 months.

This means that in 1961 the U.S. Treasury was borrowing \$85 billion a year at an approximate average interest rate of 3.6 percent at a cost of \$9 billion. But in 1970, borrowing \$124.3 billion at approximately 6 percent at a cost of \$18.8 billion.

All this in the meantime caused us to move from a 6 percent growth in gross national product in 1968 to approximately a 0.2 percent-plus gross national product growth rate in 1970—less goods for all. Of course, now there are less competitors for consumer goods. Both the segments producing consumer goods and services and those producing the nonconsumptive items are out of work. The inflation lingers because lag in production and increase of interest cost are still present and management and labor are still unrestrained in their competition over the diminishing profits from inflation. The real benefit in price is flowing in the meantime to those who have surplus funds to manage and loan.

Now what must we and should we do at this point?

First. Clearly we must set priorities to diminish activities for some time in production of materials outside the consumer market. To do this correctly, the program and policy should not destroy industrial and technological capacity but rather direct the capacity to some consumer oriented goods or services. The obvious place for some of the space and military capability to be directed is toward mass transit and urban problems—waste disposal—new cities, water pollution clearance and so forth.

Second. We need to remove artificial barriers and obstacles that discourage the increase of goods. Restrictive practices such as featherbedding—by management or labor, both have substantial cases in the railroad industry—farm subsidies, combinations in restraint of trade, and so forth.

Third. Legislative and executive reforms must be formulated to allow a faster and wider range of reactions to both inflation and recession. That is to say the management of the economy cannot be left either to the absence of Federal responsibility or to the outdated, outmoded, ineffective reactions Government currently exercises.

Fourth. Unemployment must be made more tolerable, for it is going to be one of the harsh realities of the foreseeable future. This requires Government as residual employer of some, particularly young people; training and retraining programs; and some increase in unemployment compensation and benefits.

These proposals are harsh and in some instances unpopular medicine. Without some such approach we will, however, face the risk of a deepening crisis and a loss of intelligent options for solutions. This administration has the ball and the only field they have to play in is the one inherited. It is too late to complain about the park we are in. We must move the ball.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15628—BARRING THE TRANSPORT OF NERVE GAS FROM OKINAWA TO JOHNSTON ISLAND

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a Senate amendment to H.R. 15628 to bar the transport of nerve gas from Okinawa to Johnston Island in the Pacific Ocean, and to authorize its detoxification on Okinawa.

This amendment has already been passed on a bipartisan basis by the Senate. The House conferees should concur, in support of the President's statement of last November renouncing the use of biological and chemical weapons of war, which all of mankind agree are the most horrible and inhuman means of destruction ever devised.

Reportedly about 10 percent of our stock of lethal chemical nerve gas is stored on Okinawa, an island which is soon to be reverted to Japan. The Defense Department considered a number of States as an alternate depository, but

when word got out of plans to store these weapons, these States were quick to object.

The Department hastily sent out a team to inspect the storage capacity of Johnston Island, a tiny atoll 700 miles from Hawaii. On July 1, Hickman Air Force Base, Honolulu, took over management of the island from "Joint Task Force 8," a military-Atomic Energy Commission unit whose activities have included simulated tests of nuclear weapons over Johnston Island. It was announced in the press that the move is unrelated to Army consideration of storing nerve gas, now on Okinawa, on Johnston Island.

By now, all of us should be familiar with the military style of operation on such matters. Last year Hawaii was shocked by the discovery, which I made, that the Army has not told the truth in disclaiming nerve gas tests within Hawaii. When the truth was out, we learned that extensive tests had been conducted in secret. The House acted last year to require that henceforth the Pentagon report regularly to Congress on its chemical and biological weapons testing.

Thus, although it has not been announced, we can conclude that the Pentagon does intend to store these stockpiles of nerve gas close to the shores of Hawaii.

The amendment passed in the Senate would prevent the utilization of funds from the Military Sales Act or any other law for transporting chemical munitions from Okinawa to the United States. It is crystal clear that in this context the term "United States" includes its States and all of its possessions, including Johnston Island.

I agree with the intent of this amendment, which would require the military to dispose of these nerve gases on Okinawa by rendering them harmless, instead of transporting them elsewhere. It should be pointed out that "burial" of the gas in the ocean's depths is likewise an unacceptable alternative because of the contamination to our environment that would inevitably result.

Our President has firmly stated his intention not to use these nerve gases, and I can see no logical justification for keeping them when it would be simpler and cheaper to destroy them. Such an action would be in accordance with our national goals and the interests of humanity.

BARRING TAX AID TO SEGREGATED, PRIVATE SCHOOLS

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to end Federal tax deductions for charitable contributions to segregated private elementary and secondary schools.

My bill is designed to end the tax subsidy for persons who contribute to the financial support of private elementary and secondary schools which do not admit black students. Existing Federal tax policy allows donors to such schools to

deduct the amount of their donations from their Federal income taxes.

I do not believe our Government should encourage and subsidize private segregated schools by allowing this deduction policy to continue. Since the Nixon administration has not taken firm action to end the practice, I am introducing my bill to provide a statutory prohibition of this tax subsidy.

Many Americans were appalled recently to read that attorneys representing the Federal Government had argued in court that tax deductions for all-white private schools are legal when the schools were created to avoid desegregation. Yet this is what an Assistant U.S. Attorney General, representing the Internal Revenue Service, did before the Federal District Court in the District of Columbia on May 15, 1970.

Despite repeated appeals by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the Internal Revenue Service has persisted in supporting this policy, which has seriously undermined efforts to comply with the Constitution by desegregating our public schools. There have been reports that the Nixon administration planned to reverse its support of allowing tax deductions, but other information has cast doubts on the firmness of this reported shift.

The existence of a viable public school system, open to all students on an equal basis, is too vital to leave to the indecisiveness of an administration whose policy apparently wavers in each movement of the political winds. Therefore, I believe the Congress should act immediately to prevent Federal support of efforts to undermine the Supreme Court's desegregation rulings.

My bill would amend the Internal Revenue code to provide a nondiscrimination standard for private elementary and secondary schools. A gift to such a school could not be considered deductible for Federal income tax purposes unless the school had been certificated by the Secretary of the Treasury as meeting the nondiscriminatory standard.

To obtain certification, a school would have to have a stated policy of not subjecting any student applying for admission to discrimination on account of race.

Certification would be terminated by the Secretary if the Civil Rights Commission found that the school did discriminate against black students. The finding could be made on the basis of the Commission's own investigation—either through public hearings or extensive recordkeeping requirements imposed at the Commission's option.

This provision of my bill in effect gives the Civil Rights Commission authority to decide whether a school discriminates against black students. If the Commission so determines, its finding would be binding on the Secretary to withdraw certification of the school.

Other provisions of the bill prevent evasion of its purposes by such devices as the paper transfer of assets from a predecessor segregated school.

I believe this legal protection is vitally necessary if we are to prevent our tax laws from being used to thwart and sub-

vert the laws of the land. The integrity of our public policy should not depend on the vagaries of Internal Revenue Service policy but instead should be based on firm concepts of statutory law.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert several news articles giving further background on this matter, as well as the text of my bill:

(From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1970)
UNITED STATES ACCEPTS TAX RULING ON
SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The government has decided not to appeal a court freeze on federal tax exemptions for the new private, segregated schools that are springing up in Mississippi.

But the Justice Department and the Internal Revenue Service appeared determined yesterday to continue fighting to preserve existing exemptions for the private schools that have been organized in prior years to help white parents avoid sending their children to school with Negroes.

In a countermove, the Civil Rights Commission yesterday released a letter to the IRS—its sixth letter in three years—asking for an outright reversal of the policy of granting tax exemptions for private segregated schools throughout the South.

The government had one month to appeal from a preliminary injunction entered Jan. 13 by a special three-judge federal court here granting Negroes from Mississippi part of what they sought in a broad legal attack on federal tax benefits that aid segregation. But Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold, after consultations with Justice Department and IRS lawyers, decided to let the time expire without seeking Supreme Court review.

It was understood that Griswold's action was based partly on the difficult task the government would have in overturning the non-final order—proof that the lower court was grossly in error.

In addition Griswold, a tax specialist and former Harvard law dean, took the position in 1967 as a member of the Civil tax status of racially discriminatory schools was cloudy and ought to be cleared up by the Attorney General.

The case remains in federal district court, where the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, representing five Negro families from Holmes County, Miss., are expected soon to press their claim for a permanent, broad injunction.

Government spokesmen declined to say how the Justice Department and the IRS would respond to future Lawyers Committee motions, but the federal attorneys have thus far refused to admit facts that would speed a final judgment.

For example, the IRS said it was "without information" about the plaintiffs' complaint that several tax-exempt academies are segregated and therefore, said the IRS, it was obliged to enter a formal denial to that charge.

Civil rights lawyers contend that IRS could ascertain this important fact from the Justice Department's own files and from the government's own pleadings in other school litigation in Mississippi.

A year ago the Justice Department joined with Mississippi Negroes in seeking and obtaining a court order striking down state tuition grants to the academies. The government contended that the schools were segregated and repeated the contention in arguments last week against the state legislature's latest program of loans to replace the outlawed grants.

Some government officials say there is more at stake than aid to segregated schooling in the lawsuits. They argue that if the Negroes prevail on their theory—that tax exemptions are legally the same as federal subsidies—the

Treasury Department will be beset on other fronts and forced to re-examine its entire exemption structure.

The federal court here, in a unanimous opinion indicated strongly that it was prepared to uphold the Negroes at the final judgment stage. It said:

"The federal government is not constitutionally free to frustrate the only constitutionally permissible state policy, of a unitary (non-racial) school system, by providing government support for endeavors to continue under private auspices the kind of racially segregated dual school system the state formerly supported."

IRS has maintained that it was free to grant the exemptions—which allow private donors to write off contributions when figuring their income tax—as long as no "state action" was involved in the private schools. The temporary injunction forbids future exemptions unless IRS affirmatively finds no purpose of evading desegregation requirements.

(From the Washington Post, May 16, 1970)
IRS DEFENDS TAX-EXEMPT WHITE SCHOOLS

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Government attorneys argued yesterday that tax exemptions for all-white private schools are legal, even if the schools were created to avoid desegregation.

In a 43-page brief filed with the federal district court in Washington, the Treasury Department called for dismissal of a suit filed on behalf of Mississippi black students. The suit claims that the tax exemptions—as well as the income tax deductions claimed by school contributors—are unconstitutional.

Assistant Attorney General Johnnie M. Walters, representing the Internal Revenue Service, relied heavily on language in the Supreme Court's May 4 decision sustaining tax exemptions for church property.

Walters said the IRS, rather than lending aid to racial discrimination, was maintaining the same sort of "benevolent neutrality" toward non-profit education institutions that the high court, in its 7-to-1 decision, applauded in permitting states to refrain from taxing religious property.

The Negroes have failed to prove that the tax status makes a major difference in whether the academies survive or prosper. Walters said. A special three-judge court, in an interim ruling in January forbidding new exemptions but permitting old exemptions to continue, found that many schools were counting heavily on the tax benefits as an incentive to private donors.

The Negroes, represented by the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, have moved for a broad final order to disallow the tax benefits as impermissible assistance to segregated schooling under the Constitution and the 1964 civil rights act. Walters said the case should be dismissed.

The government brief refused to admit that the plaintiffs had actually proven that the academies have a policy of excluding Negroes. In other litigation the Justice Department is contending that—because the schools are part of a program of evasion of public school desegregation orders—it is illegal for state and county officials to make tuition loans or pay teacher salaries.

In Jackson, Miss., the Lawyers Committee said it is filing an additional request for a still broader court order one that would prevent further spread of the academy movement through a \$1.25 million fund-raising drive of which Sen. James O. Eastland (D-Miss.) is honorary chairman.

(From the Washington Post, July 2, 1970)
CURB WHITE ACADEMIES IN SOUTH, HILL IS
URGED

Reese Cleghorn of the Southern Regional Council called on Congress yesterday to curb

the growth of private white academies which, he said, threaten public school desegregation in the South.

Cleghorn told the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity that Congress should bar federal tax exemptions for academies which can't show that they meet minimal standards and are free of racial bias.

A firm policy on exemptions is being debated now by Nixon administration lawyers who contended earlier this year that they were legal even for schools created to avoid desegregation, Cleghorn said.

LOCAL TAX EXEMPTIONS

Cleghorn also asked Congress to insist that the Justice Department challenge state and local property tax exemptions for all-white private schools.

New federal funds proposed to aid desegregating public schools should be denied to states that don't set minimal educational standards for private schools, Cleghorn said. They should also be denied, he added, to state and local school systems that convey property to segregated private schools.

The Senate, in voting a first-installment \$150 million for desegregation aid last week, included a ban on funds for school systems that convey property or services to segregated academies. Final action awaits a House-Senate conference.

RAISING ESTIMATE

Cleghorn said the Atlanta-based council, a human relations research and information agency, is raising its rough estimate of total enrollment in Southern segregated schools to possibly 400,000 from 300,000.

While most of the new all-white academies contend they were created for "quality education" rather than preserving segregation, Cleghorn said, many are in makeshift buildings without libraries, laboratories or lunchrooms.

[From the Washington Post, July 6, 1970]

DIXIE GOP LOBBIES WHITE HOUSE TO ALLOW "ACADEMY" TAX DEDUCTIONS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Powerful Southern Republican politicians went secretly to the White House last week in a last-ditch attempt to talk President Nixon out of an imminent policy change that would deny tax deductions for contributions to mushrooming—and segregated—private schools in the South.

With Mr. Nixon in San Clemente, the Southern Republicans took their highly sensitive appeal to Peter Flanigan, the White House aide coordinating the convulsive tax-exemption war now being waged for the President's mind. Flanigan left no doubt that he personally thinks that the government should stop giving financial help to the private white-only "academies" that now have a total enrollment of close to 400,000—the last defense against racial integration.

But Flanigan left a crack in the door, and the Southern politicians, with powerful allies within the administration, stuck their foot in it. Thus, at this writing, the issue that has swirled around the President for months pitting department against department and White House aides against each other, is still not wholly resolved.

Boiled down, the Southern argument is a warning to Mr. Nixon that ending the tax exemptions by administrative decision or by joining black litigants in the courts would mark a drastic reversal of the Southern Strategy. Further, they insist, it would be inconsistent with the Nixon strategy on school desegregation, which is to put the burden on the U.S. courts and take it off the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Accordingly, the administration should do nothing about the Southern "academies"

and leave the decision with the U.S. courts. In the Green case, a three-judge federal panel issued a temporary restraining order in January enjoining the Treasury Department from issuing any more certificates of tax exemption.

If, as seems highly probable, the courts order an end to the practice for good, the Nixon administration can't be blamed. That would be entirely consistent, the Southerners argue, with Mr. Nixon's basic school desegregation strategy. That strategy threw out HEW's guidelines, so hated in the South, and turned the problem over to the federal courts.

But inconsistency has been a Nixon administration way of life on the tax-exemption matter as well as other political concerns. Consider the almost unbelievable back-and-forth, up-and-down record on tax exemptions that has dramatized this battle for the President's mind.

Last winter, Southern Republican leaders received personal White House assurances that there would be no administration assault against all-white private schools. At the very same time, Robert Finch, then Secretary of HEW, had a letter drafted to Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy formally asking an end to tax-exemption certificates for the proliferating academies.

Finch lost that battle, but other powerful opponents of tax assistance were quietly laying plans of battle. They included Randolph Thrower, the moderate Republican from Atlanta, who heads Treasury's Internal Revenue Service.

Thrower had held up several applications for the certificates on his own authority, without any formal presidential decision, before the Green case injunction was issued.

But when the Justice Department formally entered the Green case last May it argued powerfully—to the dismay of administration moderates—that tax exemptions were perfectly legal even for academies created to avoid desegregation.

That Justice Department brief, bitterly attacked in the Northern press, also infuriated Finch (now a presidential counselor) and other White House liberals, most importantly Leonard Garment. Garment and Finch, with the President's full approval, began shaping a new policy totally at odds with Attorney General John Mitchell's Justice Department.

Last week, Justice Department lawyers were scheduled to repeat their original pro-tax exemption argument in the continuing court battle. At the last moment, Mitchell asked for a delay—presumably to give him time for an about-face conforming to a new White House policy of opposition to any more tax exemptions.

Then the Southerners arrived in Flanigan's White House office and opened the door a crack. Considering the confused, ambiguous bungling that has marked the tortured policymaking on tax-exemptions in the past, only a fool would try to predict what Mr. Nixon will finally do.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow any deduction for contributions to elementary and secondary schools which discriminate on the grounds of race

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable contribution deduction) is amended by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"(1) Nondiscrimination Requirement for Elementary and Secondary Schools.—

"(1) Requirement of nondiscrimination certificate.—

"(A) General rule.—A contribution or gift to or for the use of an ineligible elementary or secondary school shall not be considered to be a charitable contribution within the meaning of subsection (c).

"(B) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection:

"(1) Ineligible elementary or secondary school.—The term 'ineligible elementary or secondary school' means an elementary or secondary school with respect to which a nondiscrimination certificate has not been issued under paragraph (2) or with respect to which such a certificate is not in effect at the time the gift or contribution is made.

"(2) Elementary or secondary school.—The term 'elementary or secondary school' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e) (4)) which provides education at any grade between grades 1 and 12, inclusive.

"(3) Issuance of nondiscrimination certificate.—The Secretary or his delegate may issue a nondiscrimination certificate with respect to an elementary or secondary school if—

"(A) such school does not subject any student, applicant for admission to discrimination on account of race,

"(B) such school gives notice of its policy to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A) in a manner reasonably calculated to apprise the public of such policy, and

"(C) no certificate issued under this paragraph with respect to such school (or any predecessor school which used substantially the same facilities as such school) has been terminated under paragraph (3) within the two-year period preceding the issuance of such certificate.

"(4) Termination of certificate.—A certificate issued under paragraph (2) with respect to a school shall be terminated by the Secretary or his delegate at such time as the chairman of the United States Civil Rights Commission notifies the Secretary or his delegate that the Commission has determined under paragraph (4) that—

"(A) such school has not complied with the requirements of paragraph (2) (A), or

"(B) such school has failed to keep records required by paragraph (4) or to permit access thereto.

"(5) Determination of noncompliance.—Whenever on the basis of one or more complaints or other available information, the Civil Rights Commission finds that there is reason to believe that an elementary or secondary school has not complied with the requirement of paragraph (2) (A) the Commission may—

"(A) require such school to keep records for each semester or term showing the number of students who have applied to such institution (identifying them by race), and the number admitted (identified by race), together with the reasons for nonadmission in each instance, or

"(B) hold a hearing for purposes of making a determination on the record as to whether the institution has complied with the requirement of paragraph (2) (A).

If the Commission determines in a hearing conducted under subparagraph (B) that the school has not complied with such requirement, the Commission shall notify the Secretary or his delegate. If the Commission determines (after notice and opportunity for hearing) that a school has failed to keep records as required by subparagraph (A) or to permit the Commission reasonable access thereto, the Commission shall so notify the Secretary or his delegate. Any determination made under this paragraph shall be subject to judicial review in the district courts.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to contributions made more than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

**WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, JR.,
MAKES A BALANCED AND
THOUGHTFUL APPRAISAL OF THE
CURRENT SITUATION IN VIETNAM**

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day when all of us look for thoughtful, objective, and balanced comments on the major question still facing our country, the situation in Vietnam—and when we find them all too rarely—I am especially happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a very thoughtful balanced and, I believe, sound appraisal of where we stand today in Southeast Asia. It was written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, and it appeared in the Albany Times Union, in my State of New York, on July 8, 1970.

Under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Hearst's "Editor's Report" at this point.

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT VIETNAM

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAIGON.—Completing a week in Vietnam and Cambodia, and a total of two weeks out here in Asia, I think it best to get some thoughts off my mind and on paper because by the time Sunday rolls around my son, Willie, and I, and Joe Kingsbury Smith will be in Israel.

Bob Considine leaves us here and heads home via Hong Kong, Tokyo, and San Francisco, taking with him a darling little 18-month-old Vietnamese orphan girl, Ngo Tai Lam (Buttons for short). She has been adopted by Air Force Captain and Mrs. Robert Peck, of Austin, Texas. The Captain served in Vietnam and knows how urgent is the need of help for those Vietnamese orphans, many of whom were fathered by GI's who served or died in Vietnam.

Since it makes more sense to write about Asia from here than from the Middle East, I am doing this midweek column before flying to Tel Aviv.

We have met and talked with many knowledgeable people, including my friend Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky of Vietnam as well as Ambassadors Ellsworth Bunker, Samuel Berger, and William Colby. Also, General George S. Brown, who commands the 7th Air Force, and General William L. Rossen, the acting commanding general of all American forces in Vietnam. General Creighton W. Abrams was in Tokyo, recuperating from a minor operation. All these plus those previously noted in Cambodia, Hong Kong and Tokyo.

Putting all these talks together has led me to the conclusion that we are on the verge of accomplishing in Vietnam what we came over here for in the first place—namely to keep South Vietnam from being overrun and conquered by the Communist of North Vietnam.

That in a nutshell has been the name of the game all along. God alone knows the road has been dark and dreary and tragic, and the end seemed always just around the corner. Add to this the growing lack of enthusiasm at home, plus what to me has been the almost treacherous, certainly always defeatist utterances by people in high places. Finally, the self-imposed military restrictions placed upon our commanders, forcing them to fight with one hand tied behind their back, as it were. No wonder it has taken so long and seemed at times so hopeless.

It is not hopeless now. I think there is a better than even chance that South Vietnam will be able to remain free even after we have pulled out the bulk of our forces, though we

may have to keep about 50,000 troops here as we have done in South Korea for the past 20 years.

There can be no doubt that we underestimated the strength, determination and tactical cunning of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces in the early stages of our involvement. They had the country almost in their grasp in 1963. The South Vietnamese army, its morale at a very low ebb, was on the verge of collapse, with nepotism and poor military leadership in its top command. Finally, there was continuous disunity and even assassination in the national government.

That was the picture when President Johnson first ordered American combat troops in to save South Vietnam from Communist conquest. Our men came in here as they went to Europe in 1917 and again in World War II to preserve the principle of self-determination.

The Communists have been unable to mount a major offensive in South Vietnam for months now. They potentially have the capability for another Tet-type offensive, but again our military commanders are confident the Communist forces would suffer the same disastrous setback.

For the present, they have reverted to small unit, guerrilla warfare tactics. Even these operations have been diminishing.

The long-promised pacification program is progressing, solidly and effectively, and the government is regaining control of the countryside. The Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia have been smashed, and the enemy forces suffered a setback as a result of President Nixon's proper and politically courageous decision to send troops into that neighboring state.

From our talks in Phnom Penh, I am led to believe that if we and our Asian allies have the good sense to send all possible military aid—and in our case this means only arms and equipment—to the new anti-Communist Cambodian government, we will be able to keep that country free as well.

As Vice President Ky revealed in his talk with us in Saigon, South Vietnam has proposed a military alliance with Thailand and Cambodia aimed at establishing a common defense bulwark that would protect Cambodia, and, in fact, all three countries from Communist conquest.

On our part, we should rescind our existing military aid agreement with Thailand which prohibits their forces from using our military equipment outside their borders. The one thing that we have been urging most strongly is that the Asians defend themselves.

South Vietnam, Thailand and Cambodia are eager to do so now, and we should lose no time to help them do so.

Marshal Ky and I first met about five years ago. At that time he alone was running the country as premier and commanding general of the Air Forces, a dual post he held from June, 1965, to October, 1967. I liked him from the moment we met. It is true that for a leader of a nation in such dire trouble, he was at that time pretty young, rather flamboyantly dressed and inclined to be a little flip.

In the fall of 1967, Vietnam had a proper national election. It was felt by the Vietnamese and our own people that it would be more seemly for Ky to run as vice president and for an older man, more experienced in administration, to guide the ship of state through the stormy weather ahead.

Ky accepted this role in a gesture which I believe to be unprecedented in the annals of military dictatorships. It was an act of pure patriotism in the interest of politically unifying the country, and should have been hailed, as it was by me, as the act of a big man. Am sorry to say, though, that the critics of the war have consistently discredited the integrity of the two principals.

Since that time, Ky has matured a lot,

and become much more fluent in the English language. He now displays a knowledgeable concern for the future economic stability of his country rather than just a feeling for the military aspect.

Typical of this derring-do warrior, he arrived just after us in a helicopter, which he set down on the front lawn of the presidential palace. With him was the beautiful wife, who sat with us for the first part of the interview before having to leave to hostess a tea for the foreign ministers' wives.

Now only 40, I would certainly think this young vice president will follow in President Nixon's footsteps and one day be the chief of state.

Vice President Ky still thinks—and so do I—that this war will end by slowly petering out as the north realizes that it cannot conquer the south militarily. There may be a few more years of guerrilla fighting by the Viet Cong, but I think this is a more realistic view than to expect North Vietnam, which has lost nearly a million men in this vain struggle, to formally acknowledge what amounts to failure.

Then will come elections, internationally inspected I hope, to avoid subsequent carping. There seems to be general agreement that in such a proper election, the Communists would not poll more than 15 per cent or 20 per cent.

All things considered, I can't but commend to you President Nixon's present policy of gradually withdrawing our combat troops and turning the ground fighting over to the South Vietnamese.

If we have the patience and good sense to continue providing air and logistical support for the South Vietnamese forces, I am confident they can defend their country themselves.

Only thus will the sacrifice of their lives by some 40,000 young Americans not have been in vain.

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND
HEALTH ACT**

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the attention of this Nation has focused recently on the environmental crisis—the pollution of air and water, and the destruction of natural resources. In my opinion, however, this emphasis on environmental problems fails to give sufficient recognition to the pertinent question of occupational safety and health. It is ironic that one of the key areas of environmental pollution is in the workplace, and yet this distinguished body has failed to respond to this aspect of the problem.

Our environment is not solely the air we breathe traveling to and from work. It is also the air we breathe at work. This issue—the health and safety of the American working man and woman—is the most crucial issue in the whole environmental question, because it is out of the working place that the whole problem of pollution arises.

As chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, I presided over 15 days of public hearings in the first session of this Congress, and I was appalled at the slaughter taking place in our factories and on our farms. Every hour eight workers are killed and over 1,100 are disabled in job-related accidents. In only 4 years time as many people die because of their employment as have been killed in almost

a decade of American involvement in Vietnam. In dollar and cents terms, over \$1.5 billion is wasted annually in lost wages; and \$8 billion is lost to the economy. The days of lost productivity through accidents and illness are 10 times greater than loss from strikes.

After careful study of the hearing record and consideration of the views of all the witnesses, I prepared and introduced a draft bill to my subcommittee. This bill, H.R. 16785, was approved by the subcommittee and recently reported from the full Education and Labor Committee. The report filed today gives a detailed outline of the bill as well as the pertinent, and may I say, gruesome statistics on the occupational safety and health situation in this Nation. I call this document to the attention of my colleagues.

H.R. 16785 is designed to end this shameful waste of life and limb in American workplaces without placing unequitable burdens on employers. It is, indeed, my aim to have employees and employers and the Federal and State Governments cooperate to insure the fair administration of this act. To that end I have provided that both the employees and the employers have recourse to the courts and are fully protected by the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

This bill provides for the Secretary of Labor to set Federal safety and health standards based on recommendations submitted to him by an advisory committee and after formal public hearings where all interested parties are given an opportunity to testify.

In order to assist the Secretary of Labor and his advisory committees in formulating standards, H.R. 16785 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research and develop criteria, particularly concerning the new problems created by technology as well as motivational and behavioral factors involved in on-the-job safety.

In this regard, I want to point out to my colleagues that each year approximately 600 new chemicals are introduced. This subcommittee learned that there are presently 6,000 chemicals in use, yet health authorities have threshold limit values for only about 500. Because of this extremely hazardous situation, H.R. 16785 provides for the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare to develop procedures to enable employers to measure and record exposure to atmospheric dangers and make these findings available to employees.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under H.R. 16785, must also publish a list of all known or potentially toxic substances and concentrations at which toxicity occurs. Within 60 days after the determination of danger levels, no employer shall require his employees to be exposed to such toxic substances unless notified of the danger and precautions are taken for safe use. An exposed employee may absent himself without risk of harm for the period necessary to avoid danger, without loss of compensation.

H.R. 16785 does not repeal any other Federal laws prescribing safety or health requirements, but requires the Secre-

tary of Labor to report to Congress within 3 years his recommendations for avoiding duplication.

There is a crying need for the passage of H.R. 16785 to protect the lives of America's 80 million working men and women. It makes little sense for the Congress of the United States to tackle the problem of dirty air spewing forth from smokestacks without seeking solutions to the contaminated environment inside the factory.

To illustrate the urgency of this situation, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention a few recent on-the-job accidents. Here on the very doorstep of the Capitol, in McLean, one man died and two were injured while fixing a blocked sewage pipe:

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1970]

CONTRACTOR, 28, KILLED, TWO INJURED IN CAVE-IN

A 28-year-old plumbing contractor from Manassas was killed and two other workmen injured yesterday in McLean when red clay caved in around a 12-foot hole they had dug to fix a blocked sewage pipe.

Police identified the dead man as Herbert L. Wilkinson, the owner of H. L. Wilkinson Plumbing and Heating Co. in Manassas. Two of his employees, Avery F. Greer, 29, of Manassas, and James R. Heflin, 33, of Amissville, Va., were treated for minor injuries at Fairfax Hospital and released.

The cave-in occurred about 11:30 a.m. in front of a town house at 7371 Hallcrest Dr. in the 76-unit Hallcrest Heights development just north of the western end of Old Chain Bridge Road.

R. C. Winterbottom, construction superintendent of the uncompleted development, said he warned workers against all getting in the hole at the same time about 15 to 20 minutes before the accident.

Winterbottom is employed by the Hallcrest Heights Joint Venture, which had subcontracted the plumbing work at the development to the Wilkinson firm.

There was no protective shoring in the hole. Lefton Foltz, a Fairfax County construction safety engineer, said the accident "could have been prevented" with proper shoring, which he said is required by state law unless the hole is surrounded by solid rock.

James W. Reid, a resident of the town house at 7371 Hallcrest Dr., said he heard the workers' cry for help and immediately ran outside half-dressed and "dug around to get (Greer's) face free." The other two men were covered up to their upper torso he said.

Reid, an investment official for a Minneapolis oil company, said he initially thought Wilkinson was only unconscious. Medical examiner Claude Cooper later ruled that Wilkinson died of lack of oxygen.

About five feet of the 10-by-8-foot hole appeared to have been filled by the cave-in hampering rescue workers from the McLean and Dunn Loring volunteer fire departments. Police said Greer and Heflin were removed within 15 minutes of the accident, but Wilkinson's body was not removed for about 50 minutes.

Wilkinson is survived by his wife, two sons and a daughter, company officials said.

Death and disability from job-related accidents know no boundaries. In the farming heartland of this Nation 2 weeks ago, five workers lives were snuffed out in the collapse of a grain elevator in a small town in northwest Iowa:

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1970]

FIVE DIE IN GRAIN ELEVATOR

ALBERT CITY, IOWA, June 19.—At least five persons were killed today when a 150 foot grain elevator under construction collapsed

in this northwest Iowa town of 700. At least five bodies had been carried out of the rubble by early afternoon and Buena Vista County Hospital said it had received two persons injured in the collapse of the structure.

Last month in the shadow of Kennedy International Airport accumulated gases in a sewage-treatment plant caused an explosion which resulted in injury to 13 persons, two who were plant employees. Eleven other men and women were also injured, passengers in a passing bus and a hotel employee:

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1970]

THIRTEEN INJURED IN BLAST AT A SEWAGE PLANT AT KENNEDY AIRPORT

Thirteen persons were slightly injured and a sewage-treatment plant near Kennedy International Airport was heavily damaged last night in an explosion apparently caused by accumulated gases.

The police at the scene said that shortly after 7:30 P.M. an explosion at the Department of Public Works' treatment plant at 150 South Conduit Avenue, at 134th Street, blew holes in the building's brick walls, opened up large cracks and sprayed broken glass over a one-block area.

The foreman of the plant, William Borfitz, said he noticed a strong odor of gas shortly before the explosion and ordered his men to evacuate the site. As they were leaving, he said, the explosion occurred.

Two plant employees, 10 passengers in a passing bus and an employee at the International Hotel a block away, were injured slightly by flying glass. All were treated and released at the airport medical center.

Windows at the hotel were also blown in. A small fire at the nearby Department of Sanitation truck garage was quickly extinguished by firemen.

An inspector from the Department of Public Works was sent to the scene to inspect the building and see if it was still structurally safe.

A police official said the explosion had been caused by some sort of gas, either collected sewer gas from the plant itself, or gasoline fumes leaking into sewer pipes from nearby gas stations.

Hotel employees said that an odor of gas had hung over the area, usually permeated with the smell of sewage, all afternoon.

An automobile parked near the plant was overturned by the blast. Consolidated Edison crews were sent to the scene to test for possible additional gas accumulations.

Meanwhile, four highway construction workers in the State of Maine plunged to their death while engaged in building a bridge:

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1970]

FOUR WORKMEN KILLED IN A FALL FROM SPAN OVER MAINE RIVER

KITTERY, ME., June 24.—Four construction workers plunged nearly 100 feet to their death today when the staging on the under side of a bridge from Kittery to Portsmouth, N.H., collapsed.

Witnesses said that eight men fell from the sliding scaffolding when two of the supporting I-beams gave way.

Six other workers, clinging to remnants of the collapsed staging, were rescued by firemen using ladders.

Three clung precariously to a narrow girder for more than an hour until rescued. Another dangled for two hours when his arm became ensnared in rigging.

Seven workers were injured, five seriously, police said.

Those killed were identified as Noel A. Dube, 22 years old; Michael A. Wood, 23; George B. Dinsmore, 29; and Karl Koski, 20.

The accident occurred on the Maine side of the bridge which spans the Piscataqua Riv-

er. The six-lane, \$50-million bridge is scheduled to be opened sometime in 1972.

Those involved in the accident were employed by the Cianbro Corporation of Pittsfield, Mo.

William Lorenz, 26, of Portsmouth, said he was on the staging when he looked up and saw a piece of steel begin to buckle.

"I made a mad jump and grabbed a vertical beam," he said. "I shimmied up the thing about 15 feet until I reached a horizontal bar that I could cling to. Then I just hung on. I'm lucky to be alive. I don't know how I hung on."

Mr. Lorenz was rescued by firemen using aerial ladders.

He said another worker, who also was clinging to a bar, finally fell.

Harry Cook, the Maine Highway Commission inspector, said he raced out from his field office in time to see one worker slide off the dangling platform and fall.

The bridge, under construction for more than a year, extends from the Portsmouth rotary on U.S. 95 to Kittery, and is high enough to permit passage of heavy ships.

David H. Stevens, chairman of the state Highway Commission, said the accident was under investigation.

These are a few of the fatalities, a few of the statistics. They represent far more than mere numbers. They are the lives of America's working men and women. I ask my colleagues, are we going to let the loss of life and limb be the byproduct of modern industrial production and mechanized agriculture?

I intend in the next few weeks to continue bringing these statistics of slaughter to the attention of the Members of this body. The House of Representatives has the opportunity now to end this shameful tragedy by passing H.R. 16785, and I urge my colleagues to respond to this vital need for legislation to protect America's workers.

PRESSURE POLITICS

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, several Members have advised me that representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development have used pressure either directly or indirectly on them to vote against the so-called Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act. While my position was in opposition to this amendment, I abhor such tactics. For a member of the bureaucracy to attempt to blackmail any representative of the American people in Congress by implied threats to withhold benefits from his district or to offer taxpayer-paid Government projects as a quid pro quo for a vote in the House of Representatives is abhorrent. I detest this practice and any further use of it should be met with appropriate congressional action.

LEGISLATION TO TERMINATE ASSIGNMENT OF DRAFTEES TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to terminate the assignment of draftees to duty in Southeast Asia without specific congressional

authorization. This legislation will act as reassertion of congressional prerogative in the vital area of the draft and will provide an important impetus toward ending the "peacetime" draft and establishing an all-volunteer Army.

With our reduced troop strength in Indochina and with the President's pledge to withdraw another 150,000 Americans in the next 12 months, the time has come for us to halt the practice of sending inductees, so many of whom are opposed to the war, to serve in that theater. By mid-1971, according to our timetable, American troop strength in Indochina will be down to 284,000, about 265,000 below our past maximum level. Since approximately 115,000 of the 302,000 American Army personnel in Southeast Asia are draftees, it is obvious that we could bring them all home among the planned 150,000 returnees, as well as provide that no more draftees will be sent into the combat zone as replacements.

Mr. Speaker, draftees have been bearing a disproportionate burden in that agonizing war, suffering more than half the deaths while comprising only 25 percent of our total military personnel who have served in Southeast Asia. We all recognize that the draft with its many inequities is a major source of unrest among our Nation's youth, particularly those who feel strongly that our involvement in Indochina is immoral and not in America's best interest. The Supreme Court has recognized the legitimacy of youthful opposition to the war by broadening the criteria for conscientious objection, and I believe that the Congress must now initiate steps to move toward an all-volunteer force as we complete our hoped-for disengagement.

I have long advocated an all-volunteer Army, and I intend to sponsor legislation to end the draft in the near future, but until we can effectuate this important reform, the bill I am introducing today could do much to ease the tensions and agonizing decisions young people have to make with the constant realization that they may be called to fight in a war to which they are adamantly opposed. So long as conscription is still the law, legislation to exempt draftees from combat could serve as a bridge to that time when we shall, hopefully, have a volunteer military. The Gates Commission report revealed that only a small increase in recruiting expenditures could increase enlistments by 10 to 20 percent, more than enough to fulfill our current and anticipated national defense needs. By raising pay levels and instituting other reforms to make military life more attractive as a career, measures which I have proposed and which the President has also endorsed, we can look forward to allowing the Selective Service Act to lapse when its current authorization expires on June 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would prevent the expenditure of funds after date of enactment to send any draftees to South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, or Thailand, unless such action is specifically authorized by Congress later. I believe that we have every justification for accomplishing our combat troop reductions first by removing inductees from the war zone. Passage of this bill would be instrumental in reducing the tensions which have

rent this country over the war issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this legislation and pressing for early hearings.

STRANDED STUDENTS PROMPT LEGISLATIVE ACTION

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I spoke on the floor concerning the 3,000 American students who were stranded in Europe as a result of the financial collapse of the World Academy Schools for Foreign Study, the travel agency which arranged the study tours.

Today's Washington Post carries a story of the emergency airlift of 183 of these students from Switzerland. Some of these students had been saving money for years in order to make the trip. This all went for naught as a result of the unscrupulous or unsophisticated management of World Academy, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to each of my colleagues asking for cosponsors of a bill which would provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry. This legislation is necessary if we are to protect the thousands of persons who patronize travel agencies in this country.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a copy of the Washington Post article:

EMERGENCY AIRLIFT BRINGS 183 STRANDED STUDENTS HOME

(By Tom Del Vecchio)

NEW YORK, July 8.—The first batch of 3,500 American students has returned from Europe after being stranded by the financial collapse of the travel agency that arranged their study tours.

"It was bedlam" when the students heard their trips had been cut short, said Debbie Monk, 16, of Newport News, Va.

She was among 183 persons emergency airlifted from Switzerland Tuesday to Kennedy Airport.

"Most of the students raised the money for the trip themselves," said Sister Celeste Marie Reichert of St. Edmund's High School, Brooklyn, chaperon to 13 girls from that school.

The cost for the four weeks abroad was \$1,200 up.

"They worked after school and on Saturdays and Sundays," she said. "That's what's so sad. It was heartbreaking."

On Monday, World Academy, Inc., which arranged the trips, filed bankruptcy petitions in Cincinnati's U.S. District Court. Four of its subsidiaries also filed petitions.

The firm's financial collapse left no funds for further feeding or accommodations for the students, but their flights home had been paid for in advance with a charter airline company.

"We were supposed to tour seven countries, but we only saw Italy and Switzerland," said Miss Monk. "We left on June 25 and were supposed to return Aug. 2."

Sister Grace Vincent, of Ladycliff College, Highland Falls, N.Y., said some of the 10 students she escorted had worked for two summers to pay for the trip.

"I really think the government should make an investigation," she said.

Another member of the group, Steven Baines, 16, of Newport News, said, "I'm kind of mad because I don't think we can get our money back."

Earlier in the day, as another group boarded buses for Le Bourget Airport in Paris

and the trip home, blond Candy Meek, 18, of Firebaugh, Calif., had tears in her eyes.

"I've worked practically all my life in my parents' shoe store to save for this trip," she said. "I wonder if I'll be able to come again."

EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY THEATRE FOR HIGH SCHOOL CHILDREN IN RHODE ISLAND

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 Rhode Island was honored by being selected as one of two districts in the country to test the feasibility of educational laboratory theater for high school children. The experiment was so highly successful that it is being continued with acclamations from students and educators alike. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I enter this article by Carol Young into the Record in order that my colleagues may be able to familiarize themselves with this very worthwhile project:

PROJECT DISCOVERY (By Carol Young)

A theater project in Rhode Island shows that today's teenagers, brought up in a media-mod world of television and phonograph records, still can be "turned on" by the masterpieces of Eugene O'Neill, Shakespeare, and Chekhov.

More than 41,000 high school students from the State's cities and affluent suburbs, its rural communities and seaports, its ghettos and once-flourishing mill towns are being introduced to dramatic literature by seeing it come alive on the stage.

The massive laboratory theater program, called Project Discovery, was financed with funds from the U.S. Office of Education under titles III and IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts, and a local foundation grant.

The project was ushered in during the 1966-67 school year with excitement, some trepidation, and a bit of resistance from the hundreds of teachers, school department administrators, and theatrical personnel engaged in carrying out the staggering proposal.

Although the first season experienced its share of growing pains, the voices of critics today are outnumbered in the chorus of enthusiastic applause the project receives from all corners of the State. Logistic kinks have been ironed out, the scope of the project has been expanded, and a network of communications has been established among the 31 participating school districts, the Project Discovery staff, and the theater. Friends of the experimental marriage between classroom and live theater hope that it will result in a permanent bond.

The sheer magnitude of the project sets it apart. Every sophomore, junior, and senior—and a sprinkling of freshmen when possible—in Rhode Island's 72 public, private, and parochial high schools is able to participate. Even the handful of youngsters who attend school on Block Island are flown into Newport and bused into Providence for the performances.

The Trinity Square Repertory Company, which opened in Providence in 1963 and reached international acclaim when it performed in the Edinburgh August Festival tripled its permanent acting cast to 30 to prepare for the backbreaking Project Discovery schedule. The first year the company gave 40 performances along with meeting its regular schedule for matinee and evening paying audiences.

Three plays were given in the 1967-68 sea-

son and three in 1968-69. Each year's program offered a variety of works, such as Sean O'Casey's "Red Roses for Me," a drama of the Irish uprising; Shakespeare's "Macbeth"; and an adaptation of the Herman Melville novel of shipboard mutiny, "Billy Budd" by Louis O. Cox and Robert Chapman.

The project calls for far more than arranging intricate transportation schedules so students can get to the theater for a cultural experience a few times each year. The goal, according to the project sponsors, is to create an understanding and awareness of the role that live professional theater has in America's culture.

Charles A. O'Connor, Jr., former superintendent of the Providence School Department who is now a regional program director for the Office of Education in Denver, Colo., was one of the chief planners for the theater project. He said at the outset his primary goal was to make the theater program an integral part of the English curriculum, "not just a spasmodic attempt to let students see another play."

To accomplish the merger between classroom and live drama, the Project Discovery staff prepares comprehensive portfolios on each play for each of the nearly 600 high school English teachers and drama coaches in the State. The portfolios contain historical information, study guides, reference lists, biographies and pictures of the playwrights, notes from the director and other members of the repertory company, music sheets, pictures and other appropriate material. The kits save considerable preparation time for the teachers and have contributed to the general acceptance of the program by those who originally objected to the loss of their class time and the intrusion into their planned curriculum.

Thousands of paperback editions of each play are purchased for the schools—one book for every four students. Films, tapes, and records are distributed upon request.

In addition to providing supplies and educational aids, a variety of services is offered to the schools throughout the year. For example, in the 1967-68 season, English actress Joan White and Henry Butler, actor-director of an Oscar Wilde comedy, went to 32 schools explaining and illustrating comedy styles. They used a range of scenes from the plays by Shakespeare to those of living playwrights. In a notable single effort, Miss Joanna Featherstone, another actress, gave 41 school performances of American Negro literature.

In that same year, members of the theater company made about 30 school visits to participate in panel discussions and attend drama club meetings, to lecture, and to provide technical and artistic assistance in school productions.

A special feature that season was the Rhode Show, in which repertory actors toured the schools to teach the element of drama. It included material from Chekhov's "The Marriage Proposal" and Pirandello's "The Man With a Flower in His Mouth"; a section from Masters' "Spoon River Anthology"; and the Lucy song from Brecht's "Threepenny Opera." Segments of the total package varied in length from 5 to 35 minutes and it was possible for schools to select as many segments as could be fitted into class schedules. The schools were asked to limit the audience size to 200 for this project to permit a discussion period.

Still another highlight of one season was a workshop held on six Saturday mornings. In order to permit active participation, attendance was again set at 200 and many had to be turned away. Students heard lectures on choreography, acting fundamentals, make-up, costuming, and the history of the theater, and then explored particular areas of interest.

A total of \$675,153 was spent during the first year of the project. This includes \$300,000 awarded through title III of ESEA,

\$170,153 through title IV, \$165,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts, and \$40,000 from the Foundation for Repertory Theater of Rhode Island, the Trinity Square players' parent organization.

In 1967-68, the total budget dropped slightly to \$640,750, including \$307,000 from title III, \$170,000 from title IV, \$123,750 from the Federal arts agency, and \$40,000 from the local foundation.

The 1968-69 support was cut back about \$100,000 to \$544,185 (comprising \$250,000 from title III, \$154,185 from title IV, \$100,000 from the Federal arts agency, and \$40,000 from the local foundation). With the end of Federal money, the project plans to operate with local support in 1969-70.

A breakdown of the first year's budget shows how the money was spent: \$170,000 in title III funds and \$170,153 in title IV funds went to the theater, while the remaining \$130,000 in title III support was spent on staff and educational materials and services, including \$82,000 for school bus hire.

In addition, \$75,000 per year has been awarded for the theater project (under a separate contract supported by title IV funds) to the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) of St. Louis, Mo., which is conducting research and assessment of the project for the U.S. Office of Education.

The total allotment from the National Endowment for the Arts went to the theater company, while the local grant was used to rent and renovate a 1,000-seat auditorium since the company's home playhouse was too small.

Looking at the budget another way, the theater company received \$505,000 to cover all performance and production costs for approximately 160 performances.

By agreement with 38 other cities and towns in the State, the Providence School Department administers the project. It has the strong endorsement of William P. Robinson, Jr., State commissioner of education.

Rhode Island and New Orleans were the first two places in the country selected in 1966 to try out the 3-year experiment in educational laboratory theater. Los Angeles joined in 1967. Each area has its own variation of the central theme of providing live drama.

To compensate for the cutbacks and yet provide the same services, two grades instead of three attended the three performances in the 1968-69 season. By switching the grade levels around, each student could see two of the three shows. Trinity Square set aside free seats for evening and matinee performances on dates when the paying audiences attended, so pupils could see the one play they missed during the school year.

At the close of the first season the project weathered its only major storm. Controversy swirled when it came time to select the plays for the 1967-68 season because the English teachers demanded a say in the matter and the theater director insisted on reserving the right for himself. The first educational coordinator resigned in the midst of the debate, and a new coordinator, Miss Rose A. Valley, stepped in to smooth things over.

She smiles now when she recalls the tension of her first few weeks in office during which talking and consultation led to the selection of plays acceptable to both sides. Miss Valley, who coordinates activities for the school departments, and Richard Cumming, a professional musician who serves as both the theater's composer in residence and its director of educational services, share a small cluttered office in a Providence junior high school. Together they make up the meager "staff," working long days at everything from bus schedules and program planning to researching and compiling the teacher portfolios.

A minor furor developed in the spring of 1967 when officials from one school in North

Providence refused to send students to see Shakespeare's whimsical farce, "A Midsummer Night's Dream," because the wood-nymphs were considered too scantily dressed. A few eyebrows were raised but the issue quickly passed.

The students' reaction to the project and its effect on them can be measured in a variety of ways, most indicating that they are being "turned on." A good many observers consider the project stimulating and a far better method for teaching dramatic literature than handing out nightly homework reading assignments.

One research report shows that 39.1 percent of the high school pupils, or about 15,500, had never seen a live play before the project's curtain raiser, Shaw's "St. Joan." This exposure is enough to convince many that the project is worthwhile. Nearly 10 percent of the students said they have gone back as paying customers to see the company's evening performances. About 54 percent of the students said they have urged their parents to see plays.

Cumming describes the effect on students this way: "They laugh, they cry, they boo, they hiss. It's divine. They are far more responsive than their parents."

Donald Rock, past president of the State Council of English Teachers, noted that student absenteeism, higher than normal on Project Discovery days at first, has dwindled considerably. Word that the plays were good traveled among the students, he said, and more and more attended.

The students have indicated their feelings about the project in many ways. After two performances the seniors in Westerly, a large town in southern Rhode Island, decided to revive the custom of putting on a school play, a tradition that had been dropped 6 years earlier. Drama clubs have also grown throughout the State.

In South Kingston, the high school dramatics club presented a \$20 check to the Trinity Square players as a contribution to the statewide campaign to raise \$25,000 to finance the company's trip to Edinburgh for the drama festival. The students said they wanted to show their appreciation to the cast.

Student fan mail, perhaps, tells the story best. "I forgot I was in 1967 and was back in time with you. For a child my age to be completely lost in a play is something; you achieved it," a student wrote.

Another student, saying he was speaking for all students in Providence's Classical High School, wrote, "The classroom reactions to these productions were far more enthusiastic than reactions to more usual topics and the classes immediately preceding and following the plays were among the most rewarding of the school year."

The Rev. Edward W. K. Mullen, superintendent of schools in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Providence, has termed the program "a masterpiece" and praises the vision of its planners.

Still to be determined is how best to teach dramatic literature in the classroom. Teachers are now experimenting with materials to learn whether students gain more out of studying the play before or after the actual experience.

One thing seems to be certain. Project Discovery has unlocked doors rarely entered by educators in the past.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today cosponsored a proposal aimed at choking off the unlawful entry into the United States of hard narcotic drugs such as heroin, morphine, and cocaine.

The proposal would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by authorizing the President to suspend economic or military assistance under foreign aid programs when the President determines that the government of a particular foreign country which receives U.S. foreign aid has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from illegally entering the United States. The President is also authorized to provide such assistance as he may deem appropriate to assist foreign countries in their efforts to prevent the unlawful entry of narcotic drugs into the United States.

This legislation is needed because the past efforts of the State Department, other Government departments, and international organizations to persuade foreign governments voluntarily to act has proved to have had only limited effect. This legislation would give strong incentive to countries which receive U.S. foreign aid to stop illegal narcotic traffic into this country.

Heroin presently poses the most critical narcotics problem in the United States, especially in our great urban areas. The U.S. Bureau of Narcotics says there are 68,000 known addicts in the United States. Unofficial estimates, however, range spectacularly higher. For example, it is estimated that there are 100,000 heroin addicts in New York City alone. The hard drug morphine, like heroin, is also derived from opium poppy.

Another hard drug problem, albeit less critical than heroin, is posed by cocaine. Cocaine is derived from the coca shrub and originates mainly in Bolivia and Peru. Lately cocaine has been reaching illegal markets in the United States.

Heroin, morphine, and cocaine have in common the fact that they are needed for legitimate medicinal use, but this medicinal necessity in no way requires that the drugs be leaked into illegal markets to enslave our young people.

The urgency of this hard narcotics problem is best illustrated by considering the fantastic illegal profits made by the sale of these drugs in light of the horror of addiction that follows the drugs. In one major U.S. city, according to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, there were over 900 deaths caused by heroin in 1 year, 224 of them teenagers. Also it is estimated by some officials that the average heroin addict steals \$50,000 per year in support of his habit.

Ranged against the personal tragedy of drug addiction is the fantastic profit made by the foreign producers and domestic sellers of the drugs. For instance the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimates that 22 pounds of raw opium grown in Turkey and sold to an underworld broker for \$350 will produce 45,000 packets containing 5-percent heroin mixed with other substances. Each packet will then sell for \$5, for a total value of \$225,000. A morphine base

worth \$80 is said to be worth \$15,000 in the United States after it is processed into heroin. These tremendous profits go in part to the foreign producers and even more so to the organized criminal rings in the United States who distribute the drugs to the unfortunate pushers and addicts.

In closing, I might add that the language of the proposal leaves the appropriate flexibility to the President in conducting our Nation's foreign policy. The suspension of foreign aid contemplated by this proposal only follows a determination by the President that the particular foreign government had failed to act, and the suspension may be lifted upon determination by the President that the foreign government has taken the required steps. Also the President is authorized to suspend foreign aid either in whole or in part. The proposal thus strikes the proper balance between the necessity for putting teeth into current U.S. efforts to curb illegal international drug traffic and, on the other hand, the necessity of allowing the President the appropriate flexibility in the conduct of delicate foreign relations.

COMPARATIVE TABLES FOR HOUSE AND SENATE VERSIONS OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL 1971

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, next week the conference committee on the Office of Education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971 will meet to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill—H.R. 16916.

Among the working papers for the conference will be State-by-State tables setting forth for each program administered by the Office of Education the amounts contained in the two bills passed by the House and Senate for fiscal 1971.

Mr. Speaker, the figures from these tables for my own State of Indiana are most interesting. I believe that, for the most part, the allowances made by the other body will more adequately meet the educational needs of my State as well as the Nation's educational needs as presented in testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor, on which I have the honor to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the managers of H.R. 16916 for the House—on the basis of the merits of the programs for which the bill makes appropriations—will report back to the House appropriation levels substantially above those contained in the measure we adopted on April 14.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include the tables which I have mentioned in the Record at this point together with a table on the funding levels for Public Law 874—the impacted areas program—so that Members of the House will be aware of the effects on their States of the differences of appropriations in the allowances in the House and Senate version of the bill.

The material follows:

REMARKS OF WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO REDUCE THE UNLAWFUL ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF HARD NARCOTIC DRUGS

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$34,986,823	\$40,184,201	\$39,599,049	\$45,147,177	\$44,397,907
State administrative expenses	349,908	401,842	395,990	451,472	443,979
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					631,084
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					2,604,987
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,893,354	2,040,343	2,070,020	2,375,089	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,241,181	9,528,000		7,736,000	12,483,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	372,344	328,000		115,000	115,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	840,259	702,195	1,321,780	1,321,780	1,321,780
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	531,860	531,860	524,625	524,625	596,821
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,888,098	851,705		428,811	1,883,118
Loans to nonprofit private schools					34,103
State administration	35,243	34,770		34,103	360,205
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	315,250	263,508		100,000	100,000
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	51,454,320	54,966,424	44,011,464	58,234,057	64,971,984
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	571,028	571,028	623,847	662,940	642,117
Teacher education and recruitment	488,478				
Research and innovation	150,250				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,209,756	571,028	623,847	662,940	642,117
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,898,481	6,850,464	6,850,464	7,964,744	7,104,019
State advisory councils		42,566	42,566	42,566	42,566
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		378,489	378,489	445,393	445,393
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	29,598	17,228	470,701	377,256	771,608
Innovation (pt. D)		246,433		377,256	302,500
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		333,881	333,881	389,659	556,851
Cooperative education (pt. G)		265,122		349,223	349,223
Work-study (pt. H)		80,368	452,012	104,006	104,006
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,072,101	1,199,378	1,357,353	1,357,353	1,357,353
Special projects and teacher education	30,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,030,180	9,413,929	9,885,466	11,030,200	11,033,519
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,263,130	1,915,698	1,165,470	1,902,524	1,165,470
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,540,009	3,771,234	3,927,713	3,888,436	4,277,280
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,673,248	2,674,480	2,580,144	3,368,532	3,580,485
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	251,574				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,471				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	224,435	227,680		155,035	227,680
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	2,032,026				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	679,637	1,037,770			994,972
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,436,369	433,104			433,104
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	102,579	102,859	88,802	88,802	88,802
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	240,351				236,853
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,076,100				
Subtotal, higher education	17,617,929	9,212,825	7,812,129	8,453,329	11,054,646
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	297,401	268,458	260,039	260,039	260,039
Personnel development programs	423,950				
Teacher Corps	285,388				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,006,739	268,458	260,039	260,039	260,039
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	633,492	539,187	539,187	633,492	633,492
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
Construction (LSCA II)	397,777	144,077		93,652	168,825
College library resources (HEA II-A)	313,692				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	54,758				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	175,958	175,958		174,707	174,707
Subtotal, community education	1,683,329	966,874	646,839	1,009,503	1,084,676
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	561,688				
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	80,563,941	75,399,538	63,239,784	79,650,068	89,046,98
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	74,607,215	75,399,538	63,239,784	79,650,068	89,046,981

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$1,725,848	\$1,874,230	\$1,856,995	\$2,116,158	\$2,078,549
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					8,185
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					16,005
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	547,744	483,700	493,543	518,122	536,705
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	14,731,443	14,681,000		17,317,000	19,420,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	918,641	1,293,000		100,000	100,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	66,568	60,232	113,378	113,378	113,378
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	242,131	242,131	243,649	243,649	277,642
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	106,156	52,995		26,682	117,173
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	49,999	50,000			50,000
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	18,551,863	19,000,621	2,957,565	20,698,322	22,980,970
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	73,390				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	173,390	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	528,238	403,555	403,555	469,237	418,527
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		22,295	22,295	26,240	26,240
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000			45,459
Innovation (pt. D)		203,736	220,277	214,262	208,247
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		19,668	19,668	22,956	32,806
Cooperative education (pt. G)		205,240		212,006	212,006
Work-study (pt. H)		7,022	221,781	9,088	9,088
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	131,891	136,550	141,802	141,802	141,802
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	670,129	1,044,134	1,060,446	1,126,659	1,125,243
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	61,078	130,246	138,496	29,811	38,496
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	164,593	130,963	145,638	144,182	158,599
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	67,329	80,562	85,224	111,264	118,265
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	6,941				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	152,468	155,378		150,349	155,378
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	70,000				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		50,000			50,000
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	190,628	50,000			50,000
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	28,901	35,400	43,454	43,454	43,454
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	8,119				9,210
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	45,800				
Subtotal, higher education	885,857	582,549	362,812	529,060	673,402
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	112,896	114,450	113,728	113,728	113,728
Personnel development programs	423,950				
Teacher Corps	1,500				
Subtotal, education professions development	538,346	114,450	113,728	113,728	113,728
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	136,935	130,406	130,406	139,935	139,935
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	6,939	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	3,221	25,017	25,017	25,017	25,017
Construction (LSCA II)	21,765	84,436		80,945	86,150
College library resources (HEA II-A)	41,398				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	105,733	105,733		105,834	105,834
Subtotal, community education	356,191	425,301	235,132	431,440	436,645
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education:					
Total, Office of Education	21,175,776	21,267,055	4,829,683	23,099,209	25,529,988
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	20,464,678	21,267,055	4,829,683	23,099,209	25,529,988

See footnotes at end of table.

.oldat to bas is relation? se2

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$9,384,173	\$9,614,568	\$10,474,927	\$10,474,927	\$10,474,927
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					46,199
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					104,840
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,514,678	1,143,854	1,183,395	1,319,269	1,422,818
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,187,169	9,158,000		9,450,000	12,542,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,095,682	175,000		30,000	30,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	422,604	361,721	680,887	680,887	680,887
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	368,490	368,490	369,169	369,169	419,533
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	784,359	366,659		184,603	810,682
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	16,488	16,610		16,785	16,785
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	147,487	125,883			177,286
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,071,130	21,580,785	12,958,378	22,775,640	26,975,957
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	224,757	224,757	245,547	260,934	252,738
Teacher education and recruitment	547,590				
Research and innovation	47,119				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	819,466	224,757	245,547	260,934	252,738
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,185,684	2,947,567	2,947,567	3,426,998	3,056,654
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		162,854	162,854	191,640	191,640
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	58,332	15,000	321,349	279,460	332,000
Innovation (pt. D)		220,815			245,948
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		143,660	143,660	167,660	239,597
Cooperative education (pt. G)		229,193		266,893	266,893
Work-study (pt. H)		36,283	312,971	46,954	46,954
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	346,188	379,898	420,118	420,118	420,118
Special projects and teacher education	200,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,790,204	4,166,338	4,339,587	4,830,791	4,830,872
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,350,664	1,639,937	1,814,491	1,630,731	1,814,491
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,384,360	1,417,892	1,407,806	1,393,728	1,533,101
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,169,754	2,123,484	1,803,139	2,354,105	2,502,228
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	245,961				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	138,751				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	177,936	180,964		152,007	180,964
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)					
Language training and area studies	133,600				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	807,119	415,830			388,282
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,228,671	275,087			275,087
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	58,386	72,487	63,996	63,916	63,916
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	163,854				173,892
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	230,933				
Subtotal, higher education	8,139,989	5,175,681	4,139,352	4,644,487	5,981,961
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	181,870	186,777	182,441	182,441	182,441
Personnel development programs	1,363,104				
Teacher Corps	268,764				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,813,738	186,777	182,441	182,441	182,441
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	312,656	275,065	275,065	312,656	312,656
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100
Construction (LSCA II)	215,407	105,542		85,442	115,407
College library resources (HEA II-A)	202,552				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	134,680	134,680		135,360	135,360
Subtotal, community education	971,057	621,049	380,827	639,220	669,185
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	37,605,584	31,955,387	22,246,132	33,333,513	38,893,154
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	34,063,356	31,955,387	22,246,132	33,333,513	38,893,154

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$21,811,725	\$24,749,582	\$24,389,185	\$27,806,296	\$27,344,819
State administrative expenses	218,117	247,496	243,892	278,063	273,448
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					365,058
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,713,497	1,266,286	1,298,231	1,452,631	1,570,324
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,842,356	2,586,000		2,292,000	3,596,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,245,726				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	453,532	380,294	715,848	715,848	715,848
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	388,193	388,193	384,783	384,783	438,866
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	886,740	448,166		225,640	990,893
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	18,499	18,376		18,278	18,278
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	165,473	139,263			193,061
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	29,743,858	30,323,656	27,131,939	33,273,539	35,606,595
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	297,836	297,836	325,385	345,775	334,914
Teacher education and recruitment	298,587				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	596,423	297,836	325,385	345,775	334,914
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,404,568	3,693,674	3,693,674	4,294,428	3,830,344
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		204,175	204,175	240,145	240,145
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	41,607	15,000			416,035
Innovation (pt. D)		224,551	343,129	293,722	254,196
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		180,024	180,024	210,096	300,243
Cooperative education (pt. G)		234,433		278,899	278,899
Work-study (pt. H)		42,330	333,248	54,780	54,780
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	631,826	701,583	788,027	788,027	788,027
Special projects and teacher education	150,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,228,001	5,326,838	5,573,345	6,191,165	6,193,737
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,656,935	1,519,808	1,661,595	1,512,330	1,661,595
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,505,616	2,265,627	2,283,439	2,260,605	2,486,665
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,830,266	1,788,966	1,464,653	1,912,192	2,032,510
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	64,487				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	189,394	192,476		152,753	192,476
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	648,560				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		557,980			532,626
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,248,903	240,408			240,408
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	74,074	77,911	67,408	67,408	67,408
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	136,490				132,614
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	240,933				
Subtotal, higher education	9,677,658	5,693,176	4,527,095	4,955,288	6,396,302
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	187,861	191,233	186,674	186,674	186,674
Personnel development programs	665,111				
Teacher Corps	267,545				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,121,517	191,233	186,674	186,674	186,674
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	391,716	340,150	340,150	391,716	391,716
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138
Construction (LSCA II)	346,970	105,542		87,465	128,570
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,374				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,316	142,316		142,062	142,062
Subtotal, community education	1,183,604	694,236	446,378	727,471	768,576
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	20,067				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	20,067				
Civil rights education	441,183				
Total, Office of Education	47,012,311	42,526,975	38,190,816	45,679,912	49,486,798
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ^a	43,849,974	42,526,975	38,190,816	45,679,912	49,486,798

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$80,232,375	\$96,957,350	\$95,547,164	\$108,934,051	\$107,126,163
State administrative expenses	802,900	969,574	955,472	1,089,341	1,071,262
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					1,042,072
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					1,244,122
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	14,180,196	9,681,939	10,050,004	11,648,665	12,862,072
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	76,264,658	74,734,000		61,839,000	97,957,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	10,880,448	460,000		739,000	739,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,786,011	4,081,360	7,682,559	7,682,559	7,682,559
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,908,448	1,908,448	1,910,647	1,910,647	2,167,114
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	5,335,635	2,580,066		1,298,994	5,704,519
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	174,462	175,073		175,210	175,210
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,560,552	1,326,826			1,850,605
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	196,125,685	192,974,636	116,245,846	195,415,467	239,521,698
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,619,406	2,783,546	2,696,116
Teacher education and recruitment	1,920,604				
Research and innovation	2,210,700				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	6,528,933	2,397,629	2,619,406	2,783,546	2,696,116
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	18,005,856	23,903,359	23,903,359	27,789,454	24,786,338
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		1,320,663	1,320,663	1,554,000	1,554,000
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	1,468,244	60,113			2,692,182
Innovation (pt. D)		422,827	1,499,053	1,050,626	691,883
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		1,165,014	1,165,014	1,359,542	1,942,885
Cooperative education (pt. G)		512,513		916,098	916,098
Work-study (pt. H)		390,527	1,409,368	505,388	505,388
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,908,201	2,137,446	2,430,216	2,430,216	2,430,216
Special projects and teacher education	224,914				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	21,607,215	30,005,665	31,820,876	35,698,527	35,612,193
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	11,127,949	16,548,209	18,334,349	16,454,006	18,334,349
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	13,636,446	12,567,739	13,004,762	12,874,714	14,162,185
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	17,825,858	18,936,036	18,450,766	24,088,575	25,604,260
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	2,567,470				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	406,087				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	519,125	523,740		174,223	523,740
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	322,300				
Language training and area studies	2,275,532				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	6,699,777	3,453,412			3,205,727
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	15,422,360	3,110,233			3,110,233
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	534,541	399,679	300,490	300,490	300,490
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	1,577,046				1,642,020
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	7,096,900				
Subtotal, higher education	82,761,391	45,589,048	40,140,367	43,942,008	56,933,004
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	977,178	1,079,123	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190
Personnel development programs	6,201,146				
Teacher Corps	2,546,153				
Subtotal, education professions development	9,724,477	1,079,123	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	2,666,778	2,213,055	2,213,055	2,666,778	2,666,778
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210
Construction (LSCA II)	1,313,062	388,295		145,682	507,365
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,161,076				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	703,007				
Educational broadcasting facilities	168,766				
University community service programs (HEA I)	506,766	506,766		506,816	506,816
Subtotal, community education	7,639,089	3,227,750	2,332,689	3,438,910	3,800,593
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	4,171,896				
Research and development centers	3,242,638				
Subtotal, research and development	7,414,534				
Civil rights education	487,177				
Total, Office of Education	332,288,501	275,273,801	194,189,374	282,310,648	339,593,794
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	291,305,089	275,273,851	194,189,374	282,310,648	339,593,794

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants.....	\$8,914,233	\$9,283,738	\$10,069,703	\$10,448,857	\$10,272,957
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....					281,882
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....					54,067
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,767,120	1,307,980	1,360,849	1,525,351	1,650,756
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	12,924,352	12,883,000		10,090,000	16,980,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	2,655,971				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	541,044	462,359	870,323	870,323	870,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	430,472	410,474	411,038	411,038	466,110
Grants for special projects.....					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	802,055	383,233		192,948	847,328
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	3,900				
State administration.....	19,340	19,673		19,914	19,914
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	259,627	149,094		100,000	210,339
Planning and evaluation.....		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	28,468,114	25,149,551	12,961,913	23,808,431	31,903,676
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	285,258	285,258	311,644	331,173	320,771
Teacher education and recruitment.....	696,367				
Research and innovation.....	498,738				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,480,363	285,258	311,644	331,173	320,771
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B).....	2,518,883	3,293,775	3,293,775	3,829,433	3,415,598
State advisory councils.....		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B).....		181,980	181,980	214,143	214,143
Research and special project activities (pt. C).....	76,218	15,000	350,908	298,815	370,987
Innovation (pt. D).....		225,885			257,141
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F).....		160,534	160,534	187,346	267,733
Cooperative education (pt. G).....		236,304	340,489	283,187	283,187
Work-study (pt. H).....		45,451		58,819	58,819
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	225,893	275,835	301,102	301,102	301,102
Special projects and teacher education.....					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	2,850,994	4,465,832	3,659,856	5,203,913	5,199,778
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,061,131	1,880,449	1,120,607	1,867,783	1,120,607
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C).....	1,823,059	1,697,619	1,775,107	1,757,356	1,933,091
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II).....	2,814,663	2,753,794	2,480,825	3,238,865	3,442,659
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds.....					
Interest payments.....	363,089				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search.....	71,586				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual.....	188,629	191,707		152,703	191,707
Permanent.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	150,000				
Language training and area studies.....	175,765				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103).....	940,502	483,869			493,581
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104).....	1,917,682	351,983			351,983
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	200,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105).....	173,128	83,988	77,966	77,966	77,966
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A).....	212,102				207,790
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E).....	1,558,200				
Subtotal, higher education.....	12,699,536	6,493,409	5,504,505	6,144,673	7,869,384
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	231,798	210,921	205,377	205,377	205,377
Personnel development programs.....	1,597,409				
Teacher Corps.....	63,615				
Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,892,822	210,921	205,377	205,377	205,377
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I).....	386,437	335,804	335,804	386,437	386,437
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135
Construction (LSCA II).....	232,842	114,404		87,330	127,691
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	354,370				
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	102,866				
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	338,685				
University community service programs (HEA I).....	142,295	142,295		143,844	143,844
Subtotal, community education.....	1,663,632	698,700	442,001	723,808	764,169
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	346,000				
Research and development centers.....					
Subtotal, research and development.....	346,000				
Civil rights education.....					
Total, Office of Education.....	49,401,521	37,303,671	24,085,296	36,417,375	46,263,155
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ^a	42,672,729	37,303,671	24,085,296	36,417,375	46,263,155

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$8,699,833	\$11,405,817	\$11,237,792	\$12,833,308	\$12,617,835
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					130,694
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,331,546	1,687,122	1,749,460	1,976,658	2,149,925
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,265,208	3,255,000		2,868,000	4,397,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	717,392	610,790	1,149,723	1,149,723	1,149,723
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	449,925	449,925	450,905	450,905	516,499
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	724,973	336,161		169,248	743,250
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	26,250	26,375		26,600	26,600
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	234,802	199,884			280,953
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	16,599,929	18,221,074	14,837,880	19,724,442	22,262,479
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	369,463	369,463	403,638	428,931	415,459
Teacher education and recruitment	534,275				
Research and innovation	170,485				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,074,223	369,463	403,638	428,931	415,459
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,727,244	3,402,846	3,402,846	3,955,904	3,528,400
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		188,007	188,007	221,216	221,216
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	95,930	15,000			383,240
Innovation (pt. D)		232,824	391,358	325,302	272,457
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		165,851	165,851	193,534	276,576
Cooperative education (pt. G)		246,035		305,485	305,485
Work-study (pt. H)		56,570	378,146	73,208	73,208
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	457,836	503,143	561,073	561,073	561,073
Special projects and teacher education	225,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,506,010	4,841,341	5,118,349	5,666,790	5,652,724
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,668,912	1,801,634	1,020,294	1,790,102	1,020,294
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,597,398	1,593,508	1,679,997	1,663,197	1,829,518
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,360,435	2,348,049	2,258,749	2,948,932	3,134,483
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	1,796,129				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	70,500				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	257,121	210,285		153,907	210,285
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)					
Language training and area studies	644,664				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	707,988	452,481			436,967
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,461,717	385,934			385,934
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	91,915	96,574	85,465	85,465	85,465
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	163,167				172,663
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,583,600				
Subtotal, higher education	13,453,546	5,938,465	5,094,505	5,691,603	7,325,609
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	270,462	246,529	239,206	239,206	239,206
Personnel development programs	523,202				
Teacher Corps	171,534				
Subtotal, education professions development	965,198	246,529	239,206	239,206	239,206
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	514,029	440,842	440,842	514,029	514,029
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195
Construction (LSCA II)	270,118	129,729		90,595	148,935
College library resources (HEA II-A)	418,350				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	162,263	162,263		162,087	162,087
Subtotal, community education	1,471,708	839,782	547,790	873,659	931,999
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	37,070,614	30,456,654	26,241,368	32,624,631	36,827,476
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ^a	30,769,708	30,456,654	26,241,368	32,624,631	36,827,476

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appro- priation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$2,520,995	\$2,602,240	\$2,837,447	\$2,837,447	\$2,837,447
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					41,200
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					22,497
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	714,568	597,711	610,744	654,232	687,250
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,000,165	2,109,000		1,987,000	2,453,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		801,000		5,158,000	5,158,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	134,057	117,339	220,873	220,873	220,873
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	261,718	261,718	263,311	263,311	300,329
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	164,547	82,557		41,565	182,532
Loans to non-profit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000			55,214
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	200,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	6,009,383	6,884,898	4,182,375	11,425,761	12,221,675
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	116,735				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	216,735	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	653,244	653,224	653,224	759,433	677,363
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		36,090	36,090	42,468	42,468
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	34,638	15,000	236,560	223,940	73,572
Innovation (pt. D)		206,271			213,843
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		31,837	31,837	37,153	53,095
Cooperative education (pt. G)		208,795		220,154	220,154
Work-study (pt. H)		10,924	234,036	14,137	14,137
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	155,845	162,892	171,929	171,929	171,929
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	843,727	1,356,101	1,394,744	1,500,282	1,497,629
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	234,892	140,312	178,585	138,294	178,585
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	206,977	310,950	349,089	345,598	380,159
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	358,429	358,899	396,355	516,160	548,637
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	28,837				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	85,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	157,678	160,612		150,688	160,612
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,925				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	75,582	84,324			90,042
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	403,675	72,306			72,306
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	53,749	49,416	47,681	47,681	47,681
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	26,175				31,536
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	148,400				
Subtotal, higher education	2,147,319	1,226,819	1,021,710	1,248,421	1,559,558
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	125,971	128,150	126,743	126,743	126,743
Personnel development programs					
Teacher Corps	6,744				
Subtotal, education professions development	132,715	128,150	126,743	126,743	126,743
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	172,884	160,000	160,000	172,884	172,884
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,935	40,395
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,034	25,034	25,034	25,034	25,034
Construction (LSCA II)	133,812	88,754		81,865	92,135
College library resources (HEA II-A)	51,466				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	111,098	111,098		111,306	111,306
Subtotal, community education	574,198	464,790	264,938	470,993	481,263
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	137,618				
Total, Office of Education	10,061,695	10,160,758	7,090,510	14,972,200	16,086,868
Total, Office of Education comparable basis ¹	9,142,795	10,160,758	7,090,510	14,972,200	16,086,868

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$5,655,271	\$6,110,433	\$6,344,360	\$6,875,664	\$6,759,065
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					88,483
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					827,308
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,088,238	705,509	719,782	780,861	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	5,436,944	5,418,000		3,720,000	7,050,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	544,264				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	167,514	139,372	262,348	262,348	262,348
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	273,711	273,711	272,313	272,313	312,497
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	254,359	83,393		41,986	184,382
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	79,191	51,609			73,243
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,662,825	13,045,360	7,848,803	12,216,505	15,820,659
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,397	100,397	109,684	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	534,221				
Research and innovation	1,787,758				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,422,376	100,397	109,684	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	774,982	826,189	826,189	960,380	856,594
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		45,648	45,648	53,705	53,705
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	700,697	15,000		230,052	93,040
Innovation (pt. D)		207,872	245,895		217,378
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		40,267	40,267	46,986	67,145
Cooperative education (pt. G)		211,041	242,726	225,299	225,299
Work-study (pt. H)		13,655		17,671	17,671
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	216,690	231,310	250,179	250,179	250,179
Special projects and teacher education	525,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,217,369	1,622,050	1,681,972	1,815,340	1,812,079
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,046,615	1,458,426	1,583,470	1,451,832	1,583,470
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,079,303	748,751	733,608	726,272	798,898
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,624,999	1,592,830	1,291,700	1,686,391	1,792,501
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	3,603,390				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	149,635				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	165,197	168,166		151,177	168,166
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	82,557				
Language training and area studies	345,215				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		74,111			76,857
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	889,985	153,929			153,929
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	400,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	65,934	67,409	63,528	63,528	63,528
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	79,610				101,523
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,136,919				
Subtotal, higher education	10,719,359	3,313,622	2,722,306	3,129,200	3,788,872
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	132,452	133,436	131,765	131,765	131,765
Personnel development programs	636,278				
Teacher Corps	334,283				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,103,013	133,436	131,765	131,765	131,765
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	224,762	202,708	202,708	224,762	224,762
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)		40,676	40,676	40,676	40,676
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)		39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)		25,059	25,059	25,059	25,059
Construction (LSCA II)	138,580	94,985		83,193	100,773
College library resources (HEA II-A)	172,298				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	49,920				
Educational broadcasting facilities	227,328				
University community service programs (HEA I)	117,437	117,437		117,012	117,012
Subtotal, community education	930,325	520,374	307,952	530,211	547,791
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	390,000				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	390,000				
Civil rights education	152,065				
Total, Office of Education	31,597,332	18,735,239	12,802,482	18,023,021	22,301,166
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	20,990,855	18,735,239	12,802,482	18,023,021	22,301,166

See footnotes at end of table.

CXVI—1487—Part 17

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$32,030,278	\$33,005,253	\$35,965,703	\$35,965,703	\$35,965,703
State administrative expenses	320,928	330,053	359,657	359,657	359,657
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					293,167
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					4,251,151
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	4,389,257	3,182,146	3,355,263	3,863,409	4,251,151
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	17,547,731	17,676,000		14,335,000	22,863,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,694,363	17,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,358,173	1,178,032	2,217,472	2,217,472	2,217,472
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	709,479	709,479	718,370	718,370	822,202
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	2,268,779	1,059,430		533,395	2,342,396
Loans to nonprofit private schools	1,200				
State administration	53,121	54,190		55,120	55,120
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	475,164	410,691			582,188
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,848,473	57,722,274	42,716,465	58,148,126	69,852,056
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	736,246	736,246	804,347	854,750	827,903
Teacher education and recruitment	839,519				
Research and innovation	324,353				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,900,118	736,246	804,347	854,750	827,903
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	7,331,487	9,767,350	9,767,350	11,355,250	10,128,125
State advisory councils		60,690	60,690	60,690	60,690
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		539,646	539,646	634,989	634,989
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	83,400	24,563	599,050	461,300	1,100,073
Innovation (pt. D)		268,449			351,100
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		476,047	476,047	555,532	793,897
Cooperative education (pt. G)		295,999		419,975	419,975
Work-study (pt. H)		118,602	571,500	153,485	153,485
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,040,045	1,159,832	1,312,124	1,312,124	1,312,124
Special projects and teacher education	79,950				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,534,882	12,711,178	13,326,407	14,953,345	14,954,458
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,249,260	1,664,938	2,119,080	1,640,987	1,219,080
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,993,543	4,139,255	4,628,227	4,581,945	5,040,139
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	4,509,571	4,468,163	4,691,266	6,124,727	6,510,103
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	180,238				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	264,313	267,743		157,632	267,743
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	851,904				
Language training and area studies	235,182				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,312,667	1,193,372			1,293,421
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,661,823	766,372			766,372
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	168,491	132,528	112,265	112,265	112,265
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	398,154				417,052
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,115,413				
Subtotal, higher education	22,290,559	12,682,371	11,600,838	12,667,556	16,576,175
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	410,952	382,611	368,487	368,487	368,487
Personnel development programs	1,512,124				
Teacher Corps	685,906				
Subtotal, education professions development	2,608,982	382,611	368,487	368,487	368,487
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	908,640	765,698	765,698	908,640	908,640
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381
Construction (LSCA II)	398,742	177,125		100,692	214,637
College library resources (HEA II-A)	553,565				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	110,327				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	227,490	227,490		231,724	231,724
Subtotal, community education	2,308,038	1,279,587	874,972	1,350,330	1,464,275
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	518,550				
Total, Office of Education	100,009,602	85,514,267	69,661,894	88,312,972	104,043,354
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	91,304,417	85,514,267	69,661,894	88,312,972	104,043,354

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$34,745,771	\$39,816,759	\$39,236,958	\$44,734,354	\$43,991,936
State administrative expenses	347,488	398,168	392,370	447,344	439,919
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					435,357
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,623,910	2,519,412	2,625,777	3,016,236	3,314,130
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	16,133,291	16,803,000		13,749,000	20,956,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,309,974	1,598,000		630,637	630,637
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,089,383	923,415	1,738,192	1,738,192	1,738,192
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	628,796	628,796	625,028	625,028	709,664
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	2,226,363	999,405		503,174	2,209,681
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	44,018	43,958		44,096	44,096
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	393,735	333,140			465,750
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,542,729	64,163,783	44,718,325	65,588,061	75,135,362
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	682,477	682,477	745,572	792,292	767,406
Teacher education and recruitment	729,543				
Research and innovation	134,110				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,546,130	682,477	745,572	792,292	767,406
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	7,278,364	8,907,572	8,907,572	10,356,448	9,237,260
State advisory councils		55,348	55,348	55,348	55,348
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		492,145	492,145	579,137	579,137
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	95,576	22,401	543,043	424,626	1,003,311
Innovation (pt. D)		258,842			329,893
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		434,142	434,142	506,669	724,066
Cooperative education (pt. G)		282,526		389,101	389,101
Work-study (pt. H)		103,581	519,360	134,047	134,047
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,352,356	1,515,610	1,719,026	1,719,026	1,719,026
Special projects and teacher education	700,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	9,426,296	12,072,167	12,670,636	14,164,402	14,171,189
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,670,339	1,040,494	1,324,307	1,025,525	1,324,307
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,700,025	4,209,230	4,431,514	4,387,199	4,825,919
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,242,368	3,182,532	2,931,781	3,827,615	4,068,453
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	538,465				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	240,444	243,763		156,077	243,763
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	2,550,985				
Language training and area studies:					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,044,455	1,063,460			1,095,526
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,587,633	522,714			522,714
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	77,383	120,015	101,923	101,923	101,923
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	274,568				257,816
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,536,309				
Subtotal, higher education	18,752,974	10,432,208	8,839,525	9,548,339	12,490,421
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	311,043	321,528	310,457	310,457	310,457
Personnel development programs	750,849				
Teacher Corps	397,473				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,459,365	321,528	310,457	310,457	310,457
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	743,951	630,121	630,121	743,951	743,951
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
Construction (LSCA II)	357,471	157,345		96,478	187,217
College library resources (HEA II-A)	427,931				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	218,930				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,164	196,164		197,128	197,128
Subtotal, community education	2,052,751	1,091,934	738,425	1,145,861	1,236,600
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	670,000				
Research and development centers	789,680				
Subtotal, research and development	1,459,680				
Civil rights education	481,623				
Total, Office of Education	96,721,548	88,764,097	68,022,940	91,549,412	104,111,435
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	86,281,082	88,764,097	68,022,940	91,549,412	104,111,435

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$2,215,107	\$2,756,538	\$2,707,189	\$3,107,503	\$3,053,441
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					57,633
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					32,379
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	556,489	716,722	736,307	800,052	848,535
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,520,455	9,490,000		9,264,000	12,354,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,728,671				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	193,833	163,537	307,834	307,834	307,834
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	281,390	281,390	280,891	280,891	320,757
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	299,306	148,958		74,997	329,347
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	66,059	58,436			82,633
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	15,024,643	13,878,914	4,282,221	14,098,610	17,649,892
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,023	113,023	123,477	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	131,534				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	244,557	113,023	123,477	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,032,530	1,281,603	1,281,603	1,490,134	1,329,098
State advisory councils		41,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		70,809	70,809	83,328	83,328
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	25,334				144,361
Innovation (pt. D)		210,274	259,896	239,220	222,680
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		62,464	62,464	72,902	104,182
Cooperative education (pt. G)		214,409		233,108	233,108
Work-study (pt. H)		18,922	255,761	24,487	24,487
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	235,281	251,540	273,315	273,315	273,315
Special projects and teacher education	120,986				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,414,131	2,156,089	2,234,916	2,447,562	2,445,627
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	275,170	240,466	306,057	237,007	306,057
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	563,188	509,439	554,236	548,694	603,563
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	319,050	664,557	877,556	884,590	940,250
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	82,795				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	66,286				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	162,092	165,047		150,975	165,047
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	185,300				
Language training and area studies	167,132				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	327,314	169,240			171,585
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	547,034	108,157			108,157
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	30,490	53,635	49,359	49,359	49,359
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	58,366				53,070
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	453,739				
Subtotal, higher education	3,887,956	1,960,541	1,837,208	1,920,625	2,447,088
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	137,551	139,233	137,272	137,272	137,272
Personnel development programs	104,613				
Teacher Corps	282,716				
Subtotal, education professions development	524,880	139,233	137,272	137,272	137,272
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	203,338	185,071	185,071	203,338	203,338
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
Construction (LSCA II)	71,358	92,412		82,644	97,206
College library resources (HEA II-A)	112,262				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	49,920				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,728	115,728		116,439	116,439
Subtotal, community education	657,724	498,329	290,189	507,539	522,101
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	21,753,891	18,746,129	8,905,283	19,311,518	23,401,980
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	19,338,242	18,746,129	8,905,283	19,311,518	23,401,980

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$2,947,216	\$3,032,174	\$3,305,670	\$3,305,670	\$3,305,670
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					76,220
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	857,190	689,438	702,900	761,285	805,624
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,707,913	2,699,000		2,297,000	3,573,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	80,850				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	180,728	153,059	288,111	288,111	288,111
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	283,917	283,917	283,357	283,357	322,446
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	358,140	163,334		82,234	361,131
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	64,750	54,340			75,497
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	7,644,037	7,338,595	4,830,038	7,280,960	9,071,032
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	116,982	116,982	127,803	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	134,140				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	251,122	116,982	127,803	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,242,196	1,348,046	1,348,046	1,567,331	1,397,954
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		74,479	74,479	87,664	87,644
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	44,465	15,000			151,080
Innovation (pt. D)		209,607	256,007	236,674	221,207
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		65,703	65,703	76,679	109,580
Cooperation education (pt. G)		213,474		230,874	230,874
Work-study (pt. H)		16,581	252,140	21,458	21,458
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	146,680	153,041	160,663	160,663	160,663
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,433,341	2,126,999	2,188,106	2,412,391	2,412,288
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	558,213	1,258,188	1,328,614	1,254,474	1,328,614
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	639,633	581,865	613,231	607,099	667,808
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	806,240	783,258	727,493	949,785	1,009,547
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	74,845				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	162,907	165,865		151,028	165,865
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	50,000				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	400,064	206,857			210,209
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	546,443	112,507			112,507
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,308	57,748	52,914	52,914	52,914
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	65,137				63,655
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	154,800				
Subtotal, higher education	4,437,590	2,216,288	1,772,252	2,065,300	2,661,119
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,799	136,719	134,884	134,884	134,884
Personnel development programs	488,709				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	641,508	136,719	134,884	134,884	134,884
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	208,959	189,699	189,699	208,959	208,959
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051
Construction (LSCA II)	131,159	93,087		82,788	98,141
College library resources (HEA II-A)	73,906				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities	334,605				
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,079	115,079		115,039	115,039
Subtotal, community education	968,859	503,016	294,850	511,937	527,290
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	15,376,457	12,438,599	9,347,933	12,605,472	15,006,613
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	13,160,315	12,438,599	9,347,933	12,605,472	15,006,613

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$44,413,015	\$53,256,753	\$52,482,435	\$59,835,625	\$58,842,582
State administrative expenses	444,130	532,567	524,824	598,356	588,426
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					544,878
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,235,338	5,650,541	5,861,685	6,774,193	7,470,638
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,924,988	12,830,000		10,596,000	10,596,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	907,187				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,681,475	2,271,614	4,275,978	4,275,978	4,275,978
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,056,099	1,056,099	1,057,552	1,057,552	1,217,264
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	3,085,357	1,445,776		727,910	3,196,605
Loans to nonprofit private schools	2,460				
State administration	99,990	100,742		100,958	100,958
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	894,406	763,492			1,066,342
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	74,744,445	78,007,584	64,302,474	84,066,572	87,999,671
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,626,605	1,728,534	1,674,241
Teacher education and recruitment	1,499,900				
Research and innovation	918,573				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,907,358	1,488,885	1,626,605	1,728,534	1,674,241
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	10,661,193	12,769,779	12,769,779	14,845,440	13,241,143
State advisory councils		79,345	79,345	79,345	79,345
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		705,533	705,533	830,164	830,164
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	397,738	32,114			1,438,195
Innovation (pt. D)		325,957	934,315	680,833	478,047
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		622,382	622,382	726,283	1,037,913
Cooperative education (pt. G)		376,654		604,788	604,788
Work-study (pt. H)		215,941	833,315	279,453	279,453
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,460,494	1,633,780	1,854,177	1,854,177	1,854,177
Special projects and teacher education	500,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	13,019,415	16,761,485	17,798,846	19,900,483	19,843,225
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,957,766	3,016,661	3,839,510	2,973,263	3,839,510
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	6,674,449	6,624,079	6,974,245	6,904,502	7,594,953
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	9,003,578	9,290,708	8,499,990	11,097,244	11,795,497
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	1,224,052				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	146,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	385,726	389,721		165,537	389,721
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	380,000				
Language training and area studies	1,311,609				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	3,311,412	1,706,263			1,693,326
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,145,802	1,433,544			1,433,544
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,150,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	268,425	227,574	185,852	185,852	185,852
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	627,907				665,986
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	4,050,300				
Subtotal, higher education	42,687,026	22,738,550	19,549,597	21,376,398	27,648,389
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	701,085	644,963	617,727	617,727	617,727
Personnel development programs	2,187,500				
Teacher Corps	1,238,523				
Subtotal, education professions development	4,127,108	644,963	617,727	617,727	617,727
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,746,355	1,455,333	1,455,333	1,746,355	1,746,355
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776
Construction (LSCA II)	1,653,747	277,743		122,129	354,115
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,001,350				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	503,663				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	333,347	333,347		332,436	332,436
Subtotal, community education	5,352,672	2,180,633	1,569,543	2,315,130	2,547,116
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	240,489				
Research and development centers	1,707,213				
Subtotal, research and development	1,947,702				
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	145,785,726	121,822,100	105,464,792	130,004,844	140,330,369
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	127,098,647	121,822,100	105,464,792	130,004,844	140,330,369

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
PT. A: Basic grants	\$15,015,004	\$17,081,476	\$16,832,741	\$19,191,136	\$18,872,637
State administrative expenses	150,191	170,814	168,327	191,911	188,726
PT. B.: Special incentive grants					237,382
PT. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					71,160
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,974,139	2,766,361	2,868,526	3,298,148	3,625,941
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,159,363	4,146,000		3,202,000	5,468,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	157,850				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,286,642	1,090,524	2,052,751	2,052,751	2,052,751
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	630,850	664,602	662,709	662,709	753,065
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,950,699	889,093		447,635	1,965,782
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	48,185	48,281		48,292	48,292
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,016	365,908			510,072
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	27,803,939	27,323,059	22,685,054	29,194,582	33,893,808
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	745,215	745,215	814,147	865,164	837,989
Teacher education and recruitment	615,356				
Research and innovation	825,309				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,185,880	745,215	814,147	865,164	837,989
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,364,257	7,431,298	7,431,298	8,639,563	7,705,912
State advisory councils		46,175	46,175	46,175	46,175
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		410,579	410,579	483,127	483,127
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	172,804	18,688			836,983
Innovation (pt. D)		262,178	562,490	437,360	337,256
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		362,189	362,189	422,673	604,030
Cooperative education (pt. G)		287,204		399,821	399,821
Work-study (pt. H)		105,922	537,464	137,076	137,076
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	568,749	630,936	707,229	707,229	707,229
Special projects and teacher education	120,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,225,810	9,555,169	10,057,424	11,273,024	11,257,609
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,980,453	1,585,291	1,2,017,708	1,562,485	1,2,017,708
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,626,683	3,548,133	3,600,674	3,564,667	3,921,134
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	5,348,259	5,231,415	4,466,846	5,831,734	6,198,675
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	483,347				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	257,471	260,870		157,186	260,870
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	286,887				
Language training and area studies	780,439				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,044,962	1,050,631			1,049,243
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,483,714	717,108			717,108
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	170,805	129,751	115,084	115,084	115,084
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	360,578				360,293
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,725,327				
Subtotal, higher education	22,646,925	12,573,199	10,250,312	11,281,156	14,690,115
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	349,257	361,618	348,543	348,543	348,543
Personnel development programs	1,077,531				
Teacher Corps	303,628				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,730,416	361,618	348,543	348,543	348,543
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	861,433	726,836	726,836	861,433	861,433
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359
Construction (LSCA II)	206,881	171,455		99,484	206,777
College library resources (HEA II-A)	527,165				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	574,301				
Educational broadcasting facilities	488,770				
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,111	207,111		207,436	207,436
Subtotal, community education	2,954,657	1,214,398	835,832	1,277,349	1,384,642
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	65,184				
Total, Office of Education	64,612,811	51,772,658	44,991,312	54,239,818	62,412,706
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	55,470,989	51,772,658	44,991,312	54,239,818	62,412,706

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$14,591,865	\$15,057,157	\$15,939,698	\$16,916,803	\$16,636,049
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,571	159,397	169,168	166,360
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					436,436
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					73,585
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,292,488	1,648,450	1,687,138	1,904,281	2,069,872
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,653,905	2,596,000		1,782,000	3,380,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	670,028				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	722,942	612,734	1,153,382	1,153,382	1,153,382
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	461,077	461,077	460,360	460,360	523,765
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,119,359	486,312		244,845	1,075,234
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	26,323	26,194		25,924	25,924
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	235,455	198,519			273,816
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,923,442	21,337,014	19,499,975	22,756,763	25,914,423
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	432,885	432,885	472,926	502,561	486,776
Teacher education and recruitment	391,785				
Research and innovation	356,003				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,180,673	432,885	472,926	502,561	486,776
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,228,808	4,198,015	4,198,015	4,880,671	4,353,233
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		231,941	231,941	272,930	272,930
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	24,615	15,000			472,829
Innovation (pt. D)		234,958	403,804	333,451	277,170
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		204,606	204,606	238,776	341,230
Cooperative education (pt. G)		249,029		312,346	312,346
Work-study (pt. H)		59,496	389,733	76,995	76,995
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	284,335	309,838	339,991	339,991	339,991
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,537,758	5,533,951	5,799,158	6,486,228	6,477,792
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,185,784	1,073,409	1,366,200	1,057,967	1,366,200
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,146,018	2,567,000	2,628,434	2,602,150	2,862,365
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,611,023	3,656,333	3,024,524	3,948,696	4,197,154
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	286,147				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	212,383	215,572		154,250	215,572
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	795,105				
Language training and area studies	65,312				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,383,909	712,803			736,107
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,136,021	437,700			437,700
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	675,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	99,713	109,775	94,665	94,665	94,665
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	244,835				234,618
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,313,075				
Subtotal, higher education	16,244,325	8,822,592	7,163,823	7,907,728	10,194,381
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	180,053	246,996	239,649	239,649	239,649
Personnel development programs	535,761				
Teacher Corps	369,241				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,085,055	246,996	239,649	239,649	239,649
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	550,334	199,402	199,402	550,334	550,334
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212
Construction (LSCA II)	506,923	159,521		91,524	154,980
College library resources (HEA II-A)	422,878				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	40,024				
Educational broadcasting facilities	316,617				
University community service programs (HEA I)	159,710	159,710		158,862	158,862
Subtotal, community education	2,103,648	625,795	306,564	907,882	971,338
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	48,074,901	36,999,233	33,482,095	38,800,811	44,284,359
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	42,223,118	36,999,233	33,482,095	38,800,811	44,284,359

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$9,784,956	\$10,497,614	\$10,742,914	\$11,812,655	\$11,614,121
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,942,094	1,422,144	1,457,201	1,637,248	1,774,519
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,664,572	8,642,000		7,543,000	11,496,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	573,750	63,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	556,782	465,110	875,502	875,502	875,502
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	414,425	414,425	410,248	410,248	467,956
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	893,721	415,179		209,031	917,959
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	21,680	21,727		21,550	21,550
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	291,036	164,659			227,617
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,293,016	22,355,858	13,735,865	22,759,234	27,823,113
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	338,673	338,673	370,000	393,185	380,835
Teacher education and recruitment	780,110				
Research and innovation	299,868				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,418,651	338,673	370,000	393,185	380,835
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,180,467	3,598,952	3,598,952	4,184,173	3,732,002
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		198,841	198,841	233,980	233,980
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	49,833	15,000			405,354
Innovation (pt. D)		228,287	364,910	307,984	262,443
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		175,408	175,408	204,702	292,534
Cooperative education (pt. G)		239,672		290,906	290,906
Work-study (pt. H)		48,767	353,525	63,110	63,110
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	260,619	282,224	308,480	308,408	308,408
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,490,919	4,818,219	5,021,112	5,624,331	5,619,805
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,070,461	1,872,547	1,110,550	1,859,994	1,110,550
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,015,111	1,948,114	1,931,768	1,912,450	2,103,696
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,249,036	3,198,452	2,458,559	3,209,795	3,411,760
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	98,308				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	39,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to long-grant colleges:					
Annual	198,680	201,805		153,358	201,805
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	743,747				
Language training and area studies	218,743				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,051,377	531,076			562,089
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,723,101	350,022			350,022
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	150,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,473	99,770	87,151	87,151	87,151
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	208,085				
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,398,500				
Subtotal, higher education	14,303,531	7,251,786	5,638,028	6,272,748	7,877,073
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	207,864	211,581	206,004	206,004	206,004
Personnel development programs	336,778				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	544,642	211,581	206,004	206,004	206,004
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	455,789	392,897	392,897	455,789	455,789
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168
Construction (LSCA II)	201,413	122,734		89,104	139,238
College library resources (HEA II-A)	414,277				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	146,541				
Educational broadcasting facilities	268,809				
University community service programs (HEA I)	149,218	149,218		148,596	148,596
Subtotal, community education	1,742,653	771,455	499,503	800,095	850,229
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Subtotal, civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	44,793,412	35,747,572	25,480,512	36,055,597	42,757,059
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	39,690,646	35,747,572	24,480,512	36,055,597	42,757,059

See footnotes at end of table.

CXVI—1488—Part 17

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$30,207,987	\$34,326,959	\$35,452,207	\$40,419,331	\$39,748,525
State administrative expenses	302,084	343,269	354,522	404,193	397,485
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					603,821
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					2,359,545
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,622,860	1,849,465	1,901,271	2,153,182	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,407,184	9,477,000		8,139,000	10,626,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	230,278	127,000		48,500	48,500
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	759,127	641,127	1,206,827	1,206,827	1,206,827
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	477,508	477,508	475,514	475,514	544,103
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,581,651	697,959		351,404	1,543,185
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	30,673	30,230		30,014	30,014
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	274,372	229,102			317,011
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	44,893,724	48,299,619	39,490,341	53,327,965	57,425,116
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	509,972	509,972	557,144	592,056	573,460
Teacher education and recruitment	387,755				
Research and innovation	343,102				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,240,829	509,972	557,144	592,056	573,460
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,602,669	6,212,161	6,212,161	7,222,590	6,442,067
State advisory councils		38,600	38,600	38,600	38,600
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		343,223	343,223	403,891	403,891
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	43,070	15,623			699,709
Innovation (pt. D)		241,497	441,919	358,410	291,602
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		302,771	302,771	353,349	504,964
Cooperation education (pt. G)		258,198		333,357	333,357
Work-study (pt. H)		72,761	425,218	94,161	94,161
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	910,457	1,019,688	1,151,842	1,151,842	1,151,842
Special projects and teacher education	477,989				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,034,185	8,504,522	8,915,734	9,956,200	9,960,193
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,828,376	1,870,849	1,108,388	1,858,320	1,108,388
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,124,716	3,312,872	3,224,149	3,191,908	3,511,098
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,014,967	2,932,428	2,453,774	3,203,548	3,405,119
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	148,217				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	219,025	222,244		154,683	222,244
Permanent		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	864,600				
Language training and area studies	13,415				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,338,963	927,912			759,894
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,034,025	402,793			402,793
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	84,070	103,380	85,668	85,668	85,668
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	233,537				222,369
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	668,600				
Subtotal, higher education	15,689,511	8,822,478	6,921,979	7,544,127	9,767,573
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	247,063	253,807	246,120	246,120	246,120
Personnel development programs	452,063				
Teacher Corps	671,384				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,370,510	253,807	246,120	246,120	246,120
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	596,161	508,456	508,456	596,161	596,161
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	4,235	42,690	42,690	42,690	42,690
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234
Construction (LSCA II)	158,205	139,594		92,696	162,610
College library resources (HEA II-A)	309,262				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	183,946				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	168,818	159,710		168,386	168,386
Subtotal, community education	1,485,370	915,193	615,889	964,676	1,034,590
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education		5,912			
Total, Office of Education	71,720,041	67,305,591	56,747,207	72,631,144	79,007,052
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	66,843,259	67,305,591	56,747,207	72,631,144	79,007,052

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$30,428,619	\$34,326,959	\$33,827,100	\$38,566,534	\$37,926,477
Pt. B: Special incentive grants	304,314	343,270	338,271	385,665	379,265
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					1,130,256
Supplementary services (ESEA III)					468,034
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,074,668	2,150,754	2,228,360	2,554,704	2,803,651
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	3,447,717	666,000		2,671,000	4,483,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	351,676	813,574			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):	954,621		1,531,433	1,531,433	1,531,433
Grants to States	535,430	535,430	536,860	536,860	611,269
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,806,533	912,117		459,227	2,016,688
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	37,949	37,976		37,908	37,908
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	339,449	287,811			400,395
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	41,280,976	40,173,891	38,562,024	46,843,331	51,888,376
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	570,824	570,824	623,624	662,703	641,887
Teacher education and recruitment	346,923				
Research and innovation	8,270				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	926,017	570,824	623,624	662,703	641,887
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,587,332	7,152,052	7,152,052	8,315,482	7,416,855
State advisory councils		44,440	44,440	44,440	44,440
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		395,150	395,150	465,005	465,005
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	5,430	17,986	485,418	386,934	805,586
Innovation (pt. D)		248,969			308,097
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		348,579	348,579	406,818	581,373
Cooperation education (pt. G)		268,678		357,370	357,370
Work-study (pt. H)		84,660	465,771	109,560	109,560
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,266,373	1,414,980	1,603,937	1,603,937	1,603,937
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,859,135	9,975,494	10,495,410	11,689,546	11,692,223
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,533,113	1,028,548	1,309,103	1,013,751	1,309,103
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,081,348	3,778,457	3,810,300	3,772,197	4,149,416
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,345,928	3,523,681	2,898,121	3,783,670	4,021,743
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	182,628				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	56,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	224,205	227,449		155,020	227,449
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,089,051				
Language training and area studies	203,255				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	306,071	939,932			904,989
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	5,111,837	479,452			479,452
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	160,233	101,494	84,399	84,399	84,399
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	272,955				265,319
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,330,908				
Subtotal, higher education	18,197,532	10,129,013	8,151,923	8,859,037	11,491,870
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	322,474	295,177	285,423	385,423	285,423
Personnel development programs	611,791				
Teacher Corps	168,072				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,102,337	295,177	285,423	285,423	285,423
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	631,904	537,881	537,881	631,904	631,904
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
Construction (LSCA II)	229,744	143,887		93,611	168,561
College library resources (HEA II-A)	308,819				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	182,226				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,251	178,251		178,695	178,695
Subtotal, community education	1,638,587	967,662	645,524	1,011,853	1,086,803
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	281,793				
Total, Office of Education	70,286,377	62,112,061	58,763,928	69,351,893	77,086,582
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	64,993,686	62,112,061	58,763,928	69,351,893	77,086,582

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 A. OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$3,351,971	\$3,884,709	\$3,818,868	\$4,374,936	\$4,299,840
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					23,559
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					4,333
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	964,066	804,617	818,387	895,373	953,965
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,594,464	2,586,000		2,533,000	3,451,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		22,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	253,111	213,526	401,930	401,930	401,930
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	303,881	303,881	303,030	303,030	345,285
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	436,944	194,993		98,174	431,129
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	82,737	69,359			96,155
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	8,150,507	8,342,418	5,592,215	8,869,776	10,270,529
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	153,967	153,967	168,209	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	155,543				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	309,510	153,967	168,209	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,539,144	1,714,714	1,714,714	1,993,561	1,778,124
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		94,738	94,738	111,481	111,481
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000			193,132
Innovation (pt. D)		212,009	270,009	245,842	226,509
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		83,572	83,572	97,530	139,379
Cooperation education (pt. G)		216,842		238,592	238,592
Work-study (pt. H)		20,677	265,176	26,759	26,759
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	192,097	204,502	219,519	219,519	219,519
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,731,241	2,593,122	2,678,796	2,964,352	2,964,573
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	666,632	248,553	316,350	244,977	316,350
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	797,691	744,348	786,502	778,637	856,501
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	780,846	758,059	700,343	914,340	971,872
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	147,253				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	170,056	173,048		151,494	173,048
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	120,300				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	548,214	283,459			289,229
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	620,484	129,423			129,423
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	85,786	65,833	58,654	58,654	58,654
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	53,126				61,581
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	181,619				
Subtotal, higher education	4,222,007	2,452,723	1,911,849	2,198,102	2,906,658
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	149,034	151,225	148,665	148,665	148,665
Personnel development programs	60,991				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	210,025	151,225	148,665	148,665	148,665
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	258,291	230,310	230,310	258,291	258,291
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075
Construction (LSCA I)	106,355	99,012		84,051	106,355
College library resources (HEA II-A)	143,115				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities	72,216				
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,158	121,158		120,745	120,745
Subtotal, community education	806,577	555,922	335,752	568,529	590,833
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Subtotal, civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	15,429,867	14,249,377	10,835,486	14,949,424	17,081,248
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	14,495,704	14,249,377	10,835,486	14,949,424	17,081,248

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$14,445,834	\$18,207,980	\$17,942,957	\$20,456,903	\$20,117,396
State administrative expenses	150,000	182,079	179,430	204,569	201,174
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					233,380
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					213,300
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,887,002	2,088,229	2,157,621	2,472,552	2,712,786
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	25,867,892	25,785,000		18,640,000	33,565,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	494,236	23,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	936,620	805,571	1,516,369	1,516,369	1,516,369
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	529,969	529,969	534,643	534,643	609,122
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,312,943	607,549		305,885	1,343,290
Loans to nonprofit private schools	12,890				
State administration	34,987	35,310		35,312	35,312
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	312,960	267,604			372,976
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	46,985,333	48,632,291	22,431,020	44,266,233	61,020,105
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	493,874	493,874	539,556	573,367	555,357
Teacher education and recruitment	376,451				
Research and innovation	426,695				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,297,020	493,874	539,556	573,367	555,357
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,084,864	5,241,683	5,241,683	6,094,001	5,435,441
State advisory councils		32,570	32,570	32,570	32,570
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		289,602	289,602	340,780	340,780
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	128,787	15,000		371,653	590,374
Innovation (pt. D)		244,966	462,144		299,260
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		255,472	255,472	298,137	426,059
Cooperation education (pt. G)		263,064		344,506	344,506
Work-study (pt. H)		78,808	444,046		101,986
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	615,676	682,321	765,998	765,998	765,998
Special projects and teacher education	53,331				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,882,658	7,103,486	7,491,515	8,349,631	8,336,974
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,670,392	1,941,773	1,198,658	1,928,225	1,198,658
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,547,538	2,293,450	2,418,293	2,394,110	2,633,521
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,346,063	2,785,347	2,653,616	3,464,454	3,682,442
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments		234,680			
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	220,505	223,731		154,779	223,731
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	706,694				
Language training and area studies	13,131				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,346,890	693,653			688,924
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,241,212	480,057			480,057
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	69,208	107,349	89,153	89,153	89,153
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	213,395				222,503
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,624,327				
Subtotal, higher education	12,584,035	7,575,360	6,409,720	7,080,721	9,268,989
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	318,527	293,258	283,599	283,599	283,599
Personnel development programs	622,171				
Teacher Corps	156,293				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,096,991	293,258	283,599	283,599	283,599
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	606,374	516,863	516,863	606,374	606,374
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239
Construction (LSCA II)	393,560	140,820		92,958	164,310
College library resources (HEA II-A)	398,449				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	102,510				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,121	178,121		178,822	178,822
Subtotal, community education	1,786,507	943,297	624,356	985,647	1,056,999
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers	613,880				
Subtotal, research and development	613,880				
Civil rights education	225,529				
Total, Office of Education	69,471,953	65,041,566	37,779,766	61,539,198	80,522,023
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	64,111,111	65,041,566	37,779,766	61,539,198	80,522,023

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$16,694,736	\$21,630,141	\$21,315,302	\$24,301,739	\$23,898,423
State administrative expenses	167,965	216,301	213,153	243,017	238,984
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					279,996
Supplementary services (ESEA III)					3,741,143
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	13,710,871	13,994,000		12,120,000	18,300,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	116,046	465,000		250,000	250,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,296,227	1,103,113	2,076,448	2,076,448	2,076,448
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	626,114	626,114	628,412	628,412	723,158
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,557,326	722,123		363,570	1,596,611
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	48,222	48,101		48,043	48,043
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,343	364,543			507,442
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	38,857,814	42,137,179	27,291,529	43,533,533	51,760,138
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	750,780	750,780	820,226	871,624	844,247
Teacher education and recruitment	1,258,348				
Research and innovation	813,925				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,823,043	750,780	820,226	871,624	844,247
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,562,570	6,866,845	6,866,845	7,982,984	7,120,290
State advisory councils		42,667	42,667	42,667	42,667
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		379,393	379,393	446,412	446,412
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		17,269			773,375
Innovation (pt. D)	437,153	260,710	553,934	431,757	334,016
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		334,679	334,679	390,551	558,126
Cooperation education (pt. G)		285,146		395,104	395,104
Work-study (pt. H)		104,947	529,498	135,814	135,814
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	750,102	835,242	940,892	940,892	940,892
Special projects and teacher education	278,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,027,825	9,126,898	9,647,908	10,766,181	10,746,696
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	5,488,242	12,222,744	12,829,038	12,190,768	12,829,038
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	6,495,739	3,949,122	4,047,533	4,007,058	4,407,762
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	7,070,873	6,942,565	6,262,986	8,176,701	8,691,191
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	1,206,506				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	127,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	268,977	272,428		157,935	272,428
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000				
Language training and area studies	898,381				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,157,438	1,114,870			1,076,094
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	4,330,783	881,731			881,731
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,800,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	208,175	173,339	13,1834	131,834	131,834
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	507,779				499,575
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	3,984,143				
Subtotal, higher education	34,644,036	15,606,799	13,321,391	14,714,296	18,839,833
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	301,000	364,638	351,412	351,412	351,412
Personnel development programs	2,099,039				
Teacher Corps	829,390				
Subtotal, education professions development	3,229,429	364,638	351,412	351,412	251,412
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	940,815	792,186	792,186	940,815	940,815
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396
Construction (LSCA II)	633,065	180,990		101,516	219,994
College library resources (HEA II-A)	919,725				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	293,465				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	216,889	216,889		215,348	215,348
Subtotal, community education	3,113,422	1,299,528	901,649	1,367,142	1,485,620
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	959,655				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	959,655				
Civil rights education	91,670				
Total, Office of Education	90,746,904	69,285,822	52,334,115	71,604,188	83,927,946
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	74,629,878	69,285,822	52,334,115	71,604,188	83,927,946

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$32,395,258	\$42,339,833	\$41,724,218	\$47,570,100	\$46,780,618
Pt. B: State administrative expenses	324,175	423,398	417,242	475,701	467,806
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					102,509
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	6,790,000	4,691,787	4,850,885	5,600,320	396,683
Federally affected areas:					6,172,271
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,550,314	4,536,000		4,508,000	6,151,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	194,618	3,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,326,201	2,000,378	3,765,418	3,765,418	3,765,418
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	990,466	990,466	1,002,131	1,002,131	1,134,950
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	3,421,788	1,553,289		782,040	3,434,317
Loans to nonprofit private schools	5,900				
State administration	86,061	86,366		85,916	85,916
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	769,811	654,538			907,462
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	51,854,592	57,379,055	51,859,894	63,889,626	69,498,950
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,268,699	1,268,699	1,386,051	1,472,906	1,426,642
Teacher education and recruitment	1,576,186				
Research and innovation	841,068				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,685,953	1,268,699	1,386,051	1,472,906	1,426,642
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	9,582,011	12,038,767	12,038,767	13,996,341	12,483,801
State advisory councils		74,803	74,803	74,803	74,803
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		665,143	665,143	782,682	782,682
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	449,550	30,725			1,355,935
Innovation (pt. D)		309,545	838,636	618,182	441,818
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		586,753	586,753	684,741	978,544
Cooperative education (pt. G)		353,636		552,045	552,048
Work-study (pt. H)		186,486	794,545	241,334	241,335
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	991,837	1,106,931	1,251,622	1,251,622	1,251,622
Special projects and teacher education	500,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	11,523,398	15,352,339	16,250,269	18,201,750	18,162,588
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,080,085	12,690,991	13,425,007	12,652,278	13,425,007
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	5,006,293	5,922,710	6,144,144	6,082,702	6,690,974
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	8,650,342	8,534,862	7,582,356	9,899,217	10,522,089
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	435,727				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	85,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	332,282	336,028		162,057	336,028
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	90,000				
Language training and area studies	1,159,039				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	3,315,772	1,701,935			1,726,844
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	6,385,324	1,247,835			1,247,835
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	178,974	197,259	162,392	162,392	162,392
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	612,301				621,551
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,691,606				
Subtotal, higher education	35,372,745	20,681,620	17,363,899	19,008,646	24,782,720
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	550,647	579,893	555,910	555,910	555,910
Personnel development programs	2,279,616				
Teacher Corps	849,241				
Subtotal, education professions development	3,679,504	579,893	555,910	555,910	555,910
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,377,606	1,151,767	1,151,767	1,377,606	1,377,606
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,926
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602
Construction (LSCA II)	925,674	233,453		112,693	292,719
College library resources (HEA II-A)	802,205				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	522,737				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	283,198	283,198		283,968	283,968
Subtotal, community education	4,023,457	1,780,455	1,263,804	1,886,304	2,066,330
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	384,500				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	384,500				
Civil rights education	163,569				
Total, Office of Education	110,687,718	97,042,061	88,679,827	105,015,142	116,493,140
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	97,394,923	97,042,061	88,679,827	105,015,142	116,493,140

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$18,633,931	\$20,127,632	\$20,462,284	\$22,613,655	\$22,238,355
Pt. B: Special incentive grants	186,630	201,276	204,623	226,137	222,384
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					675,607
Supplementary services (ESEA III):					179,259
Federally affected areas:	2,976,699	2,097,802	2,171,620	2,488,811	2,730,770
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)					
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	3,381,658	3,368,000		2,698,000	4,438,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II):	996,022	853,429	1,606,455	1,606,455	1,606,455
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	544,185	544,185	548,158	548,158	622,014
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,563,031	719,373		362,185	1,590,532
Loans to nonprofit private schools	11,500				
State administration	35,901	36,211		36,308	36,308
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V):	321,136	274,431			383,493
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	28,650,693	28,322,339	25,093,140	30,679,709	34,823,177
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI):	552,633	552,633	603,750	641,583	621,431
Teacher education and recruitment	702,609				
Research and innovation	634,739				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,889,981	552,633	603,750	641,583	621,431
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B):	5,084,132	5,683,713	5,683,713	6,608,050	5,893,940
State advisory councils		35,316	35,316	35,316	35,316
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B):		314,026	314,026	369,525	369,525
Research and special project activities (pt. C):	472,021	15,000			640,174
Innovation (pt. D):		246,567	471,479	377,765	302,795
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F):		277,015	277,015	323,285	461,999
Cooperative education (pt. G):		265,309		349,651	349,561
Work-study (pt. H):		78,808	452,736	101,986	101,986
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	360,302	393,947	436,186	436,186	436,186
Special projects and teacher education	200,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,116,455	7,309,701	7,670,471	8,601,764	8,591,572
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):	4,093,988	1,340,828	1,706,563	1,321,539	1,706,563
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C):	3,074,487	3,107,129	3,205,052	3,173,001	3,490,301
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II):	4,516,471	4,467,393	3,778,026	4,932,439	5,242,794
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	416,615				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	99,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	227,918	231,178		155,262	231,178
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):	292,135				
Language training and area studies	260,387				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—sec. 103):	1,824,346	951,515			983,409
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—sec. 104):	2,864,880	594,127			594,127
Graduate facilities (HEFA II):	1,000,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—sec. 105):	180,132	122,169	101,943	101,943	101,943
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEFA VI-A):	318,722				311,262
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E):	994,100				
Subtotal, higher education	20,213,181	10,864,339	8,841,584	9,734,184	12,711,577
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2):	331,551	304,739	294,507	294,507	294,507
Personnel development programs	1,166,053				
Teacher Corps	443,834				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,941,438	304,739	294,507	294,507	294,507
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I):	657,518	558,967	558,967	657,518	657,518
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III):	43,022	43,022		43,022	43,022
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A):	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B):	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263
Construction (LSCA II):	177,371	146,963		94,266	172,826
College library resources (HEA II-A):	469,205				
Librarian training (HEA II-B):	280,541				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I):	177,277	177,277		177,698	177,698
Subtotal, community education	1,869,706	991,001	666,761	1,037,276	1,115,836
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	800,000				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	800,000				
Civil rights education:					
	78,967				
Total, Office of Education	61,560,421	48,344,752	43,170,213	50,989,023	58,158,100
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	53,695,378	48,344,752	43,170,213	50,989,023	58,158,100

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$22,898,224	\$26,049,684	\$25,670,355	\$29,266,967	\$28,781,248
State administrative expenses	228,982	260,497	256,704	292,670	287,812
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					272,909
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,556,732	2,481,771	2,561,513	2,941,605	3,231,584
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,398,571	8,371,000		6,555,000	11,102,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,485,317			50,000	50,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,670,831	994,943	1,872,834	1,872,834	1,872,834
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	596,859	596,859	607,581	607,581	692,582
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,655,991	772,977		389,174	1,709,051
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	41,641	41,652		41,500	41,500
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	372,479	315,664			438,331
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	40,905,627	39,985,047	31,068,987	42,117,331	48,479,851
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	641,800	641,800	701,166	745,103	721,700
Teacher education and recruitment	724,146				
Research and innovation	9,600				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,375,546	641,800	701,166	745,103	721,700
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,083,056	7,028,458	7,028,458	8,171,046	7,288,027
State advisory councils		43,672	43,672	43,672	43,672
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		388,323	388,323	456,929	456,929
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	20,573	17,675			791,594
Innovation (pt. D)		253,258	510,373	403,233	317,522
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		342,557	342,557	399,752	571,275
Cooperative education (pt. G)		274,666		371,092	371,092
Work-study (pt. H)		91,487	488,945	118,395	118,395
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	742,562	824,641	928,768	928,768	928,768
Special projects and teacher education	127,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,973,191	9,264,737	9,731,096	10,892,887	10,887,274
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,586,582	1,414,063	1,799,774	1,393,720	1,799,774
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,295,787	3,733,029	3,677,540	3,640,765	4,004,840
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	4,823,178	4,814,078	3,984,379	5,201,845	5,529,152
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	130,362				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	123,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	249,360	252,721		156,658	252,721
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,127,530				
Language training and area studies	239,679				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,972,556	1,017,094			945,265
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,987,407	618,833			618,833
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	700,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	143,722	134,033	109,742	109,742	109,742
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	343,879				339,124
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,396,200				
Subtotal, higher education	22,169,242	12,033,851	9,621,435	10,552,730	13,649,451
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	346,701	338,688	326,759	326,759	326,759
Personnel development programs	470,198				
Teacher Corps	524,256				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,341,155	338,688	326,759	326,759	326,759
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	805,469	680,765	680,765	805,469	805,469
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333
Construction (LSCA II)	512,392	164,733		98,052	197,459
College library resources (HEA II-A)	522,912				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	61,748				
Educational broadcasting facilities	340,000				
University community service programs (HEA I)	198,738	198,738		197,785	197,785
Subtotal, community education	2,549,925	1,152,902	789,431	1,209,972	1,309,379
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	2,683,838				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	2,683,838				
Civil rights education:					
	60,067				
Total, Office of Education	78,058,591	63,417,025	52,238,874	65,844,782	75,374,414
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	67,474,176	63,417,025	52,238,874	65,844,782	75,374,414

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$32,395,258	\$41,909,589	\$41,299,313	\$47,085,660	\$46,304,219
State administrative expenses	366,015	419,096	412,993	470,857	463,042
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					659,974
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,101,942	1,502,449	1,537,506	1,730,507	1,877,670
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,593,395	2,585,000		2,276,000	3,365,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	117,158				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	589,397	491,458	925,097	925,097	925,097
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	437,838	437,838	432,249	432,249	490,640
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,312,466	596,634		300,390	1,319,157
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	24,641	24,357		24,110	24,110
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	220,413	184,592			254,660
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	40,158,523	48,251,013	44,707,158	53,344,870	55,783,569
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	399,693	399,693	436,664	464,027	449,452
Teacher education and recruitment	229,137				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	628,830	399,693	436,664	464,027	449,452
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,405,983	4,712,410	4,712,410	5,479,202	4,887,082
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		260,361	260,361	306,400	306,400
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	45,826	15,000			530,814
Innovation (pt. D)		232,557	389,802	324,283	271,868
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		229,675	229,675	368,059	383,076
Cooperative education (pt. G)		245,661		304,627	304,627
Work-study (pt. H)		56,375	376,698	72,956	72,956
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	831,474	936,895	1,057,152	1,057,152	1,057,152
Special projects and teacher education	320,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	5,603,283	6,720,002	7,057,166	7,843,747	7,845,043
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,470,096	1,696,224	1,886,131	1,686,208	1,886,131
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,159,065	3,188,960	3,301,930	3,268,911	3,595,802
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,304,564	2,256,810	1,961,736	2,561,164	2,722,316
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	128,300				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	198,669	201,794		153,357	201,794
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,929,260				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,197,927	640,999			653,093
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,640,792	304,004			304,004
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,151	93,741	81,084	81,084	81,084
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	180,563				178,785
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	571,726				
Subtotal, higher education	13,920,113	7,432,532	6,280,881	6,800,724	8,673,009
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	214,182	217,901	212,009	212,009	212,009
Personnel development programs	145,925				
Teacher Corps	468,815				
Subtotal, education professions development	828,922	217,901	212,009	212,009	212,009
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	455,712	392,834	392,834	455,712	455,712
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168
Construction (LSCA II)	139,226	122,724		89,102	139,226
College library resources (HEA II-A)	298,915				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	339,973				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	150,559	150,559		149,826	149,826
Subtotal, community education	1,490,990	772,722	499,439	801,245	851,369
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	289,604				
Total, Office of Education	62,920,265	63,793,863	59,193,317	69,466,622	73,814,451
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	58,018,047	63,793,863	59,193,317	69,466,622	73,814,451

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$3,460,422	\$3,567,190	\$3,897,883	\$3,897,883	\$3,897,883
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					213,479
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					9,274
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	888,162	686,277	696,082	753,338	796,867
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,204,578	4,191,000		4,469,000	5,696,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	844,364			400,000	400,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	185,736	155,462	292,635	292,635	292,635
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	282,290	282,290	281,090	281,090	320,026
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	333,751	152,595		76,827	337,387
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	96,194	53,521			73,994
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	10,458,830	9,360,668	5,417,690	10,434,106	12,300,878
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	112,296	112,296	122,683	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	143,729				
Research and innovation	32,075				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	288,100	112,296	122,683	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,155,069	1,233,991	1,233,991	1,434,704	1,279,662
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		68,178	68,178	80,231	80,231
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	32,571	15,000			138,991
Innovation (pt. D)		209,340	254,451	235,655	220,618
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		60,144	60,144	70,190	100,306
Cooperative education (pt. G)		213,099		230,016	230,016
Work-study (pt. H)		15,801	250,692	20,448	20,448
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	156,723	164,109	173,321	173,321	173,321
Special projects and teacher education	138,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,482,363	2,010,730	2,071,845	2,275,633	2,274,661
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	729,768	1,260,776	1,331,908	1,257,025	1,331,908
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,529,733	597,086	634,395	628,051	690,857
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	877,702	848,766	734,784	959,305	1,019,666
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	71,730				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,394				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	163,086	166,045		151,040	166,045
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	21,300				
Language training and area studies	12,951				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	234,428	189,170			209,638
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	662,620	109,909			109,909
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	68,765	57,831	53,806	53,806	53,806
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	59,639				60,521
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	253,200				
Subtotal, higher education	5,785,316	2,279,583	1,804,893	2,099,227	2,692,350
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	135,982	137,296	135,432	135,432	135,432
Personnel development programs	270,762				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	406,744	137,296	135,432	135,432	135,432
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	210,196	190,717	190,717	210,196	210,196
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
Construction (LSCA II)	88,347	93,236		82,820	98,347
College library resources (HEA II-A)	108,233				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	33,737				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,187	115,187		114,763	114,763
Subtotal, community education	660,858	504,298	295,875	512,937	528,464
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	19,082,211	14,404,871	9,848,418	15,657,335	18,131,785
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	17,886,461	14,404,871	9,848,418	15,657,335	18,131,785

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$5,668,814	\$7,491,253	\$7,376,510	\$8,431,031	\$8,288,619
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					53,730
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,353,663	1,024,798	1,051,683	1,661,306	1,253,633
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,624,472	4,610,000		4,389,000	6,263,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	457,928				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	374,367	313,078	589,323	589,323	589,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	340,817	340,817	338,719	338,719	386,565
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	576,770	258,291		130,042	571,080
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,673	13,656		13,691	13,691
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	183,554	103,492			144,608
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,744,058	14,405,385	9,606,235	15,308,112	17,814,249
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	217,458	217,458	237,573	252,460	244,530
Teacher education and recruitment	176,671				
Research and innovation	274,385				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	668,514	217,458	237,573	252,460	244,530
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,199,575	2,227,091	2,227,091	2,589,253	2,309,441
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		123,046	123,046	144,792	144,792
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	82,022	15,000			250,841
Innovation (pt. D)		217,880	254,451	268,254	239,468
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		108,546	108,546	126,673	181,026
Cooperative education (pt. G)		225,076		257,459	257,459
Work-study (pt. H)		30,821	250,692	39,886	39,886
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	207,912	221,891	239,406	239,406	239,406
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,489,509	3,200,419	3,234,300	3,696,791	3,693,387
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,362,622	1,575,136	1,732,014	1,566,862	1,732,014
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,232,909	1,309,717	1,362,875	1,349,246	1,484,171
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,786,869	1,813,595	1,620,549	2,115,724	2,248,848
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	64,019				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	60,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	180,520	183,560		152,075	183,560
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	280,000				
Language training and area studies	34,980				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	726,890	359,064			356,265
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,136,397	232,407			232,407
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	75,908	74,549	67,335	67,335	67,335
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	125,481				131,608
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	511,900				
Subtotal, higher education	7,928,495	4,598,028	3,832,773	4,301,242	5,486,208
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	172,525	175,108	171,354	171,354	171,354
Personnel development programs	848,726				
Teacher Corps	541,734				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,562,985	175,108	171,354	171,354	171,354
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	330,484	289,742	289,742	330,484	330,484
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109
Construction (LSCA II)	256,938	107,683		85,898	118,375
College library resources (HEA II-A)	204,610				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	131,132	131,132		130,820	130,820
Subtotal, community education	1,029,031	634,424	395,609	653,069	685,546
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education:					
Total, Office of Education	27,422,592	23,230,822	17,477,844	24,383,028	28,095,274
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	24,000,086	23,230,822	17,477,844	24,383,028	28,095,274

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$886,124	\$932,847	\$1,006,741	\$1,058,509	\$1,038,452
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					4,123
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					704
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	646,767	551,066	564,708	600,769	628,118
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,554,294	3,543,000		3,066,000	4,641,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	221,351	14,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	113,689	100,155	188,527	188,527	188,527
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	257,521	259,550	260,934	260,934	296,963
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	113,732	61,619		31,023	136,239
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000				50,000
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	6,006,811	5,775,570	2,270,910	5,469,095	7,247,459
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	90,967				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	190,967	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	596,052	529,448	529,448	615,506	548,990
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		29,252	29,252	34,420	34,420
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	140,627	15,000	227,226	217,827	59,629
Innovation (pt. D)		204,670			210,309
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		25,804	25,804	30,113	43,032
Cooperative education (pt. G)		206,550	225,346	215,008	215,008
Work-study (pt. H)		8,388		10,855	10,855
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	121,076	123,829	173,321	173,321	173,321
Special projects and teacher education	160,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,017,755	1,174,009	1,241,465	1,328,118	1,326,632
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	141,788	193,823	119,414	192,473	119,414
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	343,532	193,116	221,473	219,258	241,185
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	222,484	219,899	264,362	345,141	366,857
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	31,014				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	44,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	153,867	156,784		150,440	156,784
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):					
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 104)		61,219			64,573
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	334,962	51,403			51,403
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	43,460	38,960	43,968	43,968	43,968
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	14,561				19,527
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	117,800				
Subtotal, higher education	1,497,468	865,204	699,217	901,280	1,113,711
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	3,661	124,027	122,827	122,827	122,827
Personnel development programs	46,706				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	50,367	124,027	122,827	122,827	122,827
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	146,589	138,353	138,353	146,589	146,589
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	20,753	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	5,299	25,022	25,022	25,022	25,022
Construction (LSCA II):					
College library resources (HEA II-A)	62,523	85,596		81,192	80,000
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	57,175				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	109,324	109,324		109,524	109,524
Subtotal, community education	441,916	438,057	243,137	442,089	440,897
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories:					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education:					
	62,931				
Total, Office of Education	9,268,215	8,476,867	4,677,556	8,463,409	10,451,526
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	8,643,061	8,476,867	4,677,556	8,463,409	10,451,526

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$24,487,811	\$33,310,467	\$32,825,491	\$37,424,592	\$36,803,488
State administrative expenses	245,001	333,105	328,255	374,246	368,035
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					342,743
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	5,233,177	3,626,822	3,755,106	4,350,987	4,790,439
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,321,861	10,287,000		8,589,000	15,684,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	774,195	27,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,652,599	1,406,778	2,648,053	2,648,053	2,648,053
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	738,898	738,898	742,620	742,620	856,573
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,796,586	863,566		434,782	1,909,341
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	2,432	61,901		62,196	62,196
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	552,014	469,127			656,933
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,804,574	51,224,664	40,419,525	54,726,476	64,221,801
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	866,823	866,823	947,003	1,006,346	974,736
Teacher education and recruitment	503,629				
Research and innovation	9,336				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,379,788	866,823	947,003	1,006,346	974,736
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,448,818	8,543,798	8,543,798	9,932,416	8,859,051
State advisory councils		53,087	53,087	53,087	53,087
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		472,044	472,044	555,425	555,425
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	338,844	21,486	657,391	499,502	962,232
Innovation (pt. D)		278,456			373,190
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		416,411	416,411	485,923	694,421
Cooperative education (pt. G)		310,034		452,135	452,135
Work-study (pt. H)		136,743	625,813	176,962	176,962
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,057,036	1,177,851	1,332,732	1,332,732	1,332,732
Special projects and teacher education	417,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,261,698	11,409,910	12,101,276	13,488,182	13,459,235
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,636,170	1,065,148	1,335,687	1,049,825	1,355,687
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,751,188	3,272,107	3,419,849	3,385,651	3,724,215
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,281,169	3,330,813	3,001,249	3,918,309	4,164,854
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	2,023,322				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	139,875				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	290,710	294,262		159,350	294,262
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000				
Language training and area studies	423,131				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,260,985	1,162,358			1,188,662
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,452,283	725,600			725,600
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,600,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	175,863	129,991	104,828	104,828	104,828
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	255,201				262,020
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,875,400				
Subtotal, higher education	21,265,297	10,030,279	7,931,613	8,667,963	11,870,128
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	420,452	437,488	420,621	420,621	420,621
Personnel development programs	705,047				
Teacher Corps	264,859				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,390,358	437,488	420,621	420,621	420,621
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,090,767	915,632	915,632	1,090,767	1,090,767
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,467	25,467	25,467	25,467	25,467
Construction (LSCA II)	545,193	199,000		105,353	244,961
College library resources (HEA II-A)	487,854				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	248,366				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	249,254	249,254		249,966	249,966
Subtotal, community education	2,731,781	1,474,233	1,025,979	1,556,433	1,696,041
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education:					
	93,322				
Total, Office of Education	80,925,818	75,443,397	62,846,017	79,866,021	92,642,562
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	71,830,476	75,443,397	62,846,017	79,866,021	92,642,562

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$9,794,395	\$9,888,110	\$10,761,354	\$10,761,354	\$10,761,354
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					488,844
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					91,418
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,112,240	860,486	873,831	959,763	1,025,184
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,219,522	10,187,000		10,115,000	13,687,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	229,219				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	288,109	241,076	453,791	453,791	453,791
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	319,982	319,982	317,977	317,977	360,421
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	525,835	273,046		137,471	603,704
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396	84,923			117,189
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,753,031	22,117,956	12,656,953	23,008,689	27,852,238
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	175,883	175,883	192,152	204,192	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	291,082				
Research and innovation	485,629				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	952,594	175,883	192,152	204,192	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,590,156	1,947,460	1,947,460	2,264,327	2,019,629
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		107,597	107,597	126,621	126,621
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	50,000	15,000	281,677	253,482	219,363
Innovation (pt. D)		214,010			230,927
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		94,917	94,917	110,778	158,310
Cooperative education (pt. G)		219,649		245,024	245,024
Work-study (pt. H)		23,993	276,038	31,050	31,050
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	289,178	314,106	344,873	344,873	344,873
Special projects and teacher education	933,162				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,862,496	2,967,800	3,083,630	3,407,223	3,406,865
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	954,594	1,332,197	1,422,810	1,327,418	1,422,810
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,288,791	972,393	1,047,147	1,036,676	1,140,343
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,040,703	1,007,149	936,027	1,222,038	1,298,931
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	59,250				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	113,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	169,625	172,614		151,466	172,614
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	159,660				
Language training and area studies	99,838				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		307,654			338,305
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,361,848	156,457			156,457
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	80,506	62,013	57,006	57,006	57,006
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	73,684				85,535
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	568,300				
Subtotal, higher education	6,319,799	3,060,477	2,512,990	2,844,604	3,722,001
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	142,814	157,834	154,944	154,944	154,944
Personnel development programs	183,920				
Teacher Corps	456,756				
Subtotal, education professions development	783,490	157,834	154,944	154,944	154,944
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	255,312	227,858	227,858	255,312	255,312
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,842
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073
Construction (LSCA II)	132,985	98,654		83,974	105,859
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,710				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	8,380				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,677	121,677		121,084	121,084
Subtotal, community education	820,488	553,613	333,282	565,794	587,679
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	862,244				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	862,244				
Civil rights education	367,646				
Total, Office of Education	35,721,788	29,033,563	18,933,951	30,185,446	35,923,727
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ^a	30,562,527	29,033,563	18,933,951	30,185,446	35,923,727

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$120,389,680	\$178,348,472	\$175,753,809	\$200,378,257	\$197,052,746
State administrative expenses	1,204,063	1,783,485	1,757,538	2,003,783	1,970,527
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					1,130,256
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					2,070,481
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	13,221,927	8,869,461	9,235,315	10,692,091	11,804,049
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	16,738,842	16,997,000		14,386,000	22,113,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	98,325	1,688,000		3,481,301	3,481,301
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,090,893	3,465,109	6,522,557	6,522,557	6,522,557
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,474,535	1,474,815	1,477,979	1,477,979	1,722,759
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	4,198,623	1,928,151		970,773	4,263,134
Loans to nonprofit private schools	151,200				
State administration	156,767	153,851		154,869	154,869
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,402,273	1,165,991			1,635,759
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	163,127,128	215,974,335	194,847,198	240,167,610	254,021,438
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,546,976	2,706,577	2,621,564
Teacher education and recruitment	2,533,652				
Research and innovation	2,538,892				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	7,403,875	2,331,331	2,546,976	2,706,577	2,621,564
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	17,023,218	20,730,525	20,730,525	24,099,228	21,494,901
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		1,145,363	1,145,363	1,347,641	1,347,641
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	872,939	52,134			2,344,682
Innovation (pt. D)		397,076	1,348,923	952,320	635,037
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		1,010,377	1,010,377	1,179,005	1,684,886
Cooperative education (pt. G)		476,396		833,339	833,339
Work-study (pt. H)		339,615	1,269,603	439,501	439,501
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	2,946,251	3,299,893	3,759,700	3,759,700	3,759,700
Special projects and teacher education	536,318				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	21,378,726	27,544,582	29,357,694	32,703,937	32,632,890
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	12,047,255	15,023,882	16,394,237	14,951,609	16,394,237
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	9,537,189	10,320,156	11,411,374	11,297,260	12,426,987
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	14,717,179	14,852,696	14,155,701	18,481,112	19,643,969
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	9,779,625				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	312,236				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	544,335	549,067		175,867	549,067
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	135,000				
Language training and area studies	2,357,698				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,110,882	2,623,120			2,938,723
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	9,896,878	2,360,852			2,360,852
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	497,178	347,369	275,587	275,587	275,587
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	1,170,283				1,153,771
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	8,008,950				
Subtotal, higher education	76,864,688	36,127,142	32,286,899	35,231,433	45,793,193
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	892,515	931,283	889,739	889,739	889,739
Personnel development programs	4,332,101				
Teacher Corps	1,174,556				
Subtotal, education professions development	6,399,172	931,283	889,739	889,739	889,739
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	2,840,719	2,356,249	2,356,249	2,840,719	2,840,719
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292
Construction (LSCA II)	2,521,607	409,187		150,133	536,326
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,018,364				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	656,562				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	493,850	493,850		485,753	485,753
Subtotal, community education	8,651,761	3,379,945	2,476,908	3,597,264	3,983,457
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	3,644,494				
Research and development centers	495,973				
Subtotal, research and development	4,140,467				
Civil rights education:					
	213,880				
Total, Office of Education	288,179,697	286,288,618	262,405,414	315,296,560	339,942,281
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	245,571,113	285,288,618	262,405,414	315,296,560	339,942,281

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$49,388,344	\$57,588,036	\$56,749,453	\$64,700,485	\$63,626,704
State administrative expenses	493,970	575,880	567,495	647,005	636,267
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					763,767
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	4,019,265	2,787,844	2,890,573	3,323,753	3,654,260
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	11,886,349	11,995,000		10,562,000	13,939,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,391,665	60,000		758,714	758,714
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,186,993	993,278	1,869,699	1,869,699	1,869,699
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,110,464	669,081	659,015	659,015	750,148
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	2,543,076	1,130,562		569,208	2,499,669
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	48,734	48,642		48,470	48,470
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	435,921	368,639			511,950
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	72,504,781	76,316,962	62,836,235	83,238,349	89,158,648
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	805,195	805,195	879,674	934,798	905,436
Teacher education and recruitment	456,656				
Research and innovation	135,931				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,397,782	805,195	879,674	934,798	905,436
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	8,971,685	10,190,085	10,190,085	11,847,550	10,567,223
State advisory councils		63,317	63,317	63,317	63,317
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		563,004	563,004	662,519	662,519
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	457,975	25,626	590,494	455,697	1,147,766
Innovation (pt. D)		266,982			347,860
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		496,651	496,651	579,617	828,316
Cooperative education (pt. G)		293,941		415,258	415,258
Work-study (pt. H)		118,212	563,534	152,980	152,980
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,495,891	1,677,851	1,904,580	1,904,580	1,904,580
Special projects and teacher education	415,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	11,340,551	13,695,669	14,371,665	16,081,518	16,089,819
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,329,263	1,437,343	1,829,403	1,416,665	1,829,403
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	4,815,571	5,388,943	5,517,832	5,462,654	6,008,921
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	4,519,639	4,465,664	4,049,973	5,287,482	5,620,177
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	164,526				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	254,954	258,341		157,022	258,341
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	2,854,457				
Language training and area studies	127,573				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,664,358	1,368,374			1,270,865
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,212,504	649,949			649,949
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	400,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	217,104	139,376	126,689	126,689	126,689
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	364,447				359,358
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,291,206				
Subtotal, higher education	26,315,602	13,757,990	11,573,897	12,500,512	16,173,703
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	337,952	338,289	326,380	326,380	326,380
Personnel development programs	809,378				
Teacher Corps	665,659				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,812,989	338,289	326,380	326,380	326,380
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	844,066	712,539	712,539	844,066	844,066
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351
Construction (LSCA II)	388,584	169,369		99,040	203,886
College library resources (HEA II-A)	678,984				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	301,099				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,608	207,608		208,836	208,836
Subtotal, community education	2,529,234	1,198,409	821,432	1,260,835	1,365,681
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	820,000				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	820,000				
Civil rights education:					
	731,116				
Total, Office of Education	117,452,055	106,112,514	90,809,283	114,342,392	124,019,667
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	110,006,832	106,112,514	90,809,283	114,342,392	124,019,667

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$4,033,993	\$4,703,614	\$4,718,350	\$5,294,981	\$5,204,615
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					216,115
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					34,149
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	815,806	653,528	659,387	710,722	749,732
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,664,431	2,651,000		3,242,000	3,768,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		1,000		400,000	400,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	162,589	136,301	256,567	256,567	256,567
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	273,216	273,216	272,292	272,292	310,381
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	329,954	146,026		73,520	322,863
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	88,341	50,000			66,106
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	8,531,663	8,878,018	6,156,596	10,513,415	11,591,861
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	109,151	109,151	119,247	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	177,879				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	287,030	109,151	119,247	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,313,021	1,207,190	1,207,190	1,403,584	1,251,903
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		66,697	66,697	78,490	78,490
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	45,834	15,000			135,976
Innovation (pt. D)		208,539	249,784	232,599	218,851
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		58,837	58,837	68,667	98,130
Cooperative education (pt. G)		211,977		227,443	227,443
Work-study (pt. H)		14,630	246,347	18,933	18,933
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	168,753	177,469	188,601	188,601	188,601
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,527,608	1,991,407	20,84,534	2,249,385	2,249,395
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	893,715	1,283,305	1,360,581	1,279,229	1,360,581
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	753,069	700,121	718,959	711,769	782,947
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	946,751	926,540	798,263	1,042,179	1,107,755
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	175,900				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	162,084	165,039		150,975	165,039
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	405,000				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	77,204	200,784			202,370
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	919,319	109,575			109,575
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	253,165				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	72,802	58,948	54,101	54,101	54,101
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	71,130				68,041
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	269,200				
Subtotal, higher education	5,097,339	2,494,312	1,981,904	2,288,253	2,900,409
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	131,498	132,699	131,065	131,065	131,065
Personnel development programs					
Teacher Corps	29,604				
Subtotal, education professions development	161,102	132,699	131,065	131,065	131,065
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	203,285	185,027	185,027	203,285	203,285
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
Construction (LSCA II)	256,991	92,405		82,643	97,197
College library resources (HEA II-A)	133,911				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	113,911	113,911		113,236	113,236
Subtotal, community education	813,216	496,461	290,145	504,282	518,836
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education:					
Total, Office of Education	16,417,958	14,102,048	10,727,481	15,886,400	17,591,566
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	14,854,169	14,102,048	10,727,481	15,886,400	17,591,566

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A:					
Basic grants	\$33,370,827	\$40,363,720	\$39,755,953	\$45,348,867	\$44,596,250
State administrative expenses	333,804	403,637	397,760	453,489	445,963
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					408,849
Supplementary services (ESEA III)					7,371,387
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,796,237	10,686,000		7,675,000	14,032,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	601,890				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,661,889	2,234,209	4,205,569	4,205,569	4,205,569
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	669,081	1,110,464	1,098,447	1,098,447	1,254,063
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	4,089,849	1,870,951		941,974	4,136,666
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	101,489	101,499		101,420	101,420
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	905,668	769,226			1,071,225
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,654,966	63,210,100	51,342,145	66,609,224	77,723,392
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,660,513	1,764,567	1,709,142
Teacher education and recruitment	902,441				
Research and innovation	110,492				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,532,856	1,519,923	1,660,513	1,764,567	1,709,142
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	12,376,685	15,503,686	15,503,686	18,024,291	16,076,464
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		856,581	856,581	1,007,925	1,007,925
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	2,239,722	38,989	959,985	697,641	1,746,155
Innovation (pt. D)		330,360			487,767
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		755,628	755,628	881,801	1,260,161
Cooperation education (pt. G)		382,829		618,938	618,938
Work-study (pt. H)		222,768	907,517	288,289	288,289
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,208,203	1,351,381	1,531,199	1,531,199	1,531,199
Special projects and teacher education	100,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	15,924,610	19,535,425	20,607,799	23,143,287	23,110,101
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,825,477	12,875,956	13,660,424	12,834,582	13,660,424
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	4,369,310	6,842,259	7,071,655	7,000,938	7,701,032
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	9,263,289	9,149,205	8,103,528	10,579,639	11,245,324
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	353,134				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	139,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	376,856	380,809		164,960	380,809
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	928,455				
Language training and area studies	228,989				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,062,019	2,208,535			2,215,139
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,474,954	1,394,980			1,394,880
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,200,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	130,405	216,768	161,361	161,361	161,361
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	681,179				665,433
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,814,700				
Subtotal, higher education	39,897,767	23,118,512	19,046,968	20,791,480	27,474,502
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	615,679	635,989	609,202	609,202	609,202
Personnel development programs	1,529,997				
Teacher Corps	729,250				
Subtotal, education professions development	2,874,926	635,989	609,202	609,202	609,202
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,685,152	1,404,949	1,404,949	1,685,152	1,685,152
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	38,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747
Construction (LSCA II)	1,080,285	270,292		120,563	343,925
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,016,270				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	302,349				
Educational broadcasting facilities	131,687				
University community service programs (HEA I)	324,216	324,216		325,054	325,054
Subtotal, community education	4,653,808	2,113,406	1,518,798	2,244,618	2,467,980
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	156,630				
Total, Office of Education	127,695,563	110,133,355	94,785,425	115,162,378	133,094,319
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	116,370,990	110,133,355	94,785,425	115,162,378	133,094,319

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$16,791,317	\$18,736,899	\$18,464,057	\$21,051,013	\$20,701,647
State administrative expenses	167,913	187,368	184,641	210,510	207,016
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					241,975
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					1,885,340
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,108,726	1,496,021	1,543,476	1,737,442	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,601,770	12,559,000		10,113,000	16,448,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	194,246	11,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	596,823	507,271	954,862	954,862	954,862
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	441,825	441,825	440,485	440,485	501,147
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,034,408	466,563		234,902	1,031,570
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	22,411	22,483		22,546	22,546
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	200,465	170,393			238,134
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	34,159,904	34,698,823	21,687,521	34,864,760	42,332,237
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	366,917	366,917	400,857	425,976	412,596
Teacher education and recruitment	380,135				
Research and innovation	100,000				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	847,052	366,917	400,857	425,976	412,596
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,795,552	4,541,401	4,541,401	5,279,822	4,709,249
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		250,912	250,912	295,249	295,249
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	253,116	15,000		316,133	511,498
Innovation (pt. D)		230,422	377,356		267,155
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		221,341	221,341	258,304	369,136
Cooperation education (pt. G)		242,666		297,767	297,767
Work-study (pt. H)		52,864	365,111	68,412	68,412
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	482,882	531,447	593,444	593,444	593,444
Special projects and teacher education	145,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,676,550	6,117,121	6,380,633	7,140,199	7,142,978
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,349,126	1,949,548	1,120,854	1,935,888	1,120,854
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,264,220	2,356,494	2,418,706	2,394,519	2,633,971
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,259,838	3,217,015	2,675,524	3,493,056	3,712,844
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds	81,295				
Interest payments	91,808				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	202,223	205,364		153,588	205,384
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	906,400				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,278,671	652,830			649,879
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,937,759	385,280			385,280
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	163,842	97,138	85,038	85,038	85,038
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	243,359				237,320
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	777,463				
Subtotal, higher education	13,606,004	7,953,669	6,437,882	7,112,089	9,168,250
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,917	221,695	215,613	215,613	215,613
Personnel development programs	552,463				
Teacher Corps	134,527				
Subtotal, education professions development	827,907	221,695	215,613	215,613	215,613
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	480,232	413,019	413,019	480,232	480,232
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179
Construction (LSCA II)	485,060	125,669		89,730	146,308
College library resources (HEA II-A)	395,613				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	181,146				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	153,588	153,588		153,920	153,920
Subtotal, community education	1,802,388	799,025	519,678	830,631	887,209
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	55,919,805	50,157,250	35,642,214	50,589,268	60,158,883
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	51,930,596	50,157,250	35,642,214	50,589,268	60,158,883

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$8,093,651	\$8,256,688	\$8,998,583	\$9,032,085	\$8,998,583
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					167,630
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					32,994
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,723,109	1,267,496	1,300,528	1,455,299	1,573,274
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,282,405	3,301,000		2,767,000	4,294,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	485,416	426,653	803,112	803,112	803,112
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	392,527	392,527	398,278	398,278	452,608
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	745,867	338,665		170,509	748,788
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	18,609	18,340		18,172	18,172
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	166,454	138,990			191,937
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	15,057,948	14,390,359	11,750,501	14,894,455	17,531,098
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	279,058	279,058	304,870	323,975	313,799
Teacher education and recruitment	994,455				
Research and innovation	613,213				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,886,726	279,058	304,870	323,975	313,799
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,577,575	3,138,872	3,138,872	3,649,238	3,254,877
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		173,422	173,422	204,067	204,067
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	253,116	15,000			353,530
Innovation (pt. D)		224,951	345,463	295,250	255,079
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		152,985	152,985	178,531	255,134
Cooperative education (pt. G)		234,994		280,186	280,186
Work-study (pt. H)		42,525	335,420	55,032	55,032
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	225,639	241,935	262,331	262,331	262,331
Special projects and teacher education	43,742				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,099,802	4,255,752	4,439,561	4,955,703	4,951,304
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,901,186	1,834,098	1,061,613	1,822,099	1,061,613
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,422,079	1,536,246	1,634,421	1,618,077	1,779,884
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,539,560	2,486,567	2,350,223	3,068,356	3,261,421
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	348,206				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	68,620				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	188,978	192,058		152,726	192,058
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	106,950				
Language training and area studies	120,593				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	978,887	502,615			512,143
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,651,456	342,465			342,465
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	86,876	89,263	78,838	78,838	78,838
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	198,461				195,573
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,321,922				
Subtotal, higher education	13,483,774	6,033,312	5,175,095	5,790,096	7,473,995
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	203,938	202,355	197,239	197,239	197,239
Personnel development programs	1,309,266				
Teacher Corps	386,867				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,900,071	202,355	197,239	197,239	197,239
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	375,683	337,786	337,786	388,844	388,844
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136
Construction (LSCA II)	387,922	114,693		87,391	128,092
College library resources (HEA II-A)	323,389				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	228,958				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,684	142,684		142,508	142,508
Subtotal, community education	1,564,847	701,374	443,997	724,954	765,655
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	1,763,473				
Research and development centers	518,759				
Subtotal, research and development	2,282,232				
Civil rights education:					
	207,597				
Total, Office of Education	39,482,997	25,862,210	22,311,263	26,886,422	31,233,090
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	30,428,796	25,862,210	22,311,263	26,886,422	31,233,090

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$46,085,501	\$56,549,804	\$55,726,371	\$63,534,060	\$62,479,639
State administrative expenses	460,885	565,498	557,264	635,341	624,796
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					21,405
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					551,393
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,692,138	5,928,233	6,129,230	7,084,901	7,814,299
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,290,582	8,759,000		6,037,000	11,401,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,767,349	2,338,965	4,402,757	4,402,757	4,404,757
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,071,500	1,071,500	1,070,926	1,070,926	1,239,960
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	3,992,360	1,796,266		904,372	3,971,538
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	104,487	103,732		103,199	103,199
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	934,630	786,156			1,090,005
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	73,399,432	77,999,154	67,986,548	83,872,556	93,799,991
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,826,756	1,941,227	1,880,253
Teacher education and recruitment	1,387,240				
Research and innovation	592,755				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,652,085	1,672,090	1,826,756	1,941,227	1,880,253
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	14,044,897	17,080,756	17,080,756	19,856,954	17,711,078
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		943,714	943,714	1,110,411	1,110,411
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	753,769	42,956			1,923,700
Innovation (pt. D)		336,098	993,434	719,544	500,432
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		832,492	832,492	971,461	1,388,290
Cooperative education (pt. G)		390,876		637,377	637,377
Work-study (pt. H)		233,107	938,656	301,668	301,668
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,758,365	1,967,553	2,235,911	2,235,911	2,235,911
Special projects and teacher education	445,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	17,002,031	21,920,755	23,118,166	25,926,529	25,902,070
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,920,537	13,022,911	13,847,465	12,979,424	13,847,465
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	5,302,145	7,898,003	8,141,348	8,059,934	8,865,927
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	9,314,508	9,471,840	8,517,601	11,120,236	11,819,936
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	1,819,562				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	90,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	415,033	419,164		167,446	419,164
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	636,445				
Language training and area studies	927,017				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,381,842	2,754,310			2,697,489
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,313,779	1,517,897			1,517,897
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,648,829				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	443,361	256,687	200,561	200,561	200,561
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	738,408				721,473
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	3,701,000				
Subtotal, higher education	44,702,466	25,390,812	20,756,975	22,577,601	30,139,912
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	719,912	661,121	633,078	633,078	633,078
Personnel development programs	2,324,878				
Teacher Corps	1,208,432				
Subtotal, education professions development	4,253,222	661,121	633,078	633,078	633,078
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,948,566	1,621,800	1,621,800	1,948,566	1,948,566
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872
Construction (LSCA II)	1,274,143	302,031		127,303	387,784
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,322,250				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	245,608				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	350,978	350,978		349,235	349,235
Subtotal, community education	5,256,947	2,390,211	1,737,202	2,540,506	2,800,987
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	2,700,000				
Research and development centers	1,454,332				
Subtotal, research and development	4,154,332				
Civil rights education	30,538				
Total, Office of Education	152,451,053	130,034,143	116,058,725	137,491,497	155,156,291
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	131,178,759	130,034,143	116,058,725	137,491,497	155,156,291

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A:					
Basic grants	\$3,427,736	\$4,261,172	\$4,189,876	\$4,797,926	\$4,715,809
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					46,320
Supplementary services (ESEA III):	950,666	751,529	766,512	835,130	887,333
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,453,728	3,443,000		3,065,000	4,532,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	125,400				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	210,946	179,825	338,494	338,494	338,494
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	280,536	280,536	281,321	281,321	322,752
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	281,708	125,274		63,072	276,980
Loans to nonprofit private schools	43,800				
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	69,988	58,982			81,882
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	9,007,841	9,363,651	5,826,203	9,644,276	11,464,903
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	127,696	127,696	139,507	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	160,366				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	288,062	127,696	139,507	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,125,087	1,294,166	1,294,166	1,504,552	1,341,961
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		71,503	71,503	84,135	84,135
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	124,574	15,000	259,896	239,220	145,758
Innovation (pt. D)		210,274			222,680
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		63,076	63,076	73,606	105,190
Cooperation education (pt. G)		214,409	255,761	233,018	233,018
Work-study (pt. H)		18,141		23,477	23,477
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	228,181	244,389	265,137	265,137	265,137
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,477,842	2,162,026	2,240,607	2,454,213	2,452,424
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	820,489	1,317,502	1,404,106	1,312,934	1,404,106
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	548,835	669,589	665,251	658,598	724,458
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,074,064	1,068,572	894,619	1,167,979	1,241,470
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	351,741				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to long-grant colleges:					
Annual	167,458	170,438		151,235	170,438
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	37,000				
Language training and area studies	46,837				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	366,701	189,606			180,445
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	643,900	134,700			134,700
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	64,566	61,106	56,117	56,117	56,117
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	75,611				78,250
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	931,289				
Subtotal, higher education	5,820,491	2,661,513	2,070,093	2,396,863	3,039,984
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,866	143,140	140,984	140,984	140,984
Personnel development programs					
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	140,866	143,140	140,984	140,984	140,984
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	240,363	215,551	215,551	240,363	240,363
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066
Construction (LSCA II)	122,211	96,859		83,592	103,370
College library resources (HEA II-A)	130,256				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	119,427	119,427		119,260	119,260
Subtotal, community education	717,593	537,173	320,887	548,551	568,329
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	75,073				
Total, Office of Education	17,527,768	14,995,199	10,738,281	15,384,887	17,866,624
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ^a	15,077,595	14,995,199	10,738,281	15,384,887	17,866,624

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$29,997,874	\$34,304,985	\$33,805,445	\$38,541,845	\$37,902,198
State administrative expenses	300,015	343,050	338,054	385,418	379,022
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					54,484
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					536,594
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,876,411	1,634,142	1,680,942	1,897,085	2,061,914
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,148,582	8,485,000		7,414,000	10,767,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,090,261	559,000		251,030	251,030
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	647,442	542,285	1,020,771	1,020,771	1,020,771
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	462,194	462,194	456,998	456,998	519,515
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,435,659	658,416		331,495	1,455,756
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	26,798	26,879		26,671	26,671
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	239,707	203,707			281,704
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,224,943	47,319,658	37,402,210	50,425,313	55,356,659
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	448,822	448,822	490,338	521,064	504,698
Teacher education and recruitment	183,963				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	632,785	448,822	490,338	521,064	504,698
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,705,545	5,581,203	5,581,203	6,489,335	5,788,053
State advisory councils		34,679	34,679	34,679	34,679
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		308,362	308,362	362,886	362,886
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	41,942	15,000			628,673
Innovation (pt. D)		237,360	417,805	342,620	282,471
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		272,021	272,021	317,476	453,698
Cooperation education (pt. G)		252,397		320,064	320,064
Work-study (pt. H)		66,128	402,768	85,578	85,578
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	938,021	1,056,859	1,194,355	1,194,355	1,194,355
Special projects and teacher education	120,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	5,805,508	7,824,009	8,211,193	9,146,993	9,150,457
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,318,847	1,556,431	1,708,208	1,548,426	1,708,208
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,318,936	2,923,329	3,024,746	2,994,499	3,293,948
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,755,247	1,785,215	1,567,846	2,046,917	2,175,711
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	58,412				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	29,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	203,508	206,656		153,672	206,656
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	1,322,163				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,352,252	758,609			750,494
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,552,012	294,365			294,365
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,260	88,808	81,417	81,417	81,417
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	145,939				142,229
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	535,600				
Subtotal, higher education	9,731,176	6,663,413	5,432,217	5,874,931	7,703,028
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	225,427	230,095	223,593	223,593	223,593
Personnel development programs	204,116				
Teacher Corps	389,168				
Subtotal, education professions development	818,711	230,095	223,593	223,593	223,593
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	489,102	420,321	420,321	489,102	489,102
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183
Construction (LSCA II)	191,554	126,735		89,957	144,785
College library resources (HEA II-A)	330,491				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	68,841				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	156,011	156,011		156,614	156,614
Subtotal, community education	1,342,800	809,868	527,122	842,474	897,302
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	363,946				
Total, Office of Education	63,919,869	63,295,865	52,286,673	67,034,368	73,835,737
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis *	60,168,230	63,295,865	52,286,673	67,034,368	73,835,737

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A:					
Basic grants	\$5,384,852	\$6,138,638	\$6,039,975	\$6,907,237	\$6,790,114
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					71,500
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					65,130
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	209,789	670,038	679,400	733,964	775,438
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,425,076	3,410,000		3,665,000	4,667,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	192,626	24,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	181,001	150,552	283,393	283,393	283,393
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	280,643	280,643	279,034	279,034	317,606
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	351,316	151,605		76,329	335,198
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	92,268	50,790			70,238
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	10,280,904	11,139,599	7,531,802	12,208,290	13,638,950
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,577	113,577	124,083	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	156,012				
Research and innovation	7,853				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	277,442	113,577	124,083	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,314,560	1,228,372	1,228,372	1,428,191	1,273,851
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		67,867	67,867	79,865	79,865
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	105,000	15,000			138,360
Innovation (pt. D)		208,940	252,118	234,127	219,734
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		59,870	59,870	69,871	99,851
Cooperation education (pt. G)		212,538		228,730	228,730
Work-study (pt. H)		15,215	248,520	19,690	19,690
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	157,733	165,279	174,659	174,659	174,659
Special projects and teacher education	50,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,627,293	2,004,149	2,062,474	2,266,201	2,265,808
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	931,287	279,677	355,964	275,654	355,964
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	835,548	764,132	665,251	804,128	884,540
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	929,478	905,666	788,041	1,028,835	1,093,570
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	68,059				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	163,222	166,182		151,049	166,182
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	109,300				
Language training and area studies	6,477				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		219,374			239,042
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	978,247	113,427			113,427
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	81,037	61,447	56,097	56,097	56,097
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	70,545				68,340
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	222,400				
Subtotal, higher education	4,487,600	2,559,905	1,915,353	2,365,763	3,027,162
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,859	136,118	134,313	134,313	134,313
Personnel development programs	184,482				
Teacher Corps	33,037				
Subtotal, education professions development	370,378	136,118	134,313	134,313	134,313
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	211,135	191,490	191,490	211,135	211,135
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
Construction (LSCA II)	264,000	93,348		82,844	98,504
College library resources (HEA II-A)	122,741				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	36,290				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	114,690	114,690		114,106	114,106
Subtotal, community education	854,019	504,691	296,653	513,248	528,908
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	17,897,636	16,458,039	12,064,678	17,687,815	19,795,141
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis	16,788,440	16,458,039	12,064,678	17,687,815	19,795,141

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$32,040,454	\$36,662,972	\$36,129,096	\$41,191,057	\$40,507,444
State administrative expenses	320,413	366,630	361,291	411,911	405,074
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					525,807
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					2,819,295
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,110,281	2,179,882	2,240,639	2,568,848	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	6,763,256	6,741,000		4,789,000	8,776,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	53,590				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	887,491	748,560	1,409,054	1,409,054	1,409,054
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	548,312	548,312	543,785	543,785	621,042
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,880,219	837,746		421,783	1,852,253
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	36,486	36,499		36,095	36,095
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	326,367	276,616			381,239
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,966,869	48,498,217	40,783,865	51,471,533	57,433,303
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	592,555	592,555	647,365	687,932	666,324
Teacher education and recruitment	755,630				
Research and innovation	377,353				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,724,971	592,555	647,365	687,932	666,324
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,544,967	7,399,834	7,399,834	8,603,098	7,673,389
State advisory councils		45,979	45,979	45,979	45,979
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		408,841	408,841	481,089	481,089
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		18,609	483,925	385,915	833,450
Innovation (pt. D)		248,702			307,507
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		360,657	360,657	420,889	601,482
Cooperative education (pt. G)		268,304		356,512	356,512
Work-study (pt. H)		84,660	464,323	109,560	109,560
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,111,779	1,243,389	1,407,690	1,407,690	1,407,690
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,656,746	10,078,975	10,571,249	11,810,732	11,816,658
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,802,933	1,127,246	1,434,723	1,111,030	1,434,723
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,740,853	3,977,080	4,018,617	3,978,431	4,376,275
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,915,617	3,853,342	3,176,221	4,146,745	4,407,664
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	203,720				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	95,774				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to long-grant colleges:					
Annual	231,544	234,822		155,498	234,822
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,690,064				
Language training and area studies	103,774				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,972,230	493,293			960,522
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,385,730	580,969			580,969
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	139,223	116,041	100,888	100,888	100,888
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	293,417				288,968
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,784,787				
Subtotal, higher education	20,609,666	10,432,793	8,780,449	9,542,592	12,434,831
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	271,931	279,580	270,606	270,606	270,606
Personnel development programs	808,592				
Teacher Corps	892,463				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,972,986	279,580	270,606	270,606	270,606
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	682,542	579,567	579,567	682,542	682,542
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275
Construction (LSCA II)	225,972	149,969		94,907	176,992
College library resources (HEA II-A)	408,431				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	280,418				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	183,638	183,638		183,828	183,828
Subtotal, community education	1,888,943	1,021,116	687,509	1,069,219	1,151,304
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	376,697				
Total, Office of Education	80,196,878	70,903,236	61,741,043	74,852,614	83,773,026
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	71,926,325	79,003,236	61,741,043	74,852,614	83,773,026

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants.....	\$73,314,190	\$74,853,133	\$81,555,130	\$82,194,584	\$81,555,130
State administrative expenses.....	734,549	748,531	815,551	821,946	815,551
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....					881,811
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....					7,729,359
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	8,478,686	5,817,974	6,063,103	7,008,106	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	30,311,176	30,111,000		23,737,000	39,629,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	4,876,004	309,000		150,218	150,218
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,723,308	2,328,984	4,383,968	4,383,968	4,383,968
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	1,214,477	1,214,477	1,216,664	1,216,664	1,377,024
Grants for special projects.....					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	4,554,006	2,326,392		1,171,277	5,143,645
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	4,800				
State administration.....	106,791	107,263		107,680	107,680
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	955,233	812,916			1,137,331
Planning and evaluation.....		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	127,273,220	118,729,670	94,134,416	120,891,443	143,010,717
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,746,815	1,856,276	1,797,971
Teacher education and recruitment.....	1,448,263				
Research and innovation.....	529,938				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	3,577,118	1,598,917	1,746,815	1,856,276	1,797,971
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B).....	15,296,068	19,648,794	19,648,794	22,844,332	20,375,619
State advisory councils.....		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B).....		1,085,598	1,085,598	1,277,466	1,277,466
Research and special project activities (pt. C).....	425,455	49,414	1,009,769	730,241	2,213,110
Innovation (pt. D).....		338,900			506,617
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F).....		957,654	957,654	1,117,612	1,597,152
Cooperative education (pt. G).....		394,806		646,382	646,382
Work-study (pt. H).....		240,910	953,864	311,766	311,766
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	2,505,509	2,823,537	3,214,895	3,214,895	3,214,895
Special projects and teacher education.....	283,905				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	18,510,937	25,632,816	26,963,777	30,235,897	30,236,210
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	7,466,566	13,254,435	14,142,141	13,207,617	14,142,141
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C).....	8,341,028	9,160,666	9,466,983	9,372,313	10,309,545
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II).....	7,524,662	10,372,986	9,169,962	11,971,932	12,725,222
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds.....					
Interest payments.....	1,107,488				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search.....	189,200				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual.....	373,876	377,795		164,765	377,795
Permanent.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	1,850,462				
Language training and area studies.....	425,414				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103).....	4,437,818	2,284,545			2,278,572
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104).....	7,246,734	1,488,272			1,488,272
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	2,800,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105).....	252,014	229,549	184,718	184,718	184,718
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A).....	818,531				815,324
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E).....	2,487,200				
Subtotal, higher education.....	45,370,993	27,218,248	23,013,804	24,951,345	32,371,589
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	627,577	658,726	630,803	630,803	630,803
Personnel development programs.....	1,632,485				
Teacher Corps.....	1,121,647				
Subtotal, education professions development.....	3,381,709	658,726	630,803	630,803	630,803
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I).....	1,664,458	1,387,913	1,387,913	1,664,458	1,664,458
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737
Construction (LSCA II).....	1,622,353	267,906		120,033	340,480
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	971,864				
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	374,104				
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	200,000				
University community service programs (HEA I).....	332,502	332,502		333,603	333,603
Subtotal, community education.....	5,279,008	2,102,048	1,501,640	2,231,821	2,452,268
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	1,709,715				
Research and development centers.....	820,000				
Subtotal, research and development.....	2,529,715				
Civil rights education.....	809,808				
Total, Office of Education.....	206,732,508	175,940,425	147,991,255	180,797,585	210,499,558
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	187,152,484	175,940,425	147,991,255	180,797,585	210,499,558

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$3,013,832	\$3,507,573	\$3,447,224	\$3,951,222	\$3,883,158
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					238,702
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					26,004
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,088,519	866,965	886,432	974,396	1,041,369
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	7,069,317	7,047,000		5,280,000	9,202,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,235,518	773,000		50,000	50,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	296,752	250,725	471,954	471,954	471,954
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	329,967	329,967	328,529	328,529	371,408
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	562,511	266,267		134,058	588,715
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396	85,470			118,691
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,860,145	13,390,300	5,384,139	11,453,492	16,255,334
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	165,614	165,614	180,933	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	443,578				
Research and innovation	3,537				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	612,729	165,614	180,933	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,478,438	1,926,493	1,926,493	2,239,910	1,997,851
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		106,439	106,439	125,257	125,257
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000			216,998
Innovation (pt. D)		214,010	281,677	253,482	230,927
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		93,895	93,895	109,583	156,603
Cooperative education (pt. G)		219,649		245,024	245,024
Work-study (pt. H)		23,993	276,038	31,050	31,050
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	146,169	152,742	160,321	160,321	160,321
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,624,607	2,783,289	2,875,931	3,195,695	3,195,099
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,253,811	1,629,481	1,801,184	1,620,426	1,801,184
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,102,791	1,081,711	1,027,389	1,017,115	1,118,826
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,047,412	2,268,497	1,773,678	2,315,643	2,461,346
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	178,722				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	168,195	171,178		151,373	171,178
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,600				
Language training and area studies	94,501				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		313,134			305,928
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,830,753	224,368			224,368
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	54,045	67,778	63,154	63,154	63,154
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	189,561				156,304
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	986,775				
Subtotal, higher education	7,124,166	4,806,147	3,715,405	4,217,711	5,352,289
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	178,237	160,149	157,143	157,143	157,143
Personnel development programs	513,069				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	691,306	160,149	157,143	157,143	157,143
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	245,448	219,738	219,738	245,448	245,448
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069
Construction (LSCA II)	243,914	97,470		83,722	104,217
College library resources (HEA II-A)	227,431				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	16,303				
Educational broadcasting facilities	59,310				
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,786	121,786		121,869	121,869
Subtotal, community education	1,019,558	544,360	325,104	556,405	576,900
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	24,932,511	21,849,859	12,638,655	19,780,446	25,736,765
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	22,052,124	21,849,859	12,638,655	19,780,446	25,736,765

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$1,632,466	\$2,018,201	\$1,979,533	\$2,277,896	\$2,237,603
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					50,580
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					415
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	637,800	543,728	554,362	588,753	614,828
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	136,062	136,000		91,000	176,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	104,377	94,392	177,680	177,680	177,680
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	251,499	251,499	254,064	254,064	289,858
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	187,862	82,130		41,350	181,590
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000			50,000
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	3,163,399	3,439,283	3,215,639	3,694,076	4,041,887
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	72,260				
Research and innovation	43,867				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	216,127	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	738,026	718,373	718,373	835,183	744,927
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		39,691	39,691	46,704	46,704
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000			80,911
Innovation (pt. D)		205,204	230,337	219,865	211,487
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		35,012	35,012	40,858	58,392
Cooperation education (pt. G)		207,298		216,723	216,723
Work-study (pt. H)		8,973	228,243	11,612	11,612
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	131,267	135,709	140,840	140,840	140,840
Special projects and teacher education	30,680				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	899,973	1,396,328	1,423,564	1,542,853	1,542,664
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	572,834	190,591	242,578	187,849	242,578
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	419,455	377,681	418,789	414,601	456,061
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	589,299	597,750	537,025	701,119	745,234
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	84,397				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	15,700				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	156,343	159,271		150,601	159,271
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)					
Language training and area studies	72,165				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	208,229	112,256			133,742
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	351,138	76,355			76,355
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	58,174	56,723	50,642	50,642	50,642
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	43,846				43,533
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	148,400				
Subtotal, higher education	3,569,980	1,620,627	1,299,034	1,554,812	1,957,416
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	120,221	122,645	121,513	121,513	121,513
Personnel development programs	144,578				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	264,799	122,645	121,513	121,513	121,513
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	153,671	152,416	152,416	163,671	163,671
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030
Construction (LSCA II)	22,344	87,648		81,629	90,601
College library resources (HEA II-A)	112,087				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,510				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	108,892	108,892		109,100	109,100
Subtotal, community education	536,388	453,840	257,300	459,284	468,256
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	8,650,666	7,132,723	6,417,050	7,572,538	8,331,736
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	7,058,176	7,132,723	6,417,050	7,572,538	8,331,736

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$26,959,114	\$31,452,550	\$30,994,548	\$35,337,120	\$34,750,658
State administrative expenses	270,742	314,526	309,945	353,371	347,507
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					356,762
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					3,280,471
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,568,334	2,498,188	2,599,571	2,985,804	
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	35,704,596	35,182,000		26,519,000	44,448,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	3,589,739	635,000		787,600	787,600
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,057,993	909,967	1,712,879	1,712,879	1,712,879
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	604,339	604,339	607,398	607,398	692,328
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,960,992	882,413		444,271	1,951,012
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	42,701	42,696		42,922	42,922
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	381,959	323,583			453,355
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	74,140,509	72,945,262	36,324,341	68,890,365	88,923,494
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	660,289	660,289	721,365	766,569	742,491
Teacher education and recruitment	689,322				
Research and innovation	27,317				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,376,928	660,289	721,365	766,569	742,491
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,874,002	8,325,655	8,325,655	9,679,706	8,633,651
State advisory councils		51,732	51,732	51,732	51,732
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		459,992	459,992	541,293	541,293
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	23,272	20,938		419,533	937,750
Innovation (pt. D)		257,508	535,265		326,947
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		405,780	405,780	473,558	676,752
Cooperation education (pt. G)		280,654		384,813	384,813
Work-study (pt. H)		102,996	512,118	133,289	133,289
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	1,132,973	1,272,206	1,440,646	1,440,646	1,440,646
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,030,247	11,177,461	11,731,188	13,124,570	13,126,873
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,335,930	1,042,262	1,326,557	1,027,268	1,326,557
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,032,353	3,570,372	3,802,964	3,764,934	4,141,426
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	2,951,774	3,062,674	2,936,761	3,834,117	4,075,365
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	459,026				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	241,008	244,330		156,114	244,330
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,006,475				
Language training and area studies	96,045				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,908,903	987,014			1,019,960
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,551,185	531,957			531,957
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	104,159	115,965	103,412	103,412	103,412
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	267,588				263,491
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,379,700				
Subtotal, higher education	15,424,146	9,604,574	8,219,694	8,935,845	11,756,498
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	319,962	318,302	307,392	307,392	307,392
Personnel development programs	581,689				
Teacher Corps	341,530				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,243,181	318,302	307,392	307,392	307,392
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	747,843	633,325	633,325	747,843	747,843
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305
Construction (LSCA II)	168,885	157,812		96,578	187,865
College library resources (HEA II-A)	420,852				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,597	196,597		197,658	197,658
Subtotal, community education	1,642,503	1,096,060	741,651	1,150,405	1,241,692
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	542,682				
Total, Office of Education	102,400,196	95,801,948	58,045,631	93,175,146	116,098,440
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis*	96,547,970	95,801,948	58,045,631	93,175,146	116,098,440

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$11,517,854	\$12,691,030	\$13,007,855	\$14,276,980	\$14,037,548
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					33,009
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					98,040
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,503,083	1,854,696	1,936,123	2,196,694	2,407,671
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,296,924	12,257,000		10,488,000	16,297,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	530,390	425,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	819,428	701,488	1,320,448	1,320,448	1,320,448
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	513,297	513,297	514,477	514,477	584,013
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,105,278	520,831		262,224	1,151,555
Loans to nonprofit private schools	29,065	30,374		30,689	30,689
State administration	259,983	230,194			324,147
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Planning and evaluation					
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	29,725,302	29,473,910	17,028,903	29,339,512	36,534,120
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	451,985	451,985	493,793	524,736	508,254
Teacher education and recruitment	433,170				
Research and innovation	284,584				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,169,739	451,985	493,793	524,736	508,254
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,724,103	4,779,695	4,779,695	5,556,995	4,956,468
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		264,079	264,079	310,748	310,748
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	47,383	15,000			538,350
Innovation (pt. D)		241,363	441,142	357,901	291,308
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		232,956	232,956	271,864	388,515
Cooperative education (pt. G)		258,011		332,928	332,928
Work-study (pt. H)		72,370	424,493	93,656	93,656
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	305,985	333,131	366,630	366,630	366,630
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,077,471	6,227,673	6,540,063	7,321,790	7,309,671
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,518,068	1,229,052	1,564,298	1,211,371	1,564,298
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,745,963	2,375,723	2,485,067	2,460,216	2,706,239
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	3,908,034	3,924,140	3,463,077	4,521,253	4,805,737
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	250,413				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	53,156				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	212,648	217,847		154,397	217,847
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III)	220,000				
Language training and area studies	453,264				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,372,312	709,565			719,018
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,618,385	525,349			525,349
Graduate facilities (HEFA I)	100,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	178,004	106,412	93,637	93,637	281,549
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	312,641				
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,517,613				
Subtotal, higher education	16,510,501	9,138,088	7,656,079	8,490,874	10,870,037
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	292,833	268,288	259,877	259,877	259,877
Personnel development programs	1,284,423				
Teacher Corps	369,943				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,947,199	268,288	259,877	259,877	259,877
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	565,959	483,592	483,592	565,959	565,959
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,220
Construction (LSCA II)	323,350	135,966		91,924	157,581
College library resources (HEA II-A)	376,750				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	357,552				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	165,768	165,768		169,913	169,913
Subtotal, community education	1,896,634	892,581	590,847	935,051	1,000,708
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education	142,010				
Total, Office of Education	55,468,856	46,452,525	32,569,562	46,871,840	56,482,667
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	49,313,337	46,452,525	32,569,562	46,871,840	56,482,667

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$16,156,287	\$19,517,670	\$19,233,459	\$21,928,214	\$21,564,298
State administrative expenses	161,563	195,177	192,335	219,282	215,643
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					108,495
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					281,788
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,615,010	1,186,348	1,210,809	1,351,106	1,458,031
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	520,634	519,000		353,000	676,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	-8,575				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	420,151	345,700	650,730	650,730	650,730
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	374,730	374,730	368,640	368,640	420,793
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	892,132	389,684		196,196	861,591
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	17,219	16,718		16,429	16,429
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	154,028	126,702			173,529
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	20,303,179	22,771,729	21,755,973	25,183,597	26,572,318
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	314,074	314,074	343,126	364,627	353,174
Teacher education and recruitment	235,097				
Research and innovation	58,498				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	607,669	314,074	343,126	364,627	353,174
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,101,498	3,544,340	3,544,340	4,120,765	3,675,448
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		195,824	195,824	230,436	230,436
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	57,903	15,000			399,211
Innovation (pt. D)		224,418	342,351	293,212	253,901
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		172,745	172,745	201,601	288,101
Cooperation education (pt. G)		234,235		278,471	278,471
Work-study (pt. H)		41,745	332,524	54,023	54,023
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	497,755	550,582	615,329	615,329	615,329
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,657,156	5,009,957	5,234,181	5,824,905	5,825,988
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,434,297	1,570,018	1,725,500	1,561,817	1,725,500
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,854,608	1,938,617	2,012,278	1,992,155	2,191,371
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	1,783,385	1,787,768	1,606,128	2,096,896	2,228,836
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	119,460				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	33,850				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	191,149	194,239		152,867	194,239
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	655,786				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		608,986			608,852
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,373,604	245,325			245,325
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	78,080	79,459	65,899	65,899	65,899
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	135,930				144,888
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	181,200				
Subtotal, higher education	8,891,349	5,474,412	4,459,805	4,919,634	6,454,910
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	85,395	182,934	178,789	178,789	178,789
Personnel development programs	552,878				
Teacher Corps	287,331				
Subtotal, education professions development	925,604	182,934	178,789	178,789	178,789
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	403,825	350,119	350,119	403,825	403,825
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143
Construction (LSCA II)	308,680	116,492		87,775	130,586
College library resources (HEA II-A)	199,360				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities	283,826				
University community service programs (HEA I)	139,136	139,316		138,584	138,584
Subtotal, community education	1,441,126	712,226	456,418	736,483	779,294
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	895,478				
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development	895,478				
Civil rights education	65,429				
Total, Office of Education	36,786,990	34,465,332	32,428,292	37,208,035	40,119,473
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ¹	33,082,867	34,465,332	32,428,292	37,208,035	40,119,473

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$14,388,760	\$17,432,234	\$17,178,501	\$19,585,340	\$19,260,298
State administrative expenses	150,000	174,322	171,785	195,853	192,603
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					138,987
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					70,821
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,403,351	2,364,521	2,435,381	2,795,124	3,069,568
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,095,973	2,089,000		1,639,000	2,723,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	99,715				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,153,770	982,463	1,849,342	1,849,342	1,849,342
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	565,995	565,995	569,933	569,933	650,238
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	1,720,045	781,646		393,538	1,728,217
Loans to nonprofit private schools	111,630				
State administration	41,056	40,967		40,682	40,682
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	367,246	310,476			429,692
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	24,097,541	24,841,624	22,304,942	27,168,812	30,253,448
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	625,438	625,438	683,290	726,107	703,300
Teacher education and recruitment	767,180				
Research and innovation	420,384				
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,813,002	625,438	683,290	726,107	703,300
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,609,990	6,327,757	6,327,757	7,356,721	6,561,704
State advisory councils		39,318	39,318	39,318	39,318
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		349,608	349,608	411,391	411,391
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	128,533	15,913	504,927	399,668	712,704
Innovation (pt. D)		252,304			315,460
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		308,406	308,406	359,913	514,342
Cooperation education (pt. G)		273,356		368,090	368,090
Work-study (pt. H)		88,951	483,876	115,113	115,113
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	543,151	600,765	672,723	672,723	672,723
Special projects and teacher education	260,000				
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,541,674	8,256,378	8,686,615	9,722,937	9,710,845
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,329,791	1,544,035	1,965,198	1,521,823	1,965,198
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,056,446	3,168,640	3,379,954	3,346,154	3,680,770
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	4,831,288	4,721,490	4,350,600	5,679,967	6,037,358
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	596,580				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	73,884				
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to long-grant colleges:					
Annual	240,649	243,969		156,091	243,969
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	113,300				
Language training and area studies	822,013				
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,005,041	1,032,197			1,075,884
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,404,584	673,709			673,709
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000				
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	189,230	134,944	113,051	113,051	113,051
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	353,677				355,530
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,357,300				
Subtotal, higher education	21,923,783	11,568,984	9,858,803	10,867,086	14,195,469
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	282,828	335,694	323,915	323,915	323,915
Personnel development programs	1,014,790				
Teacher Corps	313,757				
Subtotal, education professions development	1,611,375	335,694	323,915	323,915	323,915
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	745,365	631,285	631,285	745,365	745,365
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
Construction (LSCA II)	732,551	157,514		96,514	187,452
College library resources (HEA II-A)	518,630				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	276,081				
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	190,150	190,150		189,322	189,322
Subtotal, community education	2,571,088	1,087,260	739,596	1,139,512	1,230,450
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers	1,200,000				
Subtotal, research and development	1,200,000				
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	59,758,463	46,715,378	42,597,161	49,948,369	56,417,427
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	51,170,887	46,715,378	42,597,161	49,948,369	56,417,427

See footnotes at end of table.

CXVI—1490—Part 17

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants	\$1,364,174	\$1,401,274	\$1,633,026	\$1,633,026	\$1,523,712
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					74,149
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	580,075	501,223	507,391	534,204	554,494
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	1,696,509	1,691,000		1,774,000	2,287,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	87,394	73,280	137,939	137,939	137,939
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	249,634	249,634	249,024	249,024	283,559
Grants for special projects					
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	144,298	66,403		33,432	146,817
Loans to nonprofit private schools					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000			50,000
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	4,335,417	4,296,147	2,777,380	4,624,958	5,321,003
Education of the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	79,389				
Research and innovation					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	179,389	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:					
Grants to States (pt. B)	620,814	544,453	544,453	633,004	564,597
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		30,081	30,081	35,398	35,398
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	87,014	15,000	225,670	216,809	61,324
Innovation (pt. D)		204,403			209,720
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		26,535	26,535	30,968	44,256
Cooperative education (pt. G)		206,175	223,898	214,150	214,150
Work-study (pt. H)		7,413		9,593	9,593
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	124,625	127,831	131,830	131,830	131,830
Special projects and teacher education					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	832,453	1,192,959	1,213,535	1,302,820	1,301,936
Higher education:					
Student assistance:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	365,050	122,359	155,734	120,598	155,734
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	516,201	273,002	286,624	283,758	312,133
Loans:					
Direct (NDEA II)	411,098	402,525	344,768	450,115	478,437
Insured:					
Advances for reserve funds					
Interest payments	23,343				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search					
Institutional assistance:					
Aid to land-grant colleges:					
Annual	154,927	157,849		150,509	157,849
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	118,900				
Language training and area studies					
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	169,890	87,843			94,578
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	247,470	52,868			52,868
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	71,006	47,216	47,545	47,545	47,545
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	28,359				29,187
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	240,581				
Subtotal, higher education	2,396,825	1,193,662	884,671	1,102,525	1,378,331
Education professions development:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	116,931	117,580	116,701	116,701	116,701
Personnel development programs	56,147				
Teacher Corps					
Subtotal, education professions development	173,078	117,580	116,701	116,701	116,701
Community education:					
Public libraries:					
Services:					
Grants to States (LSCA I)	153,903	144,375	144,375	153,903	153,903
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025
Construction (LSCA II)	105,309	86,474		81,379	88,975
College library resources (HEA II-A)	49,573				
Librarian training (HEA II-B)					
Educational broadcasting facilities					
University community service programs (HEA I)	106,901	106,901		106,830	106,830
Subtotal, community education	520,512	442,576	249,201	446,938	454,534
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories					
Research and development centers					
Subtotal, research and development					
Civil rights education					
Total, Office of Education	8,437,674	7,342,924	5,341,488	7,793,942	8,772,505
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis ²	7,841,382	7,342,924	5,341,488	7,793,942	8,772,505

¹ Initial-year awards only.² The 1969 actual column shows obligations for project-type programs where the State-by-

State distribution cannot be predicted in advance, and, therefore, not shown in the 1970 and 1971 columns. For this reason the 1969 comparable figure excludes obligations for project-type programs.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS,
PUBLIC LAW 874, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION,
ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

State and congressional district	House allowance ¹	Senate allowance ²	State and congressional district	House allowance ¹	Senate allowance ²
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Total.....			Total.....	\$3,720,000	\$7,050,000
FLORIDA					
1st.....	4,507,000	6,778,000	6th.....	1,655,000	3,321,000
2d.....	483,000	849,000	8th.....	860,000	1,412,000
3d.....	1,483,000	2,480,000	1st and 2d (part of).....	345,000	634,000
4th.....	308,000	605,000	State total.....	2,671,000	4,483,000
5th.....	4,230,000	7,331,000	MAINE		
6th.....	825,000	1,277,000	1st.....	1,003,000	1,526,000
7th.....	338,000	662,000	2d.....	1,530,000	1,925,000
8th.....	40,000	47,000	State total.....	2,533,000	3,451,000
9th.....	58,000	95,000	MARYLAND		
10th.....	943,000	1,126,000	1st.....	1,152,000	1,729,000
11th and parts of 12th.....	1,120,000	1,613,000	2d.....	1,297,000	1,964,000
State total.....	14,335,000	22,863,000	3d.....	7,284,000	13,685,000
GEORGIA			4th.....	859,000	1,466,000
1st.....	1,238,000	1,684,000	5th.....	4,040,000	7,899,000
2d.....	728,000	1,041,000	6th and 8th (part of).....	279,000	548,000
3d.....	6,793,000	8,816,000	3d, 4th, and 7th.....	1,567,000	3,035,000
4th.....	333,000	656,000	1st and 3d (part of).....	2,162,000	3,239,000
5th.....	790,000	1,509,000	State total.....	18,640,000	33,565,000
6th.....	1,363,000	2,663,000	MASSACHUSETTS		
7th.....	504,000	829,000	1st.....	572,000	1,121,000
8th.....	111,000	218,000	2d.....	1,950,000	2,507,000
9th.....	1,089,000	1,991,000	3d.....	3,105,000	3,747,000
10th.....	800,000	1,549,000	4th.....	409,000	805,000
4th and 5th (part of).....			5th.....	1,140,000	2,027,000
State total.....	13,749,000	20,956,000	6th.....	475,000	924,000
HAWAII			7th.....	584,000	1,145,000
At large.....	9,264,000	12,354,000	8th.....	171,000	300,000
IDAHO			9th.....	244,000	459,000
1st.....	1,395,000	2,073,000	10th.....	629,000	1,089,000
2d.....	902,000	1,500,000	11th.....	2,393,000	3,302,000
State total.....	2,297,000	3,573,000	12th.....	34,000	66,000
ILLINOIS			Part of 5th, 6th, and 7th.....	388,000	759,000
4th.....	57,000	112,000	9th and part of 8th and 11th.....	3,000	6,000
10th.....	118,000	228,000	10th and 12th (part of).....	20,000	37,000
12th.....	2,521,000	3,414,000	4th and 5th (part of).....	3,000	6,000
13th.....	191,000	192,000	1st and 2d (part of).....		
14th.....	367,000	709,000	State total.....	12,120,000	18,300,000
15th.....	90,000	178,000	MICHIGAN		
16th.....	90,000	164,000	2d.....	18,000	25,000
17th.....	505,000	978,000	3d.....	389,000	618,000
18th.....	7,000	7,000	4th.....	25,000	44,000
19th.....	333,000	648,000	5th.....	44,000	82,000
20th.....	35,000	69,000	6th.....	820,000	998,000
21st.....	157,000	296,000	7th.....	1,860,000	2,284,000
22d.....	1,715,000	2,293,000	8th.....	884,000	1,195,000
23d.....	114,000	225,000	9th.....	20,000	24,000
24th.....	1,837,000	2,790,000	1st, 13th, 14th, 17th, and part of 1 and 12.....	448,000	881,000
14th and 17th (part of).....	370,000	721,000	State total.....	4,508,000	6,151,000
1st thru 3d and 5th thru 11th.....	2,089,000	4,084,000	MINNESOTA		
State total.....	10,596,000	17,108,000	1st.....	67,000	133,000
INDIANA			2d.....	11,000	13,000
5th.....	917,000	1,196,000	3d.....	484,000	952,000
6th.....	184,000	362,000	4th.....	514,000	1,015,000
7th.....	270,000	475,000	5th.....	284,000	518,000
8th.....	195,000	379,000	6th.....	126,000	215,000
9th.....	910,000	1,760,000	7th.....	570,000	695,000
11th.....	726,000	1,296,000	8th.....	642,000	897,000
State total.....	3,202,000	5,468,000	State total.....	2,698,000	4,438,000
IOWA			MISSISSIPPI		
1st.....	716,000	1,372,000	1st.....	452,000	529,000
2d.....	14,000	25,000	3d.....	68,000	130,000
3d.....	33,000	41,000	4th.....	176,000	249,000
4th.....	469,000	894,000	5th.....	1,580,000	2,457,000
5th.....	252,000	499,000	State total.....	2,276,000	3,365,000
6th.....	177,000	309,000	MISSOURI		
7th.....	121,000	24,000	1st.....	67,000	131,000
State total.....	1,782,000	3,380,000	2d.....	584,000	1,115,000
KANSAS			3d.....	2,929,000	4,994,000
1st.....	45,000	81,000	4th.....	241,000	474,000
2d.....	3,993,000	5,526,000	5th.....	249,000	489,000
3d.....	717,000	1,350,000	6th.....	220,000	425,000
4th.....	974,000	1,917,000	7th.....	1,469,000	1,926,000
5th.....	1,814,000	2,622,000	8th.....	140,000	271,000
State total.....	7,543,000	11,496,000	9th.....	43,000	75,000
KENTUCKY			1st, 2d and 9th (part of).....	88,000	172,000
1st.....	2,364,000	2,805,000	3d and part of 1st.....	525,000	1,030,000
2d.....	557,000	1,074,000	State total.....	6,555,000	11,102,000
3d.....	1,057,000	2,090,000	MONTANA		
4th.....	3,657,000	2,688,000	1st.....	1,790,000	2,436,000
5th.....	109,000	208,000	2d.....	2,679,000	3,260,000
6th.....	390,000	754,000	State total.....	4,469,000	5,696,000
7th.....	5,000	7,000	NEBRASKA		
State total.....	8,139,000	10,626,000	1st.....	435,000	621,000
LOUISIANA			2d.....	3,370,000	4,663,000
1st.....	50,000	97,000	3d.....	584,000	979,000
2d.....	161,000	316,000	State total.....	4,389,000	6,263,000
3d.....	1,090,000	1,703,000			
4th.....					
5th.....					
6th.....					
7th.....					
8th.....					
9th.....					
10th.....					
11th.....					
12th.....					
13th.....					
14th.....					
15th.....					
16th.....					
17th.....					
18th.....					
19th.....					
20th.....					
21st.....					
22d.....					
23d.....					
24th.....					
25th.....					
26th.....					
27th.....					
28th.....					
29th.....					
30th.....					
31st.....					
32d.....					
33d.....					
34th.....					
35th.....					
36th.....					
37th.....					
38th.....					
1st and 6th (parts of).....					
35th, 36th, 37th (parts of).....					
13th, 17th, 20th, 21st, 22d, 24th, 26th through 31st (parts).....					
7th, 8th and 9th (parts of).....					
15th and 16th (parts of).....					
9th and 10th (parts of).....					
36th and 37th (parts of).....					
34th and 35th (parts of).....					
19th and 20th (parts of).....					
17th, 21st, 23d and 32d.....					
17th and 31st.....					
17th and 28th.....					
8th and 9th.....					
7th and 8th.....					
State total.....	61,433,000	97,757,000			
COLORADO					
2d.....	2,662,000	5,091,000			
3d.....	6,185,000	9,922,000			
4th.....	1,243,000	1,967,000			
State total.....	10,090,000	16,980,000			
CONNECTICUT					
1st.....	110,000	216,000			
2d.....	2,020,000	2,752,000			
3d.....	367,000	706,000			
4th.....	110,000	216,000			
5th.....	146,000	281,000			
6th.....	115,000	226,000			
State total.....	2,868,000	4,397,000			
DELAWARE					
At large.....	1,987,000	2,453,000			

See footnotes at end of table.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS,
PUBLIC LAW 874, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION,
ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1971—Con.

State and congressional district	House allowance ¹	Senate allowance ²
NEVADA		
At large	\$3,066,000	\$4,641,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
1st	1,631,000	2,465,000
2d	154,000	300,000
State total	1,785,000	2,765,000
NEW JERSEY		
1st	650,000	1,265,000
2d	329,000	622,000
3d	2,155,000	3,569,000
4th	354,000	697,000
5th	450,000	826,000
6th	4,428,000	6,363,000
13th	94,000	128,000
14th	990,000	1,961,000
3d and 6th (part of)	18,000	35,000
1st and 6th (part of)	33,000	64,000
10th and 11th	78,000	154,000
State total	9,579,000	15,684,000
NEW MEXICO		
1st	3,622,000	5,396,000
2d	5,501,000	7,186,000
At large	992,000	1,105,000
State total	10,115,000	13,687,000
NEW YORK		
1st	1,570,000	2,693,000
2d	286,000	550,000
4th	392,000	430,000
5th	43,000	85,000
25th	34,000	60,000
27th	2,532,000	3,066,000
28th	35,000	67,000
29th	718,000	1,355,000
30th	320,000	631,000
31st	1,319,000	1,605,000
32d	1,453,000	2,179,000
33d	283,000	556,000
34th	222,000	322,000
35th	274,000	440,000
38th	72,000	142,000
40th	348,000	400,000
2d, 4th, and 5th (part of)	164,000	186,000
2d and 4th (part of)	17,000	34,000
39th and 41st	93,000	183,000
6th through 14th and 16th through 24th	3,771,000	6,263,000
1st and 2d (part of)	440,000	866,000
State total	14,386,000	22,113,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
1st	1,064,000	1,517,000
3d	4,420,000	5,464,000
5th	59,000	102,000
7th	4,670,000	6,267,000
8th	119,000	234,000
11th	230,000	355,000
State total	10,562,000	13,939,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
1st	1,770,000	2,024,000
2d	1,472,000	1,744,000
State total	3,242,000	3,768,000
OHIO		
1st	8,000	16,000
2d	35,000	70,000
3d	2,020,000	3,391,000
4th	25,000	50,000
5th	16,000	30,000
6th	288,000	553,000
7th	1,150,000	2,216,000
8th	37,000	73,000
10th	197,000	386,000
11th	79,000	146,000
12th	305,000	595,000
13th	70,000	137,000
14th	153,000	301,000
15th	154,000	304,000
17th	302,000	593,000
19th	15,000	29,000
23d	443,000	871,000
24th	477,000	937,000
20th, 22d, and 23d (part of)	175,000	345,000
12th and 15th (part of)	1,652,000	2,844,000
1st and 2d (part of)	74,000	145,000
State total	7,675,000	14,032,000
OKLAHOMA		
1st	995,000	1,930,000
2d	1,215,000	1,685,000
3d	653,000	1,113,000

State and congressional district	House allowance ¹	Senate allowance ²
OKLAHOMA—Continued		
4th	\$3,588,000	\$5,224,000
5th	1,517,000	2,946,000
6th	912,000	1,310,000
4th and 5th (part of)	1,233,000	2,240,000
State total	10,113,000	16,448,000
OREGON		
1st	401,000	532,000
2d	1,474,000	2,148,000
3d	351,000	664,000
4th	541,000	950,000
State total	2,767,000	4,294,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
1st through 5th	2,452,000	4,426,000
6th	31,000	62,000
7th	232,000	467,000
8th	487,000	965,000
9th	108,000	212,000
10th	186,000	386,000
11th	137,000	269,000
12th	448,000	892,000
13th	137,000	270,000
15th	124,000	180,000
16th	265,000	496,000
17th	218,000	439,000
18th	27,000	36,000
19th	548,000	1,043,000
23d	18,000	35,000
26th	13,000	26,000
27th	135,000	262,000
14th, 20th, and 27th (part of)	405,000	806,000
8th and 13th (part of)	42,000	82,000
16th and 17th (part of)	24,000	47,000
State total	6,037,000	11,401,000
RHODE ISLAND		
1st	1,497,000	2,123,000
2d	1,440,000	2,156,000
1st and 2d (part of)	128,000	253,000
State total	3,065,000	4,532,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
1st	4,420,000	6,396,000
2d	1,740,000	2,826,000
3d	61,000	108,000
4th	48,000	95,000
5th	520,000	651,000
6th	625,000	691,000
State total	7,414,000	10,767,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
1st	414,000	610,000
2d	3,251,000	4,057,000
State total	3,665,000	4,667,000
TENNESSEE		
1st	355,000	687,000
2d	656,000	1,300,000
3d	258,000	506,000
4th	1,076,000	1,797,000
5th	220,000	432,000
6th	654,000	1,302,000
7th	155,000	305,000
8th	273,000	527,000
9th	640,000	930,000
7th and 8th (part of)	502,000	990,000
State total	4,789,000	8,776,000
TEXAS		
1st	1,011,000	1,965,000
2d	46,000	85,000
3d	334,000	641,000
4th	372,000	629,000
5th	56,000	107,000
6th	166,000	327,000
7th	2,000	3,000
8th	12,000	24,000
9th	472,000	940,000
10th	790,000	1,246,000
11th	2,336,000	3,588,000
12th	2,589,000	4,734,000
13th	1,116,000	1,765,000
14th	787,000	1,373,000
15th	181,000	272,000
16th	2,738,000	4,308,000
17th	1,329,000	1,931,000
18th	409,000	643,000
19th	263,000	402,000
20th	795,000	1,421,000
21st	655,000	1,049,000
22d	330,000	641,000
23d	733,000	1,340,000
3d, 5th, 6th, and 13th (part of)	298,000	581,000
7th, 8th, and 22d	266,000	748,000
20th, 21st, and 23d	5,651,000	8,866,000
State total	23,737,000	39,629,000

State and congressional district	House allowance ¹	Senate allowance ²
UTAH		
1st	\$3,895,000	\$6,724,000
2d	1,385,000	2,478,000
State total	5,280,000	9,202,000
VERMONT		
At large	91,000	176,000
VIRGINIA		
1st	5,359,000	8,852,000
2d	3,873,000	6,293,000
3d	536,000	1,041,000
4th	1,540,000	2,597,000
5th	39,000	77,000
6th	386,000	746,000
7th	43,000	80,000
8th	4,277,000	5,631,000
9th	270,000	532,000
10th	10,196,000	19,599,000
State total	26,519,000	45,448,000
WASHINGTON		
1st	576,000	1,075,000
2d	1,437,000	2,156,000
3d	597,000	1,020,000
4th	1,537,000	2,371,000
5th	1,440,000	1,923,000
6th	4,514,000	7,036,000
7th	387,000	716,000
State total	10,488,000	16,297,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
2d	213,000	399,000
3d	46,000	89,000
4th	94,000	188,000
State total	353,000	676,000
WISCONSIN		
2d	466,000	684,000
3d	512,000	968,000
7th	98,000	150,000
8th	75,000	137,000
10th	236,000	296,000
4th, 5th, and 9th	252,000	488,000
State total	1,639,000	2,723,000
WYOMING		
At large	1,774,000	2,287,000
Guam	2,069,000	2,608,000
Puerto Rico	6,199,000	6,392,000
Virgin Islands	16,000	32,000
Wake Island	500,000	500,000
Grand total	425,000,000	658,800,000

¹ Assumes payment of 90 percent of sec. 3(a) entitlement and 100 percent of sec. 6 entitlement. All other sections prorated to about 45 percent of entitlement.

² Assumes payment of 100 percent of sec. 6 entitlement and of sec. 3(a) entitlement to those school districts whose 3(a) children comprise at least 25 percent of their total children in average daily attendance. All other sections (including other 3(a) entitlements) are prorated to approximately 90 percent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PODELL (at the request of Mr. Lowenstein), for July 9 and July 10, on account of official business.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for July 14 through 22, on account of officials business.

Mr. McEWEN (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for July 8, and balance of week on account of official business.

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), from 4:30 p.m. July 8, and the balance of week on account of official business.

Mr. KEE for Monday, 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. MONAGAN for 20 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONTE, today, for 15 minutes.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON, today, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GARMATZ, immediately following the President's message on Reorganization Plan No. 4.

Mr. LENNON, immediately following the remarks of Mr. GARMATZ after the President's message on Reorganization Plan No. 4.

Mr. YATES.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANGEN in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. ERLBORN.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. KEITH in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.

Mr. LATTA.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. PELL.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BROCK in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. STANTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. Celler in two instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. STUCKEY.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. HANLEY in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. DORN in six instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3728. An act to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1411-1418) and the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1421-1427); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2036. An act to remove a cloud on the titles of certain property located in Malin, Oreg.

BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5106. For the relief of Rogelio Tabhan.

H.J. Res. 1284. Authorizing the President's Commission on Campus Unrest to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 13, 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:

2205. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 91st quarterly report on export control, covering the first quarter, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2206. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the Department of the Navy; 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. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics, H.R. 16539. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council (Rept. No. 91-1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 16785. A bill to assure safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women; by authorizing enforcement of the standards developed under the act; by assisting and encouraging the States in their efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions; by providing for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health; and for other purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 91-1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 18391. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced in such country from entering the United States unlawfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (by request):

H.R. 18392. A bill to provide more equitable tax treatment for export income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 18393. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles, articles of leather footwear, and minkskins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 18394. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles, articles of leather footwear, and minkskins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18395. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of appropriations for the purpose of sending draftees to South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, or Thailand except under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 18396. A bill to exclude from gross income the first \$500 of interest received from savings account deposits in lending institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BIAGGI,

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of UTAH, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 18397. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DORN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAIMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROVER, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 18398. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LENNON, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. MCKENNALEY):

H.R. 18399. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PELL, Mr. POFF, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. QUITE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, and Mr. ROGERS of Florida):

H.R. 18400. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STEED, Mr. STRATTON, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANIK,

Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 18401. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 18402. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 18403. A bill to implement the pay comparability system for Federal employees, to establish a permanent Advisory Commission on Federal Pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 18404. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart diseases, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 18405. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Thomas Creek National Battlefield in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 18406. A bill to further amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended) so as to permit charitable contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations and certain specialized agencies and associated international organizations and programs established by the General Assembly thereof, to be deductible for income tax, estate tax, and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. FREILINGHUSEN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 18407. A bill to further amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended) so as to permit charitable contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations and certain specialized agencies and associated international organizations and programs established by the General Assembly thereof, to be deductible for income tax, estate tax, and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 18408. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18409. A bill to amend section 837 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the laws concerning illegal use, transportation, or possession of explosives and the penalties

with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 18410. A bill to establish the Fort Point National Historic Site in San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 18411. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital in Brevard County, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 18412. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to authorize the establishment of a National Guard for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 18413. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on stainless steel sheets and on articles made from such sheets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. FRASER,

Mr. CORMAN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. YATES, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 18414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow any deduction for contributions to elementary and secondary schools which discriminate on the grounds of race; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. NIX, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ANDERSON of California and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 18415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow any deduction for contributions to elementary and secondary schools which discriminate on the grounds of race; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 18416. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 18417. A bill to make rules respecting military hostilities in the absence of a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 18418. A bill to amend the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 relating to community action programs to provide for a special emphasis program to meet the credit needs of credit-worthy low-income persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.J. Res. 1301. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 1302. Joint resolution to define the principles which shall govern the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States by the President, to express U.S. foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia, and to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 676. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to

carry out a study and investigation of the Federal Meat Inspection Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Res. 1133. A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

419. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Fort Polk, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

534. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Barry Dale Holland, Portsmouth, Va., relative to the validity of certain State laws under the 14th amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the efforts of the Women's Equity Action League in fighting sex discrimination which exists in our colleges and universities, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of three letters of the organization, which were sent to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James D. Hodgson. I urge Secretary Hodgson to take action on these matters.

The letters follow:

SILVER SPRING, MD.,

July 5, 1970.

HON. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against PHI DELTA KAPPA under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which specifically forbids sex discrimination against women by Federal contractors.

The charge is based on the fact that Phi Delta Kappa, an honorary organization in the profession of education is solely limited to men. No matter how distinguished a woman may be, no matter how brilliant her accomplishments, she can under no circumstances become a member of Phi Delta Kappa, purely on the basis of her sex. Such exclusion is a violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Executive Order.

It is unthinkable that the Federal Government would give contracts to an all white organization that forbade blacks from joining; similarly any organization that forbids women from joining should be prohibited from obtaining any Federal funds whatsoever. Nevertheless, Phi Delta Kappa completed a \$61,000 contract in February, 1970 for the U.S. Office of Education.

We ask that Phi Delta Kappa be declared ineligible for any further government contracts until such time as it ceases to be a sexist organization, and that current contract negotiations, if any, be suspended at once.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed. D.,

Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education (WEAL).

SILVER SPRING, MD.,

July 5, 1970.

HON. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against Brooklyn College, under Executive Order 11246, as amended which specifically forbids Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

The charges are based on the enclosed report that was printed in the *Congressional Record* of June 3, 1970. As a former student and graduate (cum laude, 1948) I was shocked and dismayed to learn that in 8 departments (anthropology, art, geology, music, philosophy, physics, psychology and sociology) no woman has ever been appointed to the rank of full professor. In five of these (art, music, philosophy, physics and sociology) no woman has ever been made an associate professor. These figures are even more appalling when compared with the number of doctorates in these fields that go to women nationally: In psychology, women receive 23% of the doctorates; in Fine and Applied Arts, 34% of the doctorates; in anthropology, 24% of the doctorates; in sociology, 19% of the doctorates; in philosophy, 9% of the doctorates (Figures from the U.S. Office of Education, *Earned Degrees Conferred*, OE-54013-68-A).

The charges are also based on the by-laws of the college which create a hardship for women faculty who become pregnant. These by-laws are in violation of the recent guidelines on sex issued by the Dept. of Labor (Sect. 60-20.3(g)). A woman must notify the President of the college immediately upon learning that she is pregnant and begin a leave of absence at the end of that current term. In practice, this means that, although she may be in good health and able and willing to carry on with her duties, she must go on a forced leave for one year, during which time she loses all income and vacation benefits, accrued time toward sabbatical leave, pension contributions, etc. Even if the child is anticipated during the summer months, she is not permitted to carry out her teaching duties while pregnant. In essence, these by-laws punish women for becoming pregnant. It is of interest to note that the by-laws concerning pregnancy leave for administrative personnel permit the woman to adjust her leave in any way acceptable to her immediate superior. The discrimination in question here specifically applies to the woman faculty member and has been rigorously applied at Brooklyn College, although not with the same vigor at other branches of the City University.

We request that a compliance review be scheduled immediately; that such a review include an investigation of admission policies, financial support to women students, placement of graduates, hiring and promotion policies for both staff and faculty, and salary inequities. We further ask that all current contract negotiations be suspended immediately until such time as all inequities are worked out and an acceptable plan of affirmative action is implemented.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint, we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention. Please notify me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed.D.,

Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education, WEAL.

PART 3: PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE 1930-1970 SHOWING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DR. BABEY-BROOKE

A statistical analysis of promotion in the ranks of full, associate and assistant professor in the teaching faculty, including men and women, at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York from the inception of the college in 1930 to 1970 is the subject of this report. At first the year 1964 was chosen because it was at that time that Dr. Anna M. BabeY-Brooke, an assistant professor in the department of English, protested, among other charges, "that discrimination against her as an individual and against women existed at promotion time in Brooklyn College." Due partly to her case, to the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee, and to the Report of the Committee of Rank, the college administration made a gesture to correct this injustice and promoted women in wholesale numbers in 1966. This study has therefore, included an analysis of promotional practices in 1966-1968. The Brooklyn College Bulletins which are a matter of public record, were used for this study.

The names, dates of appointment of individuals together with the years required for promotion to the next rank are all enumerated. The rate of promotion for each rank is given in a departmental as well as on a college wide level. The record speaks for itself; there is no doubt about discrimination against women. Statistical tables provided in a memorandum from Deans Mais and Stroup to President Gideonse, February 21, 1962 and reissued April of 1964 by the Office of the Dean of Students as "Conference on the Status of Women" substantiate this report.

From the beginning when the College was first set up from the faculties of Hunter College—for women—and from the College of the City of New York—for men—discrimination against women existed. The men's division sent in all men as faculty; the women's division sent in both men and women: the major ranks filled exclusively by men. In 1932, 8 men were professors, but no women; 10 men and 4 women were associate professors; 21 men and 7 women were assistant professors. This trend continued so that in 1964, 34 men but no women were appointed full professors; 39 men and 5 women were associates. In the total count from 1930 to 1964, 151 men were made full professors in contrast to 16 women; 104 men were associates in contrast to 48 women.

The Bulletin of 1966-1968 shows the continuation of this trend: 145 men were full professors to 20 women; 125 men associates to 35 women; and 153 male assistants to 62 females. In the years 1966-68 the women gained 4 full professorships at the expense of 13 associate professorships and the men lost 6 full professorships but gained 21 associate professorships. The senior ranks for females showed a net loss of 9 and for males showed a net gain of 15.

The latest Bulletin 1968-1970 lists 143 men as full professor to 17 women; 135 men associates to 25 women and 158 men assistants to 52 women. In two years from 1968 to 1970, men lost 2 professorships to 3 for women. Men gained 10 associate professorships and