

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON
TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, as second ranking Republican on the Committee on Commerce and on its Subcommittee on Transportation, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) has compiled a very impressive record during his nearly 12 years in the U.S. Senate regarding the problems of transportation in our country.

These problems are now reaching crisis proportions, and I feel that the country is indeed fortunate to have a man such as Senator Scott working diligently for solutions. Since I, too, am a member of both the Commerce Committee and its Transportation Subcommittee, I am quite familiar with the dedication that the Senator from Pennsylvania has shown in this area and invite the attention of Senators to his fine record on transportation legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Scott's record on transportation be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, Senator SCOTT's record was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON TRANSPORTATION
LEGISLATION

Transportation systems in the United States have reached crisis proportions. With the increase in population in urban metropolitan areas, we have deluged our highways with automobiles and have funneled them into our cities, thus creating the greatest bottlenecks in history. Senator Hugh Scott knows that our Nation depends on a *balanced* transportation system, and he has consistently worked toward that goal.

Senator Scott was instrumental in bringing about the popular and successful Metroliner high-speed train in the crowded northeast corridor. At present, this train makes stops in Philadelphia, but high-speed *intra-city* transit may be possible with the development of the tracked air cushion vehicle, now being researched and tested in Erie.

As the Republican Leader, Senator Scott played an important role in expanding and improving our Nation's airport and airways system. More Federal assistance will be needed to keep up with the increased demands on air travel.

The following summary outlines Senator Scott's record on key transportation issues:

91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 961—To provide Federal jurisdiction and uniform law for cases arising from aviation and space activities.

S. 1070—To establish a Commission on Air Traffic Control.

S. 1179—To authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend half-price airfares on a standby basis during off-peak hours to young people, elderly people, military personnel and the handicapped.

S. 2050—Airways Safety Development Act—To authorize the Secretary of Transportation to use amounts in the Airways Safety Trust Fund for acquiring and improving air

navigation facilities; to establish such an Airways Safety Trust Fund.

S. 2518—To authorize funds for the reduction or elimination of hazards at rail highway grade crossings along the Metroliner route.

S. 2939—Intercity Rail Passenger Service Act—to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to purchase and rehabilitate or to buy new, equipment on railroad common carriers where railroad is unable to provide this equipment.

Votes

Voted to provide long-term financing for transportation programs.

Voted for the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1969.

Voted for the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970.

90TH CONGRESS

Votes

Voted against reducing funds for airport facilities and equipment from \$65.4 million to \$28.4 million.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 1588—To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation.

Votes

Voted for the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

Voted against reducing authorizations for each of fiscal years 1968 and 1969 from \$225 to \$150 million, for urban mass transportation.

Voted for the Urban Mass Transportation Act amendments.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 6—To provide assistance for development of mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

S. 2796—To authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to enter into cooperative agreements with the State to enforce State and Federal economic and safety laws and regulations relating to highway transportation.

Votes

Voted for the Urban Transportation Act of 1963.

Voted *not* to reduce by one-third the authorization for airport grant appropriations.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2392—To prohibit forceful seizure of aircraft in air commerce.

S. 3122—To encourage formation of regional agencies to develop plans for meeting urban transportation needs.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 423—To provide additional highway construction funds in labor surplus areas.

Votes

Voted for the Federal Airport Act Amendments of 1959.

Voted for the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959.

Voted for the Federal Highway Act of 1960.

Senator Hugh Scott's efforts with respect to our Nation's transportation policy should make travelling from one place to another less of a chore and more of an event. The future of transportation is exciting, and Senator Scott intends to involve government and private industry to newer and higher levels. He will continue to work for Pennsylvania's best transportation interests.

ONE YEAR LATER

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in retrospect, the Nixon doctrine, which was formulated a year ago, stands out as a corner stone of the Nixon administration. That we would become involved in no future land war in Asia was initially considered the main tenant. While this is still of prime importance, the year's passing has witnessed implementation of other aspects of the doctrine, among which is the reduction of our troops in Asian countries.

The Honolulu Star, in an editorial entitled "One Year Later," takes a look at the Nixon doctrine a year after its inception. I believe this is a very lucid review of our defense policy as it relates to the doctrine and, therefore, request that it be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

ONE YEAR LATER

It was just a year ago Saturday, that President Nixon visited Guam and enunciated what since has been called "The Nixon Doctrine."

The occasion was a press briefing and direct quotation was forbidden—thus giving a major U.S. policy pronouncement a certain obscurity and ambiguity, perhaps desired.

The President himself put the doctrine on the record in these words in a Nov. 3 televised address to the nation:

"Before any troops were committed to Vietnam," he said, "a leader of another Asian country expressed this opinion to me when I was traveling in Asia as a private citizen." He said, "When you are trying to assist another nation defend its freedom, U.S. policy should be to help them fight the war but not to fight the war for them."

"Well, in accordance with this wise counsel, I laid down on Guam three principles as guidelines for future American policy toward Asia:

"First, the United States will keep all of its treaty commitments.

"Second, we shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us or a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security.

"Third, in cases involving other types of aggression, we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested in accordance with our treaty commitments. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense."

It has become apparent since then that this Guam Doctrine or Nixon Doctrine is a major milestone in American foreign policy and is fundamental to the day-by-day decisions being made by the President.

It represents a retreat from our role as world policeman but is in no sense a "Fortress America" concept.

While the doctrine may seem reasonable to Americans we can see in current headlines that its application is far from simple.

Many Americans think it is not being applied fast enough in the case of Vietnam.

The Republic of Korea is resisting bitterly its application to reduce our forces there from 60,000 to 40,000.

The Republic of the Philippines has just learned it will mean a rollback of American

forces there from 24,000 to 18,000. Thailand finds it means a cut in U.S. defense spending in that nation.

Taiwan and Japan are sure to feel its effect as well.

Okinawa is both demanding that we leave and protesting our work force cutbacks.

In 1946, when the U.S. and Russia were just about the only nations in the world with real strength, the "world policeman" role fell naturally and necessarily on U.S. shoulders.

In the changed circumstances of 1970 when Europe and Japan have been revitalized and other nations are growing in strength that former U.S. role seems neither desirable nor necessary.

This is what the year-old Nixon Doctrine recognizes.

It is alive and well on its first birthday—and we should hold to it despite the "Yankee, Stay Here" outcries that may be heard in affected corners of the globe.

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON LEGISLATION DEALING WITH ELECTIONS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, democracy's most useful tool is the vote. Without it, we would be governed by authorities other than those chosen by the people. That is why Senator HUGH SCOTT has pressed for reform of our elections laws so that they are conducted fairly and without irregularities.

Senator SCOTT has argued for reforming campaign financing practices because, under the present system, there is too great of an opportunity for misusing funds. As the ranking member of the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, he is sponsoring legislation to provide low-cost television time to all candidates for Federal office. Senator SCOTT is also a member of the Senate Rules Committee and Judiciary Committee, both of which play an important role in determining the overall conduct of elections, thus insuring that our right to vote is never abridged.

The following summary outlines Senator HUGH SCOTT's record on election and campaign reforms.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Senator SCOTT's record was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON LEGISLATION DEALING WITH ELECTIONS

91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S.J. Res. 59—To amend the Constitution of the U.S. to provide that U.S. citizens shall be entitled to vote nationally without excessive residence or physical presence requirements.

S.J. Res. 147—To amend the Constitution of the U.S. to extend the voting right to citizens age 18 or older.

S. 2876—To provide Congressional candidates with opponents the opportunity to purchase communications broadcast time at low cost.

Votes

Voted to abolish restrictive residency requirements as a precondition to voting for President and Vice President, and to establish uniform nationwide standards relative to absentee registration and voting in presidential elections.

Voted to reduce the voting age from 21 to 18 years of age, effective January 1, 1971.

90TH CONGRESS

Votes

Voted to broaden the prohibition against soliciting political contributions from Federal employees, under the Election Reform Act of 1967.

Voted to require disclosure of gifts and certain compensation by any Senator or by any candidate seeking nomination or election as Senator.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 3435—Election Reform Act—To require all candidates and all committees supporting candidates to fully disclose details of all contributions and expenses over \$100; to limit to \$5,000 the total amount that can come from any single source to the campaigning of any candidate; to provide for special tax deduction of up to \$100 for contributions to candidates.

Votes

Voted for proposed constitutional amendment regarding Presidential succession and inability.

Voted for proposed constitutional amendment permitting apportionment of one house of a bicameral State legislature using population, geography, and political subdivisions as factors.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 480—To prohibit application of unreasonable literacy requirements to right to vote.

S. Res. 311—To authorize the Senate Judiciary Committee to examine and investigate the establishment of congressional and State election districts to ensure against any unfair practices.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 957—To provide for retention and preservation of Federal election records.

S. 2868—To eliminate poll tax as prerequisite to voting in national elections.

Votes

Voted to make Federal election laws applicable to primary elections.

Voted to revise the Federal election laws.

Voted to provide that the right to vote in national elections shall not be denied because of failure to pay poll tax.

As the Senate Republican Leader, Senator Hugh Scott will continue to fight for clean elections and fair campaign practices. Pennsylvanians can always be assured of their right to vote because of Senator Scott's efforts.

NEW SUPPORT FOR S. 30, THE "ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1969"

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce significant new support for S. 30, the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969." Mr. Robert D. Pelouin, president of International Intel-

ligence, Inc.—Intertel—made available to me a copy of his letter to Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee which expressed the support of his organization for title IX of S. 30 which prohibits the use of illegally acquired income to infiltrate legitimate businesses.

Intertel is a private organization which has as one of its principal objectives the aiding of businesses to protect themselves from the scourge of organized crime. Mr. Pelouin, himself, is no stranger to the field of organized crime, having served as chief of the first Department of Justice Strike Force and senior special attorney in the Justice Department's Organized Crime and Racketeering section. I consider significant his conclusion that the new tools for law enforcement found in S. 30 are both "needed" and "fairly limited to protect civil liberties." It is a pleasure to find that Mr. Pelouin, no longer associated with the Federal Government, continues in the struggle against organized crime and now volunteers the benefit of his experience and that of his organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call further attention of the House to the fact that Intertel supports, as does the American Bar Association, an amendment to title IX which would provide the additional remedy of private suits based upon section 4 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. I am pleased to note that this idea which I suggested some time ago on this floor has been so well received.

The letter of support for title IX of S. 30 from Intertel follows:

INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE, INC.,

Washington, D.C., August 7, 1970.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,

Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write as President of INTERTEL, a private organization, one of the principal objectives of which is to aid businesses in protecting themselves from the hidden virus of vulnerability to organized crime. My purpose is to make known to the House Judiciary Committee the support of my organization for S. 30, the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969," and most particularly Title IX of that measure, which prohibits the use of illegally acquired income or racketeering methods to infiltrate legitimate organizations. As investigators and attorneys formerly associated with the investigation and prosecution of organized crime, we can attest to the pressing need for the new tools S. 30 would provide to law enforcement. It is also our judgment, however, that proper and constitutional safeguards for individual rights have been built into the bill. We strenuously urge its prompt processing and early passage.

Well known facts highlight the degree of infiltration of the business world by organized crime figures. The Internal Revenue Service indicates that of 113 major organized crime figures in this country, 98 are involved in 159 businesses. The President's Crime Commission in 1967 reported that racketeers control nationwide manufacturing and service industries with known and respected names. Organized crime incursions into the hotel industry, the banking industry, the laundry industry, the recording industry, the drug industry, the grocery industry, as well as into the advertising, chemicals, insurance, oil and gas, public relations and real estate fields have been documented.

Title IX of S. 30, the title of our particular concern, would bar the use of income from organized crime or racketeering methods to acquire, operate or set up an otherwise legitimate commercial operation. Persons violating this law would be subject to criminal and civil-type sanctions. Law enforcement experience has shown that it is insufficient merely to remove and imprison individual mob members to break an organized crime stronghold on a business. Title IX attacks the problem by providing a means of wholesale removal of organized crime from all organizations, prevention of its return, and, where possible, forfeiture of its illicit gains. The legal devices used to achieve these ends are: criminal forfeiture, civil remedies of an antitrust nature, and a number of civil investigative procedures. These remedies are badly needed, 1) to prevent the use of business to legitimize a source of income for racketeers and, 2) to prevent the pirating of resources from legitimate business, the bilking of creditors and the terrorizing of owners and employees.

Though my organization supports Title IX as is, we also voice our warm approval of the two amendments recommended by the American Bar Association when it announced its approval of S. 30. The two recommended amendments would, 1) give the court discretion to decide which proceedings relating to racketeer influence and corrupt organizations shall be open to the public and, 2) to provide the additional remedy of private suit based upon Section 4 of the Clayton Antitrust Act.

I request that this letter and its attachments expressing Intertel support for S. 30 be included in the record of your hearings.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. PELOQUIN.

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM B. SAXBE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, with an ever-increasing population, Government services must keep pace with that growth. Health care is one of these services that must not be allowed to backslide. The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) knows that good health care is essential to a healthy society, and he has consistently supported greater Federal participation in health matters.

As the Republican leader, Senator SCOTT is working very closely with the administration to provide greater health care coverage to more of our citizens. Medicare and medicaid are good programs, but they need improvements. Mental health activity should also be given greater attention. These are but a few areas in which Senator SCOTT intends to place greater Federal emphasis.

The following summary outlines Senator SCOTT's position with respect to health care:

SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION
91ST CONGRESS
Legislation

S. 1300—To improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in U.S. coal mining industry.

S. 1865—To establish programs to find

causes and effects of malnutrition and to facilitate detection and treatment.

S. 1997—To provide for more effective prevention and treatment of alcoholism by providing grants for education and training programs and by establishing regional centers for research in alcoholism and alcohol-related problems.

S. 2809—To extend authority to make formula grants to schools of public health.

S. Res. 68—To authorize funding of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Votes

Voted for the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act.

Voted to provide interim emergency coal mine disability benefits.

Voted for the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

Voted for the Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1969 (Hill-Burton).

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 3094—To provide for inspections of mines and quarries to obtain information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents and occupational diseases.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2751—To provide additional funds for special milk program for children.

Votes

Voted for the Mental Health Act of 1963.

Voted for the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 3350—To provide program of Federal matching grants to States for over-65 health insurance.

Votes

Voted for the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959.

Voted to provide a health benefits program for government employees.

Senator SCOTT's efforts in the field of health care continue to mean that Pennsylvanians are getting better health care than ever before. Advanced techniques and prescriptions, available only through the expenditure of additional funds, can now be made available to all citizens. Senator SCOTT will continue to urge a greater Federal role in health care.

LET US STOP THE WAR

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the August 6, 1970, issue of the Kettering-Oakwood Times, a biweekly newspaper circulating in suburban Dayton, contained an editorial supporting the Amendment To End the War. As one of the original House sponsors of this proposal, I am very pleased to report this endorsement.

The fact on which the editorial bases its conclusion is the recent report by Bishop Paul Moore that the Vietnamese people do not want our presence to linger indefinitely in their country.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

LET US STOP THE WAR

Sometime this month, the Senate is expected to vote on an amendment to a \$19.2

billion military procurement bill, the "Amendment to End the War."

More than two million signatures on petitions supporting this amendment have been collected in an effort to show support for this bipartisan measure, sponsored by Senators George McGovern (D-South Dakota) and Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon).

In light of this, a recent report from Vietnam by Bishop Paul Moore, Episcopal bishop coadjuter of New York, formerly suffragan bishop of Washington, is significant.

Bishop Moore and aides, a team of 20 religious leaders and students, interviewed more than 200 Vietnamese of all walks of life.

Every single South Vietnamese interviewed wants the United States to get out of the country—some tomorrow, some over a period of months. Not one single person wanted this country's presence to remain long.

But even stronger than this feeling, the bishop found, was bitterness toward the corrupt and repressive Thieu-Ky government.

The attitudes shown in this survey indicate that we can do no greater service to South Vietnam than to leave her.

We can do nothing for all the Americans that have already died there.

But we can do something to help the Americans who are fighting there now—some of whom were eight years old when the first Americans went to Vietnam to fight—and that is get out as rapidly as possible.

The amendment's aim is simply to end involvement in military conflict in Indochina after December 31, 1970, by ending appropriations for it at that time. It would also provide, unless later needs dictate otherwise, that all American troops be out of Vietnam by June 30, 1971.

It would provide funds, as needed, for "safe and systematic withdrawal of all United States military personnel"; termination of United States military operations; assistance to South Vietnam as authorized by Congress; exchange of prisoners; and arrangement of asylum to Vietnamese who might be endangered by our withdrawal.

We support this amendment. We solicit the support of all of our readers for this effort to help restore peace to the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S "DOUBLE STANDARD"

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have again seen an amazing "double standard" in the President's action yesterday in vetoing the two bills making appropriations for the Office of Education and for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the other miscellaneous executive agencies.

His irresponsible "double standard" would turn down funds that are essential in meeting the highest national priority areas of education of our children and young people and the massive needs of our urban areas on the false grounds that somehow these programs are responsible for inflation, rising interest rates, and high taxes.

At the same time, the President does not apply the same standard to inflated profits of war contractors, to his proposed Federal subsidies to bail out private corporations such as Lockheed or the Penn Central Railroad, or the ex-

penditure of hundreds of millions of dollars to subsidize the private development of the supersonic transport plane.

The President does not even lift his voice in protest as price increases are announced in steel, copper, autos, and other basic industries—increases that push the cost of living even higher. Meanwhile, White House economic policies have pushed interest rates to their highest levels since the Civil War and unemployment has again reached the 5-percent mark and the buying power of the average worker's paycheck has dropped below its 1965 level.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not appropriations for education or housing that has driven prices or interest rates up to their record high levels. It is the Republican administration's own failures in the economic field and its misdirected priorities that give blank checks to multi-billion dollar Pentagon weapons systems. The real culprits are not children or slum dwellers but the ABM, MIRV, the C-5A cargo plane and the "wild spenders" in the Pentagon who continue to waste our resources and manpower in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of Congress to seize the initiative and to re-allocate public funds to meet our pressing national priority requirements. We have done so in increasing the Office of Education budget by \$453 million and by providing \$514 million more for HUD programs. We will certainly be able to cut many times this amount of \$967 million from the bloated and wasteful military budget alone.

Both these appropriation bills passed the House and Senate by overwhelming margins. I urge my colleagues to override both these ill-considered Presidential vetoes by equally large margins.

SIGNS OF PROGRESS NOTED IN WAR ON INFLATION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, spiraling inflation was one of the most pressing problems President Nixon inherited when he assumed office. It is now apparent that the President's approach to the problem is a sound one, and one which the people increasingly respect and support.

In an editorial entitled "Signs of Progress Noted in War on Inflation," the Nashville Banner delves into some of the more visible aspects of the President's economic policy. I believe these observations will benefit my colleagues and I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

SIGNS OF PROGRESS NOTED IN WAR ON INFLATION

The inflation pace—boiling under predecessor policies of fiscal recklessness—was mounting when Richard M. Nixon took office. Along with uncontrolled federal spending, the cost of living was in the ascendancy year by year; the consequences of it another inherited problem with which the new administration has had to cope. And for the

CXVI—1801—Part 21

most part, thinking constituents knew that there was no economic or political wonder drug to heal this disease overnight.

The President did promise to act as elementary economic principles decreed—to treat and reduce the infections that were causing this fever; and this he had been doing, notwithstanding the screams of anguish every time a saving move touched a political nerve; or liberals in either camp needed him because inflationary winds didn't instantly cease.

It has been one of the issues they have pushed with increasing sound and fury in this congressional election year. Along with the favorite text of the Doves, it has been the big hue and cry on that side. "See," they say, "Mr. Nixon has been in office now for more than a year and the war isn't over, and inflation still is with us." They overlook the fact that two predecessors, in office eight years, settled neither of these problems—but actually left both in a situation of deepening crisis.

They overlook the fact, too, that President Nixon has reversed the trend of that war. He has reduced by 119,000 the almost half-million figure of U.S. troops in Vietnam who were there when he assumed the office, and has definitely scheduled the withdrawal of another 150,000 within a year.

Try as they will, his critics can't fault the President on that—for the people know the facts in the case. But they keep trying—and even more strenuously as they see new polls attesting to the substantial margin of his public support.

Circumstances are about to disarm them, too, of those dead cats they have been throwing on the economic issue. The Commerce Department shows that the second quarter of this year show total output of goods and services stabilized after a six-month decline.

The Gross National Product is up—in terms of real meaning, not in measurement by inflated dollars. In this same interval, the pace of rising costs was definitely checked. And related statistics are demonstrably on the side of national economic strength.

That has taken time—and by no means is the nation as yet over the hump for any easy sledding. The President knows that. His advisers know it. The significant thing is that the administration is continuing to push for those adjustments—in tax policies and spending formulae—that will bring the recovery that every responsible citizen wants.

As this newspaper has observed, Mr. Nixon doesn't operate with a panic button—in the area either of foreign or domestic policy. Neither does he act with his eyes closed. Rather than the problem-making approach of wage and price controls, to put an artificial lid on the inflationary factors, he proposed and adopted volunteer action on the part of responsible labor and management leadership.

At this point there are signs that his policies, thus carefully pursued, and involving mutual trust, are paying off.

Disarming the panic element is a plus on the nation's side.

NO DEADLINE NEEDED

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, as much and perhaps more than anyone, wants to bring the war in Vietnam to an honorable end and bring our soldiers home. To set an arbitrary time limit on our involvement in Vietnam

would be folly in view of the new peace initiatives at the Paris talks, the President's planned troop withdrawals, and the Vietnamization program.

Because of the time spent and the lives lost in Vietnam, I know my colleagues will continue to work with the President as he seeks to bring this conflict to a just close. In an editorial entitled "No Deadline Needed," the Dallas Morning News reasons why the President deserves maximum flexibility and support. I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NO DEADLINE NEEDED

There are some Americans who urge that the President either set a firm deadline for getting out of Vietnam or have such a fixed time limit set for him.

The reasoning for this sort of dictated time limit is difficult to understand. Those who advocate imposing it seem to imply that the President gets a secret kick out of continuing the U.S. presence in Southeast Asia.

From the manner in which such deadlines are discussed, you'd get the impression that, for presidents, giving up the war in Vietnam is something like giving up smoking or deserts—they really know they shouldn't stay, but just do not have the willpower to do what has to be done.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, no American wants to get the American forces out of Vietnam more than the President. Like his predecessor in office, Richard Nixon knows what the war is costing the nation and his administration—in lives, in money, in the state of the economy.

But, also like his predecessor, Mr. Nixon does not want to withdraw in such haste that all that previous sacrifice will go for nothing. And if this country pulls out of South Vietnam before that country is able to stand on its own, all of the cost in blood and treasure will have been paid in vain.

Can anyone seriously believe that Richard Nixon would keep American troops in combat for one day longer than he thinks their presence is necessary?

Can anyone seriously believe that he is letting this nation suffer the losses in lives and in social unrest simply because he enjoys it?

From the political standpoint, the President's administration and his party have everything to gain and nothing to lose by achieving peace tomorrow. But if he achieved it at the price of a communist Southeast Asia, this peace could not last.

CONCERN OVER PRESIDENT NIXON'S VETO OF THE 1971 EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern over President Nixon's veto of the Office of Education's fiscal 1971 appropriations bill.

President Nixon cites the inflationary impact that the increased appropriations for education would have on the country. But how can we "hold the line against big spending" when the administration squanders billions of dollars on the Vietnam war and military projects like the Safeguard ABM? These dollars go to causes of highly dubious merit. What

more meritorious commodity do we have than our youth?

The future of the United States depends on its youth—its educated youth. The high standard of living that the United States enjoys cannot be maintained if the education of our children is threatened. To jeopardize the financial stability of our educational institutions is to jeopardize the Nation itself.

The administration's budget request sought only a modest increase in spending—indeed, an almost niggardly increase—over the last fiscal year. How many more children would this increase benefit? The answer: Too few.

The budget requested by the administration for educational purposes is painfully inadequate. Less than ample funding for the Office of Education in fiscal 1971 threatens to breed mediocrity—if not inferiority—in school systems across the country.

Let me cite just one example. School districts in all our States—Chicopee, Mass., a community in my congressional district, is one such school district—are approaching major financial difficulties because of legislation revising the allocation formula for aid to impacted school areas. Faced with rapidly rising enrollment rates, and as rapidly dwindling revenue sources, impacted school districts will need more Federal aid if they are to maintain high-quality education for the children of military personnel and Federal employees.

Mr. Nixon says that his veto of this bill is painful to him, but it is not nearly as painful to him as it would be to the country's school systems—and more important, the youth—of our Nation.

Needless to say, I will support the expected effort to override the President's veto.

**VIET VICTORY IS SO NEAR YOU
CAN ALMOST TOUCH IT**

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an article by Col. R. D. Heintz, Jr., which appeared in the Orange County, Calif., Register of July 26, demonstrates not only the success of the Vietnamization program to date, but also the need for continued implementation of the public safety programs currently underway in South Vietnam, to cope with the resurgence of wide-spread terrorist activity.

Colonel Heintz points out that from January to May 31 of this year, aside from 816 individually fingered political assassinations, there have been more than 13,000 South Vietnamese killed, assaulted, or abducted. Many of the victims have been children.

Since the beginning of the Communist drive to conquer South Vietnam, there have been 50,000 South Vietnamese cadres, including schoolteachers, revolutionary development workers, and village chiefs, murdered. In proportion, this would be equivalent to well over 500,000

Americans. Just as organized butchery of this magnitude would never be tolerated in the United States, if we had the power to stop it, so is it necessary that we Congressmen support the efforts of the South Vietnamese government to bring an end to this horror.

Preventive detention laws have played a major role in stemming Communist terrorist activities in those nations which have been fortunate enough to overcome this type of threat to their existence. When it is a question of either isolating the enemy for the protection of the population or allowing the population to be systematically decimated there can be only one choice.

The article by Colonel Heintz follows:
VIEW FROM THE FRONT: VIET VICTORY IS SO NEAR YOU CAN ALMOST TOUCH IT

(By Col. R. D. Heintz, Jr.)

SAIGON (Nana).—Are we winning?
How nearly is the war over?
When and how can we get out of Vietnam?
What does the future hold?
The answers to these big questions are what the country needs to know about the war in Indochina—a war which, in every dimension and aspect, has changed dramatically since this reporter last left Vietnam, 18 months ago.

The computers and the analysts can come up with endless statistics and quantifications in this war of numbers (so hyper-quantified that former Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson used to call it "The Scoreboard War").

They can tell you how many weapons we capture, how many bodies we tally (the "step-on count," the GIs say), the B-52 bomb-tonnages, the rice captured, the in-country troop strength, the indirect-fire attacks, the Chieu-Hoi ralliers, the junks intercepted, the night ambushes, and so on.

IMPRESSIONS

These are the trees. But the shape of the forest comes through more clearly in terms of impressions perceptions and hunches—the kind of signals no computer can quantify.

For example, 18 months ago, the night-sounds of Saigon were those of the battlefield: artillery outgoing, thunderous B-52 strikes rattling the windows, occasional spurts of small-arms fire somewhere or other inside the city.

Now, the nights are quiet, with not even the sight of a distant flare on the horizon. Only twice while in Saigon did this reporter hear any artillery at all, and that random and far away, when the wind was right.

The Hondas that choke the city streets and even the new good roads in the country . . . the bridges everywhere that are intact rather than crumpled and demolished . . . the tin and aluminum roofs that signal prosperous villages . . . the freedom of movement along roads and into villages that used to be solid VC . . . bumper corps of "miracle rice" in every paddy . . .

These impressions are among those that predominate, and in their way they tell a great deal. Behind them, and behind the big questions about the future of war, the pivotal factors that will determine the course of events—narrowly in Vietnam and broadly in Indochina—are perhaps four in number.

Pacification—The struggle to win the entire countryside from the government and away from the Viet Cong.

VIETNAMIZATION

The development and vitalization of a South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) sufficiently battleworthy to withstand the tough Communist regulars of Hanoi.

Beside Vietnamization stands its first cousin, Nixonization, or implementation of the "Nixon Doctrine," whereby Asian countries fight their own wars with their own troops.

Political viability—Evolution of the Thieu-Ky regime and Hanoi's capabilities and possible intentions.

HAND IN HAND

Pacification and Vietnamization ultimately go hand in hand. Without successful Vietnamization—i.e., without an ARVN able to shield the populated areas against devastation and invasion by the 130 North Vietnamese Army (NVA) Battalions still in the field and mainly inside, though only just inside South Vietnam—pacification can never succeed.

Today, pacification is shielded both by the ARVN and by the remaining American combat units in Vietnam. Tomorrow, it will be up to the ARVN alone.

The status of pacification is roughly as follows.

The big war inside South Vietnam has clearly receded. The Communists may be rampaging inside thinly populated, barely defended, remote northwest Cambodia, but they are no longer rampaging inside South Vietnam.

The VC are now waging a broken-backed effort to maintain themselves, using so-called VC "main force" units manned 90 per cent, not by authentic South Vietnamese, but by fillers from the north. In retrospect, it can be seen the VC virtually destroyed itself as a fighting force during the 1968 Tet Offensive.

TET VICTORY

Tet deserves a backward look, if only because it was halted by our own doomslayers and copperheads as final proof the war was unwinnable.

The Communists did not attain a single one of their stated objectives during Tet. The people of South Vietnam did not join in the proclaimed "general uprising"; the ARVN did not fold but fought; no province, region, or major population center was taken and held by the Communists; and our Marines at Khe Sanh broke the siege that was to have been General Giap's American Dien Bien Phu.

During three weeks of Tet, more than 43,000 Communists (mainly the flower of the VC's political and military cadres) were killed. Tet can now be perceived as the first great turning point of the war.

The only defeat inflicted by the Communists during Tet was in the United States, engineered by elements of the press and TV and by New Left politicians (mainly in the Senate) who have staked careers on an American defeat and humiliation.

Returning to pacification, the people of South Vietnam now seem to have committed themselves in great majority to the government. This does not mean that the government is perfect, or is so considered by the villagers. What it does mean is that the villagers now apparently believe the government will win.

ODDS-ON FAVORITE

The turning point in an insurgency comes when people make up their minds as to who will come out on top. Every indicator suggests the government is now the odds-on favorite.

The people and the Communists are now being separated as never before. More than three million South Vietnamese men (and 200,000 women volunteers) have taken arms under the government banner in the regional and popular forces and village militia.

In this contest for people rather than territory, 89.7 per cent of the population of South Vietnam now lives in government-controlled villages or hamlets. In only eight

provinces out of South Vietnam's 45 are there any mobile VC military units still alive, and these, as noted above, are mainly manned and led by North Vietnamese officers and men.

Terror is now the main recourse of the VC. Not counting 816 individually fingered political assassinations so far this year, Communist terrorists, as of May 31, had killed, assaulted, or abducted 13,009 South Vietnamese (including a large number of children).

SHADOW WAR

Terror will remain the principal VC capability for some time, at least until the Phoenix or "Phung Hoang" long-haul campaign to uproot the hardcore VC infrastructure (VCI) progresses further.

CIA-authored, the Phoenix program is in some respects our most important and least obviously successful effort in the field of pacification. It is aimed at individually identifying, the killing, apprehending, sentencing, or converting the 71,000 members of the Mafia-like VCI—the Communist political cadres who have been operating under deep cover inside South Vietnam since the days of the Viet Minh and even before. This is a shadow war by police and intelligence against the guts of the VC.

Phung Hoang has so far only scratched the surface, but it is no more designed for or capable of instant success than our own war on the Mafia. However, if Phung Hoang does not succeed in the long run, the whole success of pacification will be jeopardized.

Ever since the ARVN showed its mettle during the Cambodian incursions, Vietnamization has looked like a winner. Actually (even before the term was coined), Vietnamization passed its first test during Tet by virtue of the ARVN's surprising ability to hold together and fight for its life. Now that the Thieu regime has really accepted the fact and imminence of American withdrawal, Vietnamization is progressing well.

ASTONISHING PROWESS

The ARVN is now composed of basically well-trained soldiers with an increasingly capable corps of junior and mid-level officers being systematically brought forward.

The once scandalous top leadership of the ARVN is being upgraded, and as a result, once scandalous ARVN divisions are fighting. One has only to recall the astonishing recent prowess in Cambodia of the 7th and 25th ARVN Divisions, once rated by U.S. advisers as among the worst in the Free World.

With the surge of self-confidence and the time earned by devastation of the Cambodian sanctuaries, Vietnamization ought to progress well. Top American commanders believe the ARVN will be able to stand completely on its own feet as a fighting army against the NVA by mid-1972.

Paradoxically, as the ARVN improves, many observers feel the U.S. Army is slipping. Senior American commanders deny this emphatically. But those (like this reporter) who have spent time in the field with American divisions get strong impressions that the national malaise—borne by college-educated, middle-class, resentful draftee vectors—has reached Vietnam.

The shaggy-haired perfunctory, yacking, near-seditious U.S. units with fat, idle headquarters, crummy camps and dirty weapons cannot compare to the professional, keen, hard-charging Army, say, of 1967, which was in fact one of the finest our country has ever fielded.

Tragic as this is—if true—the fact remains it is now more important, far more important, for the ARVN to be on the upgrade than for our own army. In a sense, the latter has spent itself (or been morally spent) in order to buy time for the ARVN.

INTERNAL POLITICS

If Vietnamization and pacification, interlocked, represent one side of the coin, the

other side is the internal political situation within South Vietnam.

The dominant political act in South Vietnam is there has not been a coup since 1965, and there appears to be no likelihood of one. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, in his steely way (which seems so little perceived by detractors at home; he is assuredly no puppet of President Thieu), has reportedly told the Vietnamese the next coup will be the last one; evidently, they believe him.

Elections have been progressively held throughout the south (village and hamlet elections just last month came off in orderly and decent fashion). The Thieu regime itself entered office on a plurality of about 35 per cent of the eligible voters (nearly the equivalent to those of New York's Mayor Lindsay and President Nixon), and has at least maintained if not somewhat broadened this base.

In the recent village elections, candidacies have been contested: Government nominees have been defeated. South Vietnam is certainly no more of a democracy, say, than Jersey City or Plaquemines Parish, La., but by the standards of a developing Asian country still fighting for its life, the results are good enough.

FAR MORE DEMOCRATIC

Certainly, South Vietnam's imperfect democracy is infinitely more democratic than anything the Communists would ever permit. South Vietnam is developing * * * told the Vietnamese the next Supreme Court has overruled the government in a number of important cases and forced corrective action or legislation which has pinched President Thieu. To his credit, and the court's, the latter has nevertheless continued to function without impediment.

Economically, the short-term health of South Vietnam is good. With greatly improved security, development is gaining momentum. Crops of "miracle rice" have wiped out the country's million-ton wartime rice deficit.

Compared to past years, little of this rice is reaching the VC. Rice has, in fact, come in so well that farmers are now playing the market and withholding their crops so as to take advantage of price fluctuations.

In other words, here as elsewhere in the economy, the rules of a free market are working. Inflation remains a danger, but this, to some extent, will be countered by further American troop withdrawals, and consequent reductions in U.S. soft-goods spending.

STAGE II

Set against the foregoing conditions and developments in South Vietnam, the Communists have two main capabilities or a combination of both.

One, which they have already begun to implement in many parts of the country, is to fall back into what experts in their jargon call "Stage II," which means a low-level, protracted, relatively passive guerrilla effort without big battles, aimed at survival rather than victory.

The second capability is to hit hard across or just around the Laotian flank of, the DMZ.

Along and around the DMZ the NVA has more than three divisions and a host of supporting units and enormous logistic installations, all poised for a possible blow against the relatively thin forces in the north, where the two best ARVN divisions, the 1st and 2nd, hold the line with backup from our 101st Airborne Division and 5th Mechanized Cavalry Brigade.

A hammer blow across the DMZ would be a logical enemy way to try to shatter the top ARVN divisions and thus to set back Vietnamization as well as gain a new foothold in the once embattled four northern provinces.

What may perhaps deter such a stroke is fear it would provoke renewed bombing of the massive base complex the Communists have now developed north of the DMZ.

CAMBODIA

No discussion of enemy capabilities would be complete without mention of Cambodia. Communist operations in that country present a good example of the psychological warfare with which the Communists have often succeeded in sapping the will of our home front.

Despite widespread attacks and high-visibility military presence here, there, and seemingly everywhere in Cambodia, the Communists enjoy few significant new military advantages in that country.

They still hold the area east of the Mekong, which has been captured Communist territory for nearly a decade. They also are able to operate more or less at will in north-west Cambodia, but the region is remote from Vietnam and of little importance to the Vietnam war.

The vital areas of Cambodia (especially to the U.S.) are Phnom Penh and Kompong Som (Sihanoukville). Phnom Penh has been virtually guaranteed by the South Vietnamese: they have stationed marine battalions in easy striking distance of the capital, and much of their armor is in support for a push along Route 1 from the Parrot's Beak.

Kompong Som, it can be stated on high authority, will be kept closed to Communist shipping, no matter what happens inside Cambodia (just as the border sanctuaries will be cleaned out again, whether by U.S. or ARVN troops, when the need arises).

INTO THE VORTEX

It was the deposal of Sihanouk in March—not our raids into the border sanctuaries in May—that brought Cambodia into the vortex and off the tightrope. What is happening is hard on Cambodia, admittedly, but not gravely hazardous to American vital interests. Cambodia has belatedly but finally and inevitably been pulled into the war which Ho Chi Minh proclaimed 24 years ago as a war for a Communist Indochina.

And so, at length we return to the initial big questions.

Are we winning? Yes.

When and how can we get out of Vietnam? By next May, our army will be down to about 280,000. From that point on, it will be a supporting rather than a fighting army and it can probably become a volunteer army.

The signs now point to a Korean solution—i.e., token U.S. presence for years ahead, but few casualties and diminishing financial cost.

The imponderable is not what the Communists do, for they can now do little. That is one reason for their adamant position in Paris. As the war now stands, any settlement short of forced unification of the two Vietnams under a Communist dictatorship would be a crushing defeat for Hanoi's costly, bitter and protracted struggle.

The North Vietnamese, in short, cannot afford serious negotiations, which would of course entail compromise.

The imponderable instead is what the American home front will stand for. If our upper-middle-class, left-wing-intellectual opponents of the war, who emotionally feel it is hopeless and unwinnable, can exert their powerful influence to break off our effort (and virtually sue for peace), the war can yet be lost.

This is what Hanoi banks on as it draws aid and comfort from our copperheads and doomsayers. (It is perhaps significant that, among some units in Vietnam, the Ho Chi Minh Trail is nicknamed "The Fulbright-McGovern Memorial Highway," or just "Fulbright-McGovern.")

Will President Nixon be allowed to complete successfully what Stewart Alsop in Newsweek has so presciently described as his "Great Retreat"?

The answer lies within ourselves. As Foch said, "no one is defeated who will not admit that he is defeated."

LAW AND DISORDER II

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has loudly proclaimed its concern over the rising rate of crime, yet in terms of systematic planning to meet this situation there has been little tangible progress. The administration seems content to fight crime by advancing the use of procedurally and constitutionally questionable methods such as the "no knock" and "preventive detention" procedures.

It is disappointing that this self-proclaimed "law and order" administration has not effectively utilized existing programs to assist in modernizing the criminal justice system. The recent study of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—by the National Urban Coalition is the latest item detailing the administration's failure in this area.

Under the justification of State responsibility, the administration has not taken upon itself the responsibility to effecting changes in the criminal justice system. The report of the Urban Coalition is inadvertently a stinging indictment of the bloc grant approach, but its central significance is that it pinpoints areas that continue to be neglected.

The lack of emphasis on corrections and rehabilitation has been recognized by criminologists as one of the weakest links in our criminal justice system. Yet this knowledge has not motivated the LEAA or the States to move in these areas. The stress on new equipment has been a standard goal for most police units—but most of the studies show that the criminals might not be so much deterred by a shining new patrol car as by the knowledge that if he is caught he will be speedily brought to trial.

It is discouraging to see that LEAA has not moved forcefully in these areas, but I am hopeful that the wide circulation of the Urban Coalition's report and its recommendations will provide the impetus to move in these necessary directions.

I urge my colleagues to study the following report entitled, "Law and Disorder II":

LAW AND DISORDER II

(Prepared by the National Urban Coalition)

Crime is gripping our cities with fear destroying lives and property, consuming fiscal and human resources. Urban systems of criminal justice—including the police, the courts, and corrections institutions—are incapable of halting rising crime rates and unresponsive to the needs of the communities they serve. For decades these agencies have operated beyond public scrutiny, lacking either adequate support or constructive criticism. The public has refused to make the financial commitment necessary for the system to work. Few basic questions have been asked about crime, criminals, or the operation of the agencies set up to deal with them. Fewer answers have been found.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the grant program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the De-

partment of Justice, is the only existing major federal program which has the potential to stop the rise in crime and to modernize the agencies of the criminal justice system. In 1969, \$63 million in block grants were made available to the states for the creation of state planning agencies and the funding of action programs to improve the operation of both state and local criminal justice agencies; in 1970, appropriations under the Act were increased to \$268 million; and funding proposals for fiscal 1971 range from \$480 million to over \$1 billion. Once the billion mark is reached the federal investment in the operation of the nation's criminal justice agencies will represent one-sixth of the total national expenditure in this area.

Because of the great potential of the Safe Streets Act program for dealing constructively with one of the most frightening and costly of all urban problems, the National Urban Coalition has followed its developments with great expectations. In June, 1969, the Coalition published a report, "Law and Disorder: State Planning Under the Safe Streets Act of 1968," which pointed out that evolving patterns in the state planning process threatened to impair the effectiveness of the federal grant program.

Based on an examination of 12 urbanized states (California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas) the report observed that: Participation in the planning process was limited to a narrow group of officials, criminal justice professionals, and local government representatives—the same people who administered the system in need of reform. No effort was being made to provide linkages to the many private and public agencies concerned with the development of human resources that are essential to the prevention of crime or the rehabilitation of criminals. Nor were the insights of those who have been "processed" by the system being sought. Many states had created, at the suggestion of LEAA's guidelines, a regional substructure under the state agency that was not functionally relevant to the problems of the criminal justice system and that was either inoperative or ineffective in serving its intended purpose as a conduit for local participation.

Partly because of the regional structures and partly because of the structure of the state agencies, the planning process was reinforcing rather than overcoming the traditional fragmentation of the criminal justice system so that none of the agencies involved was taking into consideration its relationship to the others.

With few exceptions, planning efforts were suffering from a lack of know-how, both in terms of structuring a state operation and in terms of creating substantive programming goals. The report found that the Justice Department was doing little to overcome this deficiency.

This report is an updating of the June, 1969, findings, prepared from data gathered at federal, state, and local levels. It focuses on the Title I planning process developed by the states and on the action programs funded by LEAA under the state plans. It does not include an analysis of the academic assistance program established by Title I or a detailed discussion of the programs of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

SUMMARY

Despite one full year of operation under the Act, many state programs have not gotten off the ground. There is evidence that in many cases the planning process is a paper exercise, unrelated to the actual distribution of action funds. Planning funds are not reaching local governments but are going to regional entities which in most cases have no operational responsibilities. State agen-

cies—the final repositories of decision-making power—are dominated by officials of the criminal justice agencies and representatives of general units of state and local government. There is little or no representation from "citizen and community interests" (as stated in LEAA's guidelines) or from social service agencies having rehabilitative resources. Where there is minority representation, it does not adequately reflect inner-city interests. For the most part, these state-level deficiencies are not corrected by the composition of regional or local boards.

Program grants are being dissipated—geographically and programmatically—in part because of the structural difficulties which were outlined in "Law and Disorder," in part because of a lack of leadership by both federal and state agencies, and in part because of a lack of public commitment. The broad dissipation of action funds has meant that the money is not being focused on major impact programs, has little likelihood of preventing or reducing crime, and in some cases is not going to the urban population centers—where the crime is. The National League of Cities, in a report issued in February, 1970, showed that such cities as Cleveland, Toledo, Scranton, Houston, San Francisco, and Albany have received none or only small amounts of their states' fiscal 1969 funds. Our survey supported that picture.

Almost all of the 1969 action money went for police expenditures—usually communications equipment or other hardware—while only negligible attention was given to such areas as corrections, juvenile treatment, narcotics control, or court reform. This heavy emphasis on police, if continued, could cause a serious dislocation in the entire system of criminal justice. Little evidence has been produced to show that more sophisticated police equipment produces measurable results in preventing crime. On the other hand, it has been shown that meaningful treatment in corrections institutions brings down recidivism rates, that controlling narcotics addiction does away with those crimes of violence caused by the compulsion for drugs, and that effective juvenile programs halt rising crime rates in that segment of the population where crime has been increasing most rapidly. Applying simple cost-effectiveness standards, it would seem that investments in these latter areas should receive priority over the former. Yet, to date, they have been largely ignored.

As of March, 1970, only \$1,109,776 had been committed to corrections in the 12 states surveyed, while \$11,563,738—more than 10 times as much—had gone for police projects, and approximately 58 per cent of this latter amount for equipment expenditures. A total of \$1,140,708 had been spent on court reform. A look at the specific states reveals that, in Ohio, 92 per cent of fiscal 1969 state expenditures were in the police category; in Indiana, 81 per cent; in Illinois, 79 per cent; and in Pennsylvania, 80 per cent.

The President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have shown that cities and states alone cannot halt the rising crime rates, and that substantial increases are needed in federal expenditures for crime control. The Violence Commission recommended a doubling of the nation's investment in the administration of justice and the prevention of crime, with the lion's share to be carried by the federal government. Because of its present administrative and structural inadequacies, the Title I program cannot effectively handle greatly increased levels of funding. Until measures are taken to insure that planning and action funds will be used effectively, LEAA funding should be held at its present level or restricted to \$480 million, as the Attorney General recommended on March 12, 1970.

A FAILURE OF FEDERAL AND STATE LEADERSHIP

The Justice Department played only a minimal supervisory role in handing out the \$63 million in grant money appropriated for Title I in 1969. Although LEAA's annual report points to an impressive structure of regional assistance offices and contain numerical tabulations of technical assistance, telephone responses, and meetings, the Administration in fact provided little leadership in the establishment of priorities, the proper structuring of regional and local planning mechanisms, or the development of sound action programs. Nor did LEAA set up a clearinghouse operation to disseminate among the states the limited information that does exist about the effectiveness of various anticrime programs.

This lack of direction has resulted in great confusion among the states on such important questions as whether the division of a state into regions is optional or mandatory; whether private agencies active in such fields as juvenile treatment and corrections can be the recipients of action grants; or whether juvenile programs are restricted to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funds, or can be supported by LEAA grants. On another level, that of substantive impact, the lack of standards and guidelines has resulted in a tremendous duplication of effort among states and localities attacking similar problems. It has also produced such undesirable developments as the investment of "riot control" funds in small, even rural, municipalities or townships, and financial support to obsolete, irrationally constituted police departments which would either consolidate or go out of existence without the federal funding.

In many instances state agencies are looking for meaningful goals, measurements, and guidance. This year's Coalition survey showed that at least one state-agency chairman had had no contact with his regional LEAA representative. A state-agency executive director, when asked the extent of his contact with LEAA, said he would like to "get on their mailing list." And several agencies complained that the Justice Department had not even provided them with information * * * own being developed in other states or cities. For some states, the highest compliment paid LEAA was, "They haven't told us how to run our shop." The problem was particularly acute in the Midwest where the directorship of the LEAA regional office in Chicago remained vacant for several months.¹

LEAA has attempted to justify its limited leadership role by asserting that crime is a "state and local problem" and that Congress did not intend LEAA to direct the states in their program efforts. However, the language of Title I, Sections 515(b) and 515(c), authorizes LEAA to play a leadership role by evaluating "the programs and activities assisted under this title" and by rendering "technical assistance to states, units of general local government, combinations of such states or units, or other . . . agencies in matters relating to law enforcement." Recently, the Attorney General acknowledged that LEAA was "designed to provide leadership . . . and technical assistance to help the states and cities," but there is no indication to date that this has, in fact, become Departmental policy.

The chief mechanism provided in Title I for Justice Department direction and evaluation of the state programs is the annual plan. To obtain its action funds, each state must annually submit a comprehensive plan analyzing the problems of its criminal justice system and describing the ways in which it proposes to invest the federal money to meet those problems. LEAA is authorized by Title I to fund only those states which have submitted "comprehensive plans" that encom-

pass the activities of all agencies of the criminal justice system. Among other requirements, the plans must "incorporate innovations and advanced techniques," must show that federal funds are not being used to supplant state or local funds, and must show that 75 per cent of federal action funds are going to local governments for crime-control programs.

LEAA effectively cut itself off from a meaningful review of fiscal 1969 plans by failing to require states to show where the action money would be spent geographically or for what specific purposes. Instead, plans, described general categories such as "crime prevention" without including sufficient information with which to gauge the nature or impact of the program. A consultant hired by LEAA to assess the state plans concluded that the vagueness and lack of comprehensiveness in action-grant proposals made meaningful evaluation impossible.

Even if the plans had been more reflective of the proposed distribution of action funds, there is no reason to believe that LEAA would have played a stronger role in setting and encouraging priorities. Where the 1969 plans omitted or showed an insubstantial commitment to major elements of the criminal justice system, such as the courts or corrections, LEAA still distributed the action money—along with a weak warning that future plans should be more comprehensive.²

In fact, LEAA's acceptance of the heavy emphasis on police programs at the expense of other areas of the criminal justice system raises serious questions about the Justice Department's interpretation of the term "comprehensive." Moreover, LEAA has not been willing to use the leverage provided in the other Title I plan requirements discussed above.

Although changes made by LEAA in its guidelines for fiscal 1970 require that state plans provide more specifics in regard to the geographical and categorical distribution of action money, this improvement was offset by the Administration's agreement, announced in early February, to make 50 per cent of fiscal 1970 funds available to the states on the basis of the 1969 plans.

Not all of the blame for the low level of performance in 1969 rests with the Justice Department. Neither public interest nor government commitment was high at state and local levels. One state consultant working on this survey reported that the operation of his state agency has gone "largely unnoticed and unreported." Another commented, "The program has not received attention among the public at large. There is no thoughtful middle-ground dialect on the issue." A third stated, "The fact that money is available under the Safe Streets Act is still a fairly well-kept secret."

The states generally did not succeed in providing the leadership which the LEAA was so willing to transfer to them. As of April 1, 1970, several states had fallen far behind in the distribution of 1969 action funds. A number complained that they had no applicants for the money. These states had not generated a sufficient volume of project proposals because they had either failed to get information about the program out to the cities and localities or had transmitted conflicting information which made it difficult, if not impossible, for local governments to respond. Local governments in California, for example, complained that frequent changes in directives from the state agency made it virtually impossible to complete project applications.

Other states set inadequate guidelines or failed to enforce guidelines, once established. For example, Indiana set forth 14 objectives for local planning agencies, only three of which could be interpreted as encompassing purchases of equipment. Yet, as of March, 1970, over 55 per cent of the state's committed action money for fiscal 1969 had gone for equipment. Other states allowed funds to

go for routine expenditures—lighting, police uniforms, basic office equipment—which had been neglected before the federal dollars became available.³

Some governors failed to support the implementation of the program. Indiana, as part of an overall cost reduction effort, had a staff of two professionals (with an executive director earning \$15,000) administering the fiscal 1969 action program of over \$715,000. In Florida, the agency administrator claimed that he could not take steps to broaden his regional planning units to end police domination of the program because, without the law-enforcement lobby at the state level, he would be unable to obtain the matching funds necessary to trigger the federal grants. Although some state legislatures, such as Illinois' and North Carolina's, have exceeded the matching funds required for LEAA grants⁴ a number of state agencies are experiencing difficulty in getting legislative support. This represents a serious threat to the program, particularly since many local governments are finding it extremely difficult to come up with the required match for action grants.

Finally, some of the blame rests with the cities. Participation at the city level has in many cases been deficient, in part because of the restricted role which the Act itself and the state administrators have carved out for the cities, and in part because many city officials have not placed a high priority on the program. A few mayors reached in the Coalition survey were not even aware of how much money had been committed to agencies within their cities or who had participated in the planning process. The Act itself does not require support to citywide planning entities,⁵ but it is clear that unless such mechanisms are established by the mayors on their own initiative, the role of the cities in the program will continue to be restricted.

OPERATION OF THE STATE AGENCIES

Each state was required by Title I to establish a state planning agency under the governor—supported by staff—to be responsible for the development of the annual comprehensive plan and for administering the grants made by LEAA after the submission of the plan. All of the 12 states surveyed by the Coalition had planning agencies—ranging in size from 8 to 41, and supported by staff ranging from 6 to 56.⁶

Some of the states have also created task forces or panels of experts to advise the state boards and staff in such specific substantive areas as court reform, juvenile delinquency, and community relations. In addition, all but one of the states—New Jersey—have been divided into regions, each with its own board, staff, and, in some cases, advisory committee. This apparatus serves as an intermediate level between the cities and the states, developing plans and screening program proposals.

A. Who does the planning?

State planning agencies suffer from an across-the-board shortage of representatives from public and private social service agencies or from "citizen and community interests." For fiscal 1969, in the 12 states surveyed, 302 persons served on state planning agencies, of which 62 per cent were criminal justice officials, 26 per cent represented general units of state and local government, 7 per cent were from public and private social service agencies, and only 5 per cent represented citizen and community interests.⁷

New Jersey's 14-man board and North Carolina's 26-member board had no representatives other than criminal justice professionals; Florida's 29-member board had only three persons outside this category, and Michigan's 28-member board had only two. New York was an exception to the general pattern of limited board representation: that state's agency, after careful planning, succeeded in including some minority persons with strong community ties.

Footnotes at end of article.

Many states assert that representation at the state level can be limited to the "professionals" and need not be broadly diversified. Diversification, they say, can be achieved at the regional and local levels. Our review of regional structures, however, showed that in many states a heavy emphasis on criminal justice personnel was carried over to the regions. In Florida, for example, each of the seven regions is composed of four sheriffs, four police chiefs, a fiscal officer, and a hired planner. In North Carolina, 233 of the 383 members of the 22 regional policy boards are criminal justice officials, 130 represent general units of local government, and only 20 represent social service agencies or citizen interests.⁸ In Ohio and Indiana, a sampling of regional boards and advisory committees indicated a similar imbalance in favor of professionals and government officials.

Those states, such as Pennsylvania, which have attempted to broaden planning and programming participation through additions to their regional boards have failed to alter the decision-making process which places final responsibility for deciding where state funds should go at the state-board level. Despite Justice Department assertions that participation in the planning process would be broadened during fiscal 1969, the domination of criminal justice officials has continued.⁹

LEAA has claimed that there is substantial minority participation on the planning agencies. But our figures show that, although they are some minority participants, almost all of them are either local government representatives or criminal justice officials.

Before April, 1970, Massachusetts had no minority members on its state board (it has since added blacks and Puerto Ricans). Mississippi is being challenged in court under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because of the composition of its board. The allegations in that case are that the narrow composition of the board is having a detrimental effect on the kinds of programs funded by the state, with little or no emphasis being given to programs that strengthen ties between criminal justice agencies and the community. To date, the Justice Department has failed to develop clear Title VI policy guidelines for the LEAA program. The Civil Rights Commission has reported that the Administration has no mechanism for measuring performance in this area and no staff person with responsibility for determining whether the program is in conformance with civil rights laws.

Officials of the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice have reported that LEAA has not tried to alert community groups to the program nor to work with them, and that state agencies have provided no machinery to prompt minority interests. Even where mechanisms already provide for such participation, they are apparently being ignored.

The state agencies have not provided adequately for the participation of persons who have links to community groups and community problems. Nor have they included private interests which possess important resources for treatment, rehabilitation, and crime prevention, such as business, labor, and social service agencies.¹⁰ Without the inclusion of these interests, the program will continue to lack both the resources and the commitment necessary to make it work. The lack of adequate participation on the planning boards, resulting in the closed nature of the planning process, has already had a negative impact on the Title I program. It explains in large part the striking lack of innovative programming in the states and the tendency to "buy more of the same old stuff." It also accounts for the over-emphasis of law enforcement programs during 1969. And, at least two states reported that a num-

ber of community-based programs were rejected at the regional level because law enforcement officials dominated the regional boards.

The isolation of the criminal justice system from other influences and resources in society is a major cause of the system's backwardness. Until linkages are made with private agencies, civic organizations, volunteer groups, and grass-roots organizations, it will be difficult to develop effective crime prevention programs or improved community relations.

Most states have not yet begun to think of the valuable resources that could be tapped by extending the planning process beyond criminal justice professionals.

B. The regional structures

With the exception of New Jersey, which scrapped an ineffective regional network in order to deal directly with its cities and counties, all the states surveyed by the Coalition have created regional substructures under the state agency with responsibility for developing a regional contribution to the state plan, and assisting with and approving action-grant applications from localities situated within the region. Most states superimposed the criminal justice planning function on preexisting state planning districts, regional planning commissions, or councils of government; a few created new regional entities.

In some states, major cities—such as New York City and Philadelphia—constitute regional entities in themselves. In Massachusetts and New Jersey, the cities relate directly to the state agency. Only less urbanized areas are combined into regions in Massachusetts. In New York, cities with a population of 500,000 or more are allowed to become separate planning and programming entities. In the majority of states, however, local governments participate in the Title I program only through regional structures which are often the result of arbitrary geographic carving up of the states.

Many regional structures have failed to give adequate representation to major cities within their borders. Detroit and Wayne County, for example, with 40 per cent of Michigan's population and half of its serious crime, are grouped together with six other counties into one region, while less populous cities such as Lansing are in regions with only two or three counties. The City of Cleveland has only 6 per cent representation in Ohio's Region IV, yet it contains 25 per cent of the region's population. (The mayor has filed suit against the regional council challenging the regional composition.) Similarly, Gary, Indiana, has only two representatives in Indiana's Region I and no representation on the state planning agency.

In at least one state, Texas, major cities have veto powers over those parts of their regional plan which directly affect them.¹¹ Other states, such as Michigan, require that regional plans show two sets of priorities—one for the region, the other for localities within the region. By far the majority of states, however, submerge the interests and needs of their cities within the regional structure.

The major failing of the regional networks is that most of them are artificial structures devoid of legal or political powers. The pre-existent state planning regions were notorious because of their lack of authority and resources to carry out the lengthy complex plans which their staffs produced. The criminal justice planning regions suffer from the same problem. The regions are not governing entities having tax powers and funding available to them other than the money granted by the state planning agency. In many cases that money is distributed with little or no relation to the regional plan.

Most states require the regions to develop comprehensive plans which are financed up

to 90 per cent by the LEAA grant, each region receiving a grant based on a formula which usually takes into account either population or crime rates, or both.¹² Most states surveyed do not provide planning funds to local units of government even though planning at the local level would unquestionably have a greater impact on action programs; the regional grant is viewed as fulfilling the Act's provision that 40 per cent of the planning money must be made available to units of local government to enable them to participate in the formation of the state plan.

Although it is too late to prevent the formation of regions, there is a serious question whether the regional structures imposed by some of the states are authorized under title I. The language of the Act authorizes state plans to "encourage units of local government to combine or provide for cooperative arrangements." It does not suggest compulsory joinder. Regional units should be authorized only if they serve a functional purpose, if they are voluntary, and if they accommodate the fundamental planning needs of the cities.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

In most of the states surveyed, the development of the annual comprehensive plan was a lengthy, time-consuming process which frequently did little to improve the distribution of the action funds or to make the program more effective. While the process in some states helped to bring the various elements of the criminal justice system together in a coordinated effort, it is doubtful whether that alone was worth the cost.

Title I allows for a diversity of planning levels to meet a range of operational needs. State planning should deal with those problems dependent on the state for resolution, including reform of the criminal law and the laws pertaining to the operation of local criminal justice agencies, upgrading the many state law enforcement agencies, and coordination of statewide problems. The state should also provide guidance and innovative ideas for localities with major crime problems. Regional structures should be used to maximize the limited resources of small jurisdictions through sharing and joint investments, and to overcome jurisdictional limitations which prevent localities from effectively dealing with crime and criminals. Cities, as the Violence Commission and others have pointed out, should engage in citywide or metropolitanwide comprehensive planning for the reform of locally based agencies of criminal justice. Of the three levels, planning at the city level is the most important for improving the operation of criminal justice agencies and controlling the incidence of crime.

This is not the way Title I is working. In most states no planning funds are reaching those cities which do not constitute regions to assist them in the development of local plans or to enhance their participation at the regional level. In some cities police chiefs, prosecutors, and other criminal justice officials serve on regional boards, or lobby directly for state funds without citywide clearance.

Generally each of the regional units within the state prepares its own comprehensive plan, which is then submitted to the state agency for "consideration" in the development of the state plan. The scope of the regional plans in 1969 exceeded the resources available to the regions to such an extent that many critics called the entire process a paper exercise. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that many regions relied on outside consultants to prepare the plans. In Michigan, for example, four out of 11 regional plans were developed by consultants. Regional planning in Texas was similarly characterized by heavy use of consultants.

Few regions were operational—developing plans and receiving funds for those programs which should appropriately be conducted on

Footnotes at end of article.

a regional basis. Many regions were either like California's Los Angeles subregion—generating complex regional plans which had little impact on the state plan and no relationship to action funds—or like Indiana's and Illinois' regions which did little more than sign the regions' applications to the state agency.

In 1969, the states, like the regions, engaged in a planning exercise that was totally unrelated to the action resources available or to the general level of knowledge about crime in the states. A critic of the process has commented: "The state that can include the longest shopping list, decorated with the most impressive narrative—which usually means language mixing science with sociology in large doses—wins the prize." The Massachusetts plan, for example, was 1,600 pages long, and California's totaled 5,896 pages and weighed 48 pounds. But neither conveyed adequately the nature of the action programs proposed for funding, their relationship to the problems described in the plan, or their likelihood for reducing crime.

The states tended to go to two extremes. Some developed overly detailed plans which in effect precluded localities from developing their own priorities by requiring them to fit into one of the state's preferred categories. Others avoided planning responsibilities entirely by filing plans which were so general in nature that almost any subsequently submitted proposal could be tailored to fall within the plan. To illustrate the former, Illinois submitted a list of 24 program areas in its 1969 plan, but as of March, 1970, funds had not been granted in 12 of those areas because no request had been made for the designated programs. States suffering from the latter problem tended, as did Ohio, to fund numerous, scattered, small-impact programs.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ACTION FUNDS

By June 30, 1969, the states had all received their allotted action funds.¹³ By law, 75 per cent of these funds were required to go to units of local government or to combinations of such units. The remaining 25 per cent could be used for expenditures by state agencies, such as the highway patrol or the state prison; for statewide programs which would benefit a range of local agencies within the state, such as crime information systems; or for additional distribution to local governments. New Jersey, for example, distributed 88.9 per cent of its action funds to local governments.

Some states, such as Massachusetts, distributed the 75-per-cent local funding directly to local units of government for projects that had been cleared through the regional and state planning mechanisms. Others, such as North Carolina, distributed all the action funds to the regions for regional programs or for redistribution to local programs which had been approved by the state agency. Some states, such as Illinois, Indiana, and Massachusetts, had developed at the state level programs which they felt to be appropriate for local agencies but which had not been cleared by those agencies; these states were required to go out and look for participants in the designated programs. As late as April, 1970, at least two of these states were still looking for willing candidates for some of their programs. Many states requested lump sums for general categories of program activity; instead of obtaining project proposals through the planning process, they first obtained the federal grant and then opened their doors for program applicants who could tailor their needs to the broad program categories.

Title I provides federal funding on a matching scale, ranging from 33 1/3 per cent for salaries to 75 per cent for riot control or organized crime programs. Construction expenditures receive only a 50-per-cent match, all other programs get 60 per cent. The sliding scale

has produced a number of rather strange distortions. For example, the high funding for riot control has in some states led to grants to small communities which have no campuses or significant minority populations, and which probably will never be faced with a situation justifying the use of the equipment. In other states, planners have attempted to fund police-community relations programs with riot-control money in order to get the favorable match.

The restricted one-third match for salaries and the prohibition against funding to private entities have both been major hurdles to innovative program development. In such areas as crime prevention, rehabilitation, and community involvement, private organizations have far greater capabilities than do public agencies. A number of private agencies, such as the Vera Institute of Justice in New York City, have a demonstrated capacity for developing new operational models for the police or the courts. The major cost to these groups—or to planning or research units of public agencies seeking to develop new programs—is salaries.

In most states, fiscal 1969 action funds were widely scattered geographically and focused primarily on alleviating long-standing resource deficiencies within the criminal justice agencies. For the most part, there was little effort to develop major impact programs, the preference being to "show we're in operation by reaching a broad number of grantees." Michigan, for example, gave a local grant of \$600 for training; Pennsylvania \$609 for equipment; Indiana \$60 for the purchase of a narcotics detection kit; and Ohio \$94.80 for training. A minority of states did not fall into this category. Examples of major impact programs are Michigan's juvenile court and probation staff training program; Massachusetts' comprehensive reforms of the criminal and juvenile codes and its Youth Resources program; Illinois' police management studies program aimed at consolidation of small, ineffective departments; and the efforts of California and other states to develop meaningful data on the characteristics of crime, criminals, and the agencies which deal with them.

Many states failed to pose fundamental operational questions in defining priorities for the various agencies which submitted grant requests. As a result, the programs to reform criminal law or to restructure criminal justice agencies were few in number and small in scale. The tendency was to ask the operating agencies for their list of priority expenditures without determining whether performance would be better improved by altering the whole method of operation so that the expenditures would be unnecessary. One priority list submitted by a state corrections department contained 19 items ranging from increased salaries to a dishwasher for a prison dining room to plumbing renovation, with no reference to training, treatment, or other aids for inmates.

Police programs clearly dominated the first year of grants. This, in part, reflected the fact that Title I as presently written—particularly Section 301(b)(1) through (7), suggesting appropriate action grants—focuses almost exclusively on the police. In addition, police tended to be better prepared in pulling together proposals, to have substantial political backing, and to be viewed as the prime actors for reducing crime and bringing about criminal justice reform. The largest single funding category was equipment, representing 58 per cent of the police expenditures. Generally, police equipment expenditures varied in sophistication, reflecting existing funding levels for local departments within the states; lower-funded departments such as those in Indiana, Florida, and Ohio received such basic equipments as cameras, radios, and cars, while better-funded department such as those in Michigan and California received sophisticated communications systems, man-

agement systems, and training. A large number of grants were so small in size and so insignificant in purpose as to insure little improvement in present operation. This was particularly true of some of Indiana's, North Carolina's and Pennsylvania's police grants.

By and large, police expenditures went to support present practices and methods of operation. There was little innovation, functional reform, or alterations in the relationship of police departments to the neighborhoods they serve, even though these categories of expenditure tend to cost less than equipment. Although great emphasis was placed on sophisticated intelligence systems and on increased efficiency in apprehending offenders and processing them through the system, relatively little attention was given to prevention or to building community structures to help reduce the incidence of crime. Eight per cent of the police funds went to police-community relations programs which tended to focus on educating the community about the police or on assigning functions to the police which could better be performed by City Hall. There were few new "grievance resolution mechanisms," "community patrols," or "neighborhood participation" programs as suggested by Section 301(b)(7) of Title I.¹⁴

Expenditures on court reform in the 12 states constituted 7 per cent of the total,¹⁵ with major emphasis given to studies of present court procedures and some to building prosecution and defense resources.

Professor Harry I. Subin of the New York University School of Law, an LEAA consultant on state proposals for court reform, has pointed out that much of the money was going for studies—in many cases, for problems or programs such as ball reform that had already been extensively studied, suggesting that the states needed information more than money. Professor Subin deplored the lack of action programs and of new approaches to court reform. The Coalition survey reinforces Professor Subin's findings.

Despite verified statistics on the failure of present corrections institutions to provide the treatment and training necessary to enable their inmates to return to play a constructive role in society, and despite rising recidivism rates, corrections programs received only 7 per cent of the total action money in the 12 states surveyed. In two major states, California and Texas, only 1 per cent of local action funds went to corrections. Of the total corrections expenditures, the largest investment went to training programs for corrections personnel. An LEAA consultant evaluating the state training proposals described them as conveying "a picture of confusion—a picture that may cost a great deal of money and produce very little."

It is essential that expenditures in the corrections area be increased and that linkages be established between existing corrections institutions and public, private, and community groups possessing education, job training, counseling, and other supportive resources.

Two other fields with a proved relationship to rising crime rates—juvenile programs and narcotics control—received less than 6 per cent and 2 per cent respectively of the 12-state funding. This is particularly low in view of the fact that the Coalition survey focused on urban states where juvenile delinquency and drug addition are major problems. Effective programs in either of these areas could unquestionably have a major impact in the reduction of crime. In some states, planning agencies seem to be confused over the division of responsibility between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Justice Department in the juvenile area, even though most states have attempted to combine the planning mechanisms for both programs. Although increased HEW funding, with related resources in health, education, and other supportive serv-

Footnotes at end of article.

ices, would probably be the best way for financing juvenile programs, past patterns of funding indicate that LEAA has far better chances than does HEW for obtaining substantial program funds.¹⁰ If this is correct, it is imperative that LEAA direct the states to make a more substantial commitment to this important area of the criminal justice system.

The task of reducing crime and reforming the institutions of our criminal justice system is an extremely difficult one, but one that is essential to our survival as a nation. The time has come to translate unceasing rhetoric about the crime problem into tangible reform programs that confront the problems seriously and realistically. The first two years of operation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the action program created under Title I of the Safe Streets Act have been beset with problems; but they have succeeded in raising many important questions about crime and about the operation of the police, the courts, and corrections institutions. Further, the beginnings of a national planning and reform network have been created. The next few years will determine whether the Title I program is simply a new and cumbersome bureaucracy handing out money in a fashion that reinforces the existing problems of the criminal justice system, or whether it is in fact a serious effort to achieve institutional reform.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE TITLE I PROGRAM

1. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has failed to assume an effective leadership role in the Title I program. Yet Title I and the funds available under it provide substantial leverage for federal encouragement of excellence in programming at the local level. The problem of crime is too serious not to use that leverage while at the same time encourage local innovation. Therefore LEAA should begin immediately to implement the following activities.

a. Provide technical assistance for substantive planning and programming, including the establishment of priorities;

b. Utilize fully the review power provided in the Act of determining whether state plans and program objectives are truly comprehensive, "innovative," and consistent with the requirements of the Act;

c. Develop effective program evaluation procedures.

2. LEAA's guidelines for plan requirements are overly detailed, confusing, and lacking in focus. LEAA should change these guidelines to tailor plans to the resources available, to focus less on lengthy descriptions of the problems and more on the solutions proposed to address those problems, and to provide sufficient data on the proposed programs to indicate where action money will go and how it will be spent.

3. A vital and necessary prerequisite to reform of the criminal justice system is the development of comprehensive citywide or metropolitanwide programs. The cities must take the initiative to create offices of criminal justice (as recommended by the Violence Commission) or criminal justice coordinating council (as recommended by the Crime Commission). The states must be willing to make planning funds available to such entities once they have been created. And both the states and LEAA should provide assistance in program development, particularly in such areas as courts, corrections, and narcotics control, which are not now receiving adequate attention.

4. Most regional networks, as they are presently constituted, add nothing to criminal justice programs except an unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy. These regional networks should be abolished unless they are operational, are cutting out problems which require a regional body, and constitute voluntary combinations of units of local government. Major cities whose interests

cannot be properly addressed when submerging in a regional organization should be allowed to deal directly with state agencies.

5. Many states require from their regions lengthy comprehensive plans that bear little relation to the distribution of action funds. These requirements should be eliminated. Regional planning should either relate to operations to be conducted on the regional level or should be abolished in favor of data collection and project development. Where regional plans affect cities within their borders, the approval of these cities should be required, as is done in Texas.

6. The sliding scale of matching funds gives preferential treatment to programs for riot control and organized crime, and places negative restrictions on salaries—restrictions which are particularly harmful in demonstration programs. The sliding scale should be abolished.

7. The present restriction against direct-action grants to private entities prevents the program from tapping valuable resources for seeking solutions to problems of criminal justice. This restriction should be abolished.

8. Almost all of the Title I action money is being spent on police expenditures, while only negligible amounts are going for programs that could help to reverse the rising crime rate. Therefore, LEAA and state guidelines should impose a ceiling on police expenditures or specify minimal expenditures—that are enforced—for court reform, corrections, juvenile programs, and drug abuse. Further, the states should be required to earmark a defined percentage of state appropriations for much-needed experimentation at the neighborhood level for community-based or administered criminal justice reform programs. A similar earmarking should be required for efforts to reform state criminal laws and the laws pertaining to the agencies of the criminal justice system.

9. The entire planning process, from the local to the federal level, suffers from an across-the-board shortage of representatives from public and private social service agencies or from "citizen community interests." The process should be opened up to broader participation. At the federal level, a national advisory committee of private citizens should be created to advise LEAA on overall program goals, to assess long-range planning and short-run programming, and to report to the Congress on an annual basis with recommendations for strengthening the performance of the government in achieving reform of the criminal justice system. Finally, the states should include on their planning boards—and should require inclusion on regional and local planning entities—greater representation from social service, civic, and community organizations.

10. So little is known about what actually works in the crime control area that most states have few criteria for deciding how to spend their money effectively. While this report does not analyze the operations of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, it is clear that the Institute has the power to engage in far-reaching research and program development and has projected ambitious goals. Therefore, greatly increased appropriations should be provided to the Institute to expand its efforts in researching the causes of crime and the most effective ways of treating these causes. Some of the answers should be found—through the vehicle provided by the Institute—before LEAA funding levels are increased greatly.

FOOTNOTES

¹ In general, criticisms of Justice Department performance did not extend to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Indeed, many state agency officials singled out the Institute's work as particularly effective.

² Of the 12 states surveyed by the Coalition,

Ohio was censured for insufficient attention to court reform, and Texas for lack of programming in the corrections and organized crime categories. A number of states not in the survey, such as Wisconsin, Nevada, Iowa, and Rhode Island, were told to include a court component in their next year's plan: South Carolina, Nevada, and Wisconsin were required to plan for corrections reform in 1970. Despite these insufficiencies, no action was taken to hold up or reduce the 1969 action funds for these states.

³ Many of these expenditures are clearly outstanding obligations of the local government and appear to violate the Section 303 (10) requirement that federal funds not be used to supplant local funds. However, neither LEAA nor the states have interpreted them in that way.

⁴ Illinois has also provided the required matching funds for economically depressed areas such as Cairo and East St. Louis. The House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5, which held hearings on LEAA funding in the spring of 1970, has recommended that the states be required to absorb 25 percent of the matching funds for local action grants.

⁵ The Act simply requires that 40 percent of planning funds be made available to units of local government or combinations of such units to enable them to participate in the development of the state plan. As is shown later, most states have fulfilled this requirement by making planning grants to regional units within the state.

⁶ Several of the states surveyed were not yet fully staffed. Staff sizes as of the end of 1969 were:

	Professional	Clerical	Total
California.....	18	22	40
Florida.....	5	6	11
Illinois.....	24	19	43
Indiana.....	5	1	6
Massachusetts.....	39	17	56
Michigan.....	18	7	25
New Jersey.....	22	13	35
New York.....	23	16	39
North Carolina.....	6	3	9
Ohio.....	22	16	38
Pennsylvania.....	24	15	39
Texas.....	8	6	14

⁷ These figures have changed in recent months. As of May, 1970, 278 persons were serving on state planning agencies, with 60 per cent from criminal justice agencies, 28 per cent from local and state government, 8 per cent from social service agencies, and 4 per cent from "citizen and community interests."

⁸ The last figure may be high: nine of the individuals listed were in one region—Cumberland. Individuals who could not be identified were placed in this category.

⁹ Charles Rogovin, LEAA Administrator until June 1, 1970, made clear his intention that "planning participation should be broad." In a May 2, 1969, speech before the Stark County Bar Association in Canton, Ohio, he said the boards should have "representation from the general community. That is, representatives from many diverse groups, who have no professional ties to the criminal justice system, also should be included on advisory boards. Some of them should be Negroes and members of other minority groups. And it further means that all the community representatives be given a meaningful role to advise, consult, express their concern, give their judgments, help shape the best programs possible. This process should occur not only at the state level, but also at the local level, where cities and counties develop advisory boards to help draft programs for meaningful local law enforcement improvements." LEAA has not used its power to achieve this goal.

¹⁰ One exception is the planning board for New York City—the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council—which includes both private and public groups that have rehabilitative resources.

¹¹ Texas' "Policies and Procedures Governing Grants for Comprehensive Law Enforcement Planning" specifies that "regional planning grant applicants must provide evidence that will satisfy the governor and the Criminal Justice Council that (a) the central city (or cities) in the regional planning agency concurs that the application for a planning grant will meet its planning requirements . . ."

ORGANIZATION AND FINANCING OF STATE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING REGIONS ¹²

State	Eligibility for funding		Basis for funding	
	Only regions funded	Both regions and localities funded	Population	Crime index
California.....		X	X	X
Florida.....	X		X	
Illinois.....	X		X	X
Indiana.....	X		X	
Massachusetts.....	X		X	X
Michigan.....	X		X	X
New York.....	X		X	X
North Carolina.....	X		X	
Ohio.....	X		X	
Pennsylvania.....	X		X	
Texas.....	X		X	

ACTION-GRANT AWARDS BY STATE ¹³

[Amounts in parenthesis are the special grants awarded in August 1968, for riot prevention and control]

State	1969	1970
California.....	\$2,351,610	(\$414,989) \$17,287,000
Florida.....	737,035	(130,065) 5,597,000
Illinois.....	1,338,495	(236,202) 9,877,000
Indiana.....	613,785	(103,200) 4,565,000
Massachusetts.....	548,050	(117,450) 4,902,000
Michigan.....	1,055,020	(186,180) 7,817,000
New Jersey.....	860,285	(151,814) 6,372,000
New York.....	2,250,545	(397,154) 16,392,000
North Carolina.....	618,715	(77,000) 4,613,000
Ohio.....	1,284,265	(226,634) 9,563,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,427,235	(240,524) 10,591,000
Texas.....	1,333,565	(215,144) 9,936,000

¹⁴ Notable exceptions were New York's Youth Patrol for Harlem and North Carolina's "Public Grievance Officer" for Cumberland-Hake County.

¹⁵ This is higher than the national average: at least 35 per cent of all 54 plans had no court programs.

¹⁶ Last year the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation under the Juvenile Delinquencies Program Act was \$5 million; in fiscal 1970, it will reach \$10 million.

DEALINGS WITH COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, since he first came to Senate a dozen years ago, Senator HUGH SCOTT, our distinguished minority leader, has compiled an impressive record in legislation dealing with commerce and industry.

Having served with him for years on the Commerce Committee I can testify that his leadership in the committee as well as on the Senate floor has been a powerful influence in promoting this type of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Scott's legislative accomplishments in commerce and industry be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD—COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY LEGISLATION

Pennsylvania ranks among the largest industrial states in the Nation. To retain its pre-eminent position, Senator Hugh Scott has always favored legislation designed to promote the expansion of commerce and industry in Pennsylvania.

The ports of Philadelphia, Chester and Erie are essential to the continuation of Pennsylvania's industrial growth. As such, Senator Scott has always supported legislation dealing with maritime and merchant marine activity.

The Senate's Republican Leader has also been concerned for many of Pennsylvania's industries which have been adversely affected by the rising level of foreign imports. Industries such as steel, shoes, flat glass and electronics have been hard-hit in recent years, and Senator Scott has taken an active role in securing relief for them.

The following is a summary of Senator Scott's activities with respect to commerce and industry:

91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 766—Unfair Competition Act of 1969—to provide for registration and protection of trademarks, etc.

S. 864—Orderly Trade Expansion Act—to authorize the President to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries, etc.

S. 1164—Iron Ore, and Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act—to limit the amount of iron ore, pig iron and steel mill products which may be imported into the United States by giving the President authority to negotiate agreements establishing import quotas.

S. 2143—to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to develop a national travel policy, to encourage and improve domestic travel facilities, and to coordinate and act as the Federal Government's liaison with State and private tourist organizations. Provides funds for new activities of the U.S. Travel Service.

Votes

Voted against the nomination of Carl J. Gilbert to be Special Representative for Trade Negotiations because of his total commitment to free trade at the expense of some of our hard-pressed domestic industries.

Voted to authorize the President to impose tariffs, and other import restrictions as he deems necessary, and requiring the President to reciprocate when other countries remove import quotas on U.S. goods.

90TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 612—to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, etc.

S. 1796—to impose quotas on importation of various manmade or natural articles of textile fibers.

S. 3335—to apply an acceptable credit risk standard for loans to small business concerns in certain high-risk areas.

Votes

Voted to suspend foreign aid to any country which seize or penalized a U.S. fishing vessel until that country reimbursed the United States for its payments to owners of such vessels.

Voted not to reduce by 122 million the authorizations for U.S. Maritime programs.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 949—to promote State and regional centers to place finding of science usefully in hands of American enterprise.

S. 1858—to promote the expansion and replacement of U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets.

S. 2022—Orderly Marketing Act; to afford foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in U.S. market.

S. 3530—to create Federal Maritime Board-Administration.

Votes

Voted to exempt Rural Electrification Administration-financed cooperatives from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction.

Voted to authorize a qualified State to administer the safety standards contained in Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. Res. 30—to grant legislative authority to the Select Committee on Small Business.

S. 627—to promote State commercial fishery research and development.

S. 1773—to provide construction subsidies for merchant fleets.

Votes

Voted for the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1963.

Voted not to reduce by 21 1/2 percent the proposed subsidy for fishing vessel construction.

Voted for the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 610—to establish an Office of International Travel and a Travel Advisory Board within the Commerce Department.

S. 852—to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets.

S. 1722—to protect and equalize rights in distribution of merchandise identified by a trade-mark, brand or trade name.

Votes

Voted to strengthen and pass the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Voted to restore the "peril-point" provisions of existing law into the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Voted to provide for financial assistance to firms and workers adversely affected by the above Act.

Voted not to limit payments to displaced workers in affected industries to amounts they would receive under regular State unemployment compensation programs.

Voted to require the President to transmit to Congress a copy of each trade agreement entered into, with a statement of his reasons therefore.

Voted for the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Voted not to cut by \$14.2 million funds for ship construction, Maritime Administration.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2663—to provide for equalizing conditions of competition between domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the U.S.

S. 2692—to provide for a ten year program of research, construction, etc., to advance the marine sciences.

S. 1362—to encourage and stimulate production of conservation for coal; authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research.

Votes

Voted to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels.

Pennsylvania's industry should continue to grow because of Senator Scott's efforts in Washington to encourage that growth through effective legislation. Senator Scott will support additional legislation to assist Pennsylvania industries that have been hurt by imports.

THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, August 17, 1970, commemorates the ninth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. The Charter of Punta del Este signed on that date by delegates of the American republics represented the blueprint for a plan of action to attack the complex problems of development in the hemisphere. We accepted the challenge and joined with our neighbors in an undertaking with broad objectives in the areas of economic growth, education, health, agriculture, and the general well-being of all the people of the Americas.

The labor of the past stirred a continent to action and commenced a peaceful revolution in progress. Those countless people who have become involved and committed to the development process can take pride in the new growth and achievement which marks these past years of the Alliance for Progress. The hopes and aspirations of President John F. Kennedy for hemispheric strength and stability are, indeed, attainable. The pace of the task at hand is steadily quickening and his ringing call in 1961 to the governments and peoples to join in a "vast cooperative effort" is vividly brought to mind on this anniversary date.

In years past, there have been unfair comparisons between the Marshall Plan and the Alliance for Progress. These comparisons were, indeed, unfair because the circumstances involved in each are entirely different.

In Europe, the economic base was there as were the skilled technicians and management. In that great massive input of capital investment to rejuvenate a continent, the rebuilding of their shattered economies was certain given a reasonable amount of time. And the time that it took to bring Europe to her feet was an impressive lesson in applying the right ingredients in the correct measurements to insure success.

In Latin America, on the other hand, the circumstances were quite different. The needed skills and infrastructure so necessary to the development process were for the most part lacking. It has taken time to mount effective government-to-government programs to do the job of training and institution building essential to achieve growth in less developed countries.

Look at our own country. It took time to develop our institutions to the point that the benefits of a strong economy could reach the people. It took time for a strong labor movement to develop and bring better working conditions to the working man and woman in this Nation. It took time to bring rural electrification to the small farms of America. It took time to develop educational facilities throughout this great land to train and to reach our youth. It did not take 9 nor 19 nor 90 years. Even now, in our Nation, we see much that remains to be done in the cities, in the rural areas, in the fields

of health, education, and welfare for all the people.

And so in Latin America it will surely take time to institute an extension service to rural areas; it will take time to train doctors and nurses to wage their battle against disease; it will take time to gear up to reach through education the young; and it will take time to assist in the formation of cooperatives and making credit available to all who need it.

On the ninth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, we should take great pride in the progress we have shared with our Latin American friends. In the boldest and most important multilateral undertaking in the history of the hemisphere, we are partners in development. It has involved governments and peoples with a common focus on the element of change. The Latin Americans, with initiatives and supplying most of the resources needed, will attain their revolution under the Alliance for Progress. With their work and sacrifice and willingness to develop new institutions, our help can be extremely important. Our contributions, in the form of capital investment and technical assistance, will help give the Latin Americans the tools they need in their struggle against poverty and misery.

Looking back on 9 years of the Alliance for Progress, there has been a strengthening of democratic institutions, growth in economic and social development, better working conditions, homes built, schools constructed, teachers trained, water systems installed, techniques improved and a multitude of related development activities underway. As we enter the 10th year of the Alliance, we should note some rather startling accomplishments. Percentage increases today, over 1960, reveal:

Annual average growth of GNP up 5 percent.

Gross investment up 53 percent.

Primary school enrollment up 61.6 percent.

Teacher training enrollment up 122.4 percent.

Classrooms construction up 121.5 percent.

Food production up 38.1 percent.

Secondary agricultural school enrollment up 212 percent.

Number of practicing physicians up 51.1 percent.

What we must remember, and perhaps the most important of all, is that it takes time. Given the time to see the task through, this hemisphere will be stronger and happier in the days ahead. Who can say what the accomplishment list will reveal next year or in 10 years—given a little time?

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION
ACT OF 1970

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Wash-

ington Post on Monday, August 10. The article indicates concern over the lack of action on the reorganization bill, and is the article to which I referred in my 1 minute speech earlier today.

The article follows:

LAG IN HOUSE ENDANGERS HILL REFORMS

(By Spencer Rich)

Unless the House speeds up action on the legislative reorganization bill, the first major overhaul of congressional procedures in 24 years will die in the Senate adjournment rush.

The House has been debating the bill sporadically for nearly a month, putting it aside repeatedly to take up other legislation. Many controversial provisions are still to be discussed on the floor.

Senate leaders—miffed because the House killed a similar bill three years ago on which the Senate had spent six weeks of debate—have made clear they will not take floor action until the House sends over a bill.

Time, meanwhile, is beginning to run out. Although the Senate Government Operations Committee approved a bill last year almost identical to the measure passed by the Senate three years ago, it has been held from the floor to await completion of House action.

Many Senate leaders believe there will be time to send that measure to the floor before adjournment if the House finishes its bill soon. But the House did nothing on the measure last week, may well do nothing on it this week and is taking a summer recess Friday from which it will not return until Sept. 9.

Aides to Rep. B. F. Sisk (D-Calif.), floor manager of the measure, say passage by the House probably cannot be expected before mid-September at the earliest.

By then, the Senate may be driving to adjourn before the elections, with time only for top-priority bills like Social Security benefits, welfare reform, direct presidential election, and the remaining appropriations measures, including the massive defense bill. The lower-priority congressional reform bill could easily be lost in the shuffle.

If the Senate should decide to come back after election, the reform bill would have a much better chance. But even then the higher-priority bills would take most of the time.

If the Senate bill should reach the floor, it would have a good chance of rapid passage, because many once-controversial provisions were revised in the great debate of three years ago.

The bill does not eliminate the seniority system or weaken the right to filibuster. Instead, it makes a series of changes in procedures which, while individually undramatic, will add up to swifter, more democratic and more efficient ways of doing things.

Thus one provision applying to both House and Senate (which many committee chairmen may not like too well) permits the majority of a committee to call special meetings and force the filing of a report on legislation approved by the committee, even if the chairman is balky. All roll-call votes on any measure or amendment in committee would have to be shown in the committee report, a gesture to the public's right to know something of the innercommittee deliberations.

The use of general proxies (proxies given without specific instructions) would be forbidden in reporting bills.

OTHER FEATURES

The Senate reform measure also would:

Create a separate Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, giving it the jurisdiction now exercised by the Finance and the Labor and Public Welfare committees over veterans affairs. The chairman of those committees may not be happy with this.

Give the Banking and Currency committees in House and Senate general jurisdiction over urban affairs.

End the practice by which any single senator can block all committees from meeting during hours when the Senate is in session.

Establish better legislative review of federal programs and better mechanisms for looking at the federal budget, restrict senators to service on only two major committees (17 now serve on three, producing a huge work overload which often results in neglect of one assignment), and limit a senator to serving as chairman of no more than one standing, select or special committee. (These limits on committee assignment and chairmanships would not apply to senators now enjoying these positions, a "grandfather clause" which would reduce opposition to these provisions.)

Guarantee the minority at least two new professional staffers on each standing committee, and require each senator to have at least one legislative assistant.

At present, the Republican minority on some committees has only one or two staff members, with Democrats appointing all the rest on staffs that may have a dozen persons or more.

Another feature of the bill enlarges the Legislative Reference Service and seeks to transform it into a much-needed professional research service for members.

CHANGES MORE RADICAL

The House, in acting on its version of the bill, has been making more radical changes. Some observers believe that if enough of these are added to the bill on the House floor, the whole measure may be defeated when the vote comes on final passage, as opponents of different portions of the bill gang up on it.

In addition to changes in committee procedures paralleling some of those in the Senate bill, the House bill as amended so far requires committees to allow radio and television coverage of meetings, provides for the recording of teller votes, authorizes 10 minutes of debate on all amendments, flatly bans all proxy voting and provides for one-third minority staffing.

A highly controversial provision of the House bill calls for creation of a joint committee on data processing to have sole jurisdiction over the growing use of computers for keeping congressional payroll and committee records and other information retrieval.

Sisk considers this one of the key reforms in his bill, but Rep. Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D-La.) is strongly opposed to the provision because he wants jurisdiction retained by a House Administration Subcommittee of which he is chairman.

One House provision which the Senate surely will not accept, if the bill ever gets to conference, would require a two-thirds House vote for adoption of non-germane Senate amendments added to House bills. The controversy over addition of such amendments to House bills has been going on for years, and senators would probably let the bill die before accepting this provision.

An aide to one of the top Senate leaders said that, should time appear to be running out, it might be possible at the last minute to separate out all noncontroversial amendments and pass them, leaving disputed provisions for action in the future.

At least one senator, Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), said last week it may already be too late for the reform bill "because of the time element." And Rep. Thomas M. Rees (D-Calif.), supporter of the bill, said in his newsletter that he had never seen such stalling. "If this bill is a priority item for the leadership," wrote Rees, "then it's about time to figure out a new definition of the word priority."

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND THE COUNTRYSIDE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the other day, I was one of many Congressmen who signed a discharge petition to get a bill to the floor which, if passed, would guarantee equality of opportunity to both sexes.

We like to think that equality of opportunity exists in this country, but in fact, and in practice, it does not.

Editor Don Olson of the Marshall Messenger, whose newspaper won first place in Minnesota for editorial excellence, points out that there is not equality of opportunity in countryside America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Olson's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge its reading by my colleagues:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND THE COUNTRYSIDE

The American people are the most mobile in the world. We seem to be constantly on the move, traveling modern highways here and there, from one end of the country to the other. Since there seems to be no restriction on travel, it seems to follow that Americans have the freedom . . . or opportunity . . . to live anywhere they choose.

But it doesn't work out in quite that way. The hundreds of thousands of Negroes who left the South during the past decade had no good opportunity to stay there. They were pushed out by economic and social pressures in addition to racial discrimination.

They arrived as refugees in northern cities utterly frustrated and angry, ripe for the fiery oratory of an emerging leadership.

Elsewhere in the countryside young people left the towns and farms to seek employment in the large cities. They had no opportunity . . . no free choice . . . to stay in the countryside. The "pull factor" in the migration was mainly better jobs, not bright lights and culture. The "push factor" was lack of opportunity back home.

Recently released federal census figures show the migration to the big city has not slowed much, if at all. And with the built-in premise, "the greater good for the greater number" in our political philosophy, the American countryside right now stands in jeopardy.

Declining populations may be construed by some as justification for cutting state and federal spending in rural areas. This could result in a mass writing-off of thousands of countryside communities.

This type of socio-economic "jawboning" would not be predicting the future of the countryside as much as making it come true.

So what's the alternative?

We'll probably have to stop preoccupying ourselves with population figures and measuring our progress in terms of numbers of people, and take a different tack.

One such tack perhaps should be to push for equal opportunity for all people in the country. The school child at Lynd and Ruth-ton and Cottonwood should have as good an educational opportunity as the school child in Edina.

The retired couple in Minnesota or Marshall or Tracy should have as good a recreational opportunity as retired people in Bloomington.

The farmer in Lyon county should have as good an income opportunity as the small

manufacturers in St. Louis Park. We should no longer accept the false impression that since it costs less to live in the countryside, we should be willing to work for less.

If equal opportunities were to exist throughout the nation, freedom of choice to live where one wants to live would exist. And there is reason to believe that the out-migration from the countryside not only would be stopped, but would be reversed.

The task, if we choose this route to countryside rediscovery and development, is a monumental one . . . all the more reason why we should start now. And since there is little argument that all children are entitled to equal educational opportunities, perhaps that is one area that should be stressed early in the game.

The Minnesota State Legislature, almost a decade ago, was trying to equalize opportunity in the field of higher education when it created Southwest State College. And since that time the legislature has followed the same high-minded philosophy in appropriating for plant, facility and curriculum at the college.

That the legislature's motives were sound can be seen in figures that prove more Southwestern Minnesota youths are getting a higher education today. More equal educational opportunity, in other words, was created by the legislature and others, and the young people responded.

The list of new opportunities and a strong response to them is growing longer. Some 2,500 men, women and children heard the Minnesota Orchestra at Pipestone Thursday evening. It was a cultural opportunity that did not go unnoticed or unappreciated.

Let's strive for more equal opportunities in the countryside.

SIMPLE JUSTICE FOR INDIANS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in our effort to right the wrongs our various minorities may have suffered, we have too often overlooked one particular group—the American Indian.

President Nixon, however, has seen the injustices quietly endured by this people and has presented to Congress and thus to the Nation proposals which will make the life of the American Indian more equitable.

Reaction to the President's recommendations has been overwhelmingly favorable. As we will soon be considering legislation enacting these proposals, I request that the following sampling of editorial response be printed in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 10, 1970]

SIMPLE JUSTICE FOR INDIANS

"The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indians; their land and property shall never be taken from them without their consent . . . laws founded in justice and humanity shall from time to time be made for preventing wrongs being done to them . . ."

So declared the Northwest Territory Ordinance of 1787, the first full statement of U.S. Indian policy. But few, if any, national pledges have been so poorly honored.

Instead, the American Indians "have been oppressed and brutalized, deprived of their

ancestral lands and denied the opportunity to control their own destiny," said President Nixon this week as he announced a sweeping new program of assistance and self-determination.

The less than a million Indians now living on reservations or in urban slums are indeed the country's "most deprived and isolated minority group," as the President described them in his message to Congress.

Unemployment among Indians is 10 times the national average; 80% of reservation Indians have incomes that fall below the poverty line. Average schooling for all Indians totals only six years. Their infant death rate is 70% higher than that of the general population, and the first Americans rank last by almost every other health standard.

Because of the wretched condition of the Indian population, the Administration wisely chose to ask Congress to continue the trustee role of the federal government in providing special education, health and economic improvement programs.

But the President also properly insisted that Indians as tribes and individuals be given a significantly larger share of control and responsibility in programs affecting them so as to break a "suffocating pattern of paternalism."

More than \$400 million a year would be involved in new and existing programs for the Indians. Mr. Nixon specifically asked for a \$10 million increase in the \$126 million already budgeted for health programs and for a total of \$75 million for economic development projects, plus \$200 million in loan guarantees.

No less significant is the Administration proposal that funds allocated for education go directly to Indian tribes and communities rather than to school districts, where their influence is minimal.

Despite the greedy efforts of latter-day Americans, the Indians did not lose all of their land. More than 50 million acres are still in their hands but can only be leased for a maximum of 10 years. The Administration proposes tribal leases of up to 99 years, which Congress should authorize, as well as the restoration of 48,000 acres of sacred land to the Taos Pueblo tribe.

Half of the U.S. Indians have left the reservations for cities, where they also fare badly. The President would set up special centers in Los Angeles and six other cities to help ease their adjustment to urban life.

Finally, to assure that Indians are fairly dealt with by the government, independent counsel staffs would be created and Indian affairs would be elevated to higher status within the Interior Department.

The President's message thus represents an impressive, if much belated, start on undoing the "neglect of centuries." Every possible effort should be undertaken to make the first Americans more than second- or third-class citizens.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, July 10, 1970]

HOPE FOR FIRST AMERICANS: NIXON'S PROPOSAL FOR INDIANS

The proposal President Nixon announced Wednesday to improve the plight of American Indians is a promising one that deserves Congressional support.

President Nixon proposed that Indians be allowed to administer federal programs affecting them. He stressed that Indian control of Indian programs would be a voluntary matter.

In a special message to Congress, President Nixon said the Indians are the most deprived and most isolated minority in the nation. On virtually every scale of measure—employment, income, education, health—the condition of the Indian people ranks at the bottom, he said.

The President's portrayal of the dismal conditions under which Indians live is shocking—but correct.

The indicators of Indian suffering are appalling. Their life expectancy is 44 years, compared with 71 for white Americans. The average income for each Indian family living on or near a reservation—and more than half do—is only \$1,500. The average years of schooling is 5.5, well behind that of both the black and Mexican American. About 90 per cent of reservation housing is substandard. Unemployment ranges from a low of 20 per cent on the richer reservations to 80 per cent on the poorest ones.

President Nixon's proposal endorses the principle of self-determination for Indians. It will mean less control of Indian life by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There's not much doubt that the present system is not doing a good job for Indians. The federal policy of institutionalized paternalism has stifled Indian creativity and stands convicted by the shocking standards of Indian life.

If Congress approves the President's program, Indians certainly will make some mistakes. That should be expected. Every other ethnic group in the nation has made mistakes and learned by those mistakes.

President Nixon's proposal offers hope to the nation's 650,000 Indians—about 30,000 of whom live in Montana.

[From the Wichita Eagle, July 14, 1970]

MUCH TO GAIN

President Nixon told Congress the other day that "the time has come to break decisively with the past" and welcome Indians to assume greater control of federal programs that affect them.

The time is long overdue. The federal bureaucracy's benevolent-protector role in Indian affairs has not produced the desired results, and American Indians, the original residents of this land, are this nation's most neglected minority.

If Congress agrees with the President, and legislation will be needed in some cases, more than \$400 million a year in federal spending will be thrown open to control by Indians rather than by government bureaucrats.

It is amazing that the Indians have managed to hang on to racial pride in the face of the perpetual insult of living on handouts and existing on programs more often than not unsuited to their way of life.

As the President says, it is time to break with the past.

Since the white man hasn't done so well running the Indians' affairs, there is nothing to lose and probably much to gain from letting the Indians themselves have a go at it.

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 10, 1970]

NATION SHOULD RESPOND TO NIXON'S URGING TO GIVE JUSTICE TO INDIAN

For too many years the American Indian has been treated as a second-class citizen. The lands where he once hunted buffalo were taken from him by the white man and he was confined to reservations administered by government agents, many of them unscrupulous and dishonest. Solemn treaties between the government and the various tribes have been either fractured or violated, not by the Indians but by the government.

So it is like a fresh spring breeze that President Richard Nixon has promised the Indians a new deal and will prod Congress for its approval.

The President never was more accurate than when he said the condition of the Indian is a "heritage of injustice," that the white man has been guilty of "aggression" and that the Indian "surely is our most exploited minority."

"We must assure the Indian," he said, "that he can assume control of his own life

without being separated involuntarily from the tribal groups. And we must make it clear Indians can become independent of federal control without being cut off from federal concern and federal support. Every Indian community should be able to control its own school boards by setting up school boards like those in other communities."

Under the President's plan Indian tribes would take over control of all federally financed programs for their benefit rather than their being administered by the Great White Father from Washington, D.C.

Federal funds would be increased for a number of aid programs and a new position of assistant interior department secretary for Indian and territorial affairs created, thus giving the office "little cabinet" status.

The President wants to increase the revolving loan fund which allows Indians to finance economic development programs.

And he would put up \$200 million in the form of loan guarantees, loan insurance and interest subsidies to encourage private lenders to loan money for Indian projects.

An additional \$10 million for Indian health projects would be appropriated in the current fiscal year.

The President is to be highly commended for pressing a program which would make retribution for the injustices imposed on the original owners of America.

Congress should back him without any undue delay.

[From the Arizona Republic, July 10, 1970]

OUR DEPRIVED MINORITY

Congress has an opportunity to rectify America's historic mistreatment of its Indians by adopting the program recently proposed by President Nixon.

The American Indian has not suffered from neglect so much as from contradictory programs and bureaucratic paternalism. The nine-point program proposed by Mr. Nixon, outlined in a special message to the House and Senate, realistically seeks to reconcile the various viewpoints over what the government should or should not do.

Not surprisingly, the Indian themselves disagree as to what should be done, and how. Some, particularly the articulate young Indians, seem to want as little to do with Washington as possible.

But most Indians apparently favor having the federal government provide financing and technological assistance, while they themselves establish educational, occupational, and other priorities.

Indians, perhaps more than any other large group in the U.S., are caught between two contradictory and oftentimes hostile cultures. Two embrace the one at the expense of the other—the pastoral or the technological—has usually resulted in economic stagnation, with all the woes that financial poverty brings, or social maladjustment, with all the woes (high incidences of alcoholism and suicide) that accompany spiritual poverty.

The President proposed allowing Indians freedom from government control without depriving them of federal concern and support.

Thus Washington would encourage greater local control of Indian education, even to the point of transferring school control to local Indian school boards . . . a process that has proven highly successful in Arizona at the Rough Rock Demonstration School and the Navajo Community College.

It would provide loan funds for Indian economic development, in hopes of encouraging the commercial, industrial, and recreational development that is underway in this state on the Apache, Pima, Hopi, and Navajo reservations.

It means helping Indians who leave reservations and flock to such urban areas as Phoenix, Flagstaff and Gallup, only to find

themselves in a strange and often hostile environment.

And it means improving Indian health programs, in order to reduce infant mortality, TB and other sickness and disease that have doomed the Indian to a life expectancy one-third less than the national average.

For too long the Bureau of Indian Affairs has served as the whipping boy for our neglect of what the President described as "the most deprived and the most isolated minority group in our nation." In fact, the entire nation is to blame. Therefore the entire nation, through Congress, must see that the Indian is accorded equal opportunity in his native land.

[From the Fargo Forum, July 20, 1970]

NIXON'S MESSAGE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS CONTAINS PROPOSALS WHICH SHOULD BE ACTED UPON

President Nixon's message to Congress on Indian affairs contained recommendations which we hope are enacted into law.

Mr. Nixon's program can best be described as one of self-determination for the Indian. It condemns both paternalism and neglect in government policies. Mr. Nixon stated that Indians are "the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our nation." The chief executive stated that even the federal programs which are intended to meet the needs of Indians "have frequently proven to be ineffective and demeaning."

One of the nation's leading spokesmen on behalf of the Indian, Democratic Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, had praise for the President's message. Mondale, a member of the Senate subcommittee on Indian education, has long been a champion of many of the reforms Mr. Nixon recommends.

The President asked Congress to renounce its previous endorsement of the "termination" policy which promoted the weakening and ultimate finish of the reservation system. Instead, Mr. Nixon would affirm that, "the historic relationship" between Indians and the government cannot be abridged without Indian consent . . .

"Even as we reject the goal of forced termination, so must we reject the suffocating pattern of paternalism. We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group," said the President.

Mr. Nixon proposed that Indian tribes be empowered to take over the control or operation of present federally run programs if they choose without loss of federal funds.

For example, Johnson-O'Malley school aid would go directly to Indian tribes and communities as well as to public schools in order to prevent misuse of these funds. Many school districts, after receiving the Johnson-O'Malley Act federal funds for Indian education, have turned the money into the general fund, with Indians getting little benefit.

President Nixon, in his message, recognized the fact that many Indians are turning from rural to urban life, going to the cities where they are meeting special problems of unemployment and lack of social interaction. Mr. Nixon proposes to expand the operation of urban Indian centers, such as exist on a limited basis in Minneapolis and other large cities.

The President presented an impressive list of other measures which would help the Indian meet social, economic, education and health needs.

Throughout the message, the emphasis was on self-determination, giving the Indian the opportunity to live in dignity whether he chooses the reservation system or wants to enter the mainstream of American life.

The Indian himself has become more and more vocal for self-determination and participation. He wants some of the decision

making power which too long has been in the hands of an impersonal bureaucracy.

With favorable action by Congress and new and eager leadership among the Indian population, perhaps we will see some strides which will help both the Indian who chooses to retain his tribal way of life, and the Indian who would rather integrate into the larger society of American life.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, July 13, 1970]

AMERICAN INDIAN DESERVES ROLE IN SHAPING DESTINY

Assistance instead of paternalism will be a new experience for the American Indian in his relationship with the federal government, but that is the commendable direction in which President Nixon would point government policy.

It is a welcome development. Few things the U.S. government has done redound less to its credit than what it has done to the American Indian. These proud descendants of what Mr. Nixon called "the first Americans" have been defrauded, brutalized and herded in a North American adaptation of the patronization embodied in "the white man's burden."

Self-determination was shelved in favor of direction from the "great white father" in Washington. Education involved separating Indian children from the influence of their parents and tribal leaders for boarding-school courses in how to be like and liked by the white man.

Government assistance too often involved help in moving from one "permanent" reservation to another when the original turned out to have an economic potential too great to leave to a tribe of poor Indians.

The importance of land and water rights, to which Mr. Nixon alluded in his message on Indian affairs, cannot be overemphasized. "In many of these legal confrontations (over land and water rights) the federal government is faced with an inherent conflict of interest," said the President. "The secretary of the interior and the attorney general must at the same time advance both the national interest in the use of land and water and the private interests of Indians in land which the government holds as trustee."

The record has not been particularly praiseworthy. Dr. Monroe E. Price, professor of law at UCLA and deputy director of California Indian Legal Services, gives just one example of the results of such conflict of interest. "In Southern California," he wrote recently, "the San Luis Rey, which used to water the reservations of the Pauma Valley, now bypasses them to serve white-owned citrus and avocado groves and the gleaming subdivisions of Escondido . . . In the San Luis Rey case, the federal government had been 'considering' how to fulfill its trust duty for almost 45 years as valuable water was lost each year."

There is now a new militancy among the young American Indians who have seen other assertive American minorities begin to win their rights. But the American Indian still has a long way to go to escape the despair of his condition, hideously documented by the extreme rates of alcoholism among adults and the appalling number of suicides among the young.

President Nixon has wisely decided to reverse the federal policy of eventual termination, in its interest, of its trusteeship obligations with the Indians. If such termination is desired by given Indian tribes, it would be possible on their instigation.

Instead, the President would continue to honor the nation's general obligations to the Indians and begin to undo the wrongs committed by violating or dishonoring specific obligations solemnly pledged in the past.

Greater self-determination, locally operated public schools and genuine economic incentive cannot help but make the American Indian's tomorrow better than today.

From that standpoint, Mr. Nixon's policies are as much in the national interest as they are in the interests of the American Indian. But if there were any question about the sincerity of the latest presidential pledge to improve the lot of the Indian, it should be answered in the Indian Trust Council Authority proposed by the President.

That authority would be responsible for providing "independent legal representation for the Indians' natural resource rights," representation previously so unsatisfactorily provided by the government and its "inherent conflict of interest."

That same government, in Mr. Nixon's plan, would now waive its sovereign immunity from suit whenever a dispute over natural resources pitted the federal plans against the private interests of the Indians.

The tragic history of the Indian's treatment by the federal government argues against unbridled optimism. But there is hope that the American Indian may finally begin to enjoy the privileges and obligations that are supposed to be synonymous with the word American.

[From the Louisville Courier Journal, July 12, 1970]

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR THE NATIVE AMERICANS

If there is such a thing as a national guilt feeling we should have one over our treatment of the American Indian. It is a shameful chapter in our history. Not so very long ago it was a folk saying in the West that the only "good Indian is a dead Indian," and we in fact virtually exterminated the Indians in the 19th Century.

We treated the Indians first as savages and then as incompetents, and today, even with the past intentions, we don't quite know what to do about these native Americans in our midst.

Yet today the Indians have reason to hope for an improvement in their lot. We are at least thinking about and agonizing over the Indian problem. President Nixon has addressed himself to it, and his recommendations have much to commend them. In 1968, President Johnson became the first President to make Indian affairs the subject of a special message to Congress.

President Nixon acknowledges that the American Indians are "the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our nation." This coincides with what McGeorge Bundy of the Ford Foundation said in announcing a grant to help Indians in 1968. "The American Indians," he said, "beset with staggering problems of unemployment, education, health and housing, are by any measure, save cultural heritage, the country's most disadvantaged minority group."

A COMPLEX PROBLEM

No matter that the problem is one of our own making and of generations past, it is a real problem, and a complex one, and there are no simple solutions. We are groping to find a path between the policy of paternalism, which hasn't worked, and forced assimilation into our society that would deprive many Indians of the few benefits and limited sense of security they now have.

Stated simply, President Nixon proposes to give Indians more federal help than they are now getting and at the same time give them greater control over their affairs. Only of the worst features of our paternalistic policy has been the great power it placed in the hands of a few bureaucrats over thousands of Indians. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy condemned the educational system provided for Indians as "barbarous."

President Nixon plans to send to Congress an array of legislation that would enable tribal groups to assume operational control over their destiny. "As a matter of justice and as a matter of enlightened social policy, it is time," the President said, "for the 462,-

000 Indians living on reservations and perhaps as many more in urban slums to determine how best to use the federal help made available to them."

Thus, if Congress adopts the President's proposals, Indian groups would have the authority to assume control over federally administered programs dealing with schools, housing, medical services, economic development and public works. To show his good faith, the President endorsed the 64-year-old legal effort of the Taos Pueblo to have returned to them the 48,000 acres surrounding Blue Lake in New Mexico, which the government appropriated in 1906 for a national forest.

Mr. Nixon also called for more federal money for Indian aid. While the additional funds are justified and needed they would not be enough to do what should be done for Indian education and health aid. The President was silent about the demands that Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts in Alaska be granted title to ancestral lands and receive compensation for property taken from them.

On the whole, however, Mr. Nixon's proposals for American Indians are humane and sensible and would, if carried out, permit American Indians a choice between preserving their tribal culture and the benefits that go with it and assimilation—and would provide help for those who choose to leave the reservation and enter the mainstream of American society.

REPORT ON PROPRIETARY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Education and Training has, this summer, taken a look at private, profitmaking vocational schools and the job they are doing. Today, we are making public our report on proprietary vocational schools. This report includes several recommendations regarding proprietary vocational schools which, we feel, would contribute toward meeting both national manpower needs and the needs of individuals preparing for specific occupations.

The value of occupational training cannot be overemphasized. We know, for example, that some 80 percent of our young people do not graduate from college. Yet, only one student in 10, leaving the education system without a bachelor's degree, has some specific occupational preparation. This is occurring, furthermore, at a time when the Nation's economy demands more trained, skilled workers than ever before. The Labor Department, forecasting the employment situation for the 1970's, estimated that the demand for technical workers will increase by about 45 percent—twice as fast as demand for all workers; that the demand for white-collar workers will increase by about 50 percent—technological advances and computers will not solve clerical shortages, and that shortages of engineering graduates will require continued upgrading of skilled technicians. While we will be short on the trained, skilled workers we need, we will have a rough overall balance between the supply and demand for college-educated personnel. Clearly, therefore, our most

pressing manpower needs in the 1970's will come in the subbaccalaureate skilled, technical, clerical, and paraprofessional occupations.

The 1969 annual report of the National Advisory Council of Vocational Education underlined this situation:

At the very heart of our problem is a natural attitude that says vocational education is designed for somebody else's children. . . . We have promoted the idea that the only good education is an education capped by four years of college. This idea, transmitted by our values, our aspirations and our silent support, is snobbish, undemocratic and a revelation of why schools fail so many students. The attitude infects Federal Government which invests \$14 in nation's universities for every \$1 it invests in the nation's vocational-education programs. . . . The attitude must change. The number of jobs which the unskilled can fill is declining rapidly. The number requiring a liberal-arts college education, while growing, is increasing far less rapidly than the number demanding a technical skill. In the 1980's, it will still be true that fewer than 20 percent of our job opportunities will require a four-year college degree.

As our report shows, the Education and Training Task Force feels that the more than 7,000 proprietary vocational schools are doing a great deal to help meet these national needs. Of the more than 1.5 million students enrolling each year, 70 percent complete their training—as compared with only 30 to 40 percent of community college entrants and 60 percent of college entrants.

We hear a great deal about the need for diversity in American education; this is a concept we value as much as we fear the idea of a single monolithic system controlling the entire educational system. Yet too often, diversity receives only lipservice while every action is taken to strengthen the already existing institutions, whether or not they are not adequately fulfilling the roles that have been set out for them. Excerpts from monograph by Stanley Moses elaborating on the point are included below. The institutions that comprise the "core" of our educational system receive most or all of the attention, while we find that the other institutions—those at the "periphery"—are neglected. Proprietary vocational schools are too often part of the educational periphery, and the importance of the contribution that they can make is not realized or recognized. We feel that there is both room for and a need for many kinds of educational institutions in this country and that to overlook these schools as we consider Federal legislation is doing the Nation a great disservice.

I hope that the task force report on proprietary vocational schools will help in some small way to bridge the gap in information and attitudes which is all too prevalent regarding these schools, and that our colleagues will find our efforts in this area of value. I would also commend to my colleagues the very fine address made by the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, on June 19, 1970, before the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools in which he congratulated these schools on the very fine job they have been doing, and I insert it

into the RECORD. Finally, I would also like to insert excerpts from the paper by Stanley Moses which I referred to a moment ago, and an article by Lloyd H. Elliott, the president of George Washington University, which very eloquently makes the case for proprietary education as a competitive alternative to an entirely-public system:

REPORT ON PROPRIETARY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS
(By the House Republican Task Force on Education and Training, House Republican Conference, August 12, 1970)

(NOTE.—Members: John Dellenback, Oregon, Chairman; James M. Collins, Texas; John N. Erlenborn, Illinois; Orval Hansen, Idaho; Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts; Earl F. Landgrebe, Indiana; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; John T. Myers, Indiana; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Earl B. Ruth, North Carolina; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; William A. Steiger, Wisconsin; Fletcher Thompson, Georgia; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina, and John W. Wydler, New York.)

The House Republican Task Force on Education and Training conducted a series of visits to proprietary vocational schools during June and July, 1970. The six schools visited offered a wide range of programs—medical technology, dental technology, hotel management, dry cleaning operations, electronics engineering technology, investment operations, broadcasting. Although we realize that visiting these six schools does not represent an extensive study, our research and discussions with representatives of the proprietary school movement contributed to a further understanding of the role and purposes of these schools.

OVERVIEW OF PROPRIETARY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

A 1966 study reports a total of 7,071 private vocational schools serving 1,563,556 students. About 80% of these students attended trade, technical and business schools; the remainder were concentrated in cosmetology and barber schools.¹ The students are drawn largely from the lower socio-economic background level, but the rank in the upper three-fourths of their high school graduating classes for the most part. 75% of the students at trade and technical schools come from more than 100 miles away from the school; less than half of business school students live at home. About 70% of those entering proprietary vocational schools complete their training, as compared with only 30% to 40% of community college students.²

The average enrollment is rather small in each school. Business schools enrolled fewer than 350 students on an average while trade and technical schools averaged 20% smaller. The small size is partly due to the importance of small classrooms for practical work, the wide geographic distribution of these schools and their primary focus on specialized occupations. According to a survey of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, however, these schools are operating at only 60% of their capacity. Consequently, it is estimated that trade and technical schools could accommodate one-half million more students without expansion of their facilities.

Proprietary vocational schools offer a wide variety of courses in practically every imaginable occupational category—the total number of separate courses is about 1500. Tuition charges range anywhere from \$100 to \$4500 per course; the average tuition is approximately \$850 to \$900 annually.

COURSE CONTENT

A heavy emphasis on the job being trained for characterizes most proprietary programs. The instruction is specialized and concentrates on the employment goal—students

Footnotes at end of article.

study only what they will need to know on the job. The theoretical implications of their jobs are dealt with only lightly, and liberal arts is almost nonexistent. As a result of the employment emphasis, these schools maintain close contact with industry so that they can revise their curriculum in response to technological improvements and changes in labor market demands. (Because it is not necessary to get approval from large administrative bureaucracies or school boards, even major curriculum changes can be instituted in very short periods of time.) Training is provided by practical experience, and little formal education is required for entrance into these schools.

Instruction

Instructors consider their students as clients; a considerable number of failures in one instructor's course is an indication of the instructor's failure. Teaching capability is the main criterion for reward and advancement; tenure is usually not given. Small classes and individualized instruction are the norm—the average class size is 19 students. Teachers often assume the role of counselors since there is a significant lack of adequate counseling both at the secondary and post-secondary level.

Students

The average age of day students is 20 years while it is 26 or older for night students. The general age range is 17 to 48 years. The advantage of these private vocational schools is their extreme flexibility in accepting students. There are no stringent requirements; consequently, people of varying backgrounds and levels of education are able to attend—this provides a special opportunity for poor and minority groups. The average course length is 40 weeks; courses are begun as soon as there is a sufficient number of students who are interested in one field. Students are usually able to pay for their education by means of installments rather than lump-sum payments. The major challenge for students in private vocational schools is securing adequate funds to finance its expenses. Only a small minority of students attending technical schools can rely upon their parents or personal savings to pay for their entire schooling—most students work full or part time to finance educational costs.

Student bodies include:

1. High school dropouts with no occupational training.
2. High school graduates of a general education program who lack any specific preparation for employment.
3. High school graduates who fail to pass the private schools' aptitude tests in algebra or even arithmetic.
4. Persons preparing for a licensable occupation.
5. College dropouts or even college students and graduates, desiring an otherwise unavailable course, such as computer programming.
6. Persons for whom the formal education requirement is eased because they have had several years of employment experience but are currently unemployed or finding it difficult, for physical reasons, to remain in their present occupations.

Accreditation

Licensing of proprietary technical schools amounts to merely a permit to do business in a given state. It signifies that safety and commercial standards have been met but makes no implications as to the educational content of the schools' activities. Certification is related to curriculum, staff, facilities and the like and may require the approval of the State Department of Education. Accreditation, however, signifies a thorough inspection and evaluation at least every five years by a U.S. Office of Education recognized accrediting agency. Accrediting agencies for proprietary vocational schools include

the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, the Accrediting Commission of the National Home Study Council, the Accrediting Commission of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, the Accrediting Bureau for Medical Laboratory Schools, the Cosmetology Accrediting Commission, and the National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service, Inc.

Administration

Proprietary vocational schools are organized as business enterprises, in one of three ways: as sole proprietorships, as partnerships, or as business corporations.

In 1962, some 66 percent were corporations. Another recent development has occurred as large publicly held corporations have purchased proprietary vocational schools to operate them as subsidiaries. Examples are the Rochester Business Institute now owned by Lear-Stegler Corporation and the DeVry Technical Institute owned by Bell and Howell Corporation. A properly run proprietary school can yield an estimated return of 9-15% of gross annual income after taxes.

COMPARISON WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGES

It is often asked why students are willing to pay such high fees (\$900 average), often at great personal and family sacrifice, to attend proprietary vocational schools when similar courses are available at no or low cost at local community colleges. Students interviewed by the Stanford Research Institute and by the task Force⁴ gave three reasons:

1. Time: First, course length in proprietary schools is very short, usually falling between four months to a year. The same program in a community college would take two years and mean a loss of possible earnings during the additional period. Second, frequent registration for classes permits entry every few weeks in contrast to waiting for a new semester in a public institution.
2. Course content: Proprietary schools' courses concentrate on teaching only the job skills necessary to specific job goals, whereas the public school philosophy requires concurrent study of non-vocational subjects, often the very subjects in which students were unsuccessful in high school.
3. Placement service: The schools, with apparent considerable success, assist their graduates in obtaining job interviews and employment since continuation of the school as a business enterprise depends upon successful placement. Most schools offer a lifetime placement service.

PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Present public policy in federal legislation on education (as distinguished from transportation, defense and agriculture) limits grants and subsidies to public and non-profit institutions. However, aid to students, either directly or through "under contract training" is permitted.

Student aid:

1. Guaranteed Loan Program (Part B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; as amended; P.L. 90-575.
2. College Work Study Program (Part C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; as amended; P.L. 90-575.
3. National Defense Student Loan Program (Title II) of the NDEA; as amended; P.L. 90-575.
4. Income Tax Deduction for Student Dependents; 26 USC 151 (e) (4).
5. Cuban Refugee Student Loan Program; 22 USC 2601-04.
6. Social Security Student Dependents; P.L. 89-97; see Sec. 202(d) (8) (C).
7. F.E.C.A. Student Dependents; P.L. 89-488; see Sec 10(M).
8. Railroad Retirement Student Dependents; P.L. 89-700, See Sec. 5(1) (I).
9. Student Dependency and Indemnity

Footnotes at end of article.

Compensation for Veterans' Children; 38 USC 104, 414 (c).

10. Civil Service Retirement Student Dependents; P.L. 89-504; 5 U.S.C. 2251-2268; See Sec. 2251(j) and Sec. 2260, and P.L. 89-554; Sec. 8341.

11. War Orphans Educational Assistance; 38 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.

12. Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966; P.L. 89-358; See Sec. 1652(c).

13. War Widows Educational Assistance; P.L. 90-631.

14. Vocational Loans to Indians; 25 U.S.C. 471.

15. Vocational Loans to Eskimos; 25 U.S.C. 479.

Under contract training:

1. Vocational Rehabilitation Act; 29 U.S.C. 31 et seq.

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; 24 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.

3. Indian Adult Vocational Education; 25 U.S.C. 309, 452, 823 (c).

4. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; P.L. 89-794.

5. Government Employee's Training Program; 5 U.S.C. 4101-4118.

6. Economic Development Administration; 42 U.S.C. 2583.

7. Veterans' Vocational Rehabilitation; 38 U.S.C. 1501-1511.

8. Vocational Education Act of 1963; P.L. 88-210, Sec. 8(1).

9. Social Security Title II, Public Welfare Work Training Programs (AFDC); P.L. 90-248.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS AFFECTING PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

The growing need for more skilled, trained manpower in industry and services, even during periods of high employment, has been pointed out time and time again. Traditional public education, however, has done little to meet this national need; few students leave school with an entry-level job skill. 35% of all high school students do not graduate, 45% of high school graduates do not go on to higher education, and 40% of college entrants do not stay long enough to take a degree. Added up, this means that at least 80% of our young people do not graduate from college. Of those in high school only one-fourth are enrolled in a vocational education program, and only one student in ten leaving the educational system without a bachelor's degree has some specific occupational preparation.⁵

Private vocational schools have demonstrated a capacity to meet the needs of many of these students who want to develop vocational qualifications that will enable them to meet specific occupational objectives. However, educators, school counselors, and to some extent the Federal Government, have been cool, and sometimes even antagonistic to the proprietary vocational schools.⁶ Many have voiced doubts that institutions organized as business-seeking enterprises can provide a quality program. Others continue to put strong emphasis on the value of getting a four-year degree. The Federal Government is wary of appearing to provide special aid to profit-making institutions.

Yet after investigating the accredited proprietary business, trade and technical schools, the Task Force must conclude that these schools are making a major contribution both in terms of meeting the needs of individuals seeking to prepare for careers and in terms of helping to supply the reservoir of skilled manpower that is increasingly in demand. These institutions should be encouraged to continue the fine job they are now doing.

Several special advantages are offered by proprietary vocational schools. These include—

1. ability to respond quickly to changes in the manpower needs of local business and industry—courses can be added as soon as

they can be organized, without months of red tape and procedural delays.

2. ability to respond quickly to specific needs of students—courses can also quickly be tailored to meet the needs of non-English speaking students, handicapped students, or students with other special requirements.

3. ability to concentrate on the needs of each student—marginal students who have never experienced academic successes can proceed at their own pace and successfully complete courses which are aimed at developing practical techniques rather than theoretical knowledge; faculty members are chosen more on the basis of practical experience and consequently act as excellent teachers for such training.

4. Special introductory courses have been set up in many schools to help educationally disadvantaged students meet entrance standards.

5. As compared with public institutions seeking to fulfill the same role, the proprietary institutions' courses are significantly shorter in duration—students can complete their training and begin working in a much shorter time, thus, providing an opportunity for poor students who do not have the time or money necessary for a four year college program.

6. Proprietary institutions tend to have much more equipment, and more up-to-date equipment or the kind that students are likely to encounter on the job than do public institutions.

7. Proprietary institutions have incorporated such programs as loans, installment payments for tuition fees, and work placement in nearby business and industry to help disadvantaged students.

Despite these successful and commendable things that the proprietary vocational schools are doing, there do appear to be some problems—

1. Relatively high charges prevent many students from getting the training that proprietary institutions offer. The average cost of attending a year-long course in a proprietary school is between \$850 and \$900 annually. In contrast, the average cost of attending public two-year colleges, which often offer similar courses, averaged \$148 per year in 1969-70. Public vocational schools are usually free.

2. Most of the students who have to drop out of private vocational schools must do so because they can not afford the high tuition costs. Students at proprietary schools are not eligible for equal opportunity grants, and the student loan situation is extremely difficult in today's tight economy. Part of full-time jobs are about the only alternatives available in the absence of loans.

3. Not all private vocational schools are accredited or eligible for accreditation. This makes it difficult for students, their parents and others to assess the quality of the programs provided by unaccredited institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Students attending proprietary vocational schools should receive the same treatment in terms of eligibility for student aid as students attending two- and four-year colleges and universities.

We recommend that all student aid legislation which is enacted be extended to include students pursuing occupational preparation programs, including programs operated by proprietary vocational schools. A specific case in point is the Education Opportunity Grant program which now excludes students at proprietary institutions. This exclusion works a particular hardship on disadvantaged students who seek technical, trade or business courses at these institutions, and we therefore recommend that Education Opportunity Grants be made available to students attending proprietary vocational schools.

Proprietary vocational schools can participate in the NDEA Student Loan Program

only when the appropriation for that program exceeds \$190 million (FY 1971 will be the first year that proprietary schools can participate.) We feel that this restriction should be liberalized by deleting the \$190 million triggering devices and by funding applications from proprietary schools at the same level in relation to applications as other eligible institutions.

Some confusion has resulted as to the eligibility of proprietary school students under existing and proposed student aid programs. To eliminate this difficulty in the future as to the eligibility of students to participate in such programs, we recommend that a single, simplified working definition of "eligible institution" be adopted to pertain to all programs of student aid.

2. The U.S. Office of Education should collect and make public data concerning proprietary vocational schools.

These schools are performing a valuable and needed function, yet it is not possible to secure information concerning the numbers of students helped, the amount of aid provided, or the numbers and types of institutions involved—information needed if Congress is to make wise decisions regarding the relationship of federal programs to these institutions. Furthermore, objective, factual information concerning individual proprietary vocational schools—both accredited and non-accredited—is not readily available, and the consumer may suffer from this lack of information by choosing a poor quality school or one which does not meet his particular needs.

We recommend that the U.S. Office of Education begin immediately to collect and make public both kinds of data, and that efforts be started to develop effective means of disseminating information regarding proprietary schools to prospective students, high school and college counselors and vocational rehabilitation and manpower agency administrators.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Belitsky, A. Harvey, "Private Vocational Schools". The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, June, 1970, page 3.

² Pollshook, Morris M. Unpublished Survey. Business Education Research Associates, 1962.

³ Bank of America, "Private Vocational Education." Bank of America Small Business Reports, 6:11, 1965.

⁴ Venn, Grant, "Man Education and Work", American Council on Education, 1964, pp. 1-23.

⁵ Podesta, Edward A., "Supply and Demand Factors Affecting Vocational Education Planning", Stanford Research Institute, 1966.

⁶ Moses, Stanley, "The Learning Force: An Approach to the Politics of Education", Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse, N.Y., March 1970.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

Henry Adams once wrote: "Nothing in education is so astonishing as the amount of ignorance it accumulates in the form of inert facts."

Whatever prompted Adams' remark, he could not have been talking about trade and technical schools because the tools of that business are lively facts, facts that can be put to good use.

I have long been a critic of our nation's public schools because I have never felt that they were achieving even a reasonable degree of their potential.

One reason for this failure is lack of competition. Another is a philosophy of education which insists upon treating every student as though he were college material and tends to hold the blue collar worker in contempt.

I am happy to see the growing emergence of high quality private trade and technical schools in this country. This is a response to a definite need. Such schools are filling a

void left by the public schools. Private trade and technical schools are a natural development in a private enterprise economy which is demanding the personnel needed to fill certain jobs in growth fields and is insisting upon excellence.

It was former Health-Education-and-Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner who said: "The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

I think one theory that will hold water is that private trade and technical schools are helping us approach excellence in education and make progress toward our national goal of equality of educational opportunity.

It is an inert fact of the kind Henry Adams spoke of—and yet a most startling one—that 75 per cent of America's young people do not graduate from a four-year college or university.

From that inert fact we must proceed to the inevitable conclusion that far more emphasis should be placed upon vocational education than is now the case.

Instead of an almost exclusive concentration on college preparatory programs in high schools, the goal should be to meet every student's needs. That goal should translate itself into just one objective—excellence—whether the individual involved is destined to become a doctor of medicine or a plumber.

There is another conclusion that follows from the inert fact that 75 per cent of our young people do not graduate from a four-year college. This conclusion is that the private trade and technical schools are themselves a growth field.

The private trade and technical schools are ignored by some educators and fought by others.

I personally see the private trade and technical schools as a great resource for training millions of Americans, both the disadvantaged and others.

I believe that those educators and public officials who ignore the private trade and technical schools simply are not aware of the high quality of schooling offered by accredited proprietary schools and the unique ability they have to meet special educational needs.

As for those who are fighting the proprietary schools, I think they are afraid of the competition.

In my view, competition is an ingredient that leads to excellence. It is essential to success, both among organizations and individuals.

I mentioned earlier that private trade and technical schools are themselves a growth field. I say this because the number of persons who could benefit from occupational training in America is virtually unlimited.

Despite the neglect of vocational education, there are nearly as many students enrolled in proprietary and home study courses as there are enrolled in institutions of higher learning—some 6.5 million versus 7 million.

We are also told that in the Seventies 50 per cent of all jobs will require education beyond high school but less than a baccalaureate degree.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects the largest proportional employment increase in the Seventies among professional and technical workers. That projection shows an increase of almost 40 per cent for this group over the figures for the 1960s. In fact, job openings for technicians are expected to exceed 100,000 a year in the next decade.

Consequently, it seems quite obvious that vocational education should be assigned greater importance in our scale of spending priorities at all levels of government.

It also appears quite clear that the role of the proprietary trade and technical school is vital to the success of vocational education

as a whole and to the success of the individual in a rapidly changing society.

It strikes me as exceedingly strange, therefore, that the capabilities of the private vocational school for motivating and training individuals, including the disadvantaged, are to so large an extent neglected.

I personally believe private trade and technical schools should be given a far greater role in government training programs and should be used actively by the states under provisions of the Vocational Education Act.

Every effort should be made—at the Federal, state and local levels—to improve opportunities for students to attend private vocational schools if they choose.

One plan that could be used to aid students enrolling in private schools would be the combination loan and grant, amounting to at least \$2,000 annually.

I favor Federal grants each year to a substantial number of disadvantaged persons enrolling in private vocational schools.

Serious consideration should be given to legislation that would provide for vocational education opportunity grants, of an amount and duration sufficient to do the job.

If equality of educational opportunity is not to be written off as a myth, we must expand the scope of vocational education and make full use of private vocational schools as a resource for training the disadvantaged.

In that connection, I am pleased to report to you that the Administration's Higher Education Opportunity Act is being reshaped to eliminate some of the discrimination against students attending proprietary vocational and technical schools.

For instance, such students will be eligible for insured subsidized loans under the Administration bill. HEW officials have clarified this matter before a House Education Subcommittee. Where it initially appeared that private school students would be excluded, we are now assured they will be covered.

HEW officials also say they are seeking ways to make students attending proprietary schools eligible for work-study assistance under the existing arrangement of work done for an agency other than the school.

I am disappointed, however, that students at proprietary trade and technical schools would not be eligible for educational opportunity grants under the Administration bill.

I firmly believe that students planning to attend such schools should be afforded the same benefits as those intent on enrolling in four-year colleges and universities.

Those who are shaping our educational policies must rearrange their thinking if their philosophy is such that students choosing to attend proprietary schools are being discriminated against.

The interest and concern of the Federal Government should be broadened to include all education. Unfortunately, today that interest appears to exclude proprietary schools as far as the U.S. Office of Education is concerned.

Perhaps the only way we will bring about a proper concern for vocational education and the proprietary schools in the U.S. Office of Education is to split off education from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and combine it with the manpower training functions of the Labor Department to form a new Department of Education and Manpower.

This appears to be a most natural marriage and perhaps the best possible way to bring educators into the manpower training function.

Of course there are many other reasons why the creation of a new Department of Education and Manpower would seem beneficial to the Nation.

Perhaps the most compelling reason is that the present Department of Health, Education and Welfare has become so huge and unwieldy as to be virtually unmanageable.

This would appear to be a most propitious

time for such a change, a time when the President has already put sweeping Executive Branch reorganizational plans into motion with his creation of the new and powerful Office of Management and Budget to monitor existing programs and bring efficiency to the operations of the Federal bureaucracy.

As I view a new Department of Education and Manpower, the combining of these functions under a single agency would produce the broadest possible approach to equality of educational opportunity.

In creating the new department, we would indicate that we are just as concerned about the training of skilled workers and sub-professional technicians as we are about turning out scientists, engineers and professional people.

A new Department of Education and Manpower would be single-mindedly concerned with our total educational and manpower needs and would therefore be concerned with all of the national resources required to meet those needs—including the proprietary schools.

The proprietary schools have not been asking the Federal Government for assistance for themselves but for equal treatment of their students. I agree with this approach.

I am pleased that the Congress has amended the student aid programs to make students attending accredited proprietary schools eligible for National Defense Education Act student loans, insured student loans, and work-study programs.

At this point, I think it appropriate to look at the Comprehensive Manpower Act currently before the Congress.

The Act is intended to attack basic problems that hamper all Federal job training and job placement programs—the fact that various combinations of Federal, state and local agencies often compete with each other to serve the same people, the fact that programs and facilities are often duplicated and not fully utilized, the fact that administration of particular programs is confused due to overlapping, and the fact that the less adept grant-seekers fail to get their fair share of available federal support.

The Comprehensive Manpower Act is designed to develop a systematic national manpower policy and to effectively deliver job training services to the people who need them.

Better employment is a possible solution to the economic problems of about 11 million Americans. About seven million of these need more education and special training to give them the skills required in today's labor market.

By contrast, about one million people have actually been enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act programs since 1962. Currently 454,826 persons are so enrolled.

An immense effort to develop the skills and abilities of the American work force is needed in the Seventies. The Comprehensive Manpower Act seeks to set up the machinery required for that effort.

In fiscal 1970 the Federal outlay for the entire array of programs administered under the Manpower Development and Training Act was \$1.5 billion.

These programs have had some success in finding jobs for the unemployed and providing them with job training but they have not significantly reduced the overall numbers of our unemployed.

The reason the annual expenditure of \$1.5 billion has not reduced the pool of unemployed people is simple: The number lifted out of unemployment is almost exactly matched by the number entering the job market without the skills and preparation needed to qualify them for employment.

For instance, we have about 700,000 dropouts from high school each year, and 17.4 per cent of these join the ranks of the un-

employed. The cumulative dropouts between 16 and 21 years of age are listed at 2,734,000, and their unemployment rate is placed at 17 per cent.

It seems clear that we will never reduce the overall pool of unemployed until we focus far more attention on unemployment prevention—on adequate preparation of those who will be entering the job market.

It seems clear to me that every community in the country should be developing the means to reduce the flow of untrained youth into the ranks of the unemployed as well as the means to help those who are already unemployed find jobs.

This is where we need a cross-fertilization between school administrators and those whose job it is to run manpower training programs. It is all too clear at present that public school educators are failing to meet their responsibility for preparing the disadvantaged for the world of work.

Common sense dictates that education and manpower programs be complementary, not competitive as is now so often the case. School and work must be linked. That is why a Department of Education and Manpower makes great good sense.

The outlook is not bright for higher education and manpower legislation in this Congress. For a Higher Education Act the prognosis is "doubtful." For the Comprehensive Manpower Act the chances are about 50-50.

But if the Manpower Act does emerge from the House Education and Labor Committee, I think it will provide for contracts with private trade and technical schools. That is my information at the present time.

Whatever the outcome of current efforts to shape such legislation, we must do a better job of advancing toward equality of educational opportunity. And in that cause the proprietary schools can be helpful.

People are this country's greatest resource. Whatever we do to develop our people to their fullest potential benefits the entire Nation. Every time we save an individual from the human scrap heap the lives of all of us are enriched.

It is said that education is what you have left over after you have forgotten everything you have learned.

For thousands of disadvantaged Americans, education is the key to a new life. And many of them have found that key in the Nation's proprietary schools.

So tonight I salute the accredited trade and technical schools. I salute them for seeing a job that needed doing, for doing that job and doing it well. I salute them for persevering in the face of adversity, for from such perseverance comes great accomplishment.

THE LEARNING FORCE: AN APPROACH TO THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION

(By Stanley Moses)

In modern society, the formal educational system has served as the transmission belt of the social engine. It has sorted, selected, and certified its students prior to their absorption into the social order. Demands for the performance of this function are likely to increase as society becomes increasingly complex and organized. Changes in the occupational and social structure will place greater demand upon the educational system to produce the sorts of products who will be able to fit in, and to make that machine which we call American society run. But resistance against these trends is also likely to increase. For the trend of modern society is away from routine and compulsion and toward more personal choice among a larger array of alternatives. At the heart of this conflict is the educational system which has developed in the United States during the past century—a huge educational apparatus

which has dominated the market for educational services and goods and monopolized the access to public resources. The question remained whether this organized, mostly publicly subsidized system is able to meet the needs of modern society.

Our view of education has been restricted to a consideration of those activities in the Core. Ignored are the variety of activities engaged in by millions of learners in the Periphery—educational activities ranging from vocationally oriented programs in business, government and the military, proprietary schools, and anti-poverty programs, to culture and leisure oriented programs available through regular Core institutions, religious education, television, correspondence courses, and private associations. Our concept of what education is has been both restrictive and exclusive, ill-suited to the changing needs and demands of today. What is needed is a fresh look at other forms of education outside the traditional system and the ways in which they can contribute to public policy and educational planning—planning which will start with the needs of people and not institutions; which will focus on those who are served and not solely the professionals who control the service.

The changing economic structure of modern society offers the opportunity to devise an educational system more responsive to human needs. But there are many obstacles. Organized and established institutions and practices have a way of prolonging themselves far beyond their time. And around education, as with all social activity, there has developed an established, entrenched bureaucracy and network of interests and satisfactions that do not look with favor upon any alteration of the status quo which might reduce its influence and power. Nowhere is this more clearly demonstrated than in the regular public debates over resource allocation, where expenditures for education are debated chiefly in terms of higher or lower sums for the established portions of the system. Little attention is given to other forms of educational activity that might accomplish or achieve social objectives and satisfy personal goals in a way not afforded by traditional programs.

A neglect of the Periphery reinforces traditional patterns of influence and decision making in American education. As long as education is restricted to a consideration of the Core, there is little reason to consider alternative forms of educational organization and participation which might serve as competitors for public resources. As long as education is seen as restricted to those activities in the "educational system," there is no need to change the conceptions which have guided the existing forms of information and reporting about education. For the knowledge which we possess about education is also a form of power, serving as a guide for public policy formulation. Our existing knowledge has denied the existence of activities outside the educational system.

The Periphery has generally been excluded from the attention and consideration of public policy makers and this is reflected in the lack of adequate data and information regarding its activities and participants. For the collection of facts and the dissemination of knowledge is not merely a matter for the concern of dispassionate scientific research but is itself an important part of political and social conflict. Knowledge is a source of power and the way in which it is sought is determined by the values and interests brought to bear.

The lack of information regarding the Periphery may be attributed to (these) factors: Although susceptible to measurement and socially visible, it has been unable to develop a power base to match that of the Core and has been unable to change its marginality both within the structure of the educational system and as a source of in-

terest to governmental information agencies. Despite decades of lobbying, its impact has been almost inaudible when contrasted with the demands of other forms of education. This is reflected not only in our lack of information but in the minor portion of resources allocated to these activities by the public sector, to say nothing of the general downgrading of its activities, both in terms of institutional certification and in the general public view.

EDUCATION AT A PROFIT?

(By Lloyd H. Elliott)

The president of George Washington University is convinced that this country's education is bogged down in "too much bureaucratic red tape, too much homogeneity." He believes that education for the poor and the affluent alike "would be spurred along if our society could bring greater competition into the educational mainstream by encouraging profit-making educational ventures."

Education in America is in trouble. In-school education and out-of-school education are both in trouble. While progress in many areas has been notable, the gap between societal needs and educational response has been widening. Advancement in education is most obvious in medical research, food production, and the hard sciences, but shortcomings are evident almost everywhere.

Education is in trouble because more and more people of all ages are getting a poorer and poorer education in terms of preparation to meet the crises of day-to-day living in our rapidly moving society. The illiterate of 50 years ago was better off than the college dropout of today. The trouble in education will worsen before it gets better, unless:

Schools and colleges are removed from politics.

Universities are no longer expected to solve the problems of poverty at home and peace and war abroad, rebuild America's cities, or control inflation.

Accountability for the results of education (or miseducation) is opened to public view through removal of bureaucratic red tape and professional camouflage.

Parents become directly involved again in the complete educational program of their children and participate continuously in its control.

Opportunities are provided for education to benefit from the competitive marketplace of private enterprise as well as from public service.

In the education, both formal and informal, of which every civilized person is a product, it is the home that has contributed most over the centuries. In the formative years of childhood the attitudes and values, the ambitions and directions of a person's life are more basically influenced by the home than by any other force. The Dame School of the early colonial period may have been the first example of private enterprise in the field of education in America. In that day the individual woman who wished to supplement the family income could teach beginning reading, spelling, or the Catechism to a few neighborhood children. Those who bought this program for their children knew the content of the curriculum and the objectives of the teacher. Measurements of achievement were also understood by all concerned.

Control of the out-of-school environment has moved in all too many cases from the realm of the parents to that of the television programmers, the overly organized minutiae of the suburb, the uncontrollable jungles of street corner and back alley, and the power struggles of confrontation politics.

SHIFTING CONTROL BASE

Control of organized education has shifted from that small committee of parents which historically surrounded the New England school district to the halls of the state legis-

lature, to the political horse trading of the Congress or, more recently, to the professional association, the absentee school board, the labor union, or the community action group. Each shift has brought another layer of bureaucratic negotiation, influence, and supervision, all resulting in the continued loss to the community of control over its schools. In the large cities today we see thousands of administrative and supervisory persons, both from within and without the school organization, giving the individual teacher mountains of indigestible directions for teaching pupils. We see the principal of each school caught among the forces pulling in so many different directions that he dare not move in any. Frustration marks the efforts of all: parents, teachers, children, administrators, board members, and citizens. The involvement of parents with a teacher in the day-to-day education of their child, so important to the families of the first immigrants to America, has been lost.

Looking back upon the evolution of America's school and college system, it is now clear that the education of parents in terms of understanding and appreciation outweighed even the educational achievements of the children themselves. Without deep feeling for and some degree of understanding of the in-school education, it is impossible for the parent to relate the out-of-school educational experiences to the child's overall growth and development. In these earlier days adults understood, through personal involvement, the responsibility of citizenship and the relationship of local government to neighborhood needs.

Now, conflicts between home and school have never been sharper; and it should be clear that the younger generation cannot have its values severed from the older generation without being cast adrift upon society's sea of uncertainty, an unwelcome phenomenon of the day.

The advance of layer upon layer of bureaucratic administration has resulted in the loss of integrity of the individual school. Experts wrangle with experts while the teacher wrings his hands, and the chiefs talk only to the chiefs while the Indians march off in all directions, each hearing a different command. By an all too swiftly moving erosion, control of education has passed from the family to the local community to "society," where it has now become a political football among various selfish groups with special causes and goals. There was a good old day when the integrity of the individual school was paramount, and the education of children was the major concern of all who labored there.

REVERSING THE TREND

Whether public or private in nature, the control of education must be returned to the local community; the most responsible unit of that community is still the family. The individual school must be reclaimed by its neighborhood, and the principal and teachers of that school must be responsive to the parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and friends of the children. In our urban centers today, and to a lesser extent in large consolidated units outside the cities, many efficiencies of large scale operation have been lost to the inefficiencies of bureaucracy. But the loss has been more than that of efficiency. It has, unfortunately, included the loss of personal involvement by parents in the education of their children.

At the same time, financing education has become a bottomless pit. No matter how much money is poured in, valid measures of both quality and quantity remain beyond our grasp. In elementary and secondary schools across America, citizens are now spending from \$500 to \$1,200 or more per pupil per year for formal schooling. In colleges and universities, the figure goes as high as several thousand dollars for one year's education for one student. We must ask ourselves

what can be done to regain control of education so as to guarantee to the public a greater accountability for expenditures.

Having prided ourselves on achieving a great diversity in educational form and content, it is now time to add still another variable to formal education; the entry on a wide front of private enterprise into the formal programs of the nation's schools and colleges.

The suggestion is not as startling as it may at first appear. We now have contracts with private industry "to train, to teach, to educate" both individuals and groups of Americans for various objectives. Such agreements are being written by various agencies of state and Federal governments and, while often limited to special programs for "the unemployable or the dropout," they are nonetheless contracts to perform for a profit function previously reserved for public or private nonprofit enterprises. The profit motive should be put to work to effect economies in education, to enhance the quality of education and, most importantly, to attract more attention to the accountability of funds used for education.

SINGLE-PURPOSE PROGRAMS

Proprietary education has most frequently been concerned with business colleges, direct job training, or new areas of skills such as those related to the computer, bulldozer, or typewriter. Recently, a large corporation acquired through the usual business route three proprietary business colleges and announced that the colleges would be operated as subsidiaries of the parent corporation. Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of proprietary education in recent years has been the relative singleness of purpose which the institution has identified for its programs. The greatest weakness, on the other hand, has been the continued pressure to broaden the demands on public education to be all things good to all peoples. In responding, the school has come to mean in too many instances "nothing specific for anyone," "automatic promotions," "general" diplomas and "general" courses. It has come to have objectives of "socialization" and "exploration" and others of related descriptions which mean little substance, lack of quality, and few, if any, identifiable bench marks that lend themselves to entry upon the balance sheet of an educational audit.

Another possible course of proprietary education could be a public utility type educational enterprise, regulated but making a profit for its stockholders. Alongside such an educational "industry," it would be advisable to have smaller units giving formal education to individuals and groups of various ages and—a sacrifice to some, undoubtedly—completely dependent for success upon the marketability of their programs. A serious study has recommended that the country's postal system be transformed into a public utility type industry. Do the educational problems of the country not carry a far greater urgency?

School and college, and the large public university to a far greater extent, are expected to be all things to all people. State universities, in fact, are expected to stock in their warehouses educational and operational merchandise for responding to all human problems. By overt claims and by tacit acquiescence, educators have encouraged parents to believe that the school could (and would) correct all shortcomings of the home, unlock the mysteries of learning, sharpen blurred vision, inspire and arouse sleeping genius, and—the most welcome news of all—relieve the home of concern and worry. Colleges demonstrate a salesmanship that assures the prospective student of cultural enrichment, unbelievable achievement, and a life to be "lived happily ever after," if he will only apply and then, by some good fortune, be admitted to that "one and only campus."

ALL THINGS TO ALL

The state universities by both assertion and image are the worst examples of claims outrunning demands. (The author pleads guilty to contributing to the false image, having served for several years as president of one such institution.) Teaching programs are provided, so the claim might read, for all young people of the state—the sons and daughters of farmers and artisans, rural families and urban dwellers, the rich and the poor, and of course special recruitment programs for foreign students and disadvantaged. Research efforts will solve the state's agricultural, business, industrial, social, political and—yes, even the educational—problems. Public service programs—if only money is appropriated—will reach every citizen of every age and satisfy his every interest and need.

As the truth is dug out of such rhetoric, certain observations become clear:

Teaching, research, and public service are all very limited activities.

Most institutions are in reality specialized in function and limited in scope, but such limitations are usually camouflaged.

Educators have so much trouble running their own institutions that it is not very promising to expect them to operate other agencies of society as well.

Most educational programs are buried in myriad large and generally unmanageable administrative organizations.

In recommending smaller and more clearly definable educational units, it should be pointed out that similar action might be helpful for other public service agencies. Specifically, welfare services, health care, and housing are areas in which the separation of responsibility from the immediacy of the problem by layers of bureaucracy tends to take the problem out of its substantive content and make of it a political entity. In some large school systems and multipurpose institutions of higher education, answers to political problems are placed ahead of solutions to educational matters. This is a far cry from the old Deluder Satan Act of the colonial period, when parents wanted for their children a minimum of educational achievement so that each person could bear his responsibilities as a citizen, and the community in turn would be protected from ignorance. Political solutions to educational problems carry with them the danger that ignorance on the part of some people may be an insurmountable roadblock to an adequate educational solution.

Providing competition and greater choice among schools, colleges, and universities will not be easy in a monolithic, "publicly" managed system. The cry will be raised that no one should profit from a human need so vital as education, and such is a compelling argument. However, as it stands now, too many parents have no choice concerning the education their children will get, and adult "students" have little evidence of the quality of the institution they may select. It is choice that encourages and rewards parental concern and, as the family farmer demonstrated many times, the necessity for keeping ahead of the competition is the spur that makes the worker go the extra mile. Schools in poverty neighborhoods and schools among the affluent—in fact, all schools—would be spurred along if our society could bring greater competition into the educational mainstream by encouraging profit-making educational ventures. Disadvantaged children may not be able to get adequate education in any other way. Contracting for such programs with private enterprise, assessing results, and making new contracts on the basis of these results would bring badly needed reality to an educational system that now has too many "custodian type" schools, too much bureaucratic red tape, too much homogeneity, too much emphasis on teacher

benefits, too little attention to pupils' achievements, too little definition of the school's work, and too few rewards for skillful, hard-working teachers who want to correct reading difficulties, counsel youngsters, and join parents in a meaningful partnership for the benefit of sons and daughters.

Some of the trouble in education today could be alleviated by opening schools, colleges, or universities with limited objectives, clearly stated purposes and programs, financial aid to the students so they might exercise a free choice, teachers and professors committed to the programs, and survival of the institutions dependent upon the tests of the marketplace.

Education for a profit? It's worth a try.

LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH THE FLOOD OF IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Oscar Strackbein, who heads The Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, has addressed a letter to the President of the United States which again spells out the serious need for quota legislation with which to deal with the flood of imports from foreign countries. Mr. Strackbein is an expert on this topic and his opinions are widely accepted. I feel that the points made in his letter should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress, and I submit the letter for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NATION-WIDE COMMITTEE

ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY,

Washington, D.C., July 21, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your press conference of July 20, you said that you would certainly veto the trade bill if it should contain provisions you did not recommend. You were particularly opposed to import quotas except on textiles.

In support of your position you said that we are an exporting nation, that quotas could cost more jobs than they would save, and that import quotas are "highly inflationary." You also warned of a trade war.

Mr. President, I wrote you a letter dated April 9, 1970 which said that you are apparently misinformed in matters of our international trade. The letter listed a number of facts relating to our trade that, if known by you, could be expected to change your view.

I do not know whether the letter reached you. I merely received an acknowledgment from your Special Representative on Trade Negotiations, Mr. Carl Gilbert.

Let me now list some of the items of crucial importance to the formulation of a trade policy that through no fault of your own, were probably not in your mind when you reached a determination with respect to trade policy. These items have special bearing on the reasons you gave for your objection to the trade bill that has been tentatively approved by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Quota legislation, you said, "mandatory quota legislation is not in the interest of the United States." You added that, "it is highly inflationary."

This latter objection to quotas is widely

accepted as an economic truism. Yet the facts of the past decade and more, which is to say, the period during which we have had import quotas or their equivalent, have not borne out the widely held view. Quite the contrary. I shall not repeat the facts in the premises here, but enclose a copy of a statement on the subject which has been given to the press and sent to Congress where it has been printed twice in the Congressional Record. It refutes completely, so far as our own experience with import quotas is concerned, their alleged inflationary effects. Yet that is the objection most frequently pressed against the use of such quotas.

Another objection is that quotas would put trade in a straitjacket. Such an effect would depend entirely on the character of the quotas. They need have no such effect if they provided for flexibility, such as equal growth of imports with the growth of our market for the goods concerned. What would indeed be avoided is the intemperate and rapid rise of imports that visits distress and irreparable harm on our industries, such as is now occurring and has occurred in the past. I need only mention the watch industry, our fisheries, the typewriter industry, the bicycle parts industry, the sewing machine industry, household electronics, tile, sheet glass, canned mushrooms, tomatoes, stainless steel flatware, footwear, mink, standard machine tools, cordage, and others.

How many such skeletons or near skeletons can our economic landscape survive? We must not forget that each industry that loses employment to imports puts that much more of a burden on the other industries and services to absorb the more than a million addition to the work force every year.

You said also that we are an exporting nation. It were better said that we were an exporting nation. In my previous letter to you, mentioned above, I went into some detail about the turnabout in our trade in the past decade. The 1960-70 decade was one of defeat for our exports on a wide front. But for a very few products, notably machinery, including aircraft and computers, chemicals and a few smaller items, nearly all other broad product categories suffered a heavy deficit in foreign trade.

Employment in the industries that are in a deficit position exceeds that of the trade surplus sector by some 2 million.

These facts have probably not come to you in the usual reports of your intelligence sources. A record such as our trade record in the past decade would surely bring a team manager in the athletic field to a low level of repute. His winning achievement would be well below .500 on a base of 1000 and would win him no championship in any league.

Now, Mr. President, you are not alone in being deprived of the facts essential to the shaping of a sound trade policy.

The press of this country, the big press in particular, steadfastly refuses to convey to the public the basic facts that should guide the foreign trade policy of the nation. Consciously and deliberately, with hardly an exception in the East, it stubbornly withholds from the public the developments during the past ten years that effect deeply our trade posture in relation to the rest of the world.

Despite irrefutable demonstrations of the recently maturing counterproductive effect of the trade policy of the past thirty-five years, as revealed by indisputable statistical measures, the press culpably and inexcusably has smothered the facts that at long last have moved the House Ways and Means Committee to order a change of course, thanks to extensive public hearings.

By unconscionable suppression of facts, the press has conspired to nurture public ignorance of the true state of our commercial

defeat in the markets of the world and within our own borders in the face of a competitive onslaught from abroad.

Efforts over a five-year period to call attention to the clear handwriting on the wall were aborted by the press, to its profound discredit and its shame.

By ingenious methods, honed to a fine cutting edge, the press, the big press, the metropolitan press, has succeeded in keeping vital facts from the public, or dribbled fragmentary reports, in highly condensed form, to readers in a manner designed not to awaken them to the meaning of facts. The latter were unwelcome to press interests, philosophical or, more surely, commercial.

Some of the basic facts are that (1) the United States has met trade defeat in the past decade in nearly all important sectors, as already noted. To this fact, when it was called to its attention, the press, the big press, turned a broken ear drum and self-adjusted blinders.

(2) We have suffered a trade deficit in private commercial trade with the rest of the world for a number of years, not a surplus of 4, 5 or 6 billion dollars per year as reported euphorically by dedicated Departmental publicists of the government who knew better, but were imprisoned in devices not of their own contrivance. These euphoric reports were eagerly repeated by the press; and efforts to correct them were all but ignored.

(3) Employment in the trade-deficit industries is distinctly higher than in the few in which we still enjoy an export surplus. This fact has also been given to the press, but the press had free-trade fish to fry.

(4) The surplus that we do enjoy in a few products is narrowing visibly.

(5) The foreign labor cost per unit of output is in many instances well below the American, and this gap is not being closed.

(6) More and more of our industries are coming into the area of competitive defeat from abroad because foreign technology is catching up with us while their wages lag behind our wage levels.

Essentially, we are meeting our productive system, which we pioneered, coming back to us competitively from abroad, minus one ingredient, namely the high level of wages in the home market needed to buy and consume the elevated output that comes from mass production. Not having sufficiently high wages at home to absorb the output these countries must have a foreign market, and this country offers the best outlet. Never mind that the source of the competitive advantage over us is the lower foreign wages, and not, specifically not, higher productivity per man hour in manufactured goods! In that department we still lead the world; but our productivity lead is not as wide as our lead in wages. Hence our competitive handicap.

Not having met its obligation to inform the public as any press should if it is to merit the freedom guaranteed it under the Constitution, this same press is now free to criticize proposed trade legislation while the public has been short-changed in point of facts that would give it a basis of judging for itself. The press therefore has a free range of argument and can and does make exaggerated statements and use false arguments before the public; and the public is victimized.

Without knowing it, Mr. President, you too are one of the victims.

I look forward to an acknowledgment of this letter from and hope that a conference may be arranged with you for the submission of facts that will sustain what has been put forward in this letter.

With assurances of my esteem,

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
President.

A MODEST PROPOSAL FOR CONGLOMERATION

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it dismayed me to see that the Nixon administration has once more been rebuffed in its efforts to improve the quality of our Government. The President's proposal to abolish the Federal Board of Tea Experts, as an economy move, has been rescinded, largely thanks to the heroic efforts of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Former Secretary Finch has vowed that he will keep the Board of Tea Experts in existence, as required by the Tea Importation Act of 1897, and legislation has been proposed to assist in the funding of the board through an additional tax on tea.

I might say that it is shocking to me that the administration would seriously consider such an oppressive tax as a means of solving problems of economy in Government. One would think that, given the strong memories of the Boston Tea Party and the inclination of present-day citizens to oppose repressive action by government with immediate confrontation, the imposition of such a burden on the tea drinking population of this country would fan the flames of revolution.

I know that in some quarters the tea drinkers of this country are considered to be no more than effete intellectual snobs, or even bums, but it seems to me particularly appropriate at this time to avoid such a confrontation. To paraphrase our President, "When the tea issue gets hot, ice it."

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have come up with the solution to the administration's problems. We must have the Board of Tea Experts, but we must have economy in Government as well. I submit that we can have both by a simple merger of two important Federal agencies: the Board of Tea Experts and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Before dismissing this suggestion lightly, one must consider what a natural combination this is. Both agencies have the mission of protecting the American people from deleterious foreign influences. The Board of Tea Experts has a statutory duty to prevent the importation of tea that is "inferior in purity, quality and fitness for consumption in the United States."

The Subversive Activities Control Board is charged with the mission of preventing the importation of ideas that are inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption by U.S. citizens. Certainly the short distance between the palate and the brain emphasizes how closely related the functions of these agencies are.

Moreover, the SACB performs its duties primarily through the sense of smell. Their job is to sniff out subversion wherever it exists. While the Tea Board uses the sense of taste, it is well known

that taste is four-fifths smell. Thus, the membership of both agencies should be substantially interchangeable.

Beyond these obvious similarities, both agencies operate in utter anonymity, with a workload that is somewhat less than overwhelming. The Tea Board meets once a year. The SACB would meet at least that often if they could find a room to meet in and something to talk about. I daresay there is not a schoolchild in the country who could name a single member of either agency.

Finally, if one considers that tea connotes not only a drink, but a smoke as well, the beauty of this merger is even more apparent. What could be more subversive of our way of life than the uncontrolled importation of inferior tea?

The colleagues with whom I have discussed my proposal are enthusiastic about the idea. Indeed, some of them have suggested that I should propose further mergers of Government agencies in the name of efficiency in Government. It has been suggested that a particularly appropriate merger would be a combination of the Subversive Activities Control Board and the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The former chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, a distinguished tea drinker in his own right, having been the president of an eastern establishment university, has expressed a willingness to take the SACB, the Tea Board, as well as the Bureau of Solid Waste Management under his protection. In Dr. Barnaby Conrad Keeney's words, such a combination would produce an agency that "really grooves."

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue my efforts to seek out possibilities for conglomeration of Government agencies, in the hope that the heavy hand of the Federal bureaucracy can be changed into no more than an upturned pinky.

TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON FUELS AND ENERGY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the fuel and energy situation in America has reached the stage at which it can, without exaggeration, be called a crisis. The combination of poor economic management, new requirements for pollution free fuel, increased electrical power requirements and inadequate advance planning to meet these requirements, shortsighted economic regulation of fuel producers, and continuing artificial restrictions on access to foreign-produced fuels have all combined to produce this crisis. How it is resolved will have a great deal to do with how—and whether—our nation is able to solve many of its other pressing problems, from poverty to pollution.

The fact is that through a patchwork of private profitmaking, government ratemaking, and new pollution control laws and ordinances and the oil import quota system, America has reached a

point where it faces potential shortages of almost all major fuels—natural gas, residual fuel oil, and coal—as well as a shortage of its most important source of energy—electrical power. If this conflicting patchwork is not resolved by anticipation of our future needs and rational advance planning, every citizen, every business, every industry in America will feel the adverse effects.

Just this week President Nixon's Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality told the National Press Club that what is necessary to reconcile the often conflicting demands of more fuel, more energy and a cleaner environment is forward-looking and rational advance planning for the power and fuel needs of the Nation. I could not agree more with this sentiment.

It is because I feel so strongly the necessity for rational planning on a national scale to meet the fuel, energy, and environmental needs of future Americans that I am today introducing a bill, introduced earlier this month by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy.

The bill would establish a National Commission on Fuels and Energy, a 21-member commission composed of six Members of both the House and Senate and nine members appointed by the President. In addition, nine specified officials of the executive branch would be advisers. Although the bill as introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia specifies only that the nine presidential appointees be expert in the matter of fuels and energy, my bill requires that these nine presidential members shall "have particular knowledge with respect to fuels, energy, and the environment."

Another small change which I have made in the bill as originally introduced is that a 10th and perhaps 11th executive branch adviser, namely, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality and the new head of the Environmental Protection Agency recently proposed by the President, are added to those advisers to the Commission specified in the Staggers bill.

The Commission's most important responsibilities would be to investigate fully the energy demands and the fuels and energy resources of the Nation, and within 1 year to submit a report to the President which would "recommend those programs and policies which are most likely to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the Nation's rapidly expanding requirements for low-cost energy will be met, and in a manner consistent with the need to safeguard and improve the quality of the environment."

The Commission would reach its conclusions through public hearings, which it is authorized to hold, and through information furnished by departments and agencies of the executive branch which are directed to cooperate with the Commission and assist its purposes.

Mr. Speaker, if the kind of advance evaluation of requirements and advance planning to meet those requirements which is now advocated had been done 10 or 15 years ago, we might not face

today impending shortages of fuel oil, natural gas, coal, and electrical power. If that kind of planning is done today, then in 10 years we will not face another worse—and certainly far worse—crisis of the same variety. Sooner or later we must learn the lesson of our past failures to plan adequately for the future and must begin to do that planning. The area of fuels, energy, and environmental quality is a perfect place to start. The establishment of this Commission on Fuels and Energy will be a first step toward a rational resource allocation policy to insure that our children are not faced tomorrow with the kind of fuel-energy-environmental crisis which we face in America in 1970.

I urge support for this proposal, early hearings, and early enactment.

At this point I include two recent newspaper articles which point up the seriousness of the impending shortages in fuels and energy which face this country.

The items referred to follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Aug. 8, 1970]

U.S. NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE LOOMS

NEW YORK.—Hurriedly but belatedly, the federal government is trying to raise supplies of natural gas by undoing its restrictive pricing policy. Whether it will be in time to avoid industry shutdowns this winter is doubtful.

Meanwhile, the United States shortage of natural gas is spurring at least two efforts to bring it from Canadian fields above the Arctic circle. It appears that Canadian gas may appear in the U.S. market before the oil from the Alaska North Slope comes in quantity.

Nearly two decades ago the Federal Power Commission asserted its right to control the price of natural gas. This was set so low, oil men say, that it discouraged search for additional supplies. The result is that the combination of low price and no new supplies brought many users into the market whose demands cannot now be met.

A number of companies have refused to take on new industrial users; others have warned that they may not be able to maintain supplies to existing customers this winter.

"The shortage of natural gas today is real, not imaginary," said Robert E. Mead, president of the Independent Petroleum Association. "It was brought about by 15 years of unwarranted federal price control. . . ."

"This price control has stimulated an artificial demand for gas while discouraging investment in the search for gas. The result is the current supply crisis for this essential fuel."

The Power Commission has proposed that 4,600 small gas producers be freed from the price controls. It also has started a new study of gas pricing, with the aim of streamlining bureaucratic procedures and setting a new price by early fall. Sen. John Tower, a Texas Republican, has proposed a flat increase of 10 cents per thousand feet, effective at once.

Longer range, there is a proposal in Congress to establish a "national commission of fuels and energy," with more than half its members being congressmen. The theory is that these elected men are more sensitive to the country's need than bureaucrats appointed for life.

Meanwhile, financing is being sought for the two proposed pipelines into the Canadian gas fields, with extensions into the gas areas on the Alaskan north coast. One line would cost \$2.5 billion, about twice the proposed cost of the oil pipeline across the Alaskan peninsula.

However, the oil line is held up by conservationists' court cases, while the gas line could apparently be built through Canada without this problem.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1970]

**FPC HEAD WARNS POWER SHORTAGE IS
POSSIBLE NEXT WINTER**
(By Richard Halloran)

WASHINGTON.—With the nation not yet through its summer power shortages, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission warned today that further shortages were possible next winter.

John N. Nassikas, the chairman, told a luncheon audience at the National Press Club here that next winter would bring power troubles if deficiencies in fuel supplies were not overcome and if the weather was unusually severe.

He indicated that the commission would have a better idea of the dimensions of the problem within 30 days, when the results of a national inventory of fuel were scheduled to be in.

SOME CURTAILMENT FEARED

He said that the shortages of coal, oil, and natural gas used to fire boilers in electrical generating plants "is the most acute phase of our developing energy crisis."

He said that the shortages were "dwarfing the formidable problem of installing adequate generation and transmission facilities to meet short-term demand." He also said that the shortages would mean higher electric and oil bills next winter.

"If we are successful in meeting fuel problems this winter," he said, "I do not anticipate a generalized electric power shortage."

Mr. Nassikas, who has been in office for a year, said "it may be necessary to curtail some industrial gas service in the New England area and in the Middle West."

But he added that "gas distribution companies should be able to meet all essential residential and commercial customer needs unless an unusually severe winter is encountered."

Coal, which provides 21 per cent of the nation's energy, is short because new Federal mining safety and health regulations have slowed production, rail transport is inadequate and coal exports are up.

Oil, which provides 43 per cent of the energy, is short because of the Middle Eastern crises, cutbacks in oil from Libya and inadequate tanker capacity.

Natural gas provides 33 per cent of the energy and is critically short because gas companies have cut back on discovery and exploitation of new fields.

Mr. Nassikas was asked whether he thought the companies had done that to force up the price of gas. He said no but did not elaborate.

He said that increasingly restrictive anti-pollution standards had been partly responsible for the energy crisis. He called for a "balanced energy and environmental policy."

"Environmental standards must permit a transitional period allowing construction and operation of facilities to proceed," he said. He said that all methods of power generation produced some kind of waste.

"Such waste products, or thermal effects, will have an impact on the environment that cannot be completely avoided despite the most serious efforts to minimize these consequences," he contended.

He said that the best hope for an ultimate solution to the energy crisis was nuclear power. But installation of nuclear power generation is lagging two years behind schedule and will not provide significant amounts of energy until the nineteen-eighties, he said.

The lag, Mr. Nassikas said, was due to delays in delivery of equipment from manufacturers, opposition to proposed sites of the plants and technological problems.

He criticized the electric utilities for not spending enough on nuclear research. In

the last four years, he said, the Atomic Energy Commission has spent \$75-million, manufacturers \$25-million and private utilities only \$5-million on fast breeder reactor research.

He said that the utilities should spend more "to accelerate the development of vitally needed nuclear facilities to reduce environmental impact and meet power demand during the remainder of the 20th century."

He urged that comprehensive new anti-trust legislation be passed to allow companies in the power industry to adopt economies of large-scale operation and to be managed more efficiently.

He said that he did not favor a national power grid run by the Federal Government. Instead, he suggested that improved connections between existing power companies would be desirable even if they were undertaken by the Federal Government.

Better interchanges of power, he said, would have helped to resolve the problems of Consolidated Edison in New York.

EULOGY TO FRANK MESZAR III

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a stirringly warm and beautiful eulogy by Brig. Gen. Frank Meszar to his son, Frank Meszar III, which appeared in the Assembly, the magazine of the graduates of the U.S. Military Academy.

This young man who had but 24 years of life was without a doubt an unusual individual. In his brief span of time he took great interest in many things, accomplished much, and sought to learn and do still more. He was a truly fine person, a kindred spirit to the interests of his military father and his loving mother and family.

I attended the retirement ceremonies of General Meszar on Friday, July 31 at Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Ga. Having served 38 years in the military, General Meszar was the first commanding general, from March 1967 until January 1969, of the Flight Training Center at Hunter-Ft. Stewart, which he left for assignment in Vietnam.

General and Mrs. Meszar and their children call Savannah, Ga., home, and I am pleased and honored to have friends and constituents of their caliber residing within my congressional district.

I am personally gladdened at the thought that even with Frank's untimely death his father, General Meszar, has not only accepted this sad finality well, but has with a father's heart loved and understood clearly the many facets of his son's personality and character. The eulogy is a real tribute and deserves all of our attention.

The eulogy follows:

EULOGY TO FRANK MESZAR III

Captain Frank Meszar III was born in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, on 18 July 1944. He was killed on 2 March 1969 while leading his company in the attack. His family, his friends—we buried him with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery. In his span of twenty-four and a half years, he had accomplished what every man desires but many never do. He had found himself and his place in life.

What was he like? He could turn a card or pop a cork as a gentleman, for pleasure and not as vice. He drove his Corvette with a heavy foot, but never scratched a fender. He was at home in the major cities of Europe. In a ten-day period, he dated young ladies in London, Washington, Savannah, San Francisco, Tokyo, and Sydney. And yet, he confidently commanded a cavalry troop on the German zonal border as a Second Classman. He went through airborne training with two sprained ankles. He owned one of the finest private military history libraries in the Service. He could discuss in detail the battles of the Napoleonic Wars or of the American Civil War. His decorations include the Silver Star, Bronze Star Medal with cluster, Air Medal with two clusters, Army Commendation Medal, Purple Heart, Vietnamese Gallantry Cross with Palm and the National Order of Vietnam. In short, he enjoyed life, but with a constancy of purpose. From an early age he knew he would be a professional soldier. He was proud that he was the last of an unbroken military line that had its origins in Arpad's entry into Hungary.

After graduation and Ranger and Airborne training, Frank spent a year on the DMZ in Korea as an Infantry Platoon Leader and Company Commander. He volunteered for Vietnam where he served with the 173d Airborne Brigade and was an advisor to a Vietnamese Army unit. He then extended and commanded a rifle company in the 1st Cavalry Division.

I saw Frank at Fire Base Grant a week before he was killed. He had just returned with his company from an eighteen-day search and destroy operation in the jungle War Zone C. We had a most enjoyable visit. Frank was relaxed and happy. It was apparent to me that he was doing what he wanted to do and knew he was good at it. In the following lines I have tried to express how he and I felt about our profession.

THE CUP OF LIFE

How drinks your son his cup of life?
For drink he must, or spill or swill, in his appointed time.

Hiding on a northern neutral shore, pursuing fitfully through a straw,
In abject terror lest he lose the purple pap?

Or, more common, in stolid suburb sipping the uric smell of
squalling brats and shrewish spouse,

While cursing his plywood plastic jail?

But worse, a worthless wastrel, who slops his slop,

Unconscious of the maggots on the tarnished brim?

Else, a callow guru who mocks the Maker's brew,

Yet with lamprey greed he sucks the sorcerer's mendacious mead?

Even envious, a grey flannelled great,
So enamoured of his golden grail, he cannot taste the ale?

Then pity me not, nor my son;
He stood ten feet and more.

With a deliberate stare into the face of fate,
He quaffed full draught his Warrior's Cup,
And smashed it to the jungle floor.

TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE: A PROGRAM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

(By Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER)

"The right of the people to clean air, pure water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise, and the natural, scenic, and esthetic quality of their environment shall not be abridged." *The Environmental Bill of Rights*.¹

INTRODUCTION

In spite of the growing public concern over pollution, the cold hard fact is we are still *losing* the battle to preserve the environment.

There are a number of reasons for this. First is our failure to recognize the true cost of pollution and environment damage and to apply these costs against the cost of abatement efforts. Only when we fully understand the tremendous hidden costs we are bearing, will we feel the true urgency of the need for action. As a result of our failure to understand the economics of pollution, our environmental efforts have lacked the necessary commitment and have shied away from attacking the real source of the problem—the individual polluter.

Another problem is our failure to recognize that our environment is a complex and interrelated system and that each action—even one intended to cope with an environmental problem—may have an environmentally-damaging reaction.

The final failure is to recognize that a livable environment means more than the absence of pollution. A program for the environment must include the enhancement of all of the qualities of our lives. It must work toward a clean and wholesome environment in which to live and work and toward relieving the growing stresses of our increasingly complex urban, technological society.

We have the resources and the time to preserve a livable environment *if we act now*. An effective program will require the development of a new cost-benefit system to apply in determining the desirability of various programs. It is essential to replace the old system in which the *cost* was too often to the public and the environment and the *benefit* limited to a privileged few. The program we need must also recognize an essential role that the continued population growth and the continued economic expansion play in our environment.

Above all, we must require that environment concerns be given full and equal consideration in all of our public programs. Even such programs as housing, transportation, education and health—and not just those programs traditionally considered to be "environmental."

Finally, we must recognize that effective environmental action is not a burden; it is a challenge and opportunity. Success means not only a better quality of life for all of our citizens, but new markets and new jobs. A group of experts in the *Harvard Review*, not too many years ago, described the challenge as a "\$300 billion dollar market."

WATER POLLUTION

Water pollution abatement programs at both the State and Federal levels, have failed completely.

New York State's 1 billion dollar Pure Waters bond issue, approved overwhelmingly by the voters in 1965, has proved to be a sham. Under that program, we were promised that the waters of the State would be clean by 1970. But it is now 1970, and our waters are dirtier than ever. Now Governor Rockefeller, who made the original pledge, has set a new goal of 1975, but there is no reason to believe that this is any more realistic.

¹H.J. Res. 1321, introduced in the House of Representatives, June 13, 1968, by Rep. Richard L. Ottinger, et al. Also introduced in the 91st Congress on January 3, 1969, as H.J. Res. 54.

tic. Of the \$1 billion the voters authorized five years ago, only \$125 million have been spent; much of that wastefully on large staffs, redundant studies, promotional brochures, and the like. The program itself is completely bogged down in bureaucratic bungling and political squabbling.

The Federal program is no better. Launched with much fanfare, it has since been seriously under-financed and lacks effective enforcement powers. I and a group of my colleagues were able to increase Federal appropriation for pollution abatement for 1970 from the \$214 million recommended by the Nixon Administration to \$800 million, but there is no indication that, even with these nearly quadrupled funds, we will be able to make effective progress in restoring the purity of our waters with existing law.

At the heart of the failure of our existing programs is the unwillingness of Federal, state and local officials to meet the basic problem of water pollution head-on. We have concentrated our efforts in developing ill-defined, and basically unenforceable, standards of general water quality and have failed to attack the true cause of pollution at industrial sources.

I propose a radical revision of our water pollution abatement effort, which will reorganize that effort into an effective program.

Industrial: Under my program, it will be illegal, as of January 1, 1972, for any individual or corporation to dump environmentally-damaging material into the inland water systems of the United States, including estuaries. Any corporation or individual violating this law could be fined \$1,000 a day as long as the pollution continues. In addition, I propose that citizens be given the right to take individual polluters to Federal court to enjoin violators should Federal, state or local officials fail to act.

A number of industries lack money to finance effective abatement programs by this deadline. I propose to establish a Federal program to provide long-term, low-interest loans to industries that can establish the need for such assistance.

Under this program, effective abatement of water pollution from industrial sources could be achieved by 1972. In addition, the program would mean increased employment and economic activity without loss to the taxpayer, or undue hardship to any industry.

Thermal Pollution: Thermal pollution, although relatively new, is no less dangerous to the quality of our water than any other form of pollution.

Although many other industries can produce thermal pollution, the greatest threat comes from nuclear power plants which require very large amounts of water to cool their reactors. Scientists have estimated that by the year 2000, as a result of construction of the nuclear plants necessary to meet the nation's rapidly growing power needs, virtually all of our water will be seriously degraded as a result of thermal pollution. Technologically, it is possible to resolve this problem through the construction of cooling towers, bays, and other devices.

Under my Hudson River Compact Act, Interior officials compelled the AEC to add a specific condition—the first of its kind in the nation—to Con Edison's license for its Indian Point No. 2 reactor, a provision requiring the Company to take all necessary steps to prevent thermal pollution before the facility may be operated. I am presently taking legal action to have a similar condition added to the license for Indian Point reactor No. 1, which has been in operation and causing serious damage to the Hudson since 1963. But the problem should not be resolved by piecemeal efforts. We must have a national criterion.

To compel the nation's utilities and other industries producing thermal pollution to take the necessary steps to avoid such damage I propose to include "thermal pollution"

under the definition of "environmentally-damaging" material and to require that water discharged from cooling operations must be of the same temperature and quality as the water into which it is being discharged. Violators will be subject to the same fines and penalties as other polluters.

Municipal Waste: Sewage and other municipal wastes are the other major source of water pollution in the United States today. Even after 5 years of our highly-touted abatement programs, nearly one billion gallons of untreated sewage pour daily through the mouth of New York Harbor. New York City alone contributes 450 million gallons, although the city is working hard to improve this, with two plants under construction and new connections underway with existing plants. But the fact is that, today, every community in the State is contributing untreated or inadequately treated sewage to our waterways.

Even the few sewage treatment facilities we are building today are not adequate. Their effluent is returned to our rivers and streams rich in nitrates and phosphates which are themselves dangerous pollutants. Not only is this damaging the waterways but it represents a serious waste, for nitrates and phosphates are potentially valuable.

The answer is a major national commitment to the construction of effective sewage treatment facilities which will completely recycle sewage, recapturing valuable elements and returning water of the highest quality to our waterways. We have the technology to accomplish this goal, but so far, we lack the commitment.

I propose to vest a single Federal agency, such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which has the technological capability and engineering know-how, with the responsibility for carrying out this national program.

Funding for the construction of these treatment facilities should be 70 percent Federal, with the state governments contributing 20 percent and local governments contributing 10 percent. The Federal share could be financed at a fraction of the Corps' annual multi-billion dollar budget which is now devoted largely to environmentally-damaging projects such as dam building and dredging.

Coastal Waters: Today, we are endangering our richest marine resource—our coastal waters—by indiscriminate dumping of sewage, sludge, acids and industrial waste.

As I pointed out last February, such dumping operations at the mouth of New York Harbor have created a virtual "Dead Sea" less than 12 miles from New York beaches. This is an area of 21 square miles virtually devoid of marine life, contaminated with virus and bacteria and with cancer-causing heavy metals. It threatens not only our beaches, but the safety of our marine food sources such as fish and clams. Recently, at hearings held as a result of this report, officials of the Corps of Engineers admitted that there are 210 dumping sites in our coastal waters. Sixty-one of these are on the East Coast. Ninety-five are in the Great Lakes and the remainder in the Gulf of Mexico and along the Pacific shore. In addition, there is much unrecorded dumping. The Nixon Administration, in response to my demand, has called for a halt to Great Lakes dumping but has taken no effective action regarding our coastal waters.

This intolerable assault upon one of the most valuable of our resources must be stopped. I propose to make it illegal for anyone to dump environmentally-damaging materials in our coastal waters. Violators shall be fined up to \$10,000 for each violation. Police authority will be given to the U.S. Coast Guard, and the responsibility for determining whether material is damaging will be vested in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

The Oceans: Thor Heyerdahl in his current voyage across the Atlantic in the "Ra II" re-

ports observing substantial pollution in the form of large globs of oil floating in the ocean. Experts at our marine laboratories have stated that the contamination of the ocean from oil and other pollutants is now so great that if we were to halt all further environmental assaults upon our oceans today, it might take as long as 500 years for the oceans to recover. I propose that the United States government call upon all nations of the world to join in a treaty to forbid oceanic pollution, provide effective police mechanisms, and provide substantial fines or other punishment for violators.

SOLID WASTE

One immediate result of halting all forms of water pollution—and air pollution, as well—will be a substantial increase in the already nearly unmanageable volume of solid waste. For example, although it is not known exactly how much sewage sludge, dredge spoil, and industrial waste is presently being dumped at all sites in U.S. coastal waters, it is known that 18 million cubic yards annually is being dumped in only the six sites around New York Harbor—and the volume is increasing at a rate that will double every 20 to 25 years.

Even without the addition of the new sources of solid waste resulting from our air and water abatement pollution programs, the situation would be critical. The average American is responsible for nearly six pounds of solid waste every day. Major urban areas like New York are hard-pressed to find ways of dealing with the trash and garbage that is now being generated. Traditionally, these wastes are burned in low-efficiency incinerators—in themselves significant contributors to air pollution—or are used as landfill, which has resulted in the loss of thousands, if not millions of acres of valuable shallows, the most important resource for developing and maintaining the nation's fisheries. Now cities like New York are literally running out of sites.

A major contributor to the existing solid waste problem is the American packaging industry which is responsible for as much as 90 percent of the total volume. There must be a significant commitment of funds for research and development of bio-degradable packaging materials, packaging which will meet the needs of the consumer but which can then be broken down and recycled into the environment as useful products. There are, today, a number of companies producing recycled paper which would otherwise just add to the volume of trash, and a European company has reported success in developing bottles made of material that is completely bio-degradable.

For materials that are not bio-degradable and cannot be recycled, the most effective method is high-heat incineration which has been successfully developed in foreign countries but used only on a limited, demonstration basis in the United States. High-heat incineration (3,000 degrees) can be carried out with virtually no air pollution, and can reduce solid wastes by 94 to 96 percent. In the process it produces a material called "frit", which is useful in the construction of building blocks, road beds, and is now being tested for use as fireproofing material.

Many of our other wastes can be recycled without incineration and play a valuable role in our economy. For example, the sewage sludge which is now poisoning our coastal waters, is—if properly treated—a valuable source of phosphate and nitrate, which experts tell us are now in short supply, and will soon be vitally needed to maintain agricultural food supplies and meet the needs of our growing population.

I propose that the Division of Solid Wastes of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be upgraded and given responsibility for the development of a national solid waste program. Working in cooperation with

State and local governments, the Division would be charged with developing a three-point effort: (a) to provide for the development of bio-degradable packaging materials, (b) to develop effective methods of recycling of material suitable for such use and (c) to direct the installation of effective high incineration facilities to serve our population centers.

Radioactive Wastes: Another result of our tremendous technical achievement which has created a serious environmental problem is the growing uses of radioactive materials—in power generation, medical applications, and other peaceful uses. This use, which is expanding rapidly, produces radioactive wastes, many of which are extremely dangerous and are not being adequately handled at this time. The radioactive wastes from the used fuel cells of nuclear power plants are currently disposed of only in two sites in the entire United States. One of these is in Cattaraugus County in New York, 30 miles southeast of Buffalo. The present facility at Cattaraugus County is discharging radioactive materials into the local waters at about ten times the allowable level set by the Atomic Energy Commission, and the AEC has failed to act.

Unfortunately, although it has the authority, New York State has not taken any action, apparently for two reasons. First, it relies upon the AEC and also because the waters in which the material is being discharged are not classified as drinking water. Clearly whether or not people drink the radioactive water, it poses a threat to public health which must not be tolerated.

Equally serious on a national level is the fact that many experts, including prominent scientists in the AEC, believe the agency's standards are much too lax. The State of Maryland, for example, recently established standards *one percent* of those set by the AEC.

The discharge presently taking place in the waters of Cattaraugus County would be halted with the enactment of my proposal to forbid the dumping of environmentally-damaging materials in the U.S. waterways. But in the long run, this is not enough.

None of the presently proposed methods for disposing of radioactive materials—deep wells, ocean dumping—provide effective safeguards.

I propose that a high-level commission of scientists should be established immediately to carry out *independent* research to determine safe levels of radioactive exposure and safe and effective methods of disposing of radioactive wastes. The AEC, representing a vested interest in promoting nuclear development, should play no role whatsoever in the deliberations of this commission.

AIR POLLUTION

As with water pollution, present air pollution programs at the State and Federal levels are wholly ineffective—and for many the same reason.

After five years we have clear proof that the Clean Air Act of 1965 is an almost meaningless law. Its principal weakness is the failure to attack pollution at the source. Under the Act, the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA) is allowed to set standards for ambient air quality. It is not charged with responsibility for locating pollution sources, nor does it have effective enforcement powers. In fact, polluters may use the Act to evade enforcement for at least seven and some cases as much as 17 years.

Further proof of the Act's failure can be seen in New York State where it has permitted the absurd gerrymandering of air quality districts so as to protect industrial polluters.

At present, the NAPCA's research is carried on in such a manner that there are no meaningful standards for many of the most

dangerous pollutants. For example, in March of this year, I revealed that the agency had no plan to set standards governing concentrations of asbestos dust before 1972, in spite of the fact that this is the only form of air pollution definitely proven to cause lung cancer. As a result, millions of New Yorkers have been exposed to serious health hazards due to the spraying of asbestos which is used as fireproofing material in many buildings. Fortunately, following my report, New York City acted expeditiously to ban further spraying, but the residents of other cities throughout the State and the nation, do not have similar protection.

I propose that air pollution abatement laws be reorganized along the lines I have proposed for our water pollution abatement laws.

First, NAPCA will be given the authority to set and enforce standards for individual sources of pollution, if state and local governments fail to act by January, 1972. Fines of \$1,000 for each day of violation will be established and a program of long-term, low-interest Federal loans set up for industries that can establish that compliance will cause undue hardship.

Second, the NAPCA will be required to undertake an immediate evaluation of all sources of air pollution and to set meaningful criteria for emissions.

Finally, citizens will be given the power to go into Federal court to enjoin violators, if government officials fail to act.

NOISE POLLUTION

We are only recently coming to recognize the serious effect that excessive noise can have upon people and upon the natural environment. Scientists in this country and in England have found that noise can and does cause deafness, plays a significant role in mental illness, and has as yet not wholly-understood effects upon the central nervous system.

Most attention has recently been drawn to the noise pollution from jet aircraft. An amendment which I proposed to the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, and which has now been enacted into law, should give citizens the necessary legal basis for protecting themselves from aircraft noise resulting from new airport construction. But citizens are exposed to intolerable levels of noise from other sources in their community and their places of work.

I propose the enactment of a Federal law establishing an authority to conduct research to determine acceptable levels of noise and to propose effective legislation to protect our citizens from excessive exposure.

POPULATION

Basic to all of our environmental problems is the problem of our population explosion. We can readily see that our present population of over 200 million—utilizing both renewable and non-renewable resources, contributing to pollution, noise, congestion and stress—challenges our existing institutions. How much more serious will be the problem at the end of the century when we will be 300 million in number and probably consuming more goods per capita than we are now.

As a priority program, we should start immediately to determine what our population goals will be and to work out the methods through which we will achieve these goals. An effective program should include family planning assistance, removal of all state and local barriers presently interfering with the right of a doctor to give birth control information and to perform abortions as he and the patient deem necessary and desirable.

GENERAL

Finally, we must see that every Federal and state program contains provisions with language similar to that which I included in

the "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970," stating that it is declared to be national policy that each Federal project, "shall provide for the protection and enhancement of the natural resources and the quality of environment of the Nation . . . including, but not limited to, fish and wildlife, natural, scenic, and recreation assets, water and air quality, and other factors affecting the environment . . ." In addition, each provision should include similar language enabling the citizen to hold government agencies accountable for the way in which they discharge their environmental responsibilities.

REDUCED AIR FARES FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, our national economic condition causes difficulties in all sectors, but the pinch of inflation is felt particularly hard by those who are forced to live off fixed incomes, especially the elderly. They have worked faithfully all their lives but are now faced with financial insecurity as their savings and their pensions are eaten away by inflation.

The social security increase, which I strongly supported and which was recently passed by Congress, was a small and long-overdue improvement. More needs to be done, however, to assure our senior citizens a satisfying and enjoyable life in their later years.

One important measure which Congress should take is to pass my bill providing for reduced air fares for the elderly on a standby basis. I first introduced this bill in 1968 during the 90th Congress and introduced a similar version this year.

The arrangement I propose is not new in the United States, because it is presently applied to our Nation's youth. An individual would be allowed to purchase a ticket at a reduced rate but would not be able to reserve a seat on any particular flight. He would wait in "standby" status until it became clear that empty spaces were available.

The ability to travel at low prices would provide benefits for all concerned. Most importantly, of course, it would enable people 65 years of age and over to break their present enforced immobility and the isolation and loneliness it often causes. It is ironic that at a time of life when men and women have time to visit family and friends, high transportation costs keep them at home and often alone. We should do everything possible to enable our older citizens to use their leisure time to the best advantage, so that it becomes a source of enjoyment and not a burden. Permitting them to fly during nonpeak hours for reduced prices would be a significant step toward this goal.

Moreover, this policy would produce economic benefits for the airlines, by filling up seats which would otherwise remain vacant. A new market would be created consisting of people who would not be able to travel at regular prices, but

who would take advantage of the opportunity to fly if the rates were within their means.

In an era of larger aircraft, it stands to reason that the increase in the number of seats available on a given flight will result in an increase in the number of unused, nonrevenue-producing seats, it is only good economics to utilize this excess capacity to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is particularly appropriate at this time of inflation and economic uncertainty for the Congress to have special concern for those who, because of the dependence upon fixed incomes are most seriously affected. I believe that my bill would make a meaningful contribution to the lives of our senior citizens and benefit the airlines at the same time.

I urge its early passage.

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, too much has already been said about the shortcomings of our country and our democratic system. Too much said and not enough done.

When we focus our attention on a shortcoming in our system that attention seems to amplify the shortcoming far beyond its proper relationship to its environment.

That perhaps occurs because so little attention is paid to the overwhelming number of taken-for-granted ingredients of our day-to-day system that are good.

Mr. Speaker, my respected friend and colleague, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, had an opportunity last Sunday to address the Michigan Gold Star Mothers and he took great advantage of that opportunity to discuss many of the things that are good about America and the direction our country is taking.

Because I feel that we all can benefit from Mr. BROOMFIELD's remarks, I am commending them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

A quarter century ago, the world stood on the threshold of peace, shaken by years of war but confident of the future.

There was joy in the prospect of an end to destruction, an end to bloodshed and sudden death.

There was sadness in the knowledge that your sons and your daughters would not be with us to share the wonders of a world without war.

But there was a universal sense that the sacrifice had been worthwhile, that the ideals and freedoms so many died to preserve had survived undamaged and that their value had been enhanced.

There was an obligation to carry on in the names of those no longer with us, to make certain their hopes and dreams would be fulfilled.

Today, we stand on the downside of another terrible war, one that has been almost as costly in terms of bloodshed, destruction and heartache.

But unlike World War II, the war in Viet-

nam has cost us dearly in our self-confidence and our pride. We are a nation given to moments of shame and self-doubt. We sometimes question our motives, our past achievements and even the very ideals for which we fought with so much determination just 25 years ago.

We have tuned-in those always willing to tell us our faults and we are listening to them as never before. We seem to find morbid satisfaction in hearing again and again what is *bad* about America.

The dedicated anarchists and the kill-them-if-they-don't-agree crowd has always been with us, hanging around the fringes of organized society.

The defects they point to, for the most part, have always been there, too.

Most Americans have been secure enough and confident enough to listen to them with one ear, without losing their balance, their ideals, and their sense of what is right and what is wrong.

But now many are not sure anymore.

We have opened the door wide to these prophets of doom and given them center-stage in the Congress, on our television screens, the front pages of our newspapers and in our minds.

We tell ourselves that there might be some truth to what they say.

Of course there is. We were never perfect. But it is time to look at the whole picture and to talk about what is *right* with America.

It is time to remember what we believe in, what we have fought and died for in the past and to compare that with the history of other societies and other countries.

It is time to turn our mirror outward and end this morbid self-examination. We need to let that mirror reflect the rest of the world as it really is, with all of its imperfections. By comparison there is a great deal that is right with America.

It is time to give our President the support he needs to end this long war in Asia—at the very least we must give him the benefit of the doubt until his efforts have had a reasonable chance to succeed.

The hate-peddlers and firebombers have never had it so good.

They find themselves suddenly—and probably to their surprise—with a larger audience than they could ever have hoped for in their wildest dreams.

They are ready to use every trick in the book to convince us that everything we believe in is dark and ugly.

If there is a wart on America's face, we are told to chop off its head.

The honest idealism of your children and grandchildren is their number one target.

The theories of Marx, Hitler, Mao and a whole list of revolutionaries you and I never heard of are paraded skillfully through our sons and daughters heads.

"The way to make this country better is to destroy it," our kids are told in a hundred different ways. The brighter the child, the smoother the lie is told.

At stake in every one of these confrontations are the souls of our children and the soul of our country.

What can we do about it?

If we tell our children America is perfect, they will pity us.

They don't know what we are talking about when we tell them they never had it so good.

And, if we *order* them to be patriotic, they'll break our hearts.

The thing to do is to tell them the truth.

America is the greatest experiment in human dignity and freedom ever attempted by man. But it is still an experiment—one that is not yet completed. A new generation of Americans must make it better.

But they need our help. Nobody can do much about America's todays and tomorrows, if he doesn't understand her yesterdays.

We must remind them of those yester-

days—yesterdays that you are better equipped to describe than anyone.

We must remind them that the American flag is a symbol, not just a colorful piece of cloth that you and I worship blindly.

It is the symbol of all we believe in, all we have fought for, and all we hope to be. It is the sum of our spirit and the insignia of our pride.

We must remind our young people what America has accomplished under that flag in just 200 years and ask them to measure those achievements against those of any nation in history.

We must concede our shortcomings, but never doubt our accomplishments or the direction in which we are headed.

To those who say that our Constitution, our system, our ideals are no good because we have not achieved the perfect society, we must ask them to show us a workable alternative.

We must challenge them to stop burning and start building.

And, we must remind them again and again that this great system remains intact—not by accident—but because of the sacrifice and courage of those Americans we honor today.

Because they faced an enemy unafraid, we, as individuals, enjoy more freedom than any other civilization.

These young men died for us. Now, they ask only that we live for them, for the country they loved, and for the ideals in which they believed.

As we honor these brave Americans and mark the end of one cruel war, let us unite in our support and our prayers for an end to that terrible conflict in Southeast Asia.

That war, like others, will end and we will go forward as a nation to other things.

Let us do so confidently, weeping only for the past, making sure there will be no cause for tears in the future.

POW'S—PRESSURE ON HANOI IMPERATIVE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, of paramount concern to America at this time, is the goal of achieving peace in Vietnam. However, I am deeply concerned lest we, in our determined quest for peace, lose sight of another vital effort—that of freeing and bringing home more than 1,500 Americans who are either prisoners of war or who are listed as missing in action.

My concern is shared by many other Americans who are attempting, both through individual and organized efforts, to obtain freedom for the prisoners, many of whom have suffered cruel and inhumane treatment during their captivity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD an article from the National Review, written by Priscilla L. Buckley, in which she gives an account of the action that some of the concerned wives of POW's are taking:

PRISONERS OF WAR: THEY ALSO SERVE
(By Priscilla L. Buckley)

I'm Mrs. William Schuddy, she said over the phone. She and two friends were in town for a couple of days making the rounds and they'd like to see my brother, or me, or any-

one I'd designate on the staff. "My husband's been a prisoner in North Vietnam for five years," she explained, "and we're organizing to do something about it," because she didn't add, it doesn't look as if any one else will.

I don't know what I expected. Middle-aged women, I suppose, emotional, pent-up, driven. But the three who came in the door were, well, kids. Bright, attractive, with that clean tanned outdoor look of so many young American women. Attractive, and determined.

Jane Schuddy made the introductions. Kathy Plowman, a pretty dark intense girl, very thin. "Her husband's been missing in action three years." The blonde on the other side, with a gamin haircut and the big smile is Candy Parish. "Her husband's been missing in action for two years." MIA—Missing In Action. That means that there has been no official word since their planes went down. Candy has this to go on. The backup flier in her husband's plane is in a North Vietnamese prison camp; his wife has heard from him. But he hasn't mentioned Chuck Parish. Candy smiles, all but apologizes. "I've built a lot on a little," she says. The other flier has occasionally used "we'all" in his letters—"but then he's a Southerner." Could that "we'all," so casually dropped in a letter, mean that Chuck Parish is alive? Candy doesn't know. Kathy Plowman's straw is this. A couple of weeks after her Navy husband's plane disappeared, two Americans were spotted and their descriptions tally pretty well with the description of James Plowman and his pilot. Two of the nine prisoners who have been released have mentioned Buzz Ellison. Buzz Ellison was James Plowman's pilot. She wants to explain a little more fully why she, too, continues to hope. There was this other woman. Just a few weeks ago she heard from her husband: He'd been missing four and a half years. All that time she'd been writing him—writing into the void. In that first letter to her he asks how the child is. Kathy wants to make sure I get it. *Child, not son or daughter.* The wife was pregnant when he was shot down. He assumes a child was born. But when he doesn't say boy or girl, mention a name, she knows that all those letters, over all those years, addressed to Central Post Office, Hanoi, have been held up or destroyed. Why did they decide to let him write at all? And why now?

The women have an answer. Because of the pressure they and other men and women like them have brought to bear. Because of the publicity they're giving to the issue. And they trot out the figures. They are 1,586 men missing in action in North and South Vietnam and Laos (no one has heard anything from any man missing in the South or in Laos so for the moment we won't count them). About eight hundred of the missing men are fliers, shot down over the North. In the five years from 1965 to 1969, six hundred had come out from 115 men; in the six months between December 1969 and June 1970—after the families started agitating—1,200 letters have been received from 320 men. And they mention something else. A year or more ago, in November 1968, Hanoi announced that it would, as a humanitarian gesture, release three prisoners to a delegation of peaceniks headed by Rennie Davis and Dave Dellinger. And they did. They set free three Americans, none of whom had been in their hands more than six months, all of whom were in good shape. When Secretary Laird, last May, devoted an entire speech to the prisoner issue, Hanoi's response was to allow six Americans (one of them Admiral McCain's son—it was the first word he received that his son was alive) to broadcast messages that they were alive and well. In addition, Hanoi freed another three prisoners. This time, because Hanoi wanted to wring the greatest possible credit internationally from the gesture, it freed men who

had been in prison two or more years, men in need of medical care. They, too, were released to a peace delegation.

What about the peaceniks and their efforts on behalf of the prisoners? I asked. I had read that some women had refused to accept mail from their husbands which the peaceniks had brought out rather than go along with demands that they join the end-the-war propaganda campaign.

Kathy doesn't buy it. We can't, she says. "We'll grab at any straw." If they have to work through the Dellingers & Haydens & Weisses they will. Candy, who was one of the wives who went to Paris last year to plead with the Vietnamese delegation for news of their husbands, comments that when they asked North Vietnamese delegate Xuan Oanh what they could do to help, he told them to work with Dr. Spock and Women Strike for Peace. "We dropped that right there," she says. She adds that Xuan Oanh was the only delegate who would see them at all and that he was very kind, very sympathetic. He hasn't been heard from since. He's not in Paris. Candy muses, "You don't suppose they've sent him down the Ho Chi Minh Trail?" The others are amused. They've heard it before but still it's fun. Anyway, they tell me, Hanoi's position is that all American prisoners in its camps are allowed to write one letter a month to their families and the reason the wives and parents aren't getting the letters is that, what else? the Central Intelligence Agency doesn't want the letters delivered and intercepts them. Jane explains further. "We address our mail to the prisoners, care of Central Post Office, Hanoi. They obviously think that all mail to the States goes through a Central Post Office, Washington, D.C."

Hanoi, they say, is big on gestures and pronouncements. But, all told over the years, it has released only nine Americans, in groups of three and always to the custody of American peaceniks. It has never given out anything like a complete list of its prisoners. It gives out the news in dribs and drabs to suit its own purposes. Examples: Hanoi did respond to an appeal by Swedish Prime Minister Palme. It gave him a list—the first and only official list incidentally. And it contained fourteen names—only two of which are new. A list published by Chicago Veterans for Peace last November had "dated" information according to the Pentagon. Two of the seven photographs were of men who had been released a year earlier. A second list released that same week had only one new name. Last Christmas, Women Strike for Peace, with great fanfare, published a list of 141 names it had brought back from Hanoi. Most of them were repeats, very few were new. Jane interjects: "Bill's name is on all those lists. I wish it weren't. I wish some other women could know what had happened to her husband." A fortnight ago there was a big flurry. Cora Weiss, of the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, brought out a list of 334 names. Hanoi radio announced that this was the list of all the men it had in its prison camps—complete and final. But the United States knows of 376 men that North Vietnam holds or has held. This latest list like so many in the past was, according to a Pentagon spokesman, "inaccurate, incomplete, from unofficial sources." He added: "There are no names on the list that are new to us."

The prisoners are an asset to Hanoi, says Kathy. North Vietnam can dole out the names, allow more letters out, let parcels and letters in, for its own propagandistic purposes, when it wants to and how it wants to. "We've got to change that. We've got to put so much pressure on them that these prisoners will become a liability to the North." That's what the National League of Families of American Prisoners is all about.

What about H. Ross Perot? He's the Texas

multimillionaire who flew a planeload of food parcels, Christmas gifts, medical supplies and letters to Laos last Christmas hoping to be allowed to deliver them to American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. Which he never got to do. Candy and Kathy and Jane think Perot is great. He's got no personal axe to grind. But he did something that dramatized the situation. They tell this story about that abortive mission of his.

In Vientiane, the Laotian capital, North Vietnamese delegates threw back at Perot the charge that prisoners of the "army of national liberation"—technically Hanoi continues not to acknowledge that Northerners are fighting in the South—were being mistreated in South Vietnamese POW camps. Perot flew to Saigon. He enlisted the cooperation of newsmen, of photographers, of TV camera crews and of the U.S. and South Vietnamese authorities. His group toured the POW camps. They took pictures, stills and movies. They talked to the prisoners. They collected thousands of letters from them for their families back North. Back to Vientiane. The North Vietnamese refused to look at evidence. They wouldn't accept the pictures. And Perot wouldn't hand over the letters. The prisoners had told him to deliver them to their families if he could but by no means to entrust them to North Vietnamese authorities or even to Central Post Office Hanoi. They feared reprisals against their families.

Once a man sets forth down the Ho Chi Minh Trail he is gone, finished—he might as well be vaporized—so far as his family in the North is concerned. It is a one-way street. Nothing comes back up the trail by way of news. No R&Rs for Hanoi's soldiers; no one-year tours in the war zone. The soldier, if he survives, will not return home until the battle has been won and South Vietnam conquered.

Every week American and South Vietnamese authorities file a report, as required by the Geneva Convention, with the International Red Cross in Geneva giving in all the required detail the names, condition and place of incarceration of captured North Vietnamese troops. That list is there in Geneva and available. Hanoi has never consulted it. North Vietnam's Candys and Kathys and Janes could know what has happened to their husbands and brothers and sons; could know if they are in prison, if they have been wounded, how they are now, whether or not they are dead. But that might get in the way of the Communist wave of the future Ho and his successors are planning for Indochina. It might indicate the dimensions of the losses suffered by North Vietnam in the South. So there will be no letters home, no lists of dead and wounded, no information. Just the memory of the heroic soldier in the army of national liberation fighting to the death against the yankee imperialists and their corrupt lackeys in Saigon.

Most of the letters by those abandoned North Vietnamese POWs lie in sacks in warehouses today; the pictures are going brown around the edges. A few can be seen right now in an exhibit mounted and paid for by Perot in the crypt of the Capitol in Washington. They show Northern prisoners in the Southern camps; they also show a few pictures of American prisoners in the North.

A man in a cage.

"I knew they kept them in cages, and about the cockroaches and the rats," Candy says. "But I didn't know, before I saw those pictures, that they were fastened down. Lying on their backs, with their legs and arms fettered... Lots of them have dysentery...."

Janie adds: "In some places they just dig holes in the ground and drop them in. They throw food down to them, and let them live there in their own waste."

They mention these facts with very little emotion. But then these are the kind of facts they've been living with for five, three, two years.

What worries them now is Vietnamization.

American troop withdrawals continue, South Vietnam takes over more and more of the actual fighting. Eventually our troop presence is skeletal. The fighting continues in desultory fashion, on a hit-and-run raid level. There's no formal armistice or peace treaty. Just the de-escalation. That's what everyone is hoping for from Richard Nixon on down. That's the way everyone would like to see the scenario run out. But Hanoi has said it won't release its American prisoners until every last American soldier is out of the country. No strategic projection as of now calls for that. So will their husbands—at any rate Janie's—have their misery prolonged?

The senators—they've talked to lots of them, too—tell the wives that of course the Americans will be released when the withdrawal is completed. Why would Hanoi want to keep the prisoners at that time?

But the families don't believe in Hanoi's goodwill. They know that even though an armistice was signed at Panmunjom, North Korea failed to account for 389 Americans who had had one time or another been known to be prisoners. The families of those prisoners of an earlier war against a Communist foe in Asia—nearly twenty years later—still have heard nothing.

But back to Hanoi. Will a government that, as a matter of politics, withholds information from its own people about their own men, its soldiers, will such a government suddenly throw wide its prison gates unless it is forced to do so? They don't believe it. There's no reason they should from their very own, very personal, very bitter experiences with the Reds.

"The prisoners will never be released until we can make them a liability to Hanoi," Candy insists.

They get up to leave. Janie mentions that she expects there'll be a letter from Bill in her mailbox when she gets home to Virginia Beach. Nancy Rubin Jerry's wife, is just back from Hanoi and Moscow, and she brought out 143 letters. She posted them yesterday, according to a newspaper story Janie read. One could be from Bill.

They walk out, three slim, determined fighting wives whose husbands, dead or alive, have cause to be proud of them. The door swings shut. You stand there a moment, just realize with a start that they, too, are members of the Now Generation.

LEGISLATION TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE TO 18 IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Territorial and Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, I have consistently made an effort to make certain that all residents of our territories receive due process and equal application of the law of the United States under our Constitution.

It is for that reason that I am today introducing legislation to lower the voting age in the Virgin Islands to age 18. Our fellow citizens in the territory of Guam now have the opportunity to vote

at age 18. Our fellow citizens in the Virgin Islands do not. I, therefore, seek this legislation in order to put the Virgin Islands on the same basis as the territory of Guam.

Both young groups are from populations which have made great contributions to our country and have admirably served in our Armed Forces whenever called upon to do so.

I hope that the committee on which I serve and the Congress will act expeditiously to give the citizens of the Virgin Islands at age 18 the same opportunities which we now extend to our fellow citizens in other territories under the flag.

COMMISSION ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently become very concerned about the ability of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest to objectively and fairly investigate the problems on our campuses and then formulate positive and workable solutions. My concern is based upon the political philosophies and associations of some of the people appointed to top staff positions with the Commission. It also comes from an awareness that most of the witnesses that have testified before the Commission represent a liberal or radical viewpoint.

Today, Congressman BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., who represents the congressional district adjacent to mine, issued a press release which lists some of the Commission's top staff and some of their past affiliations. Congressman GOLDWATER dramatically illustrates that the staff is dominated by people with a leftist point of view, thereby making a rational investigation impossible.

I have also learned that of all the students who have testified before the Scranton Commission, all but one adhere to a liberal or radical philosophy.

The overwhelming majority of our college and university student bodies are composed of men and women who want to get a good education and who are not interested in disrupting the campuses. These students have the same right to appear before the Commission as radical students.

The problems of campus unrest are very serious and the Commission's staff and list of witnesses should be representative of every political viewpoint.

Unless the Commission on Campus Unrest has a well-balanced staff and witness list, I am afraid their report will be a complete whitewash and a political indictment against the Nixon administration.

I insert Congressman GOLDWATER's news release at this point in the RECORD:

GOLDWATER DOUBTS CREDIBILITY OF CAMPUS UNREST COMMISSION

I was very pleased with President Nixon's decision last spring to appoint a Blue Rib-

bon Commission to investigate the problems of campus unrest and to arrive at some positive solutions.

However, I think recent developments relative to the President's Commission on Campus Unrest have clouded the credibility of any of its findings.

Certainly the Chairman, William Scranton, is not in question. But I am surprised at the appointments of the top staff personnel of the Commission.

William M. Byrne, the Commission's Executive Director and a Democrat, is the former U.S. Attorney from Los Angeles, appointed under former President Lyndon Johnson.

Owen Fliss, an official with the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division under both President Kennedy and Johnson, has been appointed as a top research consultant.

Seven attorneys were recently appointed as special investigators for the Commission. Five of these attorneys also served with the Justice Department under Kennedy and/or Johnson. A sixth attorney is now a partner in former California Governor Pat Brown's law firm.

I have also learned that my Democrat opponent for Congress in 1969, John Van de Kamp, has been appointed Special Assistant to the Commission to handle public relations. Mr. Van de Kamp was the Chief of the U.S. Attorney's section of the Justice Department under former President Johnson.

I personally respect Mr. Van de Kamp and these comments are no reflection of my personal feelings. However, I believe this appointment, plus the others that I have mentioned, clearly demonstrates the narrow liberal political spectrum from which the Scranton Commission is drawing.

I also note that such publications as the *Wall Street Journal* are questioning the basic makeup of the Commission. Douglas Hallett, editorial chairman for the *Yale Daily News* and a summer employee of the *Journal*, wrote in the July 29th edition "the basic thrust of the Commission is much too one-sided and much too limited by contemporary events to be of any real value."

In summary, I believe these appointments are negating the reliability of the Commission's findings. Even more important, these developments are detrimental to the Administration's efforts to solve the problems on our college campuses. The cloud placed over the Commission's credibility is unfair to the American people and to the President elected to represent them.

BLUE COLLAR JOBS OF FUTURE TO REQUIRE MORE SKILLS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time advocate of vocational education, I was pleased to note a story in the current issue of the *Allied Industrial Worker*, published in Milwaukee, concerning the need for better skills for blue collar jobs in the future.

I believe that we must prepare young people for the jobs of the future that will be changing and modifying with the times. We can no longer train young people in the stereotyped "shop" courses that characterized vocational education in the past. Young men and women need marketable skills. They have overwhelmingly demonstrated their ability to do interesting jobs well.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this timely article to my colleagues' attention today because it underscores the very realistic need for greater attention to providing skills that can grow with the jobs of the future.

The article follows:

BACKGROUND COMMENT: BLUE COLLAR JOBS OF FUTURE TO REQUIRE MORE SKILLS

Despite reports to the contrary, the blue collar worker in American industrial life will be around for a long time.

This clear conclusion can be drawn from a huge 859-page report by the U.S. Labor Department on the occupational outlook in the United States.

The "Handbook" concedes, of course, that white collar employment is steadily increasing, but it nevertheless has a 218-page section dealing with "skilled and other manual occupations."

BLUE COLLAR JOBS TO GROW

There are now 27.5 million blue collar workers in the United States and the prospect is that their numbers will increase and not decrease over the next ten years. While technological progress is causing major changes in the job makeup in the United States through automation and other devices, the Handbook concludes:

"Nonetheless, the number of skilled and semiskilled workers is expected to continue to increase through the 1970s despite this rapid mechanization and automation of production processes. It is expected that our increasingly complex technology generally will require higher levels of skill to operate and service this machinery and related equipment."

The number of blue collar workers has dropped slightly in proportion to total employment, yet during the past ten years blue collar jobs increased by more than 4 million with the number of unskilled workers dropping slightly.

SKILLS NEEDED

What has become obvious is that within the blue collar category more and more training and education will become necessary. Employment of skilled workers is likely to increase at about the same rate as total employment; however, semiskilled jobs will grow at a slower rate while there will be no growth in unskilled jobs.

Breaking down the blue collar category, the Handbook reports that skilled craftsmen numbered 10 million during 1968 when the study was made. Some groups such as the carpenters numbered almost 900,000, followed by automotive mechanics who numbered 825,000.

Chances for jobs for skilled workers are high, since some 200,000 workers are needed annually merely to replace those who retire or die.

"Young men who acquire a good basic education (including courses in mathematics and the sciences) as well as through job training, will be better able to compete for higher paying skilled jobs than applicants without this training," the Handbook says.

SEMISKILLED NUMBERS LARGE

Semiskilled workers make up the largest occupational group in the American labor force. In 1968 there were 14 million such workers, representing almost one out of five workers in the country. Of these 8.9 million were employed in manufacturing industries, making clothing, automobiles, parts, textiles, machinery and electrical equipment.

Women numbered about 4 million in the semiskilled area, with 8 out of 10 workers in the apparel industry being women.

"The broad field of semiskilled jobs will provide hundreds of thousands of employment opportunities for young people in the years ahead," the Handbook predicted. It estimated that more than 300,000 such workers will be needed each year simply to replace those who retire or die.

The Handbook said that unskilled jobs—now about 3.5 million—will continue to drop because of the growth of mechanized equipment replacing hand labor. It noted that power-driven machinery is now doing much of the work that used to be done by hand. It nevertheless predicted that industrial expansion probably would create a need for unskilled laborers "which will about offset the jobs lost to labor-saving mechanical equipment."

VOCATIONAL TRAINING GROWTH

A current report of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare shows that the nation's investment in vocational education has more than doubled in the past five years. Approximately \$1.4 billion was spent—largely by state and local governments—during the year ending June 1969 on vocational education, as compared with \$605 million during 1965.

Approximately 8 million boys, girls and adults took Federally supported vocational training last year in more than 18,000 schools throughout the United States—46% more than in 1965 when only 5.4 million attended classes.

An increase of 20,346 vocational education teachers was reported bringing the total to 166,898.

All in all, the American blue collar worker is marching ahead in the fields of education and training as the demands for higher skills grow greater daily to meet the challenges of greater mechanization and automation.

HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT UNACCEPTABLE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I read with some concern this week a column entitled "Full Employment" by George Hagedorn in the *NAM Reports*, the weekly publication of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Hagedorn espouses a callous thesis that unemployment rates at 5 percent might not be excessive or unacceptable. He states, "Judging also by the economic record of recent years, something like 5 percent unemployment is a more realistic, attainable, and sustainable goal."

Hagedorn attributes the acceptance of the lower figures of 3.8 to 4 percent unemployment as a national goal to "politicians who want to be reelected as well as to theorists who are content to dwell in their ivory towers." I want to challenge these contentions. I think it is Mr. Hagedorn who is dwelling in an insulated position which has obviously left him insensitive to the very real and tragic economic situation in which this Nation finds itself at this juncture in its history.

What Mr. Hagedorn does not realize is that an increase of 1 percent in the national unemployment statistics means an additional 800,000 men and women without jobs. This is as if the entire population of the Capital City of Washington, D.C., were on the streets looking for work. It is the same as if approximately all of the 866,000 college and university graduates in 1969 were filing claims at the unemployment offices rather than finding placements in jobs.

Can any armchair column writer sit

back and speculate that an additional 1 percent unemployment figure may be realistic and should perhaps represent the figure acceptable as the national goal of full employment? For these 800,000 jobless about which Mr. Hagedorn speaks, there are hundreds and thousands of families lacking a breadwinner; there are teenagers who see the prospect of tuition for college becoming a dream rather than a reality as their fathers lose jobs.

I can assure Mr. Hagedorn that the percentage point is not something a politician uses for his political advantage. What it means to him is that people are out of work, that the cities in his district are declared high unemployment areas. Surely no right-thinking citizen can accept this situation of rising unemployment complacently as a pure syndrome of the seventies.

I am certain that my colleagues share genuine concern for the men and women who are today unable to find work and for those who have been laid off. The Select Subcommittee on Labor, which I chair, held 27 days of public hearings on proposed manpower bills, and we heard about high unemployment among the unskilled and rising unemployment among the semiskilled and professional workers as certain industries are forced to curtail production and go on shorter shifts.

This subcommittee will shortly be working on a bill to guarantee a job to every American who is able and willing to work. For I believe that any unemployment is too much, that every man and woman who can work should be assisted in attaining a job and should, indeed, be able to find one. In a day when the municipalities are crying for employees in the fields of health and safety, conservation and beautification, I feel this Congress can act to assist in matching men with jobs and fulfilling the needs of the community as well as providing an adequate income to the presently unemployed members of this society. To do less would be to shirk the duty incumbent upon us today.

I want to include the entire text of Mr. Hagedorn's column for my colleagues to note his remarks. I think this disregard for the welfare of American workers speaks for itself. It follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT
(By George Hagedorn)

In politico-economic circles, agreement is almost universal that the present state of the economy falls short of "full employment." Even the Administration in power seems to accept the view. (Recently the President was reported as predicting a return to full employment during the next 12 months—thus by implication accepting the judgment that we are not there now.) Political opponents of the Administration are, of course, even more vehement in assertions that the present unemployment rate is too high.

In this column we want to challenge, or at least question, this generally accepted opinion. Maybe the unemployment rate, having been *too low* a year ago, is now just about right. The all-important question is where the line should be drawn between full employment and excessive unemployment.

In mid-1970, the unemployment rate is hovering in the neighborhood of 5 percent.

The view we are questioning, then, must regard the figure as excessive and unacceptable for the long run.

Just what lower figure is regarded as the proper full-employment objective is not so clear. In their February Economic Report, Administration economists based their calculations of "economic potential" on a standard of 3.8 percent unemployment. From that one gathers that 3.8 percent unemployment is their criterion for full employment. Other economists and political spokesmen seem to have a figure in mind that is close to that one.

So, using round numbers, one may summarize the accepted view thus: 4 percent unemployment represents full employment but 5 percent unemployment represents too high a level of joblessness.

But why? Curiosity, at least, should prompt us to ask how so fine a distinction can be made. Why is 4 percent right and 5 percent all wrong? Why should we assume that the employment situation is satisfactory when 96 percent of the labor force is at work, but unsatisfactory when only 95 percent have jobs?

One would think that profound economic analysis, and careful statistical investigation, must lie behind this choice of a precise criterion for testing the presence, or absence, of "full employment."

But one searches in vain for the body of technical literature setting forth the analysis and the statistics supporting the 4 percent criterion as against some higher figure, say 5 percent. The choice seems to have been an entirely arbitrary one—as far as any basis in technical economics is concerned.

The truth is that "full employment" is a political slogan rather than an economic concept. It remained a slogan without precise statistical content until the early 1960s when the economists of the Kennedy Administration adopted 4 percent unemployment as their interim goal. Subsequent administrations have felt unable to shift to any higher figure. The leadership of the nation has slipped into the habit of regarding 4 percent unemployment as *the* criterion—despite the absence of any analytical basis for it—of full employment.

National economic experience in the years since the setting of the 4 percent interim goal ought to, but somehow doesn't, call it into question. If one were to start all over again, 4 percent would surely seem too low. During the past decade, unemployment has been below 4 percent only in inflationary periods. Worse, the mere existence of inflation is not enough. It has to be an inflation which is greater each year than the year before—a progression which can't go on indefinitely.

The experience of the past decade—for what it is worth—indicates that unemployment at or below 4 percent occurs only as part of a syndrome which involves: accelerating inflation, steeply rising interest rates, severe curtailment of homebuilding, disruption of capital markets, and other unpleasantnesses. It is surprising that as yet no one seems willing to cut the Gordian knot which ties the national leadership to 4 percent unemployment as the unquestioned goal of economic policy.

Judging also by the economic record of recent years, something like 5 percent unemployment is a more realistic, attainable and sustainable goal. However, we do not want to propose a new dogmatism which would say the same things about full employment that have been said, with 5 percent substituted for 4 percent. We would rather see a healthy skepticism toward any such precise statement of economic goals.

When we have expressed these thoughts in conversation we have often met the rejoinder that, however correct our economic analysis may be, the fact is that the politi-

cal commitment to 4 percent unemployment is so strong that it cannot be broken. None of the nation's political leaders feels that he can back away from it. This political reality must be faced, just as much as the economic realities we cite against it.

The attitude just described is so deeply engrained, among both the political and the economic leadership that the question of a meaningful definition for full employment is hardly debated at all. Nevertheless, it is a question which will not allow itself to be ignored: is 4 percent unemployment an attainable and sustainable objective for national policy? We raise it here on practical rather than ideological grounds. It is worth consideration by politicians who want to be reelected as well as by theorists who are content to dwell in their ivory towers.

Thus far, general acceptance of the 4 percent unemployment objective has led, not to its own permanent realization but to a stop-and-go type of economic fluctuation. Political leadership which accepts this objective without question will be punished for its failure as often as it is rewarded for its success.

The 4 percent unemployment objective is, ultimately, a burden to be borne by the political leaders who embrace it, rather than an asset to them. Those who first appreciate this fact will have an advantage over their rivals.

YOUTH TO BE PROUD OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend of August 8 my wife and I were privileged to be guests of "Music on the March" program held in the drum corps capital of the world, Racine, Wis., hosted by the famous VFW national drum corps champions, the Racine Kilties. We were also guests of the Seventh Annual Pageant of Drums sponsored by the VFW Post No. 2823 of my home town, Burlington, Wis. I repeat, it was our privilege to be present for these two events because we experienced America's youth performing on the field in competition that gave us a just pride in being parents in an age in which the worst of a small minority of our Nation's youth is being publicized as representative of our Nation's youth with the ultimate effect of creating a deeper gap between our generations.

Mr. Speaker, what generally passes as representatives of today's youth is false. We witnessed this past weekend the end results of months of painstaking self-discipline of over a thousand young people who presented a program of music and marching ability that stirred our pride in these wonderful young men and women who proved they had the stamina and intelligence and will to make the sacrifices of time and talent and effort necessary to produce the kind of perfection displayed in these two programs.

I want to remind my colleagues of something I am sure they already know—that America's youth of today deserve all the encouragement they can receive from their parents, their communities, their Nation—yes, their Representatives in Congress—to welcome competition; to

put their best into whatever they do; to repudiate the tendency to move toward mediocrity; and to shun the false theory that rewards are "rights" to be granted even to those who refuse to accept the labor and discipline necessary to warrant reward.

I want to publicly congratulate all the young people who presented these outstanding spectacles of talent—the Madison Explorer Scouts; Racine Explorer Scouts; Boys of '76, Racine; 32d Hussars of Madison; the Kilties of Racine, VFW national champions; the Blue Stars of La Crosse; the Kiltie Kadets of Racine; the Ambassa "Deers" of Kenosha; the Titans, all of Wisconsin; and

The Kingsmen of Anaheim, Calif.; the Kingston Indians of Kingston, N.Y.; the St. Paul Scouts of St. Paul, Minn.; the Vanguards of Des Plaines, Ill.; the Velvet Knights of Santa Ana, Calif.; the Troopers of Capser, Wyo.

I wish also to congratulate the sponsoring groups, the Racine Scout Drum Corps and the Parents Club, Inc.

I want to congratulate, too, those who worked so hard with these young people to bring them to the state of perfection—their parents who contributed so much, including their encouragement and their time and their money to support their respective corps, and the sponsors without whom these young people could not share their talents with thousands of others throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, any one who attends a drum corps competition I am sure stands taller in his appreciation of the freedom and the great spirit that not only is displayed by these young people but the freedom and the spirit of America that makes it possible for them to be so challenged.

I recommend to my colleagues that they attend at least one of these competitions during this next month so that they, too, can be rejuvenated in their faith in America, their pride in their flag, and their hope for our future.

POSTAL CRIMES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the following news release from the Post Office Department dealing with postal crimes is important because, if we believe in deterrence, these statistics certainly ought to be publicized to indicate that the Post Office Department "always gets its man." Once again, Postmaster General Blount and his staff deserve a hearty "well done" for the fine effort in keeping safe our mails. The news release follows:

POSTAL CRIMES

Arrests and convictions for postal related crimes reached record high levels in the 12 months ending June 30, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount reported today.

The new marks were coupled with an extremely high rate—98.5 per cent—of convictions won in crimes which went to trial, Mr.

Blount noted. This continues the 98-plus per cent conviction rate of recent years.

On the arrests side, this was the 15th consecutive year for a new peak to be reached. Postal inspectors were involved in apprehending 17,423 persons in fiscal year 1970, up 15 per cent from 1969's 15,150.

Convictions were up 12.5 per cent, from 11,472 in fiscal 1969 to 12,904 during the past year, to establish another high point.

"These figures should stand as a deterrent to those individuals in our society who would misuse and abuse the mail," Mr. Blount said. "The record, a fine one, speaks for itself. We are not complacent, however, and the task of maintaining the sanctity of the mails and precluding the use thereof for unlawful purposes continues as one of the highest priority programs in the U.S. Postal Service."

Chief Postal Inspector William J. Cotter, commenting on the statistics compiled by the Postal Inspection Service, said the figures also showed that:

5,318 persons were convicted for thefts from private mail boxes, an increase of 10.9 per cent from fiscal 1969.

Criminal proceedings for mail related narcotics and dangerous drug offenses are climbing. Convictions for these crimes totaled 567 in fiscal 1970, up 220 per cent from last year.

The Nixon Administration's campaign to curb the flow of unwanted obscene advertising into American homes is showing results. The number of obscenity dealers indicted by Federal Grand Juries rose in fiscal 1970 by 161 per cent. Fourteen dealers were convicted at the close of the year; 58 others under indictment awaited trial.

Credit cards, stocks, mutilated money and a kidnaping figured in four of the most noteworthy criminal cases handled by the Postal Inspection Service in fiscal 1970, Mr. Cotter said.

On July 29, 1969, after an extended investigation, 32 persons were charged in connection with the fraudulent use of stolen credit cards. Thirty eventually pleaded guilty or were convicted of mail fraud. Banks which originally mailed the unsolicited credit cards suffered losses estimated at \$12 million.

Eleven persons were indicted at Miami, Fla., on June 25, 1970, in an alleged conspiracy to "fence" or dispose of up to \$43 million in stocks and other securities stolen from the mail at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. The securities were being sent to and from banks and brokerage houses in registered pouches handled by airline companies.

On June 15, 1970, a Federal District Court jury in Washington, D.C., convicted three accused of one of the biggest armed robberies in the capitol city's history. The heist involved a U.S. mail truck hauling, among other things, a registered mail pouch with \$382,000 in mutilated but usable currency being shipped from Frankfurt, Germany, to the U.S. Treasury.

Four men received heavy sentences for kidnaping the postal officer-in-charge of the Dade City, Fla., post office and attempted hold-up last February 12. Prison sentences handed out following the quartet's convictions ranged from 35 years to life imprisonment.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

FOR SWEEPING REPEAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, "For Sweeping Repeal" appeared in the August 10 issue of *Barons*. I include it in the *RECORD* because I believe every Member of the House and Senate should read this insightful analysis which is presented so aptly by Prof. Yale Brozen.

The author condemns the burgeoning profusion of Government programs aimed at solving National problems. All too often, laws are enacted because more imaginative and viable alternatives were not found. Mr. Brozen argues for the greater use of our free enterprise system to find these alternatives to the problems at hand. He presents a number of excellent instances where the free enterprise system has been used with great success. He notes that one aspect of the postal function has been performed by private industry for quite some time and it is a far more efficient, economical, and effective performance than the "official" version.

It is very fortunate that we have articulate voices such as Mr. Brozen's to comment on this problem. I would hope that this article and others like it will spur renewed efforts to fully utilize the singular skills of private enterprise in creative problem solving.

The article follows:

FOR SWEEPING REPEAL—PROGRESS AND FREEDOM REQUIRE FEWER LAWS, NOT MORE

(NOTE.—The following commentary is taken from a speech, "The Subtle Suicide of Free Enterprise," given recently before the Midwest Employers Council, Omaha, Neb., by Yale Brozen, Professor of Business Economics, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago.)

I bring you a message that will hardly surprise you. Free enterprise in this country is one-quarter dead and one-quarter strangled. It is only half alive. We are the inheritors of a proud tradition of peaceful, progressive, permanent revolution through free enterprise, but we are seeing about us increasingly unresponsive rigidity that is freezing us into a mold of stagnation.

That rising unresponsiveness leaves the young with, they believe, no alternative but either to obtain political power or begin thinking in terms of violent, destructive revolution. The peaceful, constructive, continuing revolution that was the hallmark of America's past creating the greatness of America today is neither understood nor regarded as an alternative. Many among the young mouth Marxist and Maoist slogans because they are too ignorant to know that that is the poison which is sickening them. But they do recognize that sickness is in the air. (Students listening to Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, cheered when he said, "... an individual has to have some power to affect

the quality of his schools, the quality of garbage collection, the quality of the police protection he gets, or he's utterly helpless. This means that we've got to involve communities in political power action and we've got to do it on whatever basis is necessary.")

The young recognize the senility that is setting in, if not its causes. The cause lies in the creeping socialism we have undergone. Just look around, and you see mail delivered by a socialized enterprise; children schooled in a socialized educational system; collectivized water; compulsory government annuity insurance; research for a major industry (agriculture) done by government agencies; food inspected by another government agency, cars and trucks rolling on socialized highways, and our aged parents protected by socialized medical insurance.

In that half way house to socialism, compulsory monopoly under government regulation (we ride monopolized and regulated, if not socialized, city transit systems, commuter railroads, taxicabs, air lines, buses, and trains. Our raw materials are delivered and our products shipped by regulated trucks, trains, barge and pipelines. Our homes are heated by regulated gas. We read by socialized or regulated light. And some of us clamor for regulated prices and wage rates where they are still free, crying that only price and wage controls can stop inflation. Free enterprise is half dead and some of us are asking for a noose to strangle what still lives.

Our national malaise is that every time someone sees a problem, we think that passing a law will cure that problem. We see postal service deteriorating—pass a law to reorganize the U.S. Post Office into a U.S. Postal Service. There is poverty—pass a law to get rid of it. There is crime in the streets—pass another law. There is congestion in the airports—put in another regulation. The schools are failing to educate—pass another appropriation to give them more money. Colleges face a financial crisis—pass a law providing state aid for private colleges. Juveniles are dropping out of school or becoming delinquent—pass a law providing more counselors. Our cities are burned by rioters—pass a law making it illegal to cross state lines to foment a riot. Japanese textiles are making life tough for cotton manufacturers—pass a law limiting imports. Consumers find their appliances need maintenance—pass a law requiring mandatory guarantees.

Pass a law. Pass a law. We are asking for so many laws that Congress has to stay in session almost the year round instead of going home after three or four months as they used to do. We are getting more laws than we know what to do with. We should pass a law against more laws. We should pass a law limiting Congressional sessions to a maximum of six months each year. Pass a law. Pass a law. It's become a national refrain. Perhaps we ought to put it to music.

How many of us think about the fact that many of the problems that confront us could be better solved by repealing a law instead of passing another law. For example, perhaps the postal mess can be solved better by repealing a law than by passing another one. What would happen if we repealed the provision in our postal laws which makes it illegal for anyone but the U.S. Post Office to provide first class mail service?

It is, of course, un-American to propose an alternative to a governmentally operated postal system. After all, Ben Franklin, a great patriot, was a founder and supporter of this governmental enterprise. Anyway, what sensible American would want to go into a business which loses as much money as the Post Office?

Believe it or not, a good many Americans seem to think that the postal business is worth entering. The Post Office investigates thirty to forty cases a year where it suspects

that its monopoly is being infringed. It prosecutes fifteen to twenty cases a year.

Of course, first class mail is profitable for the U.S. Post Office and it is in this class of mail in which it has a legal monopoly. It has never bothered obtaining a legal monopoly of other classes of mail since it believed that it lost money on other classes. It was glad to have anyone who wished take these over. But, of course, who would want to get a piece of a money losing business?

A number of people evidently have been anxious to move in on this money losing business—and some have done so. Tom Murray started a service in Oklahoma City where he offered to deliver third class mail for \$25 a thousand, much less than the \$43 a thousand the Post Office charged. Also, he guaranteed delivery within a specified time. The Post Office's habit of frequently delivering such mail after the event had already occurred that was being announced created many customers for Tom Murray, giving him the opportunity to lose even more money than the Post Office since he was charging less and giving better service. To everyone's amazement, he is making money. Others find the opportunity to compete with the P.O. on these terms so attractive that Mr. Murray has now franchised operators or is operating himself in sixty other cities under his Independent Postal System of America banner. His 1500 bonded carriers are serving 70 million people in these sixty cities in the U.S. and Canada, and he appears to be making money.

In parcel post, United Parcel Service is competing with the Post Office. Its service is enormously superior to that of the U.S. Post Office, and its rates are lower. Where the Post Office charges \$1.17 for a 10 lb. package mailed in San Francisco and delivered in Portland in eight to ten days, United Parcel charges 98 cents and delivers in two days.

These are services on which the Post Office claimed to be losing money, yet private operators are providing better service at less cost and a lower price. Think of what private operators could do for first class mail service—which has deteriorated to the point of being ludicrous. The service is so poor that many companies pay the postage they are required to pay by law for first class mail but never let their mail get near a U.S. Post Office. They deliver the mail themselves rather than lose the time involved in letting a U.S. postal employe get his hands on their messages.

If we wish to improve our mail service and reduce its costs, we don't need to sell the Post Office. All we need to do is repeal the law monopolizing the carriage of first class mail for the U.S. Post Office. Also, it would help to repeal the law monopolizing the use of a householder's mail box. The would-be competitors who are now being prosecuted for violating the law could operate. The alternative services that would become available would not only be an improvement but also would greatly reduce our vulnerability to postal strikes.

At present, a large portion of the monopoly power in the hands of the U.S. Post Office accrues to the interest of the postal unions. The result has been that postal workers in the last ten years have been winning wage increases outstripping those of industrial workers. From 1959 to 1969, postal wage rates rose by 4.7% per year while industrial wage rates rose by 4.4% a year. You might never suspect that listening to the complaints of New York postmen. Given their recent success, a continuation of a monopoly Post Office is going to result in postal wage rates rising even more rapidly in the future. Postmen received a 6% increase this year and are scheduled to receive another 8% for a total increase of 14.5% as compared to the 7.8% average unions have won this year in private industry.

Simply setting up a U.S. Postal Service will not cure that situation, as has been demonstrated by the transportation unions. With competition from potential entrants to the common carrier transportation industry barred by the necessity to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity, the unions in the industry have a monopoly position which has enabled them to win wage increases well in excess of those won by other workers—and they win them at the expense of other workers. The Brotherhoods, the Teamsters, and the Air Line Pilots Association are a labor aristocracy engaging in wage setting activities which depress the wage rates of workers in other industries.

The alternative to the present proposals for passing a law to reform the Post Office—which will do nothing to improve many aspects of the situation—is simply to repeal the law monopolizing first class mail.

Free enterprisers have been remiss in bringing about a free enterprise solution to the postal scandal. A bill has been dropped into the Congressional hopper by Congressman Philip Crane from Illinois repealing the monopoly provisions in present postal laws (H.R. 16691). Has the Midwest Employers Council, or any other association of free enterprisers, given Crane's bill any support? I have seen none.

The few I have talked with have been afraid of losing their subsidies. The newspapers and magazines want their postal subsidy continued. The advertisers in these media want the subsidy continued. They are afraid that the elimination of monopoly in first class mail will mean no subsidy for second class mail. So Crane's bill receives no coverage in the media and few know of this proposed solution.

I would suggest to the advertisers who complain about governmental regulation of advertising and of their businesses, of governmental competition with their businesses, and of the burden of taxes on their businesses—which in combination are strangling the free enterprise sector—that they have only themselves to blame. If they abandon the free enterprise principle when they think it is to their interest, the whole principle becomes suspect. Who is going to rally with them to the defense of the free enterprise principle when these enterprisers want it defended if they do not support it when it may cost them something. It becomes a principle with friends only in fair weather.

To heap irony on irony, the postal subsidies which the newspaper owners and advertisers think are in their interest benefit them but little. Most, if not all of the subsidy is consumed in inefficiency, not in providing cheaper service. The subsidy they think they receive at other people's expense yields so little benefit that it is more than offset by their own tax contributions to the subsidy—a tax they pay everytime they use first, third and fourth class mail as well as the directly perceived taxes paid to provide the billion dollar a year operating loss suffered in postal operations plus the taxes paid to provide the interest on the Federal debt incurred to finance postal facilities.

If you free enterprisers want to avoid suicide, you can start on the socialized postal monopoly. Get rid of the monopoly element in this socialized enterprise. Let free enterprise provide now unimagined solutions for delivering better and less costly service than that now provided by this legal monopoly. With the elimination of this socialized monopoly, there will be less opportunity for the strangulation of free enterprise and free choice via postal regulations on what may be transported in the mail as well as via the tax and cost burdens imposed on free enterprisers by this creaking, inefficient, giant governmental business.

Let me turn to another area where we have

passed a law—and more laws—to cure the problem when a more appropriate action would have been the repeal of a law—or of several laws. We were concerned about poverty, and we passed an Economic Opportunity law in 1964 to launch a war on poverty. Numerous programs managed by an Office of Economic Opportunity were set up. These were all presumably designed to lift the incomes of those making less than \$3,000 a year. We could do more to raise the incomes of the poor by repealing laws than has been done or will ever be done by this law.

Minimum wage laws create poverty by forcing people into unemployment. Agricultural price support programs make people poor by raising the price of food and by decreasing job opportunities through the production restrictions imposed to maintain high agricultural prices. The laws regulating transportation rates prevent industry from moving to disadvantaged regions where the poor live and providing jobs for them. They increase the cost to the poor of migrating to regions where better paying jobs can be found and prevent them from curing their own poverty.

Union supporting legislation causes poverty by permitting and encouraging union power to grow to the point where it can be and is used to restrict the entrance of the poor into higher paying jobs. . . . The urban renewal program is forcing the poor out of inexpensive housing into more costly shelter. The Federal migrant housing act is eliminating the jobs available to migrant labor by forcing farmers to choose between constructing expensive housing if they use migrant labor or buying less expensive crop harvesting machinery. The tariff law is monopolizing low paying jobs for Americans in protected industries which yield only \$2.00 an hour and preventing the expansion of our export industries which pay \$3.00 to \$6.00 an hour.

The Tennessee Valley program is subsidizing people to stay put in a region where their opportunities are poor. The Rural Electrification Program is eliminating job opportunities for farm labor and depressing rural wage rates. And the taxes levied to support these programs are reducing the rate at which we increase our stock of capital—tools, machines and other equipment—and are reducing the rate at which better paying jobs would become available if these taxes were not levied. We could do more for the poor by the repeal of all this legislation than we can possibly do by the special enactments designed to help the poor.

That was a rapid summary of some complex pieces of legislation, but rather than elaborate on this topic, I want to take the few minutes remaining to analyze two other proposals. We are all puzzled by the fact that our children receive so much schooling but so little education. Without dwelling on this point, let me just say that this is the inevitable consequence of subsidizing teachers and schools. If we bought a product and let free enterprise compete to see who could win the customers' favor, we would get a better product. But if we subsidize production with no competition for customers, we are guaranteed either a lousy product or a terribly expensive product or both. That is why we are getting lots of schooling at great expense and little education.

How can we cure the situation? Let schools compete for customers. How can that be arranged? Stop giving money to schools. If you want to give money away for education, give the parents of school age children vouchers which they can use to pay tuition at whatever school that can attract their patronage. If it costs \$600 a child to operate the Omaha school system, give the parents of your school children vouchers good for up to \$600 to pay tuition at any school. Public schools would then have to compete with each other and

with private schools to see whose product can attract customers. Parents who want their children in programs with an abundance of individual attention or other especially expensive features could add the \$200 or \$300 required to pay the tuition in schools offering such programs. Present public schools would have to compete with each other for students as well as with private schools. The badly run schools would lose out to the well run schools. Schools would become more efficient in their use of resources as well as producing a better product in the competition to obtain students.

It's time we applied the free enterprise principle to this socialized arena in order to get our children educated. It's time that we stop putting children in jails labeled school from 9 to 3 every day.

This would have the advantage not only of improving the education of our children. It would also slow the indoctrination of our children with a socialist theology. The employees of a socialized enterprise are not likely to feel much loyalty to the free enterprise principle. (There are, of course, some exceptions.) Their analysis of the virtues of socializing economic activity is not likely to be balanced with more than a passing nod to the disadvantages. Their analysis of the defects of free enterprise is not likely to be balanced with equal enthusiasm for the discussion of the advantages of a free enterprise system.

You are killing the political support for the free enterprise principle by your support of socialized schooling. If you persist in this suicidal course, you will continue to get costly education and poor education for your children and an erosion of the free enterprise arena. Free enterprise will continue to die by the salami technique—slice by slice. . . .

FOREIGN TRADE RETALIATION—A CASE IN POINT

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to shed some much needed light on the question of foreign retaliation against trade restrictions, and to help draw a distinction between such retaliation and the orderly compensatory procedure provided under GATT—General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—I offer the following article by O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import Policy.

The article follows:

FOREIGN TRADE RETALIATION—A CASE IN POINT

A rising chorus of warnings about fearful retaliation against our exports should the trade bill before Congress provide for import quotas, assaults us from all sides. A veritable trade war, it is warned, will erupt should this country adopt import quotas.

If we impose import quotas other countries will jump to their trade weapons, and foreign trade will be thrown into a bristling exchange of reprisals to the woeful loss of all concerned.

The warnings from import and export interests in this country are echoed by threats from abroad as if this country were about to commit the unforgivable sin of rescuing our industries from irreparable loss from imports and our labor from climbing unemployment.

One cry is that other countries will throw up barriers against our exports and thus dry up our markets abroad. Such alarms are freely bandied about, but no hard supporting

facts are provided. It is only fair to say that such facts are hard to come by.

However, one clear example is available.

In 1954 the Tariff Commission recommended to President Eisenhower a duty increase on watches as a result of a finding of a serious injury of the watch industry in an Escape Clause action.

An outcry of retaliation was sent up by the Maryland Congressional delegation, joined by an assortment of liberal trade supporters. Maryland cried out because Switzerland, which is the principal source of our watch imports, regularly buys much Maryland tobacco.

The Swiss, it was warned, would be sure to retaliate against imports of Maryland tobacco should the President approve the recommended increase in duties on Swiss watches. Nevertheless the President did increase the watch duty.

A fortuitous fact makes it possible to test the validity of the warnings and threats of Swiss retaliation. Our Department of Agriculture maintains a record of tobacco exports by type of tobacco and by country of destination. What do the export statistics show? They are as follows:

EXPORTS OF TOBACCO, TYPE 32 (MARYLAND TOBACCO)

Country of destination and year	Pounds	Value
Switzerland:		
1954	5,817,000	\$4,790,000
1955	4,976,000	4,151,000
1956	7,395,000	5,868,000
1957	7,594,000	6,080,000
1958	6,452,000	5,260,000
1960	6,163,000	5,416,000
1962	6,756,000	6,088,000
1964	6,897,000	6,467,000

From this record of exports of Maryland tobacco the failure of any retaliatory effort that may have been, but probably was not, attempted by Switzerland stands fully confirmed. While there was a significant decline of our tobacco exports to that country in 1955, the first year after the increase in duty on Swiss watches, the considerable rise in exports in the following year merely confirms the vacuity of the claims of reprisal. Thereafter a broken but distinctly upward trend was resumed through the following decade.

Moreover, our total exports of all merchandise to Switzerland did not suffer, as the following short table shows:

EXPORTS TO SWITZERLAND	
1954	\$154,385,000
1955	153,594,000
1956	221,350,000
1957	238,562,000
1958	164,064,000
1959	188,242,000
1960	252,661,000
1961	271,973,000

The shouts of warnings and threats of retaliation whenever imposition of a quota or an increase in tariff is proposed, in any case, are easily exaggerated, especially where trade is carried on as private enterprise rather than by State trading.

For example, Swiss tobacco import merchants make profits from tobacco imports. A maximum of importation is in their interest. They do not manufacture Swiss watches. If the latter stand to suffer a setback in their export of watches, it is their problem, not that of the tobacco importers. If the watch manufacturers had sought government restrictions on tobacco imports to retaliate against U.S. action, the Swiss tobacco importers would have opposed the effort, since it would have reduced their own business.

Only if trading is a State function, as in totalitarian countries, is retaliation a ready

weapon to use, and even then it may not be convenient or profitable. When, however, other private interests than the one clamoring for retaliation would find their toes stepped on, retaliation is more likely to be blocked by politics within the country. Thus, while the hue and cry of threatened retaliation is easily raised, it is not so easily carried into effect. The teeth may be bared menacingly, but the bite is not so sure to follow.

A distinction should, in any case, be drawn between retaliation, on the one hand, and compensation, as provided for in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), on the other. Compensation may be agreed to ahead of time or after a barrier has been imposed. Such compensation supposedly will follow only after due process in the form of orderly procedure and is not in the form of reprisal. It becomes a matter of negotiation. One of the very purposes of GATT was to establish a compensatory mechanism in lieu of retaliation by roughly conforming the compensation to the damage and no more.

The objective was to bring order into trade relations among the nations. Under this principle reparation is made through compensation but its magnitude is to be measured by the damage done; not by an ill-tempered mood of reprisal. Those who now threaten retaliation are in effect enemies of GATT, disavowing its objectives.

This country has, indeed, extended and received compensation in a number of instances over a period of years under GATT.

All of which is to say that all the gnashing of teeth and showing of fangs are mostly acts to serve ulterior ends, and represent the flouting of GATT.

FACTS AND FIGURES ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, testified before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee. He testified to the AFL-CIO's continuing very deep commitment to improvement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, along the lines of legislation now being considered in that subcommittee under the chairmanship of the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

At the invitation of the able chairman of the subcommittee, I was privileged to participate in that hearing, and I was moved to compliment President Meany because of the fact that the thrust of his testimony was not for legislation that would only benefit his membership, but toward helping precisely those American working people who were not organized and who were, as a consequence, among the poorest paid and hardest worked.

Because President Meany's testimony and the appendix thereto contained a great deal of important statistical information which will be of use to all of us when the Fair Labor Standards Acts amendments are reported to the House by the committee, I insert these documents at this point in the RECORD:

CXVI—1803—Part 21

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meany. I am president of the AFL-CIO and am here to present its views on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

These amendments are among the most important legislative proposals before the Congress.

Let me summarize the kind of Fair Labor Standards legislation we need.

We need protection for the 17 million workers not now covered by the Act.

We need to increase the minimum wage to \$2 an hour—at the very least.

We need double-time pay for overtime work.

We need premium pay for overtime in excess of 8 hours a day.

We need to shorten the work-week or the work-year.

Fair labor standards have little impact on the vast majority of organized workers. Unions, through collective bargaining, have generally been able to establish substantially higher standards than those contained in the Act.

But there are millions of low-wage workers who need the protection provided in this Act and who need a higher minimum wage and it is on behalf of these workers that we urge modernization of the Act.

When the Congress adopted the current \$1.60 figure in 1966, it was barely enough to provide an income above the government-defined poverty level. Then the nation was engaged in an all-out war on poverty and it was recognized that an increase in wages for millions of Americans working at substandard wage levels was one immediate and effective way to help win that war.

Some progress has been made. Millions of Americans at the low end of the income ladder were moved a step or two above the poverty level. And we in the AFL-CIO were proud to have fully and forcefully helped make that possible.

But today millions of working Americans are slipping backwards—down again to the lowest rungs. They are the sorriest victims of inflation. And millions more never moved out of poverty.

Secretary Richardson outlined the problem to the Senate Finance Committee just the other day, when he said: "In 1968, 39 percent of the poor families with children in this country were headed by full-time workers."

Inflation hits these people harder than anyone else. Today's minimum wage of \$1.60 is—just a few cents more—in terms of purchasing power—than \$1.25 was in 1966.

So we need a no-nonsense approach to the problem of eliminating poverty among the working poor—one that takes into account that we have inflation in this country.

It is time to realize that if we want to get rid of the bulk of poverty in the United States, the way to do it is to get rid of sub-standard wages.

By the Administration's own testimony, "any male head of a four-person family earning less than \$1.85 per hour in a full-time job in Illinois, or \$2.16 per hour in Massachusetts, or \$2.23 per hour in New York, would have more cash if he were on welfare."

That is appalling.

For the United States of America to be heading into the last third of the Twentieth Century in this condition is shocking. The existence of so many "working poor" is both an American tragedy and an American disgrace.

These people work hard at useful jobs; struggle to maintain their economic independence and self-dignity; and attempt to achieve self-reliance against overwhelming odds. Yet they are paid less than a subsistence wage.

We do not believe any employed worker should be forced to go on the welfare rolls in order to survive.

It has been clear for a long time that the simplest most direct and least expensive way to eliminate poverty is to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act so that it is adequate to the times. That is what we urge the Congress to do.

Now let me take the problem point-by-point.

First is the increase in the wage itself from \$1.60 an hour to, at the very least, \$2.00.

At \$1.60 an hour, a worker earns an annual income of only \$3200, if he has a full-time, year-round job. Even \$2 an hour is barely above the government-defined poverty level for families with two children.

A \$2 minimum wage is not an adequate wage. It is a floor—a good and necessary floor and one that will benefit the entire economy by building purchasing power, eliminating some welfare costs and eradicating the blight of poverty from one big section of struggling America.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the second way Fair Labor Standards can help eliminate poverty.

The AFL-CIO wants the 17 million workers, now excluded by the Act, included under the Act. These workers have been excluded too long. There never was any real justification for their exclusion and there is real justification for their inclusion.

Included among these 17 million are workers in state and local government, largely still unprotected, millions more in retail trade and in various other industries; domestics and others.

Then, too, there are the farm workers. These are the people I want to especially talk about. About half of them get a minimum wage, but that ceiling never gets up to \$1.60 an hour. There is no reason for this difference. It is a clear case of double discrimination.

All the farm and migratory workers of this country want is to become economically self-reliant and to be treated like workers in all the other industries of America.

They are no less human.

Their basic necessities of life are no less or different.

They are no less immune from pocket robbing inflation.

And, like the other uncovered working poor, they look to the Congress for a floor under their wages—the same floor given other workers.

So it is time for all farm workers to come under the full protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act, just like the other covered workers.

Now, let's talk about double time for overtime and premium pay for overtime in excess of 8 hours a day. The AFL-CIO believes double time for overtime is necessary to encourage employers to hire additional employees, instead of scheduling regularly employed people for overtime.

Thirty-two years ago, an overtime penalty of time and a half was considered adequate. But today it doesn't do the job.

In 1938, supplements to wages and salaries were about 4.5 percent of employee wages and salaries. Since then, the percentage has jumped, so that it has become financially advantageous for employers to schedule overtime work, rather than take on new workers.

There is no doubt that double-time for overtime would help solve this problem, simply by making the practice so expensive that employers would add workers to their pay-rolls.

Premium pay for overtime in excess of 8 hours a day, as distinguished from FLSA's requirement for overtime after 40 hours, would have the same effects and advantages.

At a time when there is serious unemployment in the economy, and when unemployment is continuing to climb, there is good reason for the Congress to think seriously about creating new jobs by reducing the

work week or the work year, with no reduction in pay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say something about enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In the last few days, the Labor Department has reported that illegal wage underpayments have amounted to one billion dollars since the Fair Labor Standards Act became law 32 years ago.

To put this figure in perspective, let's see just how big \$1 billion is. If the minimum wage was \$2 an hour, then a person earning that and nothing more would have a \$4,000 yearly income.

So chiseling to the tune of \$1 billion is like cheating 250,000 people out of their entire subsistence income for a full year.

Even the billion-dollar figure does not tell the whole story. Only a third of the money known to have been unpaid is ever recovered.

These blatant violations are the result of an inadequately enforced law and too few compliance officers and investigators.

Full enforcement is the only answer to chiselers.

There are two major bills before this committee—H.R. 10948 and H.R. 17596. Generally we favor H.R. 10948 and have serious disagreements with H.R. 17596. We previously discussed these in a letter addressed to you last May and I ask that a copy of it, which is included with my testimony be made a part of the record.

Let me conclude with this observation:

The whole history of the Fair Labor Standards Act proves that it works and that it adds to the economic well-being of the country. Every Secretary of Labor, no matter what his party ties, has made reports to the Congress on FLSA's impact. Universally these reports prove that FLSA works, for the workers, for the economy, for the country.

The Declaration of Policy in the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is as valid today as it was in 1938, says the United States must, as rapidly as practicable, eliminate labor conditions "detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the job of translating this policy into fact requires constant change, constant modernization.

Each of the previous amendments has been designed to that end.

In 1970, we have new problems requiring new legislation to make the goal of this law a reality.

So we urge these amendments, Mr. Chairman, and we urge that they be made promptly. Every day of delay penalizes millions of American families who should not be asked to suffer an additional, unnecessary hour.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY

The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide an immediate increase in the federal minimum wage to no less than \$2 an hour and extension of the Act's coverage to the 17 million non-supervisory workers not now covered by the law. Such action is essential to update the minimum wage level, which was most recently revised four long years ago, and to lift the wages and living standards of the working poor.

Modernization of the Fair Labor Standards Act is urgently needed, now. The present minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour, under the amendments adopted in 1966, was barely tolerable at that time. It is utterly inadequate in 1970—in the face of four years of an inflationary rise of living costs and improvements in the nation's standard of living. Moreover, millions of the poorest-paid workers remain unprotected by the Act.

The major purpose of this statute, as out-

lined in its Declaration of Policy, is to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions "detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living, necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

To fulfill the Act's intent, it has been necessary to increase the floor under wages, as the cost of living and the nation's productivity have increased. It has also been necessary to extend the coverage of the Act. In the 32 years since enactment, FLSA has been amended four times—the minimum wage was updated four times and coverage of the Act was extended twice.

An increase in the federal minimum wage to at least \$2 an hour, immediately, is now required on the basis of the economic facts. Indeed, the Eighth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO last October unanimously adopted a resolution on the minimum wage, which declared: "The unchecked rise in living costs may soon make even a \$2 minimum obsolete."

Modernization of the Act in 1970 would represent a major step in the effort to eliminate poverty. Over half of the poor, according to the government's definition of poverty, are in families headed by a worker in the labor force—low-wage, part-time or unemployed workers. About one-third of the poor—and nearly 40% of all the children growing up in poverty—are in families, headed by a full-time, year-round worker, whose wages are so low that his family is impoverished.

At a \$2 an hour minimum wage, a full-time year-round worker would earn approximately \$4,000 a year. This is not much above the government-defined poverty line of about \$3,900, at 1970 living costs, for a non-farm family of four. But it would represent quite an improvement over the \$3,200 such a worker makes at the present \$1.60 federal minimum rate.

We urge the Congress to raise the federal minimum wage to \$2 an hour, effective February 1, 1971, for all jobs that were covered prior to the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. On that date, workers who were first covered by the 1966 amendments, will receive the final step-up to the \$1.60 federal minimum; we urge the Congress to raise the minimum wage for this group to \$2 an hour, effective February 1, 1972.

The minimum wage for farm workers, presently covered by FLSA, should be raised to \$1.60 on February 1, 1971, and to \$2 on February 1, 1972. The minimum wage for those who are first covered by the additional coverage we urge Congress to adopt this year, should be set at \$1.60 an hour, effective February 1, 1971, and to \$2 on February 1, 1972.

In that way, a federal minimum wage of \$2 an hour would be established as rapidly as feasible. We believe that such single-standard minimum wage of \$2 an hour should apply to all workers, covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act—to young workers and older workers, black workers and white workers, women workers and male workers. Multiple minimums for different categories of workers would be discriminatory.

The protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to all workers. Employees of smaller retail establishments, state and local government employees, hired farm workers and others still denied coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be guaranteed the benefits of the federal minimum wage and protection against excessive hours of work. The Act's coverage, which now protects 46 million workers, should be extended to the remaining 17 million non-supervisory wage and salary employees who are not protected by this federal law.

Approximately 6 million workers currently protected by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act are denied its

hours protection because of specific exemptions. We believe that farm workers, hotel and restaurant workers, local transit employees, agricultural processing workers and other similar groups need protection from excessive hours, as well as an adequate floor under their wages. This hodgepodge of exemptions should be eliminated.

The overtime premium rate of time and one-half for over 40 hours of work per week—which is provided in the Act—is no longer an effective deterrent to long overtime hours. The growth of fringe benefits that are exempt from overtime requirements have made this premium-pay provision a less effective deterrent than in 1938, when it was enacted. We believe that FLSA should provide double-time premium pay for overtime hours of work per week.

We also urge the Congress to establish double-time premium pay for overtime work in excess of 8 hours per day—as a supplement to the FLSA provision of overtime pay for overtime hours of work per week. Such provision is needed to protect workers, not only from long work-weeks, but also from long work-days.

In addition, we believe that the equal pay requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act, prohibiting discrimination in wages based on sex, should be extended to cover executive, administrative and professional employees. There is no basis for discrimination to exist in any segment of our economy.

Such updating of the Fair Labor Standards Act would bring obvious benefits to the workers directly involved—essentially the millions of working poor and their families. The improved buying power and living conditions of these lowest-wage workers would also be beneficial to their communities and to the national economy—lifting sales and employment and curbing the increase of welfare costs.

Moreover, the record of past improvements of FLSA clearly indicates that the economy can readily adjust to the increased minimum wage, with merely few and isolated cases of adverse impacts, while the entire national economy is benefitted substantially.

Fair labor standards legislation has had opposition from the very beginning. There are those who have opposed any attempt by federal or state law—or even by collective bargaining between unions and employers—to establish minimum rates of pay. They cried "disaster" when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed 32 years ago and they have repeated their predictions of general disaster whenever any improvements of FLSA have been discussed.

Opponents of fair labor standards legislation have concentrated their predictions on increased unemployment. Every increase in the minimum wage has been greeted by predictions of rising joblessness.

Yet the Fair Labor Standards Act and its improving amendments have raised the wages of most of the nation's lowest-wage workers—raising their standard of living and helping to bring them and their families into America's mainstream. Employment has increased and business has prospered. Reports to the Congress by the Secretary of Labor on the effects of increases in the federal minimum wage—required by law—show that there have been substantial benefits and only rare isolated instances of adverse effects, involving a few small firms and very few employees.

The time for further updating of FLSA is now.

\$2 MINIMUM WAGE

An increase in the minimum wage to \$2 an hour is needed immediately to assure workers at the bottom of the economic ladder a wage that at least reaches above the government-defined poverty line for a full-time year-round worker who is the head of a non-farm family of four.

To succeed in eliminating poverty among the working poor, the nation needs \$2 minimum wage. Examination of the economic impact of a \$2 minimum shows that the economy can make the necessary adjustments, without serious detrimental effects. In the past, the economy has adjusted easily to increases in the minimum wage, even to the 60 percent increase passed in 1938. Surely an increase in the minimum wage to \$2 an hour can be absorbed without difficulty, in an economy whose gross national product is about \$980 billion.

An increase in the minimum wage to \$2 an hour, combined with extension of FLSA coverage, would be a major, effective step towards the reduction of poverty in America.

Government statistics on poverty show that the heads of more than half of all poor families have a job. Moreover, nearly half of these employed family heads, representing more than a fourth of all poor families, have been holding down a full-time job for a whole year.

All told, poor families that are headed by a man, fully employed throughout 1968, included 6 million poor persons—including over 3 million children under age 18. Poor families headed by a fully-employed woman worker represented nearly an additional million persons with almost 600,000 children. Thus, nearly 40% of all the children, growing up in poverty, were in families of workers with regular full-time jobs. And the total number of people in such families of full-time year-round working poor was about 7 million.

This is the most shameful aspect of the poverty problem—the working poor. Particularly shameful is the condition of poverty among families where the head is employed full-time. That a man risks poverty for his family when he does not or cannot work all the time might be expected, but to end the year with so inadequate an income, even when he has worked all week every week, often makes his efforts seem hopeless.

Notwithstanding the essential stress on more jobs to reduce unemployment and part-time work of those who seek full-time jobs, it is clear that at least for poor families headed by full-time year-round workers, an increase in the minimum wage is a major road out of poverty. And for poor families, headed by part-time workers, an increase in the minimum wage would be an important step in helping them move above the government-defined poverty status.

At \$1.60 an hour, a worker earns an annual income of only \$3,200 to \$3,328 if he has a full-time year-round job. Even \$2 an hour is not much above the government-defined poverty line for non-farm, four-person families (that poverty line is about \$3,900 at 1970 prices).

Studies made by the U.S. Census Department show the extent of low wages. Nearly 5 million (4.8 million) men worked full-time year-round and still earned less than \$4,000 in 1968, according to the Bureau of the Census. These were men who worked at least 35 hours a week for 50 to 52 weeks during the year.

The majority, or nearly 4 million of these men, were white, though they represented only 11 percent of the male full-time year-round work force. However, nearly 31 percent, or about one out of every three Negro males who held a full-time year-round job in 1968, earned less than \$4,000.

The report on women workers is even worse—over 6 million women workers who worked full-time year-round in 1968 earned less than \$4,000. About 39 percent of white women who worked full-time year-round, and 61 percent of Negro full-time year-round workers, earned less than \$4,000.

There were nearly 11 million workers—out of 52 million workers who worked year-round at a full-time job in 1968—whose earnings were below \$4,000. Unless the minimum wage

is increased to \$2 an hour, these workers, who toll day-in and day-out, will not be able to achieve a decent income.

The Census Bureau reports that a non-farm family of four needs an income of \$3,919¹ per year to begin to lift itself above the government-defined poverty line. If a family has three children, an annual income of \$4,615² is needed to move it beyond that poverty line. Yet several million families—including those headed by full-time year-round workers—have lower annual incomes.

How can we expect children to aspire to be normal, productive Americans when they see their parents working, but still not earning enough to meet even minimum family needs. Certainly, a minimum wage must be set that allows a worker some dignity—a wage that shows his children it is worthwhile to work, a wage that is a real alternative to idleness and delinquency.

While improving the income of the aged and disabled is an essential step toward reducing poverty, such social security measures reach only one part of the poverty group. Training workers for jobs and educating children are also essential and desirable methods of meeting parts of the poverty problem in America.

But the majority of all poor families are headed by employed persons. A most important program to eliminate poverty, therefore, is to raise the inadequate wages of the working poor. It is because of the low minimum wage—and inadequate FLSA coverage—that many workers earn \$1.60 or less an hour.

If the conditions that breed poverty in this country are to be changed, poverty wages must be eliminated. These conditions will not change unless the FLSA minimum wage is increased.

Moreover, an immediate increase in the minimum wage to no less than \$2 an hour is justified—and required—by the inflationary rise of living costs and the post-World War II trend of increasing productivity in the national economy.

Between 1966, when Congress amended FLSA to establish a federal minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour, and May 1970, the Consumer Price Index rose 19.5%. This sharp rise has cut the buying power value of the \$1.60 minimum. Indeed, the buying power of that minimum wage is now down to only \$1.29, in 1966 prices.

A 19.5% immediate increase in the minimum wage is needed merely to restore the minimum's buying power to what a \$1.60 an hour level meant in 1966, when the Congress last revised FLSA.

In addition, all American workers have an economic and moral right to share adequately in the economy's rising productivity. The trend of rising output per manhour since 1947 has been an average yearly rate of 3.3%. And experts from the government and business have projected an average yearly increase of somewhat over 3% for the decade of the 1970s. The minimum wage, therefore, should be increased an additional 12-plus percent to update the \$1.60 minimum, in line with the nation's rising productivity.

These two factors add up to over 31.5%—the need to raise the minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour by more than 31.5%. That is certainly more than sufficient justification to boost the minimum to \$2 an hour—a rise of 25%—to offset the increase of living costs and to provide the lowest-wage workers with an adequate share of the benefits of the economy's rising productivity.

Even a \$2 minimum wage is far from an adequate wage. It is merely a floor. But it would be a step in the right direction.

For a worker to enjoy a modest and adequate standard for himself and his family, he needs approximately \$5.00 an hour, according

¹ 1968 figure adjusted to May 1970 by changes in the Consumer Price Index.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

to 1969 figures of the U.S. Department of Labor's City Worker's Family Budget. This budget indicates that an urban family of four needs an annual income of \$10,077 to live in "modest but adequate" circumstances. Even the Bureau of Labor Statistics' "lower budget for a four-person family" requires about \$3.28 an hour or \$6,567 a year.

An analysis of this "lower family budget" shows how meager its provisions are: It provides a family of four (husband, wife, boy 13 and girl 8) with \$35 a week for food, including lunch money; \$91 a month for rent and about \$24 a month to cover outlays for furnishings and household operations. It provides approximately \$10 a week for transportation; \$539 a year for medical care; \$320 a year for other family consumption expenditures; and \$619 in personal taxes, including federal, state and local income taxes, as well as social security taxes.

Cut those items in half—to \$17.50 a week for food and \$45.50 a month for rent—and that is what an urban, four-person family can afford, if its only income is from a full-time year-round worker who is paid \$1.60 an hour.

Even at \$2 an hour, or \$4,000 a year, the worker still would be required to pay \$49 in federal income taxes, and \$208 in social security taxes (according to the 1971 tax tables), leaving only \$3,743 for family expenditures. But a \$2 minimum would be an improved floor—assisting millions of low-wage people to lift their living standards.

A \$2 minimum would tend to re-establish the relationship between the minimum wage and compensation per manhour in the private economy. In 1950, when the 75-cent minimum became effective, it was 56% of compensation per manhour in the private economy. However, in 1968, when the \$1.60 minimum became effective, it was only 47.4% of hourly compensation in the private economy. And it has declined further since then.

Bringing the minimum wage to \$2 an hour would help the lowest-paid workers keep pace with what has been happening in the economy. Since February 1968, when the \$1.60 an hour rate became effective, average hourly earnings for non-supervisory workers in the private non-farm economy rose 43 cents an hour (June 1970). This figure represents the change in average earnings of some 47 million production and non-supervisory employees in the private non-farm economy. Raising the minimum wage by 40 cents would assure that the lowest-paid workers will not fall farther behind.

The picture for manufacturing is similar. Average hourly earnings of factory workers have risen 41 cents since February 1968. However, for millions of low-wage workers there is little, if any, movement except for increases in the minimum wage. These low-wage workers need a minimum wage of \$2 an hour now.

Low-income families, who would receive the direct benefits of a rise in the minimum wage, spend their earnings quickly. The increased earnings would be placed rapidly into the economy's spending stream, rather than saved or hoarded.

This additional buying power and spending among the nation's lowest-income families would lift the demand for goods, services and jobs. And as these additional funds were circulated through the economy—spent and invested by merchants, distributors and manufacturers—the economy would receive a continuing and multiplying lift.

In an economy that can produce an increasing abundance of goods, it is both morally and economically necessary to provide additional, much-needed buying power to the nation's lowest-wage workers and their families.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENTS TO A \$2 MINIMUM

The economy can adjust readily to a \$2 minimum wage. The real impact of an in-

crease in the minimum to \$2 on the economy's total wage bill is rather small.

A \$2 an hour minimum wage universally applied would affect some workers in every major industry grouping. Detailed distributions of earnings data are not available from the Labor Department on a current basis for the entire economy. However, a review of the earnings of full-time year-round workers reported by the Bureau of the Census offers some insight into those industries that tend to pay their workers low wages. In 1968, according to the Census, 11 million full-time workers, or 21 percent of the total number of 52 million year-round full-time workers, earned less than \$4,000:

FULL-TIME YEAR-ROUND WORKERS WITH EARNINGS BELOW \$4,000, BY INDUSTRY, 1968

Industry	Number of full-time year-round workers earning less than \$4,000	Percent of total full-time year-round workers in the industry earning less than \$4,000
Agricultural, forestry, fisheries.	1,299,165	56.7
Mining.....	42,000	10.4
Construction.....	451,035	15.3
Manufacturing.....	2,295,997	14.2
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities.....	381,542	9.4
Wholesale trade.....	238,058	11.9
Retail trade.....	2,157,592	32.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	528,974	19.4
Business and repair service.....	298,010	18.3
Personal services.....	1,121,231	60.4
Entertainment and recreation services.....	81,603	26.6
Professional and related services.....	1,773,457	23.5
Public administration.....	316,688	8.4
Total.....	10,985,352	

Source: Consumer Income—Current Population Reports Series P. 60, No. 66, December 1969—Table 45, Bureau of the Census.

It would now cost approximately \$8 billion to raise the earnings of full-time year-round workers to \$4,000. This amounts to only 2% of the total wage bill of \$380 billion paid in 1968, as wages to all full-time year-round earners.

The cost-impact of an increase to a \$2 minimum for all non-supervisory workers—part-time as well as full-time—would similarly be in the neighborhood of 2% of the economy's total wage bill. Certainly the economy can afford to devote about 2% of its total wage and salary expenditures to raising the wages of the lowest paid workers to \$2 an hour.

With output per manhour in the private economy expected to increase at better than 3% a year, on the average, in the 1970s, a 2% increase in the total wage bill to provide a \$2 minimum should be absorbed rather easily—particularly in an economy whose gross national product is approaching a trillion dollars.

The size of today's national economy can readily absorb a \$2 minimum wage. The minimum wage in 1938 was 25 cents an hour. At that time the Gross National Product (total production of foods and services) was \$85 billion. In 1970 the GNP is expected to be about \$980 billion, or eleven times as great as in 1938. If the 1938 economy could stand a 25-cent an hour minimum wage and even expansion of that minimum to 40 cents by steps, then certainly a \$980 billion economy can stand a \$2 minimum wage.

In addition, a \$2 minimum wage will probably reduce—or curb the growth—of welfare costs, as low-wage workers' incomes are raised.

The Area Wage Surveys of the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide some insights into the possible impact of \$2 an hour for some

occupations in certain cities. These surveys show that in most cities, some workers earn less than \$2 an hour for particular occupations—such as janitor, laborer or guard—while the great majority of such workers are paid more than \$2 an hour for the same occupations.

For example, a Labor Department study of large Pittsburgh establishments, employing at least 50 men and women, found that over 2,000 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2 an hour. However, 71 percent of janitors and cleaners in Pittsburgh, in such establishments (5,100), were paid over \$2 an hour, indicating that the Pittsburgh community's standard for this type work was above \$2 an hour. Yet without a \$2 floor under their wages, thousands of custodial workers in Pittsburgh were paid under \$2 an hour by some employers. Further examples of the prevalence of low pay are provided in Tables V–XII for Detroit, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Chicago, San Francisco, Cleveland, New York and Indianapolis.

Most sectors of the economy and most industries can easily absorb an increase in the minimum wage to \$2 an hour out of rising productivity and profits, as they successfully accomplished in the past. Some high-productivity, high-profit industries can absorb the increase and afford to reduce prices. Some others, whose productivity and profits are low, would probably have to raise prices somewhat. But the over-all impact on the price level should be very small, if at all.

The economy should be capable of adjusting successfully—and with only rare instances of adverse effects in isolated cases—as has been achieved during past adjustments to increases in the federal minimum wage.

The Labor Department has studied the effects of each increase in the minimum wage and extension of FLSA coverage. And the Secretary of Labor has reported these findings to the Congress, as required by the Act.

In 1950, when the minimum wage went to 75 cents an hour, total employment grew 1,300,000. Reporting on the effects of increasing the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, the Secretary of Labor concluded: "Though causing significant payroll increases, the 75 cent rate had only very minor determinable effects on employment and other non-wage variables in the five low-wage manufacturing industries surveyed. Even within a selected group of establishments as those with reported adjustment problems, the non-wage consequences of the 75 cent requirement were on a whole not very substantial."

In 1956, when the minimum wage was raised to \$1.00, total employment again increased, by 1,600,000 workers. The Labor Department studied the effects of this rise of the minimum wage in seven low-wage, small-city areas. The Secretary of Labor concluded, "Few employers in subject industries indicated that they found it necessary to discharge workers in adjusting to the higher federal minimum."

In 1962, after the \$1.15 minimum wage had gone into effect in late 1961, total employment increased 1 million, following a slight decline during the recession of the previous year.

The report of the Secretary of Labor stated: "The 1961 minimum wage increases had no discernible effect on the nation-wide level of employment in the industries affected. On an overall basis employment has risen in these industries since the 1961 amendments took effect."

In 1966 after evaluating the effects of the \$1.25 minimum wage, which became effective in September 1963, the Secretary of Labor reported: "On balance it would appear that the \$1.25 minimum wage was adjusted to without adverse employment effects in these low-wage, high impact areas. . . . This con-

clusion was based on a study of 15 low-wage areas particularly affected by changes in the minimum wage.

The Secretary of Labor reported to the Congress in January 1966:

"The period during which the 1961 amendments have become effective has been one of extraordinary price stability. The general wholesale price level in April 1964 (seven months after the \$1.25 rate went into effect for the majority of covered employees) was almost exactly the same as it had been in April 1961 (five months before the effective date of the first step increase from \$1.00 to \$1.15)."

After trying to find a possible unemployment impact from the increase in the minimum wage to \$1.40, which went into effect on February 1, 1967, the Labor Department could find only 63 people in the whole country whose layoffs may have been related in some form or other to the higher minimum wage.

As for total employment in the nation, it expanded 1.8 million in 1964, after the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage became fully effective. And it rose 1.5 million in 1967 and another 1.5 million in 1968, as the 1966 amendments went into effect.

In January 1969, the Secretary of Labor reported to the Congress:

"Increases in the minimum wage required by the 1966 amendments became effective during a period of rising prices. That the minimum wage had little influence on this trend is evidenced by comparing the price movement during the first 6 months of 1966, before the 1966 amendments went into effect, with the trend in the first 6 months of 1967 and 1968, when the first two phases of the amendments became effective. The Consumer Price Index increased 1.7 percent in the first half of 1966 as compared with 1.1 percent in the corresponding period of 1967 and 1.9 percent in that of 1968. Wholesale prices of industrial commodities advanced significantly less in the first half of 1967 and 1968 (0.2 percent and 0.9 percent) than in 1966 (1.4 percent)."

"A continuation of the special study of the relationship between price changes and minimum wage impact in laundries, initiated last year, lends additional support to the conclusion that factors other than minimum wages were determinants of price rises. These data do not indicate any consistent pattern between the degree of impact of the minimum wage and the prevalence and extent of price changes. For example, a large proportion of the laundries which paid no workers less than \$1.15 an hour prior to February 1, 1968, the date on which that rate became the minimum, increased prices. Price increases of 5 percent or more were more prevalent among laundries where the impact of the minimum wage was small than among those where it was large."

Summarizing the employment effects of the 1966 amendments, the Secretary of Labor reported to the Congress in January 1969:

"Regarding the impact of the 1966 amendments: Employment in the areas affected by the extensions of coverage has increased, and there is no evidence of any restraining effect of the broader coverage on employment opportunity. The increased minimum wage levels set in 1966 have not contributed to the current inflationary spiral to an extent which permits reasonable questioning of their net value in strengthening both the position of low-paid workers in particular and the economy in general."

"All of the major nonagricultural industry divisions showed employment gains over the period from September 1966 to September 1968, except construction. The largest increase in the private sector in relative terms was in the services group, where the minimum wage has had the largest impact."

Different Secretaries of Labor in different Administrations representing both Republican and Democratic parties, have reported their detailed findings to the Congress that adjustments to each increase in the federal minimum wage and extension of FLSA coverage were accomplished successfully—with increasing total employment, very little direct impact on prices and only rare, isolated instances of adverse impacts.

These successful achievements point to the flexibility of the American economy and to its ability to adjust readily to the further amendments of FLSA that the AFL-CIO is urging Congress to adopt at present.

MINIMUM WAGE PROTECTION UNDER STATE LAWS IS INADEQUATE

Whenever amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act are under consideration by the Congress, questions are raised about the role of state laws. Over the years, some state laws have filled the gaps left by the federal law. But most of the workers not covered by federal laws, are not covered by state laws either. Furthermore, those workers who are covered by state laws only, are frequently covered by a wage which is too low to yield any meaningful benefits.

Of the 11.8 million workers in the private sector, not protected by the federal Act, 7.7 million are not covered by state minimum wage laws either. About 1.6 million of those 4.1 million who receive some state coverage, are under obsolete state minimum wage laws which are well below the federal standard. For example, the rates in Kentucky are 65 cents to 75 cents an hour and even in Ohio, some rates are below \$1 an hour.

Twelve states have no minimum wage laws or wage orders. In the other 38 states, what passes for protection is often grossly inadequate as to coverage or level of minimum wage required, or both (see Tables I-IV for details on current state minimum wage requirements).

In only 16 states (plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) are any workers, covered by state laws, entitled to minimum rates equal to the federal minimum or better. And even in these jurisdictions, lower rates frequently apply in a number of occupations or industries.

In 17 states no minimum rate is higher than 1.25 per hour. For example, in Arizona, current rates range from 47 cents to 55 cents per hour, while under the Minnesota law, the minimum wage ranges from 75 cents to \$1.15.

The evidence clearly shows that with few exceptions states simply have not been ready and willing, even if able, to provide adequate minimum wage protection for workers not covered by the federal law. Federal action in 1970 is essential if minimum wage legislation is to be responsive to the needs of all workers.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The AFL-CIO favors extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all workers in industries affecting commerce. The coverage of the Act should be extended to all jobs within reach of the federal authority.

In 1961 and again in 1966, the Congress recognized the plight of workers excluded from the Act. In amendments enacted in those years the Congress brought the benefits of the Act to millions of additional workers. These expansions of coverage brought the Act closer to meeting its original objective, as expressed in the Finding and Declaration of Policy, the elimination of "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers."

The benefits which accrued to workers from these amendments and the ease with which industry adjusted to the changes

prompted the Secretary of Labor to recommend universal coverage in his 1969 report to the Congress under Section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In this report he stated:

"I recommend complete coverage of all workers—with no exceptions of any kind. To the extent that this proposal carries beyond the reach of Federal authority it should be implemented by available methods of encouraging the adoption of comparable State standards."

Today there are 63 million non-supervisory wage and salary employees, but only 46 million are covered by FLSA. The remaining 17 million workers are not accorded federal statutory minimum wage or overtime protection. These include household domestics and some employees in retail trade, state and local government, some farm workers, and thousands of others in various industries.

The following table summarizes the situation:

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE OF NONSUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT BY INDUSTRY
(In thousands)

Industry	Total number of non-supervisory employees	Total number covered	Total number not covered by the FLSA
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.....	1,273	620	653
Mining.....	570	565	5
Contract construction.....	3,444	3,409	35
Manufacturing.....	18,381	17,793	588
Transportation, communications and utilities.....	4,164	4,095	69
Wholesale trade.....	3,524	2,686	838
Retail trade.....	9,948	5,803	5,145
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	3,119	2,349	770
Services (excluding domestic).....	8,289	5,794	2,495
Domestic service.....	2,185	2,185
Public sector.....	7,866	3,141	4,725
Federal Government.....	2,440	729	1,711
State and local government.....	5,426	2,412	3,014

Source: Wage and Hour Public Contracts Division.

The AFL-CIO calls for extending FLSA protection to all the 17 million workers in the various industries who are now not covered.

These workers need minimum wage protection. Many of the workers who would be covered by our proposal earn less than \$2.00 an hour.

Here is a quick summary of these deplorable conditions:

Of the 4 million additional workers in retailing who would be protected by our proposal, over a third of them, or more than 1½ million workers, are paid less than \$2 an hour.

In the absence of minimum wage protection, the wages of these workers at the bottom end of the nation's wage distribution simply remain stationary or creep up belatedly, over the years, at only a fraction of the pace of general wage advances.

In industries where almost all employees are covered—such as manufacturing—production-worker wages averaged \$3.36 an hour in June 1970. This is 65 cents more than 4 years ago, and \$1.10 higher than in 1960.

In industries with only partial coverage—such as retail trade and hotels—workers' wages have not shown such advances and the gap continues to widen. Retail trade average hourly earnings are \$2.43, an increase of only 52 cents in the past 4 years.

In hotels, hourly earnings rose 55 cents in the period from 1966 to 1970, and the average wage in 1970 is still less than \$2 an hour.

This picture of general wage advances, unshared by a large, laggard group because of

exclusion from coverage of the Act, is also apparent in other partially-uncovered or totally-uncovered industries.

Domestic workers

Private household work constitutes one of the least attractive fields of employment—due to substandard wages and working conditions, in the main. This condition reflects the exemption of this occupation not only from minimum wage legislation, but also from most other types of labor legislation from which most workers benefit.

In 1969 there were more than 2 million domestic workers. Of these, approximately 1.6 million women (98% of all workers in this category) were employed as private household workers. Approximately 416,000 were classified as babysitters. [This figure is very rough and probably understated. Also, it may be misleading to assume, as is frequently done, that none of the babysitters are performing full-time household work.]

Approximately 200,000 women employed as private household workers were heads of families, as of March 1969. The median (mid-point) wage of this group was \$1,523 per year (40 hours per week x 52 weeks per year). The average hourly wage, therefore, was 73 cents. While the situation of day workers, in terms of salaries, hours and duties, has improved over the years, nevertheless, the majority of these workers enjoy no labor protection whatsoever. They receive no benefits such as pensions, no guarantee of severance pay, no guarantee that payment promised would be given, no paid vacation, and transportation often takes up to two hours one way.

Recently, Mrs. Matty E. Wardell, a domestic worker of St. Louis, described salary increases from the old, almost slave labor standards of \$1 a day. "Then we went to \$2, then jumped from \$2 to \$4. The next jump was to \$5 and then to \$7 and then to \$8 plus carfare and a lot of people (employers) really thought that was the limit." (Taken from COPE Memo, June 22, 1970)

It is important to note that the demand for private household workers remains high. The supply will not be forthcoming until legislation improves working conditions and brings new status to this field of employment. Minimum wage coverage would act as a stimulant.

RETAIL TRADE

Out of some 10 million retail workers—including restaurant workers—5.8 million are presently provided with FLSA protection, while 4.1 million are excluded from such protection.

The AFL-CIO proposes that all retail employees be covered by both the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Act, regardless of the dollar volume of business of the enterprise or the establishment. We propose the elimination of the existing dollar volume tests for coverage of establishments in Section 13(a)(2) and of enterprises in Section 3(s) of the Act. We believe that employees of all firms, as well as all employees of all stores of a firm, should be covered.

At present, two stores of the same chain may be treated differently. If one store of Company X has yearly sales of \$250,000 or more, it is covered; but the other store of the same company may not be covered if its annual sales are less than \$250,000. This anomaly would be rectified if all establishments and enterprises were covered.

The AFL-CIO proposal would cover an additional 4 million retail workers—bringing the total number of covered retail workers to nearly 10 million.

A study of wages paid retail workers shows the great need for FLSA protection. A June 1966 Labor Department survey showed that only 1% of the workers in covered establishments (those with sales of \$250,000 or more

which were parts of million-dollar enterprises) earned less than \$1.25 an hour—the then applicable minimum wage. In contrast, 20% of those in uncovered establishments (establishments with sales of less than \$250,000 which were also parts of million-dollar enterprises) were paid less than \$1.25 an hour.

In other large stores (those where the enterprise sold less than \$1 million worth of goods but its establishment sales were more than \$500,000), 8% of the workers were paid under \$1.25 an hour.

The situation in certain segments of the uncovered group is particularly shocking, as many workers still earn less than \$1 an hour, particularly in some of the stores in the South.

The June 1962 and the June 1966 Labor Department studies of the impact of the 1961 amendments show that employers adjusted easily to the extension of minimum wages to the retail industry. The continuing exemption of large numbers of retail workers means unfair competition for covered employers and harmfully low wages for unprotected employees.

Most union contracts in this industry show that wages well above the minimum wage can and are being paid by fair employers. However, to provide protection for those retail workers who have not benefited by the 1961 and 1966 amendments to the federal minimum wage, extension of the minimum wage to all workers in the retail industry is necessary.

The so-called Mom & Pop stores would not be directly affected by this proposal. These stores, which are owner-operated, typically hire no workers or an occasional part-time worker. Thus, they are outside the scope of this proposal. Actually, Mom & Pop stores benefit from effective minimum wage legislation. Such legislation protects small shopkeepers from being undercut by retailers who pay unfair subminimum wages.

Restaurants

Among retail employees still not covered by the Act, a major group is restaurant workers. While 350,000 such workers are now covered, approximately 1 million non-supervisory restaurant workers are not protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act. The AFL-CIO proposal would extend coverage to these workers.

The Labor Department's nation-wide survey of restaurant employment and wages shows that employment increased by 3,900 workers between October 1966 and April 1967—the period spanning the effective date of the initial phase of the 1966 amendments to the minimum wage law. They found that the "largest employment increase occurred in the South where the (minimum) wage impact was greatest." During that same period, employment in noncovered restaurants actually declined by 2,600 workers. The same study also noted a wide gap in earnings between employees in covered and noncovered eating and drinking establishments following adjustment to the dollar minimum wage. Average hourly earnings for noncovered workers increased slower than that for covered workers. In April 1967, nearly 17% of all non-tipped workers in noncovered establishments—those with less than \$250,000 in annual sales—were paid less than \$1 an hour, while only 2% of such workers in covered establishments were paid under \$1 an hour. A special tabulation was made by the Labor Department of some 6,300 establishments, identified specifically, in both October 1966 and April 1967. One of the important insights that was found in this detailed analysis was that firms required to make large wage adjustments because of minimum wage coverage, did so with ease. The Labor Department found "there was no inverse relationship between employment changes and magnitude of wage impact. In

fact, the reverse was true. Consistently, the employment increases were greater in those groups where the impact of the minimum wage was greater."

Nearly a third of all restaurant employees are now guaranteed a minimum wage of \$1.45 an hour (\$1.60 on February 1, 1971) by the federal minimum wage law. Thus, it is clear that the industry can adjust to a minimum wage when required to do so.

Long hours are another problem in this industry. One-fifth of all restaurant employees are now working 48 hours or more each week. In 1966, when the restaurant workers were provided coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, Congress failed to provide them with overtime protection. Such protection is necessary for these workers just as it is for other workers in our society. If a statutory 40-hour week were established for all restaurant employees, as many as 60,000 additional full-time jobs could be made available.

Hotels, motels

Many hotel and motel workers need the benefits of FLSA coverage. Low pay and long hours characterize their employment. There are 549,000 non-supervisory employees in the hotel and motel industry, only half of whom are now covered by a federal minimum wage, and even these are excluded from overtime protection. The covered segment of the industry has shown that it can accommodate itself to minimum wages. The present non-covered group could also do so.

Long working hours are also a feature of the hotel and motel industry. Twenty percent of the employees work 48 hours or more a week. By extending the overtime protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all hotel and motel workers, and establishing a standard work-week of 40 hours, as many as 20,000 additional full-time jobs could be made available.

Tips

The AFL-CIO would like to see the tip provision of the FLSA eliminated. This provision allows employees' tips to count toward the minimum wage. If an employee regularly receives more than \$20 a month in tips, his employer may take credit for tips up to 50% of the applicable minimum wage. However, if an employee is receiving less in tips than the amount allowed, the employer must pay the balance—so that the employee receives at least the minimum wage.

The AFL-CIO believes that an employee should be guaranteed at least a minimum wage and that his employer should be required to pay this group. The employee should not have to depend on the generosity of the customer to earn a living wage.

Motion picture theatres

The exemption (13(a)(9)) now applicable to the more than 100,000 non-supervisory motion picture theatre employees should be removed. This is a group that sorely needs minimum wage protection.

A 1966 Labor Department study of wages paid in motion picture theatres showed that 75% of the men and women who worked in motion picture theatres were paid less than \$1.60 an hour. While motion picture projectionists earn well above the minimum, thousands of concession attendants, cashiers, ushers and janitors are paid pitifully low wages.

Payroll accounts for only 23% of receipts in the motion picture industry. Wage costs are thus a small part of total costs—and increasing the wages of those workers paid less than a minimum wage to that wage would not have substantial effects upon the industry, but would certainly yield benefits to the lowest-paid workers.

Small logging crews

Small logging crews of 8 or fewer employees are now exempt, and thereby denied FLSA protection. In 1966, when the logging exemp-

tion was modified to exempt crews of 8 or fewer employees, the House Committee Report stated: "The decision on eight employees was made after careful consideration and investigation of conflicting facts. The Committee believes the eight-man criterion to be a sound basis for exemption at the present time, but intends to further investigate these logging operations." The reduction in the logging exemption from 12- to 8-man crews was designed to bring under the Act most of the exempt logging workers. It appeared at that time that a majority of these workers were employed on crews of 9 to 12 men. Actually, the change has not had the effect which the Congress intended. Many employers merely adjusted their operations so as to meet the 8-man test for exemption from FLSA. The law's protection should be extended to all logging workers now excluded from FLSA coverage.

Logging employees need minimum wage protection. Thousands are paid less than \$1.60 an hour. Past Labor Department surveys showed that large percentages of these workers in small non-integrated logging establishments, particularly in the South, earned pitifully low wages.

Many of these workers are in areas of our country plagued by poverty, such as parts of Appalachia and northern Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. They need minimum wage protection in order to achieve even minimum standards.

Overtime protection is also needed for workers in this industry. The 1964 Labor Department survey showed that 15% of the employees worked more than 40 hours a week. There is no reason why they should not enjoy the same overtime safeguards as covered logging employees.

Farmworkers

The AFL-CIO urges the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all farm workers. The wages paid most farm workers are far below the minimum wage standards established by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Even those farm workers on very large farms who were given minimum wage protection by the 1966 amendments were not guaranteed a wage equal to that legislated for nonfarm workers.

All workers newly covered by the 1966 amendments were guaranteed a minimum wage of \$1 an hour beginning in February 1, 1967. Nonfarm workers were required to be given annual increases until they reached the statutory minimum of \$1.60 an hour on February 1, 1971.

However, no provision was included for raising the wages of covered farm workers to \$1.60 an hour. The minimum wage for farm workers went to \$1.30 an hour on February 1, 1969, and stopped there. Nonfarm workers brought under the Act by the amendments are now assured a wage of at least \$1.45 an hour and a further raise to \$1.60 on February 1, 1971.

The Report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare clearly indicated that it was not the intention of the Committee that farm workers remain a substandard group under the Act. The report states:

"It is the intention of this committee that all workers under the act be subject to a single minimum wage. The committee action in limiting the pattern of escalation for agriculture at this time to \$1.30 in February 1969 is to insure that there be a careful evaluation of the effects of applying a minimum wage to agriculture. The committee expects that agriculture will adjust without adverse effects as have other industries under the act and that additional increases will be provided in the future."

What has been the effect of bringing farm workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act? The Department of Labor in a report on Hired Farm Workers, submitted to the Congress in January 1969, states:

"Employment on all farms rose 7 percent between May 1967 and May 1968. On covered farms hired farm-worker employment increased 36 percent during the period spanning the effective date of the \$1.15 Federal minimum wage. During this same period employment on noncovered farms decreased 9 percent. Record crops and the trend toward commercial-type farms have contributed to the increased employment on covered farms.

"In the South where the effect of the Federal minimum was greatest, covered employment increased one-fifth between May 1967 and May 1968 while there was a slight decline in employment on noncovered farms."

As of February 1, 1970, the Labor Department estimates that there are about 1,200,000 hired farm workers. Of these, somewhat more than a half-million workers are now under the Act. The remaining farm workers should also be given the benefits of the Act.

While the lot of farm workers has been improving in recent years, it has been a very slow process. Some farm workers benefited by being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1966. Others are finding their status improved by collective bargaining agreements which assure them a minimum wage of at least \$1.75 an hour. But many still look to the federal government to protect their interests and to see that they are not discriminated against by the payment of substandard wage rates.

EXTENSION OF HOURS PROTECTION

Certain groups of employees covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act are exempted from the maximum hours provisions. Currently, some 6 million workers (or 13%) who are protected by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act are denied its overtime protection. There are some 19 specific exemptions spelled out in Section 13(b) of the Act. There is, today, no basis for most of these exemptions, particularly those affecting such large groups of employees as hotel and restaurant employees, farm workers and local transit employees.

Also, the overlapping exemptions pertaining to agricultural processing workers should be eliminated.

That the Congress intended to phase out these exemptions is evident from this statement included in the Conference Report on the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966:

"It was the declared intention of the conferees to give notice that the days of overtime exemptions for employees in the agricultural processing industry are rapidly drawing to a close, because advances in technology are making the continuation of such exemption unjustifiable."

The Department of Labor has recently completed and sent to the Congress a detailed report on this subject. The report concludes:

"The survey findings clearly indicate that consideration should be given to the phasing out of the overtime exemptions currently available to the agricultural handling and processing industries under Sections 7(c) and 7(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act even though this would affect a significant proportion of man-hours in two of the industries studied. Although focusing primarily on Sections 7(c) and 7(d) of the Act, the survey data also indicate that there is no sound basis for the continuation of the year-round exemptions available under Sections 13(b)(14), (15) and (16) of the Act nor for the overlap that presently exists between the exemptions under Sections 7(c) and/or 7(d) and those under Section 13(b)."

"The favored position held for three decades by agricultural handlers and processors because of full and partial exemption from the 40-hour weekly overtime standard applicable to most industries covered by the FLSA needs reexamination. . . ."

PUERTO RICO, VIRGIN ISLANDS AND SAMOA

For Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa, where special minimum wage rates are allowed, Congress should provide for automatic statutory increases in these special minimum rates equivalent to the cents-per-hour increases in the U.S. mainland rate.

These minimums should be adjusted automatically, so that the workers in these areas may advance along with other U.S. workers and maintain the same competitive relationship with these workers. Experience under the 1961 and 1966 FLSA amendments indicates that an automatic statutory adjustment of these special minimum rates is both desirable and necessary at the time of mainland adjustments.

EXTENSION OF EQUAL PAY ACT TO EXECUTIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

We urge the Committee to approve a specific amendment which would extend the Equal Pay Act to executive, administrative and professional employees. The Equal Pay Act, which outlaws wage discrimination on the basis of sex, appears in the Fair Labor Standards Act as Section 6(d). Executive, administrative and professional employees are excluded from its coverage by reason of the exemption from Sections 6 and 7 under Section 13(a)(1), which was designed to exempt such employees from minimum wage and overtime standards if they met certain standards set by the Secretary of Labor.

Bills to cover this group under the Equal Pay Act have been introduced by Representative Edith Green in the House and by Senator Philip Hart in the Senate. (H.R. 15971 and S. 3612). Their bills, which are identical, would simply modify the 13(a)(1) exemption to make it inapplicable for purposes of the Equal Pay Act.

The AFL-CIO has been a strong supporter of equal pay for equal work, without regard to sex. We believe this principle should be universally applied without regard to occupation.

There is, actually, no specific rationale or reason for the exclusion of these particular employees from the equal pay provisions of the law. Their exclusion is simply a technicality arising out of the fact that the Equal Pay Act of 1963 was enacted as an amendment to the FLSA, complete with FLSA exclusions and exemptions, developed for other reasons. It was argued at the time that making equal pay coverage co-extensive with minimum wage coverage would make for easier administration and compliance. Equal pay is now a well-established, effectively functioning portion of the law, and it is time for the "transitional" considerations under which this group was excluded to be reexamined.

Protection against wage discrimination on the basis of sex is at least as necessary for executive administrative and professional employees as it is for any other group of workers. We respectfully urge their inclusion in the Equal Pay Act be now approved.

DOUBLE TIME FOR OVERTIME

The AFL-CIO calls for an increase in penalty pay for overtime work from time and one-half to double time. We believe that this change is necessary to discourage employers from scheduling overtime work and to encourage them to hire additional employees.

The present statutory premium, under the Fair Labor Standards Act—time and one-half for over 40 hours work in a week—was adopted 32 years ago. It was written into law to encourage the expansion of job opportunities and to discourage the scheduling of overtime work. Thirty-two years ago, an overtime penalty of time and one-half was adequate for that purpose. It is much less effective today.

Time and one-half is not so costly to the

employer as it might seem at first. The increased volume of production in the overtime hours reduces the employer's overhead costs per unit—the greater volume is spread over fixed overhead costs.

But more than that, the cost of hiring additional workers has increased, through both legislation and collective bargaining; various fringe benefit costs have been added to the employment-cost package, which varies with the number of workers employed, rather than with the number of manhours worked. In balancing out these additional costs against the present overtime penalty, many employers apparently believe that overtime is cheaper.

In 1938, when FLSA was enacted, supplements to wages and salaries were about 4½% of employee wages and salaries. In the thirty-two years since then, the percentage expended on supplements has jumped to 23%. Most of these benefit payments are not included in computing overtime pay. There has been a tendency, therefore, for many employers to schedule overtime work, rather than to increase employment. For example, in 1969, according to Labor Department studies, nearly 8% of the hours worked by manufacturing production and maintenance workers were overtime hours.

A comparison of the earnings of overtime workers, with those working 40 hours, shows small differences in the level or distribution of wages. Those working overtime averaged 9 cents an hour less than those who worked 40 hours a week, according to a March 1964 study of manufacturing by the Wage and Hour Division. Certainly this does not substantiate the claim that overtime hours are necessary because of a lack of skilled personnel.

An increase in the overtime penalty from time and one-half to double time would increase the employers' costs of scheduling such overtime; it would deter employers from scheduling overtime and provide an incentive for business firms to hire additional workers.

Of course, to make the double-time penalty fully effective, the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act needs to be extended to the millions of workers who are still excluded from the law's protection. Only 60% of all wage and salary workers are covered by the overtime requirements of the federal wage-hour law.

The AFL-CIO recommends an amendment to FLSA to provide double-time pay for overtime hours of work.

DAILY OVERTIME STANDARD

The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to establish a daily overtime standard, with double-time penalty-pay for over 8 hours of work per day.

Currently, the overtime premium of time and one-half is required by FLSA for work over 40 hours a week—regardless of the number of hours worked in any single day. The Work-Hour Contracts Act of 1962, applying to government contractors, provides a daily overtime standard, as well as a weekly standard.

We believe that the establishment of a double-time penalty for work in excess of 8 hours per day would be a deterrent to the scheduling of such overtime work by employers. It is our view that FLSA should protect workers against excessive working hours per day, as well as against excessive hours of work per week.

It is certainly time, in 1970, for Congress to amend FLSA to provide premium penalty-pay for work in excess of 8 hours per day.

REDUCTION OF WORKING HOURS

The Eighth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO, held in October 1969, unanimously adopted the following resolution on this subject, succinctly presenting our views:

"The reduction of worktime has been a long-time goal of unions. This goal con-

tinues, as we prepare for the 1970s. We shall seek reduced schedules of working hours, additional paid holidays, longer vacations, sabbatical leaves, early retirement and similar provisions—to increase leisure and improve the quality of life of working men and women, while also creating additional job opportunities.

"Furthermore, the overtime premium rate of time and one-half is no longer an effective deterrent to long overtime hours. With the growth of fringe benefits that are exempt from overtime requirements, this premium serves as less of a deterrent than it did when first established in 1938 under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In order to discourage employers from scheduling considerable overtime, the premium should be raised to double time. Therefore, be it

"Resolved, We reaffirm our traditional support for reducing hours of work.

"We reiterate the position taken by the 1967 Convention, in support of legislation for a 35-hour workweek and double time for overtime.

"Furthermore we urge the incoming Executive Council of the AFL-CIO to examine the many aspects of reducing working time and increasing leisure."

ENFORCEMENT OF THE FLSA

Currently the Act is enforced either through court actions brought by the Secretary of Labor on behalf of individual employees or by such employees going into court themselves to recover unpaid wages due such employees under the terms of the Act. When the individual goes to court, he may recover not only the unpaid wages but also an equal amount as liquidated damages, plus court costs. However, if the Secretary of Labor goes to court, he can collect only the back wages due the individual, without any penalty. We believe that when the Secretary of Labor takes an employer to court for failure to pay minimum wages or overtime, a similar penalty should be applied.

Experience indicates that the Secretary of Labor is able to adjust most back-pay questions without taking the employer to court. However, we believe that if it is necessary for the Secretary of Labor to take an employer to court in order to enforce the standards required under the law, the courts should be able to assess a penalty against the employer as well as require him to pay what he should have paid in the first place. Without such a penalty, merely requiring the employer to pay the unpaid back wages is relatively ineffective; employers are simply encouraged by the absence of a penalty to take their chances on not being caught.

The extent of Fair Labor Standards Act violations can be seen in the large amounts of underpayments discovered annually by Wage-Hour inspectors. Even today, more than thirty years after the Act first went into effect, such underpayments are running approximately \$100 million a year. Unfortunately, Fair Labor Standards Act investigators are able to inspect only about 3% of covered establishments annually, with the result that undiscovered amounts are estimated to be about two to three times that figure.

MINIMUM WAGE ESCALATOR

The AFL-CIO does not believe that minimum wage levels, in the future, should be set mechanically—tied to percentage pay increases for federal employees or to increases in the Consumer Price Index.

Under one proposal, future minimum wages would rise when and in accordance with increases granted to federal employees when such increases are granted. This provision would in all likelihood have the effect of retarding wage increases in both public and private sectors and could be expected to be vigorously opposed especially by the unions of federal employees. Equally objectionable

is the proposal of automatic increases in minimum wages based on increases in the Consumer Price Index.

Both of these proposals carry with them the presumption that the minimum wage is adequate and, therefore, minimum automatic adjustments geared to changes in federal pay scales or increases in living costs would be adequate. This is demonstrably false. Since such automatic increases would be on a percentage basis, they would obviously be minimal because the minimum wage base itself is still unduly low.

The minimal automatic increases would also serve as a future excuse for not legislating the size of increases that are necessary.

We seriously doubt that it is feasible or desirable for Congress to abandon the oversight function with respect to the level of the minimum wage which it has under existing law. Such periodic review by the interested Congressional committees and the Congress as a whole has been useful in the past in supporting and enlarging labor standards protections, and experience indicates it will be fully as useful in the future.

MULTIPLE MINIMUMS

The AFL-CIO is opposed to different minimum wage levels for workers in different industries.

The suggested classification of industries for minimum wage purposes on the basis of the time when these industries were brought under the FLSA would have the effect of permanently freezing minimum wages at different levels among these industries. Heretofore, when industries have been brought under the Act the minimum wage in these industries has advanced, as soon as the escalation period for new industries has expired, along with and in accordance with the minimum wage for already-covered industries.

The proposed minimum wage categories would seriously and unfairly discriminate against those industries where the minimum wage is most needed, that is, those industries where it has the greatest impact. This would most significantly affect the retail and service industries, and agriculture.

Also, the minimum wage is, at least philosophically, supposed to provide the minimum income necessary for a decent standard of living. There is no rational ground for believing that some workers and their families need more or less income than others to provide for a decent standard of living. Most certainly, such an idea cannot be supported on an industry classification basis.

It does not seem to us, for example, that there is any basis whatsoever for saying that the federal minimum for a steel worker in Pittsburgh should be more than a retail worker in Pittsburgh to support his family. Furthermore, different minimum wages for employees in different industries would undercut the philosophy of the minimum wage, and its effect would be to undermine the achievement of necessary periodic increases in the minimum wages across-the-board.

The Congress should not provide legislative sanction to the unjustified premise that some workers must be permanently condemned to exist in greater poverty than others. The proposal would be confusing to the public since it would undoubtedly lead to such designations as "mini" minimums and "maxi" minimums, designations which are obviously inconsistent.

MINIMUM WAGE AND YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The AFL-CIO is opposed to a sub-minimum wage for youth, or any other category of workers. We believe that if a job is worth doing, it is worth a fair wage—no less than the federal minimum wage, regardless of who is doing the job.

Some opponents of FLSA improvements allege that minimum wage legislation puts young people out of work. The evidence, how-

ever, indicates that the high levels of youth unemployment, in recent years, are not due to FLSA provisions.

To understand the employment problems of youth, it is important to remember that teenage unemployment has always been higher than the national average for all workers. This is because teenagers are new jobseekers, they often seek only part-time employment near home, they look for temporary summer jobs and then return to school. Moreover, out-of-school teenagers tend to have very high quit rates.

The unemployment rate for 16 to 19 year-olds in the labor force increased from 10% in 1947 and 1948 to about 16% and 17% in the recession years 1958 and 1961, and was equally high in 1963 and 1964 when the general employment situation had begun to improve. With the continuing improvement in employment, it declined to slightly less than 13% in 1966 and remained at about that level in 1967-1968—after the 1966 amendments went into effect.

The real problem of teenage unemployment in the 1960s was that it did not drop as fast as the decline of joblessness among adults 25 years of age and older. In the early years after World War II, the teenage unemployment rate was about three times greater than the unemployment rate among adults. In 1963, it moved to four times higher and by 1966-1968, it was five times greater.

This worsening of teenage unemployment in relation to adults could hardly have been caused by FLSA when it began to show up in 1963 or in the years that immediately followed. For, from 1938, when FLSA was adopted, until February 1, 1967, most typical teenage occupations were not covered by FLSA—such as medium-sized and small retail stores, restaurants, service establishments and farms. Such business activities that typically employ teenagers were not covered substantially by FLSA until 1967, under the terms of the amendments adopted in 1966.

The roots of the teenage unemployment problem of the 1960s can be found in the sharp rise of the birthrate after the end of World War II. The great increase in births in the years after World War II resulted in a sudden, sharp rise of teenagers looking for employment in the 1960s. And although teenage employment increased considerably in the 1960s, it was not enough to match the sharp influx of youngsters into the labor markets.

During the decade 1948-1958 there was actually a slight decline in the number of teenagers in the labor force—reflecting the low birthrate of the depression years of the 1930s. But in the 10 years, 1958-1968, the number of 16 to 19 year-olds in the labor force skyrocketed 53%, from 4.3 million to 6.6 million. The average yearly increase of teenagers in the labor force was about 230,000 in 1958-1968, in sharp contrast to the slight decline in the previous 10 years. One would expect that such massive change in the number of teenagers in the labor force could create problems, particularly if the demand for teenage workers did not keep pace.

Many of the part-time farm jobs, once held by teenagers, disappeared with the growth of large industrial-type, mechanized farms and the general decline of farm employment. The rapid decline of small neighborhood stores eliminated many other jobs once held by teenagers. The expansion of less-skilled jobs in retail stores and the various services was not as fast as the skyrocketing supply of teenagers in the labor force. Harold Goldstein of the Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that employment in the kinds of jobs typically employing three out of four teenagers increased 20% in the past decade—in contrast to the over-50% rise in the supply of teenagers in the labor force.

In addition, there has been the increasing

participation in the labor force of married women 35 years of age and over, which results in some degree of job competition with teenagers. Many married women with no small children at home, are now at work on part-time or full-time jobs that often employ teenagers—for example, in supermarkets, restaurants, retail stores and movie theaters.

Nevertheless, employment of teenagers increased sharply in 1958-1968, in contrast to a small decline of teenage employment during the previous decade. In response to the massive influx of teenagers into the labor force in 1958-1968, teenage employment increased from 3.6 million to 5.8 million—an average of about 220,000 a year.

This turn-around in teenage employment, from a small decline in 1948-1958 to a sharp rise in 1958-1968, occurred despite the improvements in FLSA, which minimum-wage opponents claim result in denying jobs to teenagers. But this great expansion of teenage employment was insufficient in the face of the even greater growth in the number of teenagers in the job markets.

Despite the clear, factual record, some opponents of fair labor standards laws claim that the federal floor for wages results in all kinds of supposed troubles, particularly Negro teenage unemployment. This assertion is as far from the facts as other attempts to blame fair labor standards legislation for a variety of economic ills.

The causes of higher unemployment rates among Negro teenagers—about twice as high as among white teenagers—are similar to the problems confronting teenagers in general, except for two major differences: 1) racial discrimination in education and hiring has had adverse effects on Negro teenagers in the job markets; 2) the migration of a large proportion of Negroes from the rural South to the cities, as well as the mechanization of farming, has resulted in a decline of teenage farm employment.

In 1958-1968, the non-white teenage labor force rose even somewhat faster than the total teenage labor force. The number of non-white 16 to 19 year-olds in the labor force rose from 504,000 in 1958 to 780,000 in 1968—about 27,600 per year. But the migration of the Negro population to the cities and the mechanization of southern agriculture sharply reduced farm employment of Negro teenagers.

Educational opportunities for Negro youngsters have been generally inferior—in both the rural South and in urban slum areas—and the preparation of many Negro youngsters for employment was also inferior. In addition, there is discrimination in hiring.

Despite these difficulties, non-white teenage employment increased sharply—from 366,000 in 1958 to 585,000 in 1968, or nearly 22,000 per year. However, this sharp increase in employment was less than the sharper rise of the non-white teenage labor force. The result was increased unemployment.

These are the real problems that have caused high unemployment rates for 16 to 19 year-olds, in general, and for Negro teenagers, in particular. The Fair Labor Standards Acts and its improvements are not among these causes, and reducing wages for teenagers cannot be expected to solve their job problems.

The solution to teenage unemployment, generally, and especially Negro teenage joblessness, requires a growing economy and full employment. For the major solution to teenage unemployment is increased jobs. And if there are insufficient job opportunities in the regular job markets, there should be a federal program of public service employment—for both adults and teenagers—to create jobs for the long-term unemployed and seriously underemployed, in providing badly-needed public services in parks, recreation centers, hospitals, schools and other public and private non-profit facilities.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps—a part-time public-service employment type program for both in-school and out-of-school youth—should be expanded considerably to provide young people with regular work-experience, training and encouragement to remain in high school through graduation.

The Job Corps program for unemployed out-of-school youth should be maintained to provide them with basic education and skill training for entry into the job market.

Improved vocational training is needed in the school systems, to prepare young people for the skill requirements of the job markets. Manpower training programs should be geared to meeting actual requirements in the labor market. Outreach programs—such as those sponsored by the AFL-CIO building trades unions in many areas—should be expanded to motivate and assist young people for entry into apprenticeship programs and skilled occupations. And federal law should be enforced to wipe out racial discrimination in hiring.

The solid base of increasing teenage employment of the 1960s and the start of federal aid for education, manpower training and youth employment programs should be continued and improved.

Such progress and the expected leveling off of the rise of teenagers in the labor force in the coming years—as a result of the lower birth rate since the latter 1950s—could begin to solve the teenage unemployment problem. But what should not be done is to establish a special, lower minimum wage for teenagers.

Opponents of the federal minimum wage often advocate that teenagers should be covered by lower minimum wage rates than adults because they are supposedly less productive. The effects of such special lower minimum wage for teenagers would have four clear social disadvantages: displacement of working family heads, discrimination against young workers, a loss of dignity in the work performed by teenagers, and increased profits to those employers who would discriminate against teenagers by paying them lower wages than adults for the same work.

Some employers would be more than happy to hire teenagers at a lower wage than adult workers, especially since low-wage employers are those most affected by minimum wage legislation. On February 1, 1968, there were about six million workers who required wage increases to bring them up to the new federal standard of \$1.60 an hour. Many of these six million were adults and some of them would have lost their jobs if employers had the choice of raising their wages to \$1.60 an hour or firing them and hiring teenagers for a lower wage. Such potential displacement of heads of families by lower-wage teenagers would be socially undesirable.

Also, most lower-wage jobs are unskilled or semi-skilled and require little training. Hence, the volume of work in these occupations, regardless of the age of the worker, is approximately equal. To pay a lower wage to teenagers for the same job as an adult would be clearly discriminatory against teenagers.

It should also be remembered that many teenagers measure the dignity of a job by the amount of money the employer is willing to pay. Work would hardly seem worthwhile to a teenager doing the same job as an adult if he were receiving a lower wage than his adult counterpart.

The advocates of a two-step minimum wage—lower for teenagers—use the high unemployment of teenagers to plead their case. They do not seem to realize that what they would achieve by a lower minimum wage for teenagers, relative to adults, is to attack the effect of the problem and not the cause. Providing the basis in federal law for teenagers to work for less than adults on the same job does not create more jobs. It would decrease the wage costs of those employers

who would displace adults and hire teenagers, thereby raising their profits, and result in greater adult unemployment.

The need is to provide more job opportunities for both teenagers and adults—with FLSA as a uniform wage floor—rather than to encourage low-wage employers to displace adults and hire lower-wage teenagers.

A detailed study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages³ found that: "No single factor explains the high rates of unemployment experienced by youth. Imperfect mechanisms for finding out about the world of work and the existence of jobs, uneven changes in population, changes in the composition of demand, legal restrictions upon the employment of youth, as well as general economic conditions, have all played a part."

The final conclusion from this 189-page report is: "During the coming decade, the teenage population will increase 12 percent compared with 40 percent in the 1960's. Assuming no major decline in economic activity, this slower rate of growth, alone, should help ease problems of absorbing teenagers into the employed labor force."

This same study provides information on the failure of employers who are now authorized to employ students at less than the minimum wage to make full use of this authorization. Only 42% of the hours authorized were actually used. A significant number of employers noted that teenagers were unwilling to work at less than the minimum wage.

There is no justification in the record for a sub-minimum wage for teenagers. Moreover, establishment of a sub-minimum for teenagers would be followed by serious adverse impacts.

The federal minimum wage should provide a single standard for all workers regardless of age, sex, color or creed.

IMPORTS

There is serious question whether it is appropriate to include in a minimum wage bill the suggestion dealing with the impact of imports on employment.

The proposed provisions on this subject are largely hortatory, and there is considerable question as to the manner in which these provisions are to be enforced. Simply writing them into government contracts, without specifying the methods by which the necessary stipulations would be enforced would seem to accomplish little. In any event, the problem of imports would appear to be one to be dealt with under appropriate foreign trade legislation, rather than the minimum wage law.

TABLE I.—Basic hourly minimum wage rates³ under State laws, July 1, 1970

1. Alabama, none.
2. Alaska, \$2.10.
3. Arizona, 52 to 60 cents.²
4. Arkansas, \$1.20.
5. California, \$1.65.²
6. Colorado, \$1.00 to \$1.25.²
7. Connecticut, \$1.60.
8. Delaware, \$12.25 to \$1.45.
9. District of Columbia, \$1.60 to \$2.00.
10. Florida, none.
11. Georgia, \$1.25.
12. Hawaii, \$1.60.
13. Idaho, \$1.25.
14. Illinois, none.
15. Indiana, \$1.25.
16. Iowa, none.
17. Kansas, none.
18. Kentucky, 65 to 75 cents.
19. Louisiana, none.
20. Maine, \$1.60.
21. Maryland, \$1.60.
22. Massachusetts, \$1.60.

³ Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages, Bulletin 1657, BLS, 1970.

23. Michigan, \$1.60.
24. Minnesota, 75 cents to \$1.15. ²
25. Mississippi, none.
26. Missouri, none.
27. Montana, None.
28. Nebraska, \$1.00.
29. Nevada, \$1.60.
30. New Hampshire, \$1.60.
31. New Jersey, \$1.50.
32. New Mexico, \$1.60.
33. New York, \$1.85.
34. North Carolina, \$1.25.
35. North Dakota, 90 cents to \$1.45.
36. Ohio, 90 cents to \$1.25. ²
37. Oklahoma, \$1.00.
38. Oregon, \$1.25.
39. Pennsylvania, \$1.60.
40. Puerto Rico, 40 cents to \$1.60.
41. Rhode Island, \$1.60.
42. South Carolina, None.
43. South Dakota, \$1.00.
44. Tennessee, None.
45. Texas, \$1.40.
46. Utah, \$1.00 to \$1.15. ²
47. Vermont, \$1.60.
48. Virginia, None.
49. Washington, \$1.60.
50. West Virginia, \$1.00.
51. Wisconsin, \$1.45. ²
52. Wyoming, \$1.30.

¹ Rates currently in effect or scheduled for later effective date.

² Excludes men.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Labor Standards Administration.

TABLE II.—Summary of basic hourly minimum wage rates¹ under State laws, July 1, 1970

	Jurisdictions
No minimum wage-----	12
No law-----	9
No orders in effect-----	3
Less than \$1.60-----	22
\$1.25 or less-----	17
Over \$1.25, less than \$1.60-----	5
\$1.60 or more-----	18
1.60-----	15
Over \$1.60-----	3

In 7 states, minimum wage does not apply for men.

¹ Rates currently in effect or scheduled for later effective date.

TABLE III.—States grouped by basic hourly minimum wage rates¹ under State laws, July 1, 1970

NO LAW
Alabama, Florida, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.
NO ORDERS
Illinois, Kansas, and Louisiana.
\$1.25 OR LESS
1. Arizona, 52 to 60 cents. ²
2. Arkansas, \$1.20.
3. Colorado, \$1.00 to \$1.25. ²
4. Delaware, \$1.25.
5. Georgia, \$1.25.
6. Idaho, \$1.25.
7. Indiana, \$1.25.
8. Kentucky, 65 to 75 cents.
9. Minnesota, 75 cents to \$1.15. ²
10. Nebraska, \$1.00.
11. North Carolina, \$1.25.
12. Ohio, 75 cents to \$1.25. ²
13. Oklahoma, \$1.00.
14. Oregon, \$1.25.
15. South Dakota, \$1.00.
16. Utah, \$1.00 to \$1.15. ²
17. West Virginia, \$1.00.

OVER \$1.25, LESS THAN \$1.60

1. New Jersey, \$1.50.
2. North Dakota, 90 cents to \$1.45.
3. Texas, \$1.40.
4. Wisconsin, \$1.45.²
5. Wyoming, \$1.30.

\$1.60

1. Connecticut.
2. District of Columbia.
3. Hawaii.
4. Maine.
5. Maryland.
6. Massachusetts.
7. Michigan.
8. Nevada.
9. New Hampshire.
10. New Mexico.
11. Pennsylvania.
12. Puerto Rico (40 cents to \$1.60).
13. Rhode Island.
14. Vermont.
15. Washington.

OVER \$1.60

1. Alaska, \$2.10.
2. California, \$1.65.²
3. New York, \$1.85.

¹ Rates currently in effect or scheduled for later effective date.

² Excludes Men.

TABLE IV.—Number of workers covered under State minimum wage laws only¹

As of February 1, 1970, 4,107,000 workers not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act were covered by state minimum wage laws. Rates applicable:

	\$1.25 OR LESS
North Carolina-----	\$139,000
Arkansas-----	42,000
Indiana-----	91,000
Minnesota-----	86,000
Ohio-----	141,000
Oklahoma-----	13,000
Colorado-----	24,000
Nebraska-----	40,000
North Dakota-----	21,000
Utah-----	10,000
Kentucky-----	91,000
West Virginia-----	24,000
Delaware-----	20,000
Idaho-----	24,000
Oregon-----	70,000
Total-----	836,000

\$1.25-\$1.60

Wisconsin-----	88,000
Texas-----	322,000
South Dakota-----	22,000
Wyoming-----	15,000
New Jersey-----	229,000
Total-----	736,000

\$1.60 OR MORE

Connecticut-----	136,000
Maine-----	11,000
Massachusetts-----	234,000
New Hampshire-----	26,000
Rhode Island-----	31,000
Vermont-----	18,000
Michigan-----	260,000
New Mexico-----	23,000
New York-----	707,000
District of Columbia-----	55,000
Maryland-----	87,000
Pennsylvania-----	357,000
Alaska-----	7,000
California-----	426,000
Hawaii-----	30,000
Nevada-----	26,000
Washington-----	101,000
Total-----	2,535,000

¹ Excludes Georgia & Puerto Rico.

TABLE V.—Cleveland, Ohio

Some 3,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in a September 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Cleveland, Ohio area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 955 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2.00 an hour. However, 85% of janitors and cleaners in Cleveland were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour in such establishments. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B....	290	15
Clerks, file, class B.....	205	32
Keypunch operators, class B....	137	12
Guards and watchmen.....	782	43
Laborers, material handling....	144	3
Packers, shipping (women)....	168	23

TABLE VI.—New York, N.Y.

Some 17,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in an April 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the New York City area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 3,544 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2.00 an hour. Almost 90% of janitors and cleaners in New York, however, were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour in such establishments. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Office boys.....	1,775	41
Clerks, file, class B.....	976	26
Typists, class B.....	2,131	16
Guards and watchmen.....	3,186	30
Laborers, material handling....	859	7
Packers, shipping.....	712	13

TABLE VII.—Indianapolis, Ind.

Some 4,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in an October 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Indianapolis, Indiana area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 1,199 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2.00 an hour. However, about two-thirds of janitors and cleaners in such establishments were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B....	340	29
Clerks, file, class B.....	187	47
Keypunch operators, class B....	175	25
Guards and watchmen.....	459	43
Laborers, material handling....	341	10
Order fillers.....	95	8

TABLE VIII.—Los Angeles—Long Beach and Anaheim—Santa Ana—Garden Grove, Calif.

Some 11,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in a March 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Los Angeles, California area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 2,591 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2.00 an hour. About 85% of janitors and cleaners in such establishments, however, were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B.....	391	7
Clerks, file, class B.....	829	48
Switchboard operators, class B.....	454	26
Typists, class B.....	1,070	16
Laborers, material handling.....	337	4
Packers, shipping.....	93	8

TABLE IX.—Pittsburgh, Pa.

Nearly 4,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in a January 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Pittsburgh, Pa. area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 2,091 janitors and cleaners paid under \$2.00 an hour. Two-thirds of janitors and cleaners in such establishments, however, were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B.....	239	25
Keypunch operators.....	177	26
Stenographers, general.....	292	18
Typists, class B.....	466	44
Guards and watchmen.....	308	15
Watchmen, manufacturing.....	46	18
Laborers, material handling.....	53	1

TABLE X.—Chicago, Ill.

Nearly 12,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in an April 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Chicago, Illinois area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 3,364 janitors and cleaners were paid under \$2.00 an hour. However, almost 90% of janitors and cleaners in such establishments were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B.....	559	7
Clerks, file, class B.....	1,336	32
Office girls.....	689	48
Typists, class B.....	1,029	14
Guards and watchmen.....	2,601	35
Laborers, material handling.....	591	2
Packers, shipping (women).....	477	18

TABLE XI.—San Francisco, Calif.

Nearly 700 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in an October 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the San Francisco, California area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 416 guards and watchmen were paid under \$2.00 an hour. Ninety percent of guards and watchmen in such establishments were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for type work was well above \$2.00 an hour. Yet, without a floor under their wages, hundreds of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Keypunch operators.....	12	1
Office girls.....	79	25
Typists, class B.....	131	5
Janitors, porters and cleaners.....	46	1

TABLE XII.—Detroit, Mich.

Some 4,000 workers earning less than \$2.00 an hour were reported in a January 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of occupational wages paid in the Detroit, Michigan area. This study of establishments employing at least 50 men and women, found 1,531 janitors and cleaners paid under \$2.00 an hour. More than 85% of janitors and cleaners, however, were paid over \$2.00 an hour, indicating that the community standard for this type work was well above \$2.00 an hour in such establishments. Yet, without a floor under their wages, thousands of workers were paid under \$2.00 an hour.

Further examples of such low pay were:

Occupation	Under \$2	Percent of workers in occupation paid under \$2
Clerks, accounting, class B.....	330	14.0
Clerks, file, class B.....	339	47.0
Typists, class B.....	603	22.0
Guards and watchmen.....	411	9.0
Laborers, material handling.....	128	1.0
Truckdrivers.....	13	.1

FEDERAL FUNDS TO ERADICATE IMPORTED FIRE ANT HAVE INCREASED 85 PERCENT IN 3 YEARS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the progress made the last 3 years in the effort to eradicate the imported fire ant.

For fiscal year 1968, before my election, Congress appropriated \$4,138,800 for fire ant eradication.

In my first year in this body, the appropriation was increased 22 percent to \$5,036,200.

In my second year, appropriations increased to \$5,643,200 and this coming fiscal year will have available \$7,643,200 to fight this pest.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we have been able to increase Federal funds by 85 percent over the last 3 years for fire ant control and eradication. I consider this to be a remarkable record and I again pay trib-

ute to my colleague, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, for his leadership in this program.

As the Members know, this is a cooperative program with State and local funds supplementing Federal appropriations. I am pleased to note that the 1970 session of the Mississippi Legislature appropriated \$1,000,000 for the State's share of an eradication program.

Hon. Jim Buck Ross, Mississippi's Commissioner of Agriculture, has organized a program in our State to work with the various county boards of supervisors. He has obtained the services of the nationally known pest control expert, Bill Fancher, to head the eradication effort.

Now that State funds are available, I expect the program to go forward rapidly and successfully. However, it cannot do so until landowners and boards of supervisors provide maximum cooperation.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—AUGUST 3, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now in the ninth month of a business slowdown. At midyear, prices are still climbing, production is sliding, unemployment is increasing, profits are off, and interest rates remain high.

The President says the business downturn has "bottomed out." No one foresees a further slide into a recession, and all agree progress has been made against inflation, even though the evidence has not been sharply reflected in the Consumer Price Index. Also on the darker side is the fact that unemployment remains a serious concern, and it may increase even more.

In Washington, the discussions on the status of the economy have centered largely on how vigorously the Government should act to energize the economy. Some urge the Government to use the Federal budget—fiscal policy—and the supply of money and credit—monetary policy—to stimulate the economy. Believing that we are in a state of recession, they argue that Government spending should be increased and the budget deficit enlarged to stimulate the economy.

Others urge that Government spending be restrained and the budget kept in approximate balance, but that the Federal Reserve expand the money supply and bank credit a little faster than has been done in the past. Still others warn of a danger of losing the fight against inflation if the economy is pumped too quickly. Pointing to a slowing down of the economic decline, a cooling of the inflation and the stock market rally, they say economic expansion at this time would be disastrous for the dollar.

This clash of views on national economic policy recalls the quip: "If all the economists in the world were laid end to end, they would not reach a conclusion. From all this debate on economic policy, however, there is emerging a view of the economic outlook for the coming months.

Inflation does seem to be on the wane. Wholesale prices, which were increasing at an annual rate of about 6 percent in January through April, rose at a rate of less than 2 percent in May and June. But, as if to remind us the battle still has not been won, wholesale prices rose in July at the sharpest rate in 6 months.

We must be careful not to raise our hopes too high since many factors are still operating to push prices higher—large wage claims, high prices for basic commodities, the rise of protectionism, the increase in employers' social security taxes, the costs of meeting consumer protection, and the continuing rise in the cost of services.

One economist indicates we are moving out of the "epidemic" phase of inflation, adding that a 4 percent rate of increase in prices by the end of the year seems to be a reasonably good bet. Thus, it appears satisfactory price stability is not likely to be reached, although improvement will be made.

Maybe the best description of inflation is the way one writer put it, "Things are getting worse slower." The rise in the rate of inflation may have halted, but inflation goes on.

The employment picture will not improve, and may even weaken. The economy simply is not going to generate job opportunities fast enough to take care of the new people coming into the labor market. The human costs here are severe.

For the next few several months, the outlook is for anything but a boom. Recovery will not be as quick and as dramatic as many have predicted, and as all of us want. We are not yet out of the least severe, but the most sustained, recession of the post-war period.

At least for the balance of 1970, I have no great optimism. Even if there is a slight upturn in the coming months, I expect economic sluggishness and slack.

We have not really found the solution to the most complex problem of modern economics: how to have sustained high employment of men and resources, and an acceptable rate of economic growth in the economy, along with price stability.

PELLY SUPPORTS PRESIDENT'S VETO

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support President Nixon's veto of the independent offices appropriations and Office of Education bills. The major problems facing America today remain inflation and our high cost of living, and yet, Congress continues to try to force the President to spend money in such amounts that it throws our economy

deeper into debt. To keep up this practice will only lead to either higher prices or an increase in taxes, and I submit that the American public cannot afford either.

I voted for the education bill when it passed the House. One reason was that individually it did not appear excessive. I also personally have always placed a high priority on spending for education. But, in aggregate, now that the Congress has added spending to so many bills, the amounts are far too much. Just these two bills include nearly \$1 billion over the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, we have a revolt against excessive taxation in America today, and until we begin to exercise fiscal responsibility, which must begin here in Congress, there can be no control over inflation.

Our No. 1 priority at this time must be to achieve a healthy economy, expand through peacetime activities, and accomplish reasonable price stability. To achieve this, we must support the President's veto of these two appropriation bills.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that once that veto is allowed to stand, that the appropriate committees would work within the President's request and with particular emphasis on the needs of veterans and our schools and that Congress then would react immediately and responsibly.

AUTO INDUSTRY SHOULD NOT BE MADE "FALL GUY" FOR AIR POLLUTION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee A. Iacocca, president of Ford Motor Co.'s North American automotive operations, makes a great deal of sense, in my opinion, relative to the criticism that has been leveled at the automobile industry in recent times. In an interview carried in this morning's Detroit Free Press, Wednesday, August 12, 1970, Mr. Iacocca, considered the No. 2 man at Ford, touches on a variety of points which many people, particularly the greatest critics of our auto business, often overlook or conveniently forget.

Certainly, we must clean our air and protect it better in the future. In that regard the auto industry must accept its share of responsibility. On the other hand, it should not be made the "fall guy" for our air pollution problems.

The article on Mr. Iacocca follows:

"LET'S NOT GET HYSTERICAL," IACOCCA SAYS
DEARBORN.—"All right," said Lee A. Iacocca, president of Ford Motor Co.'s North American Automotive Operations. "Let's give in to some of the hysterical outbreaks and ban cars—just for one week."

Iacocca paused, a big cigar stuck in the corner of his mouth as he sat in his spacious office here. "Do you realize the mess we'd have if that happened?" he asked.

"Look, this is a car-related economy. This industry employs more people than any other single industry. The radicals say do away with cars. Let me tell you that we'd have a

depression the likes of which you've never seen."

Iacocca, the No. 2 man in the Ford Motor empire, was discussing government intervention in the auto industry and criticism of it. He was clearly perturbed. "The internal combustion engine will be with us for the rest of the century," he said.

"The most promising power plant isn't steam or electric. It's gas turbines, and we'll start making them for industrial use in 1971.

"If anyone is going to obsolete us, we'd better be the ones to do it. Critics say we're holding back, that we have a vested interest in the internal combustion engine. You don't think for a minute that we want an electric company to come up with a good electric car before us, do you?"

"One of the big arguments is that the government put a man on the moon, so why can't automakers clean up their car engines right away. I say, 'yeah, but that was taxpayers' money that put him there.' You've never heard of a company trying to go to the moon, have you?"

"Why the double standards? Why can't the automakers pool their resources on the safety issues. The government says we can't do this, that it would eliminate 'competition.' I ask where the morality is here. Hell, we'd be working to save lives.

"I'm all for social progress. I'd like to see all of America's subways as nice as the ones in Russia. I have morals. Don't get political with me, that's all I ask. Let's not get hysterical.

"When the government sets standards, says meet them and tries to tell you how to do it—well, that's getting pretty close to interrupting the free enterprise system."

Iacocca got up from his chair and began to pace around the office. "Federal intervention is needed in some areas," he continued. "They must set uniform standards for everyone. If we had a pollution-free car for \$50 extra and nobody else had it, do you know what would happen? We wouldn't sell cars.

"Take the 1956 Ford. We saw a lot of people were getting killed on the highway. We loaded the car with safety features and really pushed them. GM pushed a new powerful V-8 engine. We kept saying to the public, 'Look, you don't understand. These features are good for you.' GM picked up all the marbles that year.

"On this pollution issue, nobody has all the facts. A recent University of California study in the Los Angeles area showed that almost 50 percent of pollution was caused by cars, but only 12 percent of the toxicity came from autos.

"We admit we've done things wrong. We're the only ones who can clean things up. The government, with its bureaucracy, will never do it.

"How do you react to adverse unwarranted criticism? Write a letter to the editor every time it appears in an editorial?"

"We've been somewhat quiet about criticism for a long time. I spend more time in Washington than I'd like to. The politician talks to people every day. That's his job. Mine is making automobiles. The public is entitled to hear both sides of the story. We're beginning to pick our shots, and I spend more time in Washington now than I'd like to. If this doesn't work, we'll go to the press."

PSYCHOLOGICAL HABITUATION TO WAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1970, I included in

the RECORD a 1967 study written by Dr. Isidore Ziferstein entitled "Psychological Habituation to War: A Sociopsychological Case Study," originally published in the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry.

Dr. Ziferstein has recently updated that study in a paper entitled "Epilogue—1970." I am inserting this psychological analysis of the factors leading to and maintaining American intervention in Vietnam at this point in the RECORD and recommend it highly to my colleagues:

Epilogue—1970

(By Isidore Ziferstein, M.D.)

The techniques of psychological habituation to the acceptance of war are being continued by the Nixon Administration, as it prepares and implements new "Viet Nams" in Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos, even while claiming that its policy is to get out of Vietnam and all of Indochina.

To illustrate this type of double-think: on July 27, 1969, a front-page article in the Los Angeles Times reported: "[Nixon] the Hawk of Yesteryear, arrived in Manila Saturday on a Dove's wings. The man who, as vice-president, talked about sending American infantry into Indochina as long ago as 1954, now proclaims Asia for the Asians and no more Vietnams."

Yet, two days later, in Bangkok, the same Nixon, shedding his Dove's wings, pledged to the King of Thailand and a world-wide television audience, that the United States would fight shoulder to shoulder with the government of Thailand, to defend it against internal subversion or external aggression.

These exchanges took place against a background of a controversy between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Administration, in which the Administration engaged in some fancy foot-work. On July 7, 1969, Senator J. William Fulbright had revealed the existence of a secret pact between the United States and Thailand which blueprinted how U.S. troops would be used if needed to help the Thai government "resist Communist aggression." At first the Pentagon refused either to affirm or deny the existence of such a pact. Later the Pentagon denied its existence. Still later, the Pentagon declared that what existed was not a pact, but "only a military contingency plan" (such as generals are wont to draw up on a rainy afternoon when they have nothing else to do.) However, the Pentagon refused to let the Senate Foreign Relations Committee see the plan or pact.

It then became known that the document (plan or pact?) had been signed by General Stilwell and by the Thai Minister of Defense. (It should be noted the contingency plans are not signed by leaders of foreign governments. They are drawn up secretly by military planners and held in reserve. This was obviously not "only" a contingency plan, but an international agreement signed by the representatives of two governments.)

Then on July 25, 1969, at the start of his Southeast Asian tour, President Nixon entered the controversy. On July 26, 1969, the Los Angeles Times headlined: "President Denies Secret Pact for Thailand Defense."

On August 22, 1969, the newspapers reported that: "Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said he did not agree with the controversial U.S.-Thailand military contingency plan, adding that 'it does not have the approval of this Administration.'" However, a day later, the newspapers reported that "the State Department sought to dispel the idea that Laird's public disapproval of a military contingency agreement (sic) with Thailand constituted official repudiation of the bilateral understanding." (Note how, for the first time, the term "military contingency

plan" is changed to "military contingency agreement", thus seemingly inadvertently blurring the distinction between a contingency plan and an international agreement, and further habituating the public to acceptance of what-ever-it-is.) "Press officer Robert J. McCloskey said the plan continues in existence, and while he agreed with Laird that it is on the shelf, he said also that it could be taken down at any time necessary." (Apparently without the advice or consent of the Senate.)

Finally on November 8, 1969, the press reported that "Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird capitulated after months of pressure and supplied a copy of the controversial U.S. defense agreement with Thailand to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Fulbright, after reading the text, described it as 'a blue-print for a massive U.S. involvement' in Thailand, adding that 'we're pretty heavily involved there already.'" (And this involvement continues to escalate as American planes, and ground-"advisers" are engaged in counter-guerilla activities in Thailand.)

Senator Stuart Symington has begun to reveal the results of his subcommittee's investigation of several administrations' (including the Nixon administration's) escalation of a clandestine war in Laos. He states:

"As shown by the transcripts, finally released six months after the hearings, the United States has been, and is, participating heavily in a secret war that has cost many American lives and billions of dollars. It is a war conducted far away from any Vietnam interdiction effort along the Ho Chi Minh trails of southern Laos.

From a modest 1962 role as a supplier of equipment to the government of Prince Souvanna Phouma, the United States has now become involved in fighting on a broad scale. Under the veil of what was officially termed "armed reconnaissance," American fighter-bombers, as far back as 1964, began to attack Communist ground targets and troops—and therefore inevitably civilians—in northern Laos; and American air effort in that area has grown continuously since that time.

This air support took quantum leaps during the various bombing pauses over North Vietnam, reaching a peak after the 1968 executive order to cease all raids over that country.

For over five years this secret American war has been going on in northern Laos; but until recently, the only reports on United States activities in that distant land were from representatives of the press who went to the scene in efforts to ascertain the facts.

During the years 1964 to 1969, as the clandestine American role grew steadily, executive branch discussions and presentations to Congress were extremely limited; in some cases they were actually misleading. (Emphasis added—I.Z.)

The subcommittee finally heard testimony on all phases of Laos, including U.S. support of this war; but the American people are still being denied full information because of the continuing refusal of the executive branch to declassify portions of the transcript which we consider should be in the public domain.

Also of grave concern is the fact that this secrecy permitted the Administration to escalate heavily the fighting in that area while it was deescalating, with much public fanfare, the war in South Vietnam. As a result, the American people were misled as to the overall role of the United States in Southeast Asia, whereas the enemy—fully aware of the stepped-up United States bombing—received quite a different impression with respect to the actual intentions of our government." (Los Angeles Times Opinion Section, Sunday, August 9, 1970.)

Now let us analyze briefly the anatomy of public-relations techniques employed in putting across the Cambodian venture. Here,

too, as in the case of our original involvement in the Vietnam war, the involvement was at first seemingly indirect. Late in April, 1970, it became known that our South Vietnamese "allies" were invading, in force, the sanctuaries of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese just inside Cambodia. It was announced that no American combat troops were involved. The next step occurred on April 30, with the announcement by President Nixon of a massive invasion of the sanctuaries by American troops. It was stressed that the purpose of the incursion was solely to destroy the sanctuaries, and that American troops would not venture deeper into Cambodia, nor would they fight to defend or support the Lon Nol government of Cambodia.

A few days later, this was modified to state that American forces would not penetrate Cambodia beyond a line 21.7 miles from the border. This was taken to apply not only to ground forces, but also to air and naval forces. The President also pledged to pull all U.S. troops and advisers out of Cambodia by June 30.

At his May 8 news conference President Nixon was asked whether the South Vietnamese subscribe to the American pullout deadline, and he answered: "No, they do not. I would expect that the South Vietnamese would come out at approximately the same time that we do, because when we come out, our logistical support and air support will also come out." (Emphasis added—I.Z.) However, by May 24, Secretary of State Rogers was indicating to newsmen that South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia will have U.S. support, including air support, after American troops pulled out. (Los Angeles Times, May 25, 1970.)

And by June 24, it was announced that U.S. war-planes struck deep into Cambodian territory to help the Lon Nol government troops break the month-long siege of Kampong Thom. This air-strike was 140 miles inside Cambodia, about 120 miles past the 21.7 limit set by President Nixon. At the same time, a Defense Department spokesman maintained that President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Laird had ruled out United States combat air support for South Vietnamese forces operating more than 21.7 miles inside Cambodia. (Los Angeles Times, June 24, 1970.)

Similar double-talk (or psychological backing and filling) was demonstrated when Herbert Klein, the President's communications director, said that U.S. troops would be pulled out of Cambodia by June 30, but that they would return to Cambodia if necessary. A correspondent asked: "When might they return? Could they return July 1?" Mr. Klein replied, "Could be!"

In his July 1 "conversation" with three TV commentators, President Nixon stated unequivocally: "All Americans are out [of Cambodia]" and "We have no plans to send any advisers into Cambodia." However, on the same day, a dispatch by Jack Foisie in the Los Angeles Times reported:

"But there is evidence that some American military men continue to participate in the Cambodian war. Some are in civilian clothes and most of them commute daily from Vietnam bases and return before dark. They thus may technically fulfill the White House declaration that no American combatants other than aircraft crews remain involved in the Cambodian struggle."

And Foisie reports further: "Although Pentagon spokesmen have denied that U.S. ground crews are present to service these air craft [at the Phnom Penh airport], there is evidence to the contrary reported by correspondents on the scene."

A later report in LIFE (July 10, 1970) datelined Phnom Penh, states:

"The seed of U.S. involvement has taken and is burgeoning with all the apparatus

of military, political and economic aid. . . . At the Phnom Penh airport six Westerners are loading an olive-green truck with a large olive-green container. They wear civilian clothes, but U.S. combat boots show beneath their trousers. Short haircuts and the nice moves of the man trying to hide his walkie-talkie indicate the imminent surfacing of more American presence in Cambodia. Fresh-sprayed paint shrouds every official marking but one on the truck door. It reads, 'For Official Use Only'. Embarrassed and close-mouthed, two of the party concede they are U.S. airmen, in Phnom Penh—way beyond the 21.7 mile limit—to install 'navigational equipment'. . . . The war is settling in for a long stay."

A report by Arthur J. Dommen, correspondent of the L. A. Times, datelined Phnom Penh July 25, states that "the war in Cambodia takes on some of the aspects of the war in Vietnam in late 1964 and early 1965." Meanwhile, as more and more reports began to appear that American Phantom jets were flying close support for Cambodian government troops, napalming, bombing, and strafing the anti-Lon Nol forces, American military spokesmen resumed their psychological backing and filling. On August 4, a U.S. spokesman in Saigon, when asked about these reports, said, "We have no reports on that. The only missions we fly are interdiction missions." The L. A. Times comments, "He was referring to announced U.S. policy of confining American raids in Cambodia to attacks on enemy supply lines and bases." However, the very next day, the L. A. Times reported that "American officials in Saigon confirmed that the U.S. Air Force is answering a Cambodian request for help by sending up to fifty fighter-bombers on daily raids in Cambodia." The paper added that "the President's stated policy of limiting air missions to interdiction seemed to rule out direct air support for Cambodian forces, but was ambiguous enough to allow a wide latitude of interpretation by U.S. field commanders." Two days later, August 7, the L. A. Times reported that "Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird denied that American war planes are flying close support for Cambodian troops fighting North Vietnamese." The following day, August 8, the L. A. Times reported further on Laird's interpretation of "the Administration's flexible definition of interdiction." The report states, "Laird, who makes a strong effort to pursue a policy of candor, convinced no-one with his exercise in semantics. . . . When pressed to explain how bombing 300 yards in front of troops, under control of a forward air-controller in a light plane, could be called interdiction, Laird ventured somewhat lamely: 'It depends on what you refer to as interdiction.'" (Shades of Humpty-Dumpty's advising Alice that "When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean. . . .")

The press-report continues, "In Saigon the U.S. command was more candid. Military officials there, according to United Press International, said the decision was to provide air support, but to call it interdiction. That way, they said, they could comply with Mr. Nixon's directives."

Senator Mike Mansfield commented prophetically, "If this continues, it could mean that we will have a repetition of what happened in Vietnam; namely, that first we will provide air-support, then send advisers, then deploy troops, and thus get into a full-fledged war."

As one reads these reports, he gets a feeling of déjà-vu. The same news-management, the same manipulation and confusion of public opinion by double-talk and psychological backing and filling, that took place over the years in the Vietnam adventure, is now being repeated in Cambodia. And there is grave danger that at some point Mr. Nixon and his military advisers will decide that American public opinion is sufficiently confused,

divided, polarized, and therefore helpless, to warrant an all-out massive effort to achieve a military victory.

There is reason to fear that, just as the Eisenhower administration made a firm decision, unbeknownst to the American people, as far back as March, 1954, that the United States would intervene in the war in Indochina, if that were considered necessary to prevent the loss of Indochina to the communists, so the Nixon administration may have decided to extend the war into Cambodia and Thailand, and to score a knock-out blow against "Communist subversion" in all of Southeast Asia, using nuclear weapons if necessary. While Nixon has officially withdrawn American ground forces from Cambodia, he is encouraging Thailand to intervene. A dispatch from Bangkok reports that "both Thai and U.S. officials here said last week that the U.S. appears to have a clear obligation to come to the aid of Thailand if Bangkok's efforts to support the Lon Nol government provoke attack by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces. A high American official said he believed the United States would act under such circumstances." (L.A. Times, August 9, 1970.) (The Nixon administration seems to be committed to a policy of provoking the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong, and thus widening the war.)

The use of nuclear weapons by the U.S. is a real, and fearsome, possibility. We have already used these weapons in one war. Statements over the years by various government figures, including former President Eisenhower, show that we rely heavily on the nuclear weapons as our chief "persuader." And recent disclosures by Senator Stuart Symington are most disquieting. He reports that "the executive branch refuses to disclose [even] to proper committees of the Senate, full details about the vast proliferation of nuclear weapons that we have distributed all over the globe." (Los Angeles Times Opinion Section, August 9, 1970.)

All these techniques and all these events continue to take their toll of the emotional health of the American people. It was this fact that moved the American Psychoanalytic Association, which had always carefully refrained from taking any political position, to protest the extension of the war into Cambodia and to state:

"At a time when this country's leadership has stated a commitment to disengagement from Vietnam, we are suddenly and without warning confronted with an extension of military involvement. This has resulted in a dramatic increase in anxiety, turbulence and conflict, involving crucial segments of our population."

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following message taken from the editorial page of a fine community newspaper in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the New Daily Messenger of Homestead, Pa.

Mr. Earle V. Wittpenn, editor of the Messenger, printed a message he discovered had been posted in Pvt. John Naujokitis Post 373, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Homestead, by the post trustee, Charles Black.

In view of the rising controversy over mandated quotas for foreign imports

which are severely damaging various domestic industries, I am inserting the message in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

An American is a man who drives home in a German car from a French restaurant and a Swedish movie; slips off his Hong Kong suit and Italian shoes and puts on an English robe and Mexican slippers. He sips Brazilian coffee from Red China while sitting on Danish furniture. He then decides to write his Congressman, using Canadian paper and with a Japanese pen and India ink, demanding the Congressman do something about all the gold leaving this country, the U.S.A.

Mr. Speaker, the definition may be considered humorous, but the message is the kind of thing that gets my Irish up—and I am Slavic.

WE CAN'T RISK U.S. SECURITY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, all too much we are hearing today from those not only in the Congress, but outside, who want to cut down on the national defense of this country. Our country's defense posture is the basis for the security of the free world.

Insofar as I am concerned, we are going to keep this country at a level of defense that can meet any emergency from any foreign aggressor.

I am delighted to append an excellent article from the News-Gazette of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., of Thursday, August 6, titled, "We Can't Risk U.S. Security." This editorial sets the problem out so completely and concisely that there can be no misunderstanding of what is now happening among certain people in this country who do not regard national defense as a No. 1 problem. It follows:

WE CAN'T RISK U.S. SECURITY

Self-preservation is the most basic natural law of the human and animal worlds. Some members of Congress who like to think of themselves as sophisticates or intellectuals either believe this law has been repealed or no longer is of any consequence.

They are mistaken. Feeding their egos on the discontentment surrounding the Vietnam war, these men—many of them in the Senate—have adopted a neo-isolationist stance on the grounds that "human values" deserve higher priority than defense in a free society.

What they fail to realize is that a free society cannot exist in a world containing a number of totalitarian powers unless its defenses are adequate. While they are chipping away at defense spending wherever they can find it, the Soviet Union—to name only one of the totalitarian states—is expanding its military capabilities in a manner which could threaten this nation's existence as a free society.

Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, father of the U.S. Navy's nuclear force, has been as critical of the defense establishment as any man, but always with a view toward improving the nation's defenses. Noting that Soviet ballistic missile subs now patrol both U.S. coasts, presumably with their missiles zeroed in on American cities, Adm. Rickover said:

"The Soviets are capable of starting tomorrow the biggest war there has ever been and frankly I am not confident of the outcome."

These sentiments have been echoed in recent days by Dr. Edward Teller, the nuclear physicist, and Sen. John Stennis, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In case one chooses to ignore their warnings, there is the gloating of Adm. Sergei Gorshkov, commander of the Soviet navy, who boasts his nuclear submarines have "bound the hands" of the United States.

Defense spending has been reduced in the last year, and it can be cut more in the years ahead as the Vietnam operation is phased out. But only a fool would risk the future security of the nation because of an impatient or distorted view of defense in an uncertain world.

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record, resolution No. 7 adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners at their 37th annual meeting this year. This association represents commissioners from the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The resolution expresses the opposition of the association to Reorganization Plan No. 4.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 7: REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4—U.S. GOVERNMENT

Whereas, the Administration's Reorganization Plan No. 4 would transfer the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the marine game fish research program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to the Department of Commerce; and

Whereas, it also is proposed that the oceanic portion of the anadromous fisheries program be transferred to the Department of Commerce; and

Whereas, the reproductive success or failure of these anadromous fish will be determined within inland waters and within estuaries; and

Whereas, the Department of Commerce is an agency having limited biological research capability; and

Whereas, it is the opinion of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that it would be preferable to establish a broad scope department which would include the present Department of the Interior as its nucleus;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at their 37th Annual Meeting this first day of August, 1970, at the International Inn in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, opposes Reorganization Plan No. 4 and urges the Congress to reject this reorganization proposal; and

Be it further resolved that the President be urged to establish a Department of Natural Resources which would include the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the civil functions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in addition to the Department of the Interior bureaus.

INFLATION ALERT IS ONLY A FIRST STEP

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the administration released a lengthy "alert" that included a comprehensive breakdown of price and wage increases which have recently added fuel to our inflationary fires. The lengthy document, long overdue, detailed critical areas of economic trouble, including rising transportation, trucking, and home heating and power costs that have up to now not been visible in the published indexes.

The administration and the Council of Economic Advisers are to be credited with spotlighting these pressing areas of inflation. But, as the Washington Post's respected business and financial editor, Hobart Rowen, observes in yesterday's issue, this is only a first step. It is neither a corrective action nor a preventive measure, and does nothing more than put the Nation on notice of past defeats in the battle on inflation.

I would once again urge the administration to institute tough Federal guidelines to limit price and wage increases, as well as establish selective controls on credit. The sad realities of the present inflationary economy as outlined by the administration's alert are ample evidence that these guideposts are needed now. The 0.5 percent in the July wholesale price is not encouraging.

The recent alert, then, is at least a hesitant step in the right direction. But like Rowen, I am concerned that the administration will consider the job done, and not act forcefully from its own greater awareness of the dangerous trend that continues to carry the economy toward serious disruption. In my judgment, failure to act now that the administration has sounded its own alert would constitute gross irresponsibility.

Rowen's article follows:

INFLATION "ALERT" IS FINE AS A START

(By Hobart Rowen)

Mr. Nixon's "inflation alert" of last Saturday is the best evidence so far that what this country needs is a stronger wage-price policy to curb inflationary pressures that aren't being halted by other government measures.

First, let it be said that the administration deserves a good deal of credit for publishing the "alert," which included a straightaway rundown of price and wages increases that have gotten out of hand.

There were some among Mr. Nixon's advisers who would have preferred to release a long academic history of the causes of inflation, and let it go at that. But the Council of Economic Advisers put together, as well, a summary of the most pressing areas of current inflationary pressure, and the entire document prepared for the new Commission on Productivity was published.

Arm-twisting and criticism by the President was side-stepped. But there didn't have to be any name-calling: the essential story came through. And that is, as everybody knew, that some unions have gotten wage in-

creases that exceed a reasonable level; and some industries are raising prices beyond any measure required by their costs. The question now becomes what, if anything, Mr. Nixon proposes to do about these situations beyond CEA Chairman Paul McCracken's prayerful hope that in some "inscrutable way," things will right themselves.

It is significant that the "alert" (which is probably a bad name for the exercise) did not simply discuss past price rises. That would have been, as Prof. Robert Solow once suggested, not much more of a clue to the future than an old weather report. Instead, the long and serious document detailed areas of incipient trouble, including rising transportation, trucking, and home heating and power costs that haven't yet been fully reflected in the published indexes.

Precisely as McCracken suggested, the report lifted "the level of visibility on prices and costs in these areas." It was a wholly worthwhile educational process, particularly the detailed discussion of inflated consumer bills for gas and electric power.

It should be a shock for the public to learn that the price of coal has gone up 35 percent this year, and home heating oils 25 percent. And since power companies must borrow heavily to finance expansion, the 21.5 percent boost in interest rates last year is another factor contributing to higher electric utility bills. (Remember the old conventional wisdom that high interest rates would control inflation?)

But a responsible government must do more than point out what is happening; that is a good first step, but it is not enough.

By the same token, it is fair to observe that price problems in the service area—like the recent boost in bus fares in Washington—are the toughest to cope with although a strong and determined government could find ways of alleviating the situation, at least for low income groups.

In the other areas cited—rising coal and electric power costs, higher natural gas prices, advances in rubber tire and cigarette prices—government policy of a broad nature could more effectively protect the consumer. What is needed is a new attitude on the part of regulatory agencies whose instincts are normally to protect industry's profit margins first and the consuming public's needs second (if at all); in addition, stronger measures are needed to deal with industries like rubber tire producers and unions such as the Teamsters which call their own shots on prices and wages without any government interference.

Similar problems exist in the construction industry, and these—because the local unions have so much autonomy—are undoubtedly difficult to cope with.

But an effort needs to be made, shucking off the wistful belief that prices and wages are set in the spirit of free competitive enterprise, and that nothing, therefore—even a raging inflation—should be allowed to interfere with the "market place" process.

This is utter nonsense, and no better proof has been offered than the President's own report. Take the rubber tire example: during April and May, the union negotiated with the major rubber companies for a 7 to 8 percent hourly increase in wages for a three-year period.

The most important single product group is tires and tubes, and here, productivity has been rising steadily, at an average of 5.1 percent during the 1960s. Productivity is a simple measure of labor efficiency; in tires and tubes, it means that a tire worker on the average has been turning out 5.1 percent more goods per hour. Thus, his compensation can increase by about the same amount without raising prices.

Indeed, in the best of all free enterprise worlds, if wages did not increase in the face of such a gain in productivity, the industry would reduce prices and still maintain its profit margins.

But back to the real world: the 7 to 8 per cent boost in tire worker compensation, being greater than the productivity gain means a boost of 2 per cent or perhaps 3 per cent in unit labor costs. But because labor compensation represents only 30 per cent of the value of the tires, the wage hike translates into only 1 per cent in production costs. And what did the companies do? They announced in June and July a 5 per cent hike in replacement tire prices.

The worry here is that having turned out a lengthy "alert" with lots of history and basic economics, Mr. Nixon's inflation-watchers may consider the job done. There was no specific timetable for the next "alert." But one should come soon, and be more specific. As Maurice Mann, scheduled to be George Shultz's economic aide, said in a speech back in June, "The economy can't endure the types of excessive wage and price increases we've seen recently."

VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that vocational-technical education serves an essential role in our rapidly changing society. It offers alternatives to the purely college preparatory curriculum, and offers a means for keeping in step with the changes in labor market needs of today and tomorrow. It also serves to relate learning to reality, and vocational training produces self-sufficient, able, and productive citizens.

In my own congressional district in Massachusetts, the city of Lowell and the towns of Dracut, Dunstable, and Tyngsborough have joined together in planning the Greater Lowell Regional Vocational-Technical School which promises to be one of the Nation's finest examples of vocational education. Members of the school committee for this school have worked hard and long in planning, organizing, and preparing the school's innovative curriculum. Serving on the original school committee from the town of Dracut were: Helen B. Feeney, Frank J. Krawcyk, and Ernest A. Mercier; from the town of Dunstable were: James C. Dadoly, Frank Hanchett, and Lois A. Starbird; from the city of Lowell were: George D. Kouloheras, Patrick J. Mogan, and Paul J. Robinson; and from the town of Tyngsborough were: Harold O. Bell, Rupert E. Stangroom, and Francis X. Sullivan. Present members of the Greater Lowell Regional Vocational-Technical School Committee who are laying the groundwork for the actual construction of the school are: Harold O. Bell of Tyngsborough, chairman; George Gath of Lowell, vice chairman; Helen B. Feeney of Dracut, secretary, Ernest A. Mercier of

Dracut; Frank Hanchett of Dunstable; and Paul J. Robinson, Clement McDonough, and Daniel Kane of Lowell. The time, effort, and energy these men and women have devoted over the past months to the school is worthy of special recognition and praise. Their work has resulted in a new curriculum that, as it pointed out in the following editorial in the Lowell Sun for July 29, 1970, is designed to give the vocational student an education to be proud of—an education that is not a dead end:

THE REGIONAL SCHOOL

The Greater Lowell regional school committee last week swallowed a bitter pill and announced its proposed vocational school will cost the region's taxpayers \$18 million and maybe more.

But the committee has a good product to sell for that \$18 million—a new curriculum that gives the vocational student an education to be proud of, an education that is not a dead-end.

The individualized program, heralded by State Commissioner of Education Neil V. Sullivan, gives the student a chance to make progress on his own terms and at his own speed, in a wide variety of professions. He can get the theoretical background to get retraining later on in his working career, or to go on to college.

The vocational student, too often the low man on a rigid school success scale, has been forgotten in most schools over the years, forced into a "trade training" program that can not be called education, if education is a broadening of one's capacity to learn by oneself.

Under the curriculum of the regional district, written for the committee by the Arthur D. Little Co., the vocational student will have the theory behind his trade—the basic skills in English, mathematics and the humanities to give him an education as an individual, a sensitivity for the issues he will face as a member of the community.

The vocational student too often has been forgotten in the expanded curriculum and humanities program, existing for a decade with his training classes and enough of the applied academics to have him figure the area of a piece of plywood and little more.

In the new school, slated to open its doors to 550 of its 2,000 students in 1972, the vocational student will develop a responsibility for his own educational program under the individualized curriculum—and with that responsibility, be treated as an adult controlling his own destiny instead of being led down a minutely detailed educational path. He will have a stake in determining his own future and that is important for a sense of self-pride, a sense of direction in a confusing outside world.

The regional committee has worked hard—in its selection of the Arthur D. Little Co. to write its curriculum and in its defense of that curriculum in the face of criticism from more traditional educators who fear the loose organization of the school.

The committee has worked to get the innovative curriculum approved by the state Department of Education and superintendent-director Robert R. Reeder has worked closely with the region's superintendents to see that that curriculum will be adopted in a smooth, orderly fashion.

Next spring, after the architects complete plans for the buildings, the voters of Lowell, Dracut, Tyngsboro and Dunstable will give a final verdict on the first phase of the regional school's building program. We hope those voters will recognize the regional school as a much-needed shot in the arm for an antiquated Lowell school system.

CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT STAVE MERITED TO HELP RETURNING SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, a program of considerable merit has been brought to my attention by a constituent, Mr. Luther Klosterman, of Fort Washington, Pa., a World War I veteran who is active in the American Legion. Mr. Klosterman has championed the cause of the veteran through his service as a Legionnaire on the local, district, State, and national levels.

The program, in draft proposal, is titled Project STAVE—Strengthening the American Veteran Educationally—and is the creation of Miss Laura M. Trexler, an education program specialist in the U.S. Office of Education.

Miss Trexler, a former resident of Pottstown in my congressional district, is an educator who served in the Naval Reserve during World War II as a WAVE education and program officer. In 1949, she organized and also served as the first Post commander of the Harriet L. Kulp Post No. 759 of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania. She was commander of this women's post for two terms and has been active on the local, district, State, and national levels of the American Legion.

As the education officer at the Naval Training Center in San Diego from 1946-47, Miss Trexler was responsible for initiation of a coordinated education program serving the three commands on the base—the Recruit Training Command, the Service School Command, and the Ship's Company.

Capt. E. R. Durgin, USN, then assistant chief of naval personnel, in a communication to the commander of the U.S. Naval Training Center at San Diego, lauded the educational program for which Miss Trexler was responsible. She also had additional responsibilities for the Demobilization—Separation—Center at the Naval Training Center.

I cite this background information to demonstrate Miss Trexler's understanding, interest, commitment, and experience in serving the serviceman and veterans. She has the comprehension and insights into the problems of returning servicemen as well as the practical knowledge for making programs work.

USE EXISTING FACILITIES

Project STAVE is envisioned as a program that would coordinate all existing facilities of the Federal, State, and local governments into a cohesive plan to assist returning servicemen to return to civilian life, either in a working capacity or as students in educational institutions. I think that it should be one of the priorities of the U.S. Office of Education in compliance with sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 11185, dated October 6, 1964.

Under Project STAVE, the U.S. Office

of Education would provide the leadership and cooperation with Health, Education, and Welfare, and other governmental and professional organizations in integrating and coordinating the proposed services. This would offer both vertical and horizontal direction, and dissemination on the Federal, State, and local levels.

The existing agencies such as the appropriate State education agency and the local school systems and their staffs would be the local base to establish the individual personal contact and interest in each serviceman. His specific problem or concern would be the link between him and the respective agencies.

In a concerted effort to assist the returning serviceman, local school personnel would generate community interest through service, fraternal, and local organizations. The expertise of each member of the community would be on call to work for Federal, State, and local agencies in providing these services. They would assist in job identification and placement, work-study programs, apprenticeship training, vocational, technical, trade school, junior college or 4-year college programs.

Under the program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education through its regional offices and the chief State school officer in each State would designate a single point of contact within each State education office to serve as a clearing house for the contact and follow through with each returning serviceman and veteran on the local level. The designated officer would have the responsibility to give leadership, replicate the national services or model on the State level, and maintain liaison with each local education agency.

TARGET POPULATION

These services would be aimed primarily at returning servicemen. Not only do they merit this assistance, but they represent a national investment with the capability to help meet our manpower needs. A concerted effort is required to relate service experience to the work world and to provide the occupational and vocational opportunities available to the veteran in his immediate area of residence.

Local community involvement organized by the local education agency would utilize individual resources available. It would extend and reinforce previous services of the Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Labor. It would integrate and continue involvement of these agencies, and fraternal and service organizations.

In advancing this program, Miss Trexler has expressed concern about the debriefing, high unemployment, and limited counseling opportunities available for the Vietnam veterans. She has noted that many are young and from economically disadvantaged families. Many have limited access and experience in educational and career counseling. While her plan is relatively simple, it has many good psychological, sociological, and economic ramifications.

Project STAVE proposes that the Department of Defense make available to

all returning servicemen a short form to be completed in duplicate which would be mailed to the State and local educational agency in the area to where the veteran will return on his discharge. The local school administrator would designate a staff member, usually a counselor, to contact the returning serviceman immediately on his return to civilian life. This person would encourage the veteran to explore all possibilities for employment or education. He would assist the veteran in contracting the Veterans' Administration, State employment service, and fraternal and veterans groups which could help him.

Under this plan, the staff member and local school administration would become the catalyst for community involvement, concern, and commitment. The community, as a cooperative, would assume obligations and responsibilities for assimilating the veteran and his family into the mainstream of life.

With projected figures of 1 million returning servicemen in fiscal 1971 and between 1.3 and 1.5 million in fiscal 1972, it is imperative that this Nation develop a program of this nature. It also is important that sufficient leadtime be allowed so the program can be made vital and operational.

Dynamic and aggressive leadership in the Office of Education projected through the State education agency to the local levels would establish the local education agency as the catalyst.

Because of the importance of this approach and the large number of returning servicemen, I would like to see the Office of Education initiate, at the very least, a pilot project based on Project STAVE. I will be glad to lend my assistance.

In addition, I am most pleased that this program has been generated by an educator within the Office of Education. It is encouraging to know that within the bureaucratic ranks of Washington that there are concerned and committed individuals who recognize a void and move to fill it with a program conceived and developed on their own time and with their own initiative. I am glad that Mr. Klosterman brought Miss Trexler's program to my attention and that she was kind enough to provide me with this material.

I want to encourage the Commissioner of Education to mount and support a pilot project as the beginning to what hopefully will evolve as a practical and effective program to serve the returning serviceman whose service to all of us cannot be measured in words alone, but should be measured in deeds to him.

BERLIN WALL

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago today, the world woke up to the news that Soviet troops in Berlin had choked off access to and from their sector, walling in 1½ million East Berliners.

Our initial reaction was one of anger

and concern but emotions soon cooled, and most of us turned our attentions to other matters. But for the Berliners who live and work in the sector every day of their lives, the wall remains a very real and immediate concern. To us, the wall may seem more like a symbol, tucked away in a corner of our minds, but we must not forget those who live with its reality.

Thousands of East Berliners fled the sector before the construction of the wall, and thousands more are now held there against their will. Let us remember them on this day, commending their courage, and reminding them of our support.

All of us look forward to the day when a unified Germany will again take its rightful place in the family of nations, and all of us respect the rights of Berliners to share in that experience.

Let us never allow time and distance to remove the tragedy of the Berlin Wall from our memories. When President Kennedy associated himself with that spirit, saying, "I am a Berliner," he spoke for freedom-loving Americans.

HERMAN KENIN

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's cultural resources have been diminished with the recent death on July 21 of Herman Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians. Mr. Kenin was a familiar and respected figure in the music industry and the labor movement.

He was raised in a labor family and became a professional musician while attending Reed College in Oregon. After attaining his law degree at Northwestern College of Law, Herman Kenin was faced with a difficult career decision over whether to continue with his music—by this time he had his own band—or practice law. He opted for the legal profession, but, like many others, was loathe to sever his ties completely with the music world. He kept his membership with the musicians and over the years rose from local office to be elected national president in 1958, a post to which he was re-elected in each of the 12 succeeding years.

Herman Kenin's experiences in the 300,000-member union, which includes members of symphony orchestras as well as popular music groups, led him to become a forceful proponent of Government support for our cultural institutions. He and his union played a major role as in advocating the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities and have been among its strongest supporters ever since.

It was my good fortune to know Herman Kenin as a resident of my State of Connecticut, as a major contributor to the building of a constructive relationship between the arts and our National Government, and as a good friend for many years.

My sympathies go out to his wife, Maxine, and their two sons, James and David